UFC Proposal for RTE Representation

Faculty Senate

March 13, 2019
A plan to create an ad hoc committee to look into the representation of the nontenure track faculty is announced at the **February 2018 Meeting of the Faculty Senate**.

Recommendations from the Committee on Academic Titleholder Representation is presented at the **September Meeting of the Faculty Senate**.

University Faculty Committee resolution endorsing the recommendations is presented at the **November Meeting of the Faculty Senate**.

Various concerns are discussed at the **December Meeting of the Faculty Senate**.

Ten sense-of-the-senate votes are taken at the **February Meeting of the Faculty Senate**.
Now Let’s Step Through the Proposal
Recommends use of the terminology “RTE Faculty”.

Supports the alignment of this constituency with the Faculty Senate.
With respect to UVR in the research, lecturer, and extension tracks, it recommends the “Senior Only” option.

Consistent with this, it recommends giving UVR to the top two ranks of the four-rank librarian and archivist tracks.
Notation: RTE* and UF*

“RTE*” will hereafter denote the RTE faculty who have UVR:

- Research Professor (all ranks)
- Clinical Professor (all ranks)
- Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)
- Research Scientist (both ranks)
- Senior Scientist/Scholar
- Senior Research Associate
- Senior Lecturer
- Senior Extension Associate
- Librarian, Associate Librarian
- Archivist, Associate Archivist

“UF*” will hereafter denote the University Faculty who have UVR:

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- The Emeriti

(Consistent with current legislation.)
All RTE Faculty, regardless of UVR, would be allowed to attend Senate meetings and speak.

Departments can let RTE faculty without UVR participate in their secret-ballot senator elections if they so choose.
The Proposal

Recommends:

1 RTE-designated Senate seat filled by Cornell University Library.

1 Ex Officio seat each for the SA, GPSA, EA, ROTC, and the postdocs

1 Emeritus-designated Senate seat filled by CAPE

(The Library and Postdoc seats are new.)
The Proposal

Recommends that there be nine at-large Senate seats to be filled through university-wide elections. The seats would be designated as follows:

- 3 for tenured members of the UF*
- 3 for untenured members of the UF*
- 3 for members of the RTE* faculty

The electorate for these positions would be the UF* and the RTE*.
Attributes of a Good Senate Membership Plan

It must be possible to have RTE* Senators from the departments. This is because it is in the departments where having a positive TT-RTE chemistry does the most good.

It is important to have College at-large Senate seats because it creates a guaranteed RTE* presence with an independent voice. They will be necessary until there is sufficient representation through the departments.
# Department RTE Senators: Compromise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOS-7</td>
<td>Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-8</td>
<td>Departments can send only University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-9</td>
<td>Each Department gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SOS-X | Use the SOS-9 rule for having two seats: TT + RTE* >25. In a 2-seat department, one of the senators can be RTE*.                                                                                   |     |     |     |
## College at-large RTE Senators: Compromise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOS</th>
<th>Essence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOS-7</td>
<td>Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-8</td>
<td>Departments can only send University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-9</td>
<td>Each Department gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOS-X** Use the SOS-7 and SOS-8 rule for 2 seats: RTE*>25. Drop the SOS-7 and SOS-8 rule for 3 seats: RTE*>100.
Department Senate Seat Rules

Each of the 72 departments gets one seat if $TT + RTE^* \leq 25$ and two seats if $TT + RTE^* > 25$.

Each department must have at least one University Faculty Senator.

College At-Large Senate Seat Rules

The 10 colleges each get one $RTE^*$-only seat if $RTE^* \leq 25$ and two seats if $RTE^* > 25$. 
Every three years there would be an adjustment in the distribution of senate seats based on current UF* and RTE* numbers.

Every three years the University Faculty Committee with broad consultation would assess the quality of Faculty representation. All concerns would be discussed in the Faculty Senate.

Proposed modifications would be brought before the University Faculty in accordance with the Bylaws of that body, i.e., The Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty.
5 Voiced Concerns
1. College RTE At-Large: Why? How?

Why?
A pathway for small-department RTE* faculty representation.

A pathway for RTE* faculty who want to represent themselves.

How?
Self-nomination

Each college has its own e-voting mechanism.

No-takers means OK to leave vacant.
2. College RTE At-Large: It Tips the Balance

The Numbers:

a) If the number of 2-seat depts increases by 70% then mathematically we could have \#RTE > \#UF* .

b) Even with current populations, the delegations from CVM, JCB, ILR, and LAW could mathematically have RTE* majorities.

The Realities:

a’) Maybe in 10 years after unprecedented levels of RTE* hiring and zero increase in the UF.

b’) CVM, JCB, ILR, and LAW know what’s best for themselves.
3. Quorum: Possible Worry?

50 vs 65 is unlikely to be a problem because

-- the membership profile will change in q-friendly directions

-- we will push for more effective use of single-meeting alternates

-- we will use e-voting as required*

-- sense-of-senate operation does not require quorum

*E-voting on the calendar and the consensual relationship policy was at the 95% level
4. Critical Topics: How to Process and Vote?

- Creation of new titles and ranks
- Assessing teaching and research in promotions cases
- Tenure-related procedures
- Etc

Committee on the Academic Programs and Policy

Committee on the Academic Freedom Professional Status of the Faculty

Committee on RTE Faculty Issues and Policy

Roll call voting will support separate tallies for UF and RTE*

The Faculty Senate

One must remember Senate voting on critical issues is almost always advisory
5. Irreversible! Go Slow

We are taking radical steps that may not work out. Then what?

Comments

The Senior-Only UVR Option is a non-radical “go slow” strategy.

Membership numbers will evolve slowly and if we pay attention the various allocation rules can be adjusted under the auspices of continual UFC oversight.
Yes or No

Thinking in terms of whether or not it will improve the Cornell environment for research, teaching, and extension, do you support this proposal for broader representation and engagement?