

January 15, 1974

To the Trustee Members of the Governance Committee

The major business of the Faculty Meeting this morning was the discussion of the attached three resolutions, which had previously been voted unanimously at a meeting of the School of Historical Studies the week before. (Note: Professor Kennan was present neither at that meeting nor in the Faculty Meeting). All three resolutions were passed with large majorities, all Historians and Mathematicians voting for, and the three physicists present and Geertz voting against (except for some abstentions on two parts of the third resolution).

There was little discussion of the second and third paragraphs of the document. Discussion of the first paragraph was not concrete and it is not clear from the discussion whether any of the concrete proposals contained in the various documents you have already seen would command wide assent among the Faculty.

Carl Kaysen

Mr. H. C. Petersen, Chairman  
Mrs. H. H. Gray  
Mr. R. M. Solow  
Mr. D. B. Straus

cc. Mr. J. R. Dilworth

Enclosure

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

January 15, 1974

To the Trustee Members of the Governance Committee

The major business of the Faculty Meeting this morning was the discussion of the attached three resolutions, which had previously been voted unanimously at a meeting of the School of Historical Studies the week before. (Note: Professor Kennan was present neither at that meeting nor in the Faculty Meeting). All three resolutions were passed with large majorities, all Historians and Mathematicians voting for, and the three physicists present and Geertz voting against (except for some abstentions on two parts of the third resolution).

There was little discussion of the second and third paragraphs of the document. Discussion of the first paragraph was not concrete and it is not clear from the discussion whether any of the concrete proposals contained in the various documents you have already seen would command wide assent among the Faculty.

  
Carl Kaysen

Mr. H. C. Petersen, Chairman  
Mrs. H. H. Gray  
Mr. R. M. Solow  
Mr. D. B. Straus

cc. Mr. J. R. Dilworth

Enclosure

Actions taken at the meeting of the School of Historical Studies on  
January 10, 1974

It was moved that it was the sense of this meeting that the representative of the School on the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance should report to the Committee the following: (1) that the School believes that no nomination to a professorship which is not approved by the Faculty should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, and that no person who is not approved by the Faculty should be appointed to a professorship at the Institute; (2) that the School believes that only the Faculty of the Institute may determine the manner in which its approval of a nomination to a professorship shall be given. Passed unanimously.

It was moved that the School disapprove the proposals, circulated among members of the Committee and the Faculty, (1) to set up a mandatory outside Standing Committee for each School, with the function of arbitrating disputed appointments, among other things; (2) to assign a special role to academic Trustees. Passed unanimously.

It was moved that the School was of the opinion the Sec. 15 of "Responsibilities" as formulated at present does not give the Faculty enough voice in the selection of the Director and does not make it clear that, if the Director is to be made a Professor, he needs to go through the same procedures as the other Professors of the Institute. Passed unanimously.

## MINUTES

Meeting of the Faculty of the School of Historical Studies  
Held in the Dining Hall at ten o'clock on January 10, 1974  
Final Draft

Present: Professors Cherniss, Clagett, Elliott, Gilbert, Gilliam, Habicht,  
Lavin, Thompson, and White

Absent: Professors Kennan, Meiss, and Setton

1. The minutes of the last meeting were approved.
2. The Executive Officer reported that Mr. Benjamin Nelson's name had been placed on the Alternates List after that of Dr. Bodnar's for an opening in the second term of 1974/75.
3. The Executive Officer reported that Dr. Xavier de Salas would not be able to take up his membership for the current term.
4. Professor Lavin reported that Mr. Loren Partridge, who had been elected to a membership for the academic year 1974/75, had been informed by his University that he would not receive any sabbatical pay. Professor Lavin, feeling that the stipend which has been offered to Mr. Partridge would not be adequate in these circumstances, asked the Faculty to consider an increase of this stipend. Professor Clagett moved that Mr. Partridge be offered the sum of \$10,000 for the academic year, and this motion was seconded and unanimously carried.
5. The following requests for short-term visits to the Institute were approved:
  - (1) Professor N. G. L. Hammond for one week beginning about March 25, 1974, with lecture: \$300.
  - (2) Professor Geoffrey Woodhead for two or three days prior to March 31, 1974: \$200.
  - (3) Dr. Ursula Schlegel for three to five days in March: \$200. It was understood, however, that Professor Lavin will make the necessary inquiries to determine whether Dr. Schlegel can in fact visit the Institute for more than one day.
6. Professor Clagett suggested that Professor Peter Fraser may wish to visit the Institute while he is in this country. Professor Thompson agreed to inquire whether Mr. Fraser can come here, and an honorarium of \$300 was unanimously voted to be paid in the event that the visit is arranged.
7. Professor Gilliam then gave a report of the second meeting of the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance of the Institute. He said that Mr. Peterson, the chairman of that committee, had wished the representatives of the Schools to obtain the Faculty's views concerning the questions discussed

