N o r t h w e s t e r n   U n i v e r s i t y

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting
of
May 5, 2009

The University Senate held its second meeting of the 2008–09 year on May 5 in Swift 107 on the Evanston Campus. GFC Chair Laurie Zoloth called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

I. Zoloth began the meeting by introducing herself and other members of the General Faculty Committee. She then explained some of the context of her involvement with the GFC and her curiosity about faculty lack of interest in meetings of the University Senate. The intervention she designed with others in the GFC has been based upon a perception that faculty members are insufficiently aware of the Senate and the GFC or the possibility of a town hall type of meeting. Faculty governance is a way to operate as a community. It is difficult for a medieval type of institution to remain committed to the transparency that Northwestern needs, she said. Besides the need for one Northwestern, we need a Northwestern in which we feel a sense of ownership and have a collegiality in which to put the resultant good will to work.

The purpose of the present meeting is to discuss three issues: the University economy, ownership of the research we do, and the question of University governance.

II. Provost Dan Linzer expressed his pleasure at seeing an unusually large turnout on both campuses for a meeting of the Senate. He noted that today was President Henry Bienen's 70th birthday, which he is celebrating in India, having come from meetings in Doha and Qatar. Linzer asked the Faculty to join him in wishing President Bienen a happy birthday.

He then offered his insights into Northwestern's budget based upon information collected by James Hurley, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning. Among the various sources of University revenue is grant income. Jay Walsh and his Office for Research have been processing hundreds of grants that have come in as the result of the Stimulus Bill, which has created new opportunities for the faculty. Budget planning works over a three-year cycle which must take account of recurring commitments. In order to avoid spending more than we have, planners must make difficult guesses about variables such as endowment growth, student numbers, financial aid needs, and indirect cost income. They try to keep errors on the conservative side, placing surpluses into reserves just as schools, departments, programs, and individual discretionary funds need to do. These reserves can then be used to fund past one-time commitments for construction and renovation projects, setup funds for new faculty, one-time investments, or seed funds for new projects. Contingency funds are built into the budget for unforseen costs and revenue shortfalls so it will not be necessary to cut positions as some of our peer institutions have done. Contingencies are also built in to the non-recurring budget, which pays for capital projects. It this planning goes as hoped, we are not forced to spend to the edge of our budget. If there are any negative variants in our model, we may go over the edge and be forced into drastic reductions. Contingencies are thus set at roughly 3% of the overall budget, which is about $1.5 billion. For the current fiscal year it is estimated that we will err on the positive side of what we have committed and the consequent residuals will be available for current projects such as the completion of Silverman Hall, the renovation of Harris Hall, completing payments for the renovation of Annie May Swift, or adding intercampus communications in the Psychology Department and Wieboldt Hall.

One of the reasons for the relative good health of the Northwestern budget has been the functioning of our endowments to pay for recurring commitments. Northwestern receives about 18% of our operating budget from endowment income. Though endowment appears in reports as a single number, most of our endowments are situated in the University's different schools. A research endowment in the Medical School cannot legally be tapped to fund a performance in the Theater program. Government expectations that a certain fixed percentage of the overall University endowment should be used for financial aid cannot be met within the restrictions set by donors, as legislators have now acknowledged. Paradoxically, because our operating budget is less reliant upon endowment than many of our peers, we have been less affected by endowment shrinkage. Examples of institutions that rely on endowment for 50% of their annual budget show them operating much closer to the edge where damaging cuts must be made. Harvard, for example, plans to reduce its staff by 1600 people. Northwestern, by contrast, will make no staff reductions. We have also been able to supplement traditional sources of income with revenue from Lyrica, the medication developed at Northwestern and distributed by Pfizer. 100% of the dollars received from Lyrica royalties have gone into endowment. In December 2007 we sold off a large piece of the future revenue to a company that was expecting to make more money on future royalties than by spending the money up front. We put the proceeds of that sale into endowment in January–March 2008. In September the endowment fell slightly, but in the long term it was still a good fit, supporting ongoing needs. We have developed much better relationships with most of our hospital partners and disaffiliated with another. Clinical revenues are strong: we do not own any of our hospitals, which are instead partners, but they want to reinvest in our academic mission because the quality of our academic medical center contributes to the success of the hospitals. More than 60% of the University's budget is in the medical center, not including the hospitals. One of the difficulties in comparing budgets and endowments is that many universities own their hospitals, whose endowments and budgets are reported in the university figures. For example, 40% of the University of Michigan's reported endowment actually belongs to its hospital.

