



to help explain why CAP members hesitate to speak in meetings. When a CAP member speaks on the faculty floor, we worry -- and have heard -- that many people experience and interpret what is said as defensive, self-serving, silencing, and impositional. Also, because any individual CAP member who speaks is heard as representing the whole committee, we hesitate to speak for more personal reasons: we worry that we will misspeak, get angry, and thereby jeopardize our work together as a faculty. CAP in no way wants to create any of these effects, and so we often remain silent. In t!

those cases when faculty colleagues have made the points that we would have made, we have felt that is much better than our speaking up.

Another reason we have not spoken much is a specific request that came from the faculty floor. Helen Grundman suggested last year that committees should present their reports and then step back and let the faculty discuss them, rather than further explain and defend. This recommendation, which was enthusiastically affirmed by the faculty, came in the response, I believe, to the meetings the previous year where the faculty felt we couldn't discuss the proposed curricular changes because every comment was defended or argued against. So another reason CAP hasn't engaged much in these discussions is because the faculty asked committees not to.

Finally, while CAP hasn't spoken much on the faculty floor, we did present our view of the events that happened last year at the October meeting — in a written document in response to requests from faculty colleagues made to the Chair of the Faculty. Mindful of other business and the amount of time that we had already spent on this issue, David Karen and I thought it would be best that I not speak too long on the floor of the faculty, so I made a few points by way of overview and directed faculty to the full letter and timeline in the packet. There were no questions or discussion at that time.

The other members of CAP and I are willing to acknowledge that we need to revisit this choice not to speak in discussions on the faculty floor. If we can change the dynamic, if we can create an environment in which CAP members can speak and be heard as colleagues and not as adversaries, then I, and I believe other CAP members, will be more willing to speak.

We also have been exploring the ways in which these particular instances are framed by a larger sense of discomfort that all faculty experience when they meet with CAP (and that all of us currently on CAP have experienced, over the years, when we have met with CAP). As part of the ongoing



respect and honor that request. Colleagues share these details because they inform the situation that person and his or her colleagues are experiencing in their departments and so that we can understand that situation in all its complexity.

This happened in previous years and it happened last year. To include that information as part of CAP's rationale for making a decision would be, to my mind, a deep violation of confidentiality and trust and would seriously hinder that person's capacities on campus. And yet some people might feel that they cannot understand the decision without that information. If we went too far in the direction of not sharing enough specific information, we apologize for that and offer the explanations in the Addendum as an effort to provide sufficient information without causing everyone involved further or additional pain.

Another question, one that now serves as the premise for Rad Edmond's recent motion, is whether the recommendations CAP made last year were made as a group or rather within the frame of individual reviews of positions. At the last meeting, Peter Beckmann usefully outlined how many of the recommendations were made prior to last year, on a department-by-department basis. A list of those recommendations and where they have been mentioned in previous CAP documents as well as relevant excerpts from the POG and By-Laws that guided CAP last year are also at the end of this message.

I think it is important that we be honest and acknowledge there is not a single department or program on campus that, if consulted, would have said or would say now, "Yes, you can cut a line. We don't really need it." As Michael Rock has pointed out, we all feel under-resourced and any department or program would fight fiercely for its resources. CAP felt and continues to feel that it would be extremely damaging to have dragged out the process by talking with the full faculty about recommending reductions in particular departments — a process the POG and By-Laws state is not required, likely for that reason.

During the course of its deliberations, CAP did consider the possibility of cutting whole departments, but we heard from individual faculty members and in faculty meetings that there is a strong desire to preserve our core — fields that are not robustly subscribed but that are essential to the liberal arts. So instead CAP identified places where, given the criteria we use to make decisions about resources, we felt that, without eliminating whole programs, departments, or majors, we could recommend that a line not be returned to the pool for reallocation. Then we approached departments — either as part of the Phase III of Balancing Mission and Resources or as the separate but related part of CAP's charge for last year —

In the motion that Rad has brought to the faculty, he is, I believe, conflating two interrelated but distinct processes: the first part of CAP's charge for last year — "set longer-term academic priorities for the College that transcended the nearer term exigencies of open positions" — and the second part — "use that strategic vision of academic priorities to decide how to continue the process of reducing the faculty by 5-8 lines knowing that resources from these cuts would be reinvested in faculty compensation and would help us achieve as many of our goals as possible while working with limited resources" (Report on CAP Charge, 2010-2011, p. and CAP Annual Report to the Faculty, 2009-2010, pp. 14-15).

According to the POG and By-Laws, and to our own sense of appropriate process, the first part of the charge required and entailed extensive consultation with the faculty. As outlined in our letter to the faculty and timeline, CAP invited all faculty members to participate in one-on-one meetings (in which 95% of the faculty participated) and in open forums and small- and large-group d





department, the two positions (the tenure-track and interim position) would be folded together to create a tenure-track position. CAP and the Administration conveyed their enthusiasm for ensuring a critical mass of resources and an ongoing presence of German studies. CAP indicated our expectation that when the tenure-track faculty departure or retirement announcement occurs, there would be a three-year transition timeline.

## Italian

Concerns about the balance of enrollments in the Italian Department have been discussed over a long period, in meetings with CAP and with the Provost, with both the current and the previous chairs of the Department. Enrollments at the upper level in Italian and in intensive Italian have been small. In last spring's meeting, CAP and the Chair of Italian agreed that the Italian Department will