-2-

by the committee and that he, Professor Gilliam, had asked for this present meeting to be arranged in order that before the meeting of the full Faculty on January 15th the School which he represents might hear his report, discuss it, and, if possible, reach agreement concerning the questions under consideration and give him suggestions or instructions concerning the position that it wishes him to take with respect to the questions now before the committee or any other matters that it thinks should be brought before the committee at its next meeting on January 19th.

The principal topic discussed at the last meeting of the Faculty-Trustee Committee, Professor Gilliam said, was that of the procedure to be adopted for making appointments to the Faculty, concerning which two documents had been circulated before the meeting, one prepared by Professor Selberg and the other by Professor Adler. Professor Gilliam then described and analysed the procedures proposed in these two documents and then remarked that besides the question of appointments to the Faculty there are several other specific questions to be considered, the procedures to be followed in choosing a Director and the definition of a "major academic innovation" and the manner of dealing with such an innovation, i.e. the proposals for revision of Sections 15 and 14 respectively of the document entitled "Responsibilities of the Faculty...".

There followed a general discussion of the procedure to be used in the appointment of professors and of the principles that should determine any such procedure, the focus of the discussion being the proposals that had been made by Professors Selberg and Adler. This culminated in Professor Clagett's motion, seconded by Professor White, "that the School disapproves the proposal made by Professor Adler on November 29th." This motion was passed unanimously after discussion during which in response to suggestions that it would be well to specify the grounds for objection to Professor Adler's proposal Professor White moved and after discussion withdrew an amendment reading "that the School disapproves any plan whereby nominations to professorships shall be submitted to the scrutiny of a standing committee such as that described by Professor Adler in his communication of November 29 and that it disapproves of the arrangement also described by Professor Adler whereby an academic member of the Board of Trustees shall have special authority to pass on nominations for professorships."

The question of Section 15 of "Responsibilities of the Faculty..." was then raised, and Professor Clagett moved "that the School of Historical Studies approves Section 15 as now accepted by the Trustees with, however, the following addition, that should the Director also be appointed as a professor in the Institute faculty approval for such an appointment will be obtained." In the discussion of this motion Professor Lavin said that he did not think Section 15 went far enough towards strengthening the Faculty's voice in the selection of the Director. The motion was put to a vote and was lost with 4 votes recorded against it and 3 in favor of it. Thereupon Professor Gilbert moved "that the School of Historical Studies is of the opinion that Section 15 as formulated at present does not give the Faculty enough voice in the selection of the Director and does not make it clear that, if the Director is to be made →

a professor, he needs to go through the same procedures as the other professors of the Institute." This motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Gilliam then asked that the School, having expressed its disapproval of certain proposed procedures for the appointment of professors, follow a suggestion made by Professor White in the course of the earlier discussion and state affirmatively what form of procedure it would prefer. He said that he was himself in favor of retaining the procedure that obtained in recent years, and he moved "that the School of Historical Studies would prefer that the Institute retain the present procedure that it has been using in the nomination and appointment of professors to the Faculty". Professor White seconded the motion. The motion was carried with six votes in favor of it and two opposed.