Northwestern also borrows less money to pay its long-range bills, living more within our means than many of our peer institutions. When we borrow money, often for long-term projects such as buildings, we take out bonds and pay them off over 20–25 years. Consequently, our debt load is lower. We are constantly comparing notes with other institutions: James Hurley of Budget and Planning and Eugene Sunshine of Business and Finance compare notes with their colleagues in other institutions. The resulting comparative tables show changes they have made; endowment payout has kept flat at Northwestern, not decreasing the revenue from this source. Though the size of our endowment has decreased, the same revenue is available to spend. It will be a challenge to sustain that performance in future years. Comparisons of salary pools at other institutions such as Brown, Berkeley, Carnegie Mellon, Cornell, Duke, Dartmouth, Harvard, Hopkins, MIT, Miami, NYU, Princeton, Rochester, Stanford, Syracuse, and Williams tell the story. All have announced salary freezes or reductions. We have not had to do that.

We are seeing damage: philanthropy, not surprisingly, is down. Not only do people have less money, but larger gifts are often made by signing over stock that has appreciated, saving the owner from liability for capital gains tax while the University gets the benefit of the appreciated stock. But when the stock has not appreciated, owners are less motivated to make that gift. Cash gifts suffer from reduced cash flow: that affects us because a portion of our operating budget in departments and schools relies upon such cash gifts. Another source of cash is tuition; while enrollments are higher or constant, tuition dollars may not go as far because our no-loan program and our loan cap program for undergraduates entail a greater discounting of tuition, and families are needier. A larger number of students are applying for financial aid and they are requesting higher amounts. We have therefore increased our financial aid budget by about 10% for the incoming class. The number of students qualifying for Pell Grants, first-time college students in their families, students from Chicago public schools, have all gone up significantly for next year. As a result, a large piece of our budget is going into financial aid because one of our most important commitments is access to education independent of means. Need-blind admissions and meeting full financial need of students accepted into Northwestern are a part of that commitment.

One of our most pressing challenges in the present economy is to find the necessary cash to meet commitments. We invest money in the endowment, which is a hugely complex pot of investments in multiple areas such as real estate. It is difficult to sell off a parcel of land to pay utility bills or salaries when real estate is not liquid. U.S. Stocks, which do belong to a liquid category, are at a low level, and anyone who sells now will lose out on their later appreciation. Available cash, which is liquidity, comes from tuition which is insufficient to meet month-by-month needs. Each month, the endowment needs to generate $23 million cash to pay the bills. Northwestern's prudent management of budgets and endowments has made it possible to minimize borrowing. As of last August, the endowment was worth about $7.4 billion; at present, its value is about $5.1. The loss of $2.3 billion is hard to ignore. With a spending rate of about 5%, that is roughly $110 million in our budget for which we do not have revenue. We therefore ask what we can do more efficiently. Our FY 2009 return is down 25%. We borrow money, we have tuition, we cut costs, we reduce our long-term commitments, and we try not to overspend. We have created incentives for the deans to save and have the resulting money available over the next few years. Unless the economy rebounds, FY '11 will find us in dire straits. Money unspent in FY '09 will shore up our budget in FY '10. Savings from not filling vacancies have yielded about $13 million throughout the University. For the tuition increase, we initially modeled in a larger number; but given the state of the economy and the needs for financial aid, that increase has been trimmed. This is the lowest tuition increase we have had in more than twenty years. The 3.5% increase has been offset by a financial aid increase of 10%. The inflation index, normally estimated at 2%, is not being given this year and is replaced by a 3% reduction in non-salary programmatic costs. Salary pool increments will be positive but small, with some allowance for merit increases. The budget process is normally tied in with strategic planning, with additional funds allocated for that purpose. This year no additional funds will be allocated. No University-wide personnel reductions are planned; existing faculty lines that are now vacant have had searches approved where there is a request to do so in the hiring plan. This is also expected in FY '10. Some building and renovation plans have been cut back. We are still anticipating a balanced budget for FY '10.

In faculty searches, we have asked the deans to prioritize. The greatest reductions have been in incremental positions where certain departments or fields had been slated for growth. We would rather support the people who are here than add new mouths to feed. Searches that were already under way or had become recommendations or offers have been funded, resulting in some incremental hiring this year. The Administration has tried to rein in expectations for faculty setups in the various schools, which is especially difficult in the sciences and engineering.

James Hurley commented that the measures displayed on-screen are budget containment ideas that have not been prescribed by the University; they are ideas from the schools and vice presidential areas. The only actual prescription for next year is the 3% reduction in non-salary funds and approved but unfilled positions, mostly in staff, from previous budget cycles.

In response to a question from the floor, Linzer explained that reviews of course rotations entail less frequent offerings of courses with low enrollments, entailing cutbacks in hiring of adjunct teachers. The single biggest category of discretionary spending in Weinberg during Linzer's tenure as dean was replacement teaching. In better times this category goes unquestioned. Nelson Sprusten asked about the Athletic Department: is it being asked to reduce spending in the same way as other parts of the University? Because the Athletic Department reports to the President rather than the Provost, Linzer was unsure of the athletic budget; but James Hurley said that they are taking the same base 3% reduction on their non-salary line as the rest of the community. Christine Froula asked about increased use of Lecturers in respect to the ratio of Lecturers to tenured faculty. The Provost noted that Lecturer faculty have higher teaching loads and lower salaries, which makes possible more undergraduate course offerings per dollar with Lecturer faculty. Tenure-line faculty are also tasked with the scholarly work of their disciplines and the training of graduate students. The central administration has not prescribed anything to the schools about positions. No tenure-track lines have been taken away and few incremental lines that would require new funding have been added. Lecturer-level appointments are determined at the school level, and the deans' plans are not yet fully known. Some adjunct teaching on a course-by-course level has been assigned to ongoing Lecturer faculty to sustain an ongoing curriculum. Overall, there is no planned change in the ratio of Lecturer to tenure-track faculty. William Ocasio asked how administrative salaries have been affected by changes in the economy of the University. Linzer replied that the salary pool applies to all units including the Administration. When the President's salary is reported, more than half is deferred income because he has been here fifteen years. Money not taken as his salary is invested alongside the endowment; until last year, it has grown rather well. The salary reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education was before the endowments fell. Also factored into the presidential income is the presidential house. The imputed income has to be reported as if he owned the house. All of these benefits are factored into the total. The amount of cash paid is a very different number. A question from the Chicago campus concerned external funding, which is depended upon for research programs and a portion of salary. Up until the operation of the federal stimulus package, these grants have been increasingly difficult to win. The pay line at the National Institutes of Health, for example, had fallen in many areas below 10% so that more than 90% of proposals were not being funded. What contingencies exist in the University to help make up that funding gap? Linzer answered that there is some funding, but to a small degree. Some modest bridging funds can be provided if there is some expectation that the funding will be renewed. But the extent of the bridge is very limited. Joseph Hupp remarked that the relative stability of Northwestern's hiring plans give us a large competitive advantage. Linzer made a distinction between lines and hiring plans: plans to fill positions that have previously been filled remain undisturbed. Those that would add new positions have been selectively filled. Many other schools have canceled searches, so in the junior ranks especially Northwestern faces little competition in some fields. We have a big advantage in senior recruitment, especially against state universities that are extremely hard hit by budgets over a number of years.