The meeting was recessed for luncheon at 12:35 and was reconvened at 2:15 P.M. Professor Clagett proposed that the School for the guidance of its representative affirm certain principles such as those mentioned earlier in the discussion by Professor White concerning the Faculty's rôle in the appointment of professors and its right to determine for itself the procedure by which it reaches and expresses its decisions.

After Professors Habicht, White, and Lavin had spoken at some length on the question of such principles, Professor Lavin recommending the exploration of the possibility of reaching general consensus within the faculty by offering concessions in one area in return for concessions in another, Professor White moved "that it is the sense of this meeting that the representative of the School of Historical Studies on the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance, Professor Gilliam, should report to the Committee the following: (1) That the School believes that no nomination to a professorship which is not approved by the Faculty should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and that no person who is not approved by the Faculty should be appointed to a professorship at the Institute; and (2) that the School believes that only the Faculty of the Institute may determine the manner in which its approval of a nomination to a professorship shall be given". This motion was seconded by Professor Clagett; and in the course of the discussion of the motion Professor Lavin proposed to substitute for it the following motion: "that it is the desire of the School that there be a balance of authority between the Director, the Faculty, and the Board in matters pertaining to appointments to any of these posts, and that the Committee should strive to reach a solution in which the wishes of these respective bodies are respected". Professor Gilbert seconded the motion for this substitution. In the discussion of the substitute motion it was pointed out that the balance of authority to which this refers is not precluded but is implied by the original motion and that the latter leaves open the possibility of changes in the present procedure such as the creation of a standing committee of the Faculty for review of nominations, for which Professor Gilbert expressed his preference. Professor Lavin with the concurrence of the seconder, Professor Gilbert, then withdrew his substitute motion; and the original motion made by Professor White was passed unanimously. After passage of

-4-

this motion Professor White asked and the members present agreed to have the minutes expressly include the understanding that the second part of the motion passed is compatible with any alteration of the procedure of the Faculty for expressing its concurrence or lack of concurrence with nominations to professorships upon which the Faculty itself may decide, such for example as the creation of a Committee of the Faculty to which the Faculty may delegate its authority to whatever degree it may desire.

Professor Gilliam then asked for questions and suggestions concerning Section 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the document entitled "Responsibilities of the Faculty..." and the revisions of these proposed by Professor Adler in his communication dated January 3, 1974. Professor Claggett recommended with the concurrence of the School that in paragraph 1 the clause "but which would not have financial implications beyond those normally accompanying the appointment of a new professor" be deleted and that the word "not" in the following words not be italicized.

Professor Elliott proposed that the representative of the School ask the Committee to consider the question whether the Director should be a Professor.

Professor Lavin asked about the status of the question of academic trustees. In reply to this Professor Gilliam said that there were to be four academic trustees, one in the area of interest of each School, that two of these were considered to be the present trustees, Professor Solow and Mrs. Gray, and that according to his understanding a committee of the Board was now in communication with the Schools of Mathematics and of Natural Sciences regarding their proposals for trustees who would represent the areas of their respective studies.

Professor Elliott in reply to a request for information then reported the procedure followed and the progress thus far made by the committee of the Faculty elected to consider the nomination of a candidate for a professorship in the School of Social Science.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 P.M.

Harold Cherniss  
Executive Officer

January 15, 1974

To the Trustee Members of the Governance Committee

The major business of the Faculty Meeting this morning was the discussion of the attached three resolutions, which had previously been voted unanimously at a meeting of the School of Historical Studies the week before. (Note: Professor Kennan was present neither at that meeting nor in the Faculty Meeting). All three resolutions were passed with large majorities, all Historians and Mathematicians voting for, and the three physicians present and Coertz voting against (except for some abstentions on two parts of the third resolution).

There was little discussion of the second and third paragraphs of the document. Discussion of the first paragraph was not concrete and it is not clear from the discussion whether any of the concrete proposals contained in the various documents you have already seen would command wide assent among the Faculty.

Carl Kayser

Mr. H. C. Petersen, Chairman  
Mrs. H. H. Gray  
Mr. R. M. Solow  
Mr. D. B. Straus

cc. Mr. J. R. Dilworth

Enclosure