Laurie Zoloth remarked by way of closing this part of the meeting that if we have to cut, we should save the staff. These people are relatively underpaid, and deserve the support of the faculty.

III. She next introduced Sarah Pritchard, University Librarian, to discuss issues surrounding ownership of research. Pritchard explained that this subject is currently identified as open access; but different campuses handle the subject in different ways under different rubrics. This is a convergence of trends that have been in effect for about the last fifteen years, representing both a threat and an opportunity. Significant price increases have occurred in standard publication of scholarly periodicals, with double-digit price increases yearly, outstripping the ability of universities to keep these materials. At the same time, the growth of the Internet and new ways of using it has stimulated faculties, scholarly societies, and non-profit organizations to look at new ways to disseminate scholarly research and to publish across many disciplines. Besides critical cost issues in the sciences, opportunities in the humanities for new forms of analysis via data mining and high performance computing have come to light. During the same time, open access has become an important new concept in scholarly publishing. Both availability of materials and the business model have changed, with new roles for the federal government and public interest-driven access. She then introduced Scholarly Communication Librarian Marian Burright to provide an overview of the scholarly communication world and the potential for open access.

Burright stated that part of the responsibilities of her newly-created position is to work with faculty on copyright management. Open access refers to the publication of research; it is not a business model, though various business models may be used in open access. Specifically, it is research publication made available to the user without financial, legal, or technological barriers. This does not necessarily mean cost-free. One model involves a page charge which the author pays to publish in a particular journal. Institutional memberships are an alternative where the institution buys membership in a certain publication, allowing a number of authors to publish. Such arrangements make the published research accessible to the entire world. Only when publications so available reach critical mass does open access begin to have a particularly strong impact in the world. Peer review and open access are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Premier publications may be open access, for example the Public Library of Science. Fees for publication may be subsidized by allocation from grant money. Business models are continually emerging and changing. Open access came to be as a result of federal policy. The NIH mandate of 2008 provides that the grantee institution and the principal investigator deposit the final peer-reviewed manuscript into PubMed Central, which is the primary open access archive for biomedical research. In March 19, 2009 this law became permanent, no longer subject to annual review. This sets a precedent for other federal agencies, suggesting that anyone receiving money from a federal agency should keep track of their funding requirements. Final peer-reviewed manuscripts become available for open access in PubMed Central within twelve months of publication, following an embargo period. The author must retain sufficient copyrights to grant NIH the ability to display the work publicly: authors need therefore to be well aware of copyright assignment. Benefits to authors and institutions include higher visibility; if Google can call a publication the chance of being cited improves.

Examples of open access publications include the disciplinary repositories formed by various academic communities, largely found in the sciences: archive.org, for example, supports mathematics and physics literature; Social Sciences Research Network is prominent in the fields of law, economics, and social sciences. Institutional repositories tend to have unique collections that are especially useful to a certain institution, and they tend to be richer in the arts and humanities. Institutional "mandates" are another driver for open access. Harvard, MIT, and UT Austin have arrangements that allow non-exclusive rights to article publication in an archive that is publicly available free of charge, provided that the article is not sold for profit. At UT Austin, the agreement covers only NIH grantee publications.

Burright's role includes the interpretation of copyright agreements for faculty authors, who have more leverage with publishers than may at first appear. Other resources include the Sherpa Romeo database, which works with the name of a journal or publisher and provides its copyright policy. There is also a directory of open access journals. Flexible copyright tools such as the Creative Commons license work within existing copyright law. The path is also open for other federal agencies to require open access. Institutional repositories are becoming common; we are building our own at Northwestern. Institutional mandates and business models are continually emerging, and the number of open access journals is continually increasing. The publishing industry is interested in cooperating with authors because they allow the industry to make money.

Zoloth commented that open access has been open access has been one of the main concerns of the university senate at Harvard and MIT in the past year.

IV. The final part of the meeting was a discussion of faculty governance reform. Zoloth thanked the chairs of departments that allowed members of the General Faculty Committee to speak directly to departments about the importance of proposed changes. She also thanked members of the GFC for the time and effort expended in developing the proposal now before the Senate. Three years of reflection about faculty governance entailed a robust process of discourse. A first reading in January presented the need for an important and fundamental change. It proposed election of representatives to a new senate by department. The GFC understood that the faculty need to participate more robustly in University civic life. A September survey of the faculty uncovered a general feeling of alienation, lack of information, indifference over decades to faculty input, and top-down governance. Concerns about child care and overcommitment were also expressed. A One Northwestern idea evolved into a needed sense of ownership. Two levels of governance are new proposed: an academic senate that is representative and elected by department, with ongoing training on effective functioning, leadership of the University resting in the committee structure, recommendations to the Trustees' Executive Committee and thus to the Board of Trustees, with ongoing governance meetings every month in the academic year. The University Assembly would replace the present Senate, meeting three times a year and open to everyone on the faculty and administration. It would have a broad oversight of matters that affect all of us. The proposal seeks to draw on what the GFC feels is good in existing mechanisms such as the Program Review Council. Democracy is as important as administrative expertise. The ability to petition for agenda items, not currently provided in the bylaws, as another new provision. The work of the University can be undertaken in large committees that are added as needed, and the Executive Committee receives quarterly reports. The narrative of GFC planning has been interrupted by the transition from a Bienen-Dumas administration to a new Schapiro-Linzer administration. We also did not anticipate how our economic situation could change in eight months. New trustees and new federal guidelines also change the climate in which we operate. We have presented several goals in the present academic year, including a faculty club, day care, an ombudsman service, and a budget advisory committee. At present, President Bienen does not think we should vote on the governance proposal now before us; Provost Linzer and Marilyn McCoy are also opposed. The fear is that we will constrain or prevent the new President from moving forward with the faculty. Morton Schapiro has in fact asked us not to do anything that would box him in. Out of respect for the current and incoming Administration, Zoloth, said, she does not want to do anything that would have that effect. Do we therefore want to go to the next step (a discussion with the new Administration) with the current proposal as our working draft document and its support by the Senate? Do we instead support a proposal from the Lecturer staff for separate representation? Currently available figures reporting the number and appointments of the current faculty are undependable: Provost Linzer commented that the data provided by the office of Associate Provost James B. Young is all wrong. There are in fact about 450 tenured and tenure-track faculty in WCAS: twice the number reported by Young's office.

Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi remarked from the Chicago campus that it remains unclear what is meant that the incoming Administration would be boxed in by a vote in support of a new governance structure. Stephen Eisenman, Chair-elect of the GFC, added that the GFC has been discussing the proposal for a solid three years, meeting with many in the departments and in open meetings and making a great deal of progress. He intends to move that the issue be brought to a vote in this meeting; while President Bienen has expressed his opposition to a vote, it is not clear that it would box anyone in or create a contradiction. It is the GFC's understanding that the document does not become part of the legal documents of the University until it is approved by the Trustees. That will not happen until after President Schapiro meets with them next year, probably with GFC participation. We also understand that Schapiro has not had the chance to review the documents, and we think he should have the right to do so. The understanding of the GFC is that if they are approved by the Senate, they will be taken to President Schapiro early in his tenure for his review. If he makes recommendations for changes, the GFC will examine them and if they are substantive they will be brought before the full Senate for another vote. Any bill passed by the Senate can be amended. This process has been discussed with President Bienen and for whatever reason he was unsatisfied with it, stating that he felt it would present a fait accompli to the new President. Matters that remain to be settled include the question whether Lecturers receive adequate representation. This was addressed by the GFC, which voted that they would be represented in the Senate by department. There are other ways this issue could be addressed; one would be to have a standing committee of the new Senate that deals intensively with the question of Lecturers, Adjuncts, and other non-tenure line teaching staff. When Schapiro reviews this matter, he may have amendments that the GFC will consider.

Eisenman then moved that the new governance documents prepared by the GFC and reviewed by the full faculty be put up for vote by the Senate. Following a second, a member of the Medical faculty who had served as president of the Cornell medical school GFC reported that during his tenure there he witnessed what used to be a trickle-down administrative system change to a bottom-up type of committee where issues of importance would be brought from the departments to the dean; the committee had the dean's undivided attention for two hours every month. He hoped the GFC here can accomplish something similar with the Central Administration. The problem at Northwestern, he said, is one of scale. It was hard enough in a medical school where the concerns of clinical departments differed from those of the non-clinical. The asked if the possibility of sub-GFCs for each school has been considered. Regarding Lecturers, he remarked that all of the Medical School departments have non-tenured clinical faculty who are fully as involved in the life of their department as tenure-track faculty and who also need representation. He added that when the institutional culture becomes one where the faculty can accomplish nothing, people stop attending meetings.

Reginald Gibbons made a procedural suggestion: if the proposals on the floor could be labeled as a provisional draft, we would not need to take the time now to discuss specific features of the kind just mentioned. The question today is only whether to put forward a provisional or working draft of what future faculty governance would be. Eisenman accepted this as a friendly amendment that does not require a vote.

Provost Linzer began his response by applauding the efforts of Zoloth and the entire GFC in thinking through faculty governance as thoroughly as they have. Today, he said, the discussion is about the process for its proposals in the context of a presidential transition. Because he is stepping down, President Bienen is not comfortable making big changes and recommendations to the Trustees on faculty governance because they took shape as he was on his way out. Incoming President Schapiro wrote to Zoloth he would prefer working with the faculty on its proposals after he arrives rather than have it presented to him as a completed resolution that he would have to take to the Trustees for their approval. "As you know," he wrote, "I am a big advocate for shared governance and I might just be able to contribute something to the discussion." Does the faculty want to give Schapiro the opportunity to participate in a discussion which will shape the proposal, or does it want to present him something to approve or respond to rather than thinking it through together? If the issue is forced upon him by a vote today, one option is that Schapiro will report the proposal to the Trustees as is with the recommendation they reject it. That is the confrontational approach; better to let him get his feet on the ground and engage with people before he is reacting to a vote.

Marilyn McCoy read a message sent by President Bienen to Stephen Eisenman: "As you know, President-Elect Schapiro has asked that you not take a vote on May 5. He would prefer to have a chance to engage the GFC in the fall before any vote on governance is taken. It was unclear to me from a recent memo from Laurie Zoloth that a vote was intended. I had thought, reading her memo, that none was. Thus as I told you I would, if the GFC went ahead with a vote on May 5, I am asking Provost Linzer and Vice President Cline to make sure that my e-mail to you is distributed to all faculty. I want faculty colleagues to know that President-Elect Schapiro has asked you to delay any voting, and that I oppose any vote on May 5. I will make my position also clear to the Board of Trustees. I am sorry to say that I do not think this is the best way to build consensus and cooperation."

Seth Lichter of the School of Engineering and GFC pointed out that much of the current financial crisis also occurred after Bienen made his retirement announcement. His current policies are not seen as boxing Schapiro in; they were important issues that had to be addressed at that time. Nothing that Linzer has done boxes in Schapiro; it rather gives him a better place to stand as he begins. It would have been irresponsible to postpone financially prudent steps. Yet they are asking that the faculty do just that regarding faculty governance. The next GFC president has made it clear that we are discussing these proposals with the new President. Voting now gives us a better place to stand and to begin than doing nothing.

Heather Colburn of the Spanish Department expressed concern about proceeding further without considering the Lecturer faculty in a more direct way. Lecturers make up about a third of the Weinberg faculty and teach about a third of undergraduate courses. In some departments, lecturers are still not invited to attend faculty meetings or vote on undergraduate curriculum. A number of programs that are not officially departments, and a number of their faculty do not hold dual appointments in an actual department. It would not be appropriate to go forward with faculty governance proposals without discussing these matters.

Zoloth pointed out with regard to school-based GFCs that there is an academic senate at the Medical School. That body sends a representative to the larger GFC. About half the Northwestern faculty and 60% of the Northwestern endowment is in the Medical School. Their voice is represented. She regretted that Lecturers cannot vote on many things; but in this one area, the GFC commitment in the governance document to the Lecturers and full-time faculty is clear. The GFC remains open to hearing proposals to strengthen this commitment.

Carol Simpson Stern of Performance Studies commended the work of the GFC. But she repeated her advice to the Senate last spring not to take action of this magnitude — a total restructuring, of faculty governance. In her view, the tenure and non-tenure categories do not have parity. It is also a terrible mistake to have a new President come in to face resolutions without the courtesy of a dialogue with him. Reg Gibbons replied that the intent of his friendly amendment was precisely to avoid the impression that the faculty is denying Schapiro a dialogue or boxing anyone in on either side. The intention is to emphasize that the GFC has made a basis for discussion and a starting-point. Zoloth added that her reply to Shapiro's e-mail promised him that there is no intention to box him in with a fait accompli, but rather to offer a process. Eisenman explained that today's vote is to accept the document with recognition of its legalities, that it needs to be approved by the Trustees. Therefore the President will have a chance to express his views. He also said that Schapiro's opposition to a vote was based upon its presentation to him by Henry Bienen as a future fait accompli that would box him in.

Joseph Hupp of Chemistry ventured that if Henry Bienen were to present this proposal to the Trustees he would recommend its rejection, and that Schapiro would do likewise if tasked to do so. Ezra Getzler of Mathematics said that the document does not represent his interests as a member of his department. Rather than a place where we come together, it is the point where our conflicts and differences will be discussed because the GFC does not sufficiently represent his department.

Charles Thompson raised as a point of order that under the existing rules as well as the proposed bylaws, a vote to be taken must be specified under the agenda. The Chair ruled this objection out of order. Acting as parliamentarian, Sarah Pritchard stated that as the official adjournment time of 6:30 had passed, the body must vote to extend. The body voted by a show of hands to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes.

Matthew Grayson of Electrical Engineering interpreted the friendly amendment to mean that the proposal on the floor is not meant as a binding final document. If the explicit, official language of the vote specifies that the faculty is deferring a final vote and asks that the working document be sent to the incoming President, it would more perfectly convey the spirit of the friendly amendment.

Before leaving for his evening commitment, Provost Linzer pointed out that the alternative to voting for the proposal is for the GFC to come forward to President Schapiro, as it is fully empowered to do, and present the draft as a basis for discussion. It does not require a Senate vote to bring this document forward. Ratification by Senate vote would not advance the discussion.

Following additional statements for and against voting on the motion at this meeting, Stephen Eisenman withdrew the motion. It has been his perception, he said, that the current Administraton has from the beginning opposed the process of restructuring faculty governance. President Bienen at first said he did not know what was in the documents. He later showed a better knowledge of their content without supporting any expansion of faculty governance. The incoming President appears to have a different perspective, and it is unfortunate if it has been presented to him that it is an measure that would box him in. The ambiguity of the meaning behind a no vote prompted him to withdraw the motion. Zoloth proposed instead that a vote be taken showing support for the efforts of the GFC in bringing the subject of faculty governance forward. This alternative resolution was expanded to say that the Senate further urges the GFC to continue their dialogue with the new President on the basis of this document.

Following a brief additional discussion, the Senate voted in favor of this resolution by a vote of 28 to 8. Zoloth remarked upon closing the meeting that the numbers that we have on the size of the faculty are not accurate. This information is needed from the Administration so we can have a real process. From the faculty at large, the GFC needs engagement in writing. It especially needs to know the nature of any concrete objections to structural changes in shared governance and to the actual content of the changes that have been proposed, not just to the process of change.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel H. Garrison
Secretary to the Senate