

P.O. Box 133
Arlington, VA 22202

CAPITAL DISTRICT 200404

07 JUL 2015 PM 3:1



Dr. Mark S. Monmonier
Distinguished Professor of Geography
318 Maxwell Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244

13244



July 3 2015

Dr. Mark S. Monmonier
Distinguished Professor of Geography
318 Maxwell Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244

Dear Dr. Monmonier,

In a time long, long ago (circa February or March 1978) I sat in on your lecture to Clark University Geography Department faculty and students in Worcester, Massachusetts. I believe your visit was in regard to the Geography professor's position vacated a year earlier when Dr. Kang-Tsung Chang was denied tenure.

My involvement in the review-and-hiring process was nil!

Over 30 years later an ex-Clark geography graduate student involved in a minor way on the hiring panel passed the enclosed notes to me; I was not privy to them in 1978. I thought that you should be offered these notes. The author is likely Geography Department faculty member Dr. William A. Koelsh.

That's it...except to congratulate you on an impressive career as an author and Syracuse University educator. I have read "How To Lie With Maps" and love the book!

Respectfully yours,

An anonymous Clark student

March 29, 1978

To: Geography Colleagues

From: WAK

Re: Departmental Demography, with Special Reference to
Recommended Cartography Appointment

Friday's agenda calls for the adoption of the Cartography Search Committee's recommendation that Mark Monmonier be appointed to fill the cartography slot. I have looked over Monmonier's file and supporting letters, as well as about ten of his publications, and have listened to the points made in last Friday's discussion. I have no problems with his speech hesitation, and I await the further evidence of the Committee regarding his classroom performance.

Monmonier is 35 years old, and has been an Associate Professor for five years; he has held a tenured appointment for two years. He will not consider moving to Clark except at full Professorial rank. I read a certain reluctance on the part of the Committee to recommend appointment at that rank on the merits - or at least a hesitancy on the part of some members on that point. I understand ~~that~~ the perceived need to appoint a cartographer whose publications leave no residual problems concerning tenure. But what I heard at the meeting is that this factor is being played against the reservations and the general lack of suitable candidates, to strengthen the case for a professorship.

During the past week, in trying to weigh where I stand on the appointment, I have plotted Monmonier's demographic characteristics against those of the department. I realize that this is one consideration out of many, but the results of my explorations were so intriguing that I set down my findings and reasoning, so that any counter-responses may be thought out before the meeting.

At present we have a faculty of fifteen ^{persons} (I mean departmental slots, not counting Harry Schwartz), of whom twelve are tenured. Seven tenured positions, or just about half the entire department, are already full Professors. The ~~five~~ Associate Professors, ~~three~~, with the exception of Doug Johnson, are ~~all~~ three to ten years older than Monmonier and have served in rank from five to nine years. The youngest current full Professor is forty (this year) and the oldest fifty-four. No full Professor now on the staff attained that rank at Clark at Monmonier's age, though Berry was made Professor at 35 elsewhere and Karaska was a year older when he became Professor here. Only two of the present tenured group holding rank at Assistant Professor or above were advanced in rank as part of the initial appointment (Karaska and Lewis). Monmonier, if appointed Professor, would be junior in age to all present tenured faculty except Johnson (also 35), junior in length of tenured status to all except Johnson, and promoted earlier than ~~anybody~~ who received his ^{Professorship} in an American university.

I am not arguing that Monmonier is not a good man; perhaps ^{he is} a very good man. What I ask of the Committee is to tell me that without mental reservation and by comparison to Kates, Kasperon, Cohen, etc, Monmonier is that good or indeed rather better.

(See attached Table for raw ~~data~~ demographic data)

My second point of concern is not so much with Monmonier but with the demographic consequences of making any new senior appointments. The last column of Table I shows projected retirement dates for existing tenured faculty, assuming a retirement age of ^{65 and} 70. (Actual retirement may average closer to 65, but I take a worst-case position, mindful that there may be no mandatory retirement age within a few years.) The earliest retirement, then, at 70, is sixteen years away (Knos). By the end of a quarter of a century, six ~~only~~ of the present tenured faculty must retire (Knos, Cohen, Berry, Kates, Karaska, Koelsch - the last two only in the 25th year.) The last of the present dirty dozen ~~must~~ (Johnson) must retire ~~only~~ thirty-five years hence; Monmonier would have the same conditions. If appointed full Professor in 1978, Monmonier would serve at that rank longer than any full professor in the history of the Graduate School of Geography, though not the longest in teaching service. (The record, 44 years, is held by another cartographer, Guy Burnham, who, however, held no academic rank until he became Instructor in Cartography in 1946, by which time the cartography he had taught for over twenty years and was to teach for the next twenty was already technologically obsolete, as Professor Kasperson can corroborate in spades!)

Demographically, the School is over-professored, over-tenured, and middle-aged in the tenure ranks, and will be so for a very long time to come. Let us turn to the possible loss rate. We have had a painful turnover of non-tenured faculty in the Cohen years, but the tenured staff has shown remarkable stability. In 1965, two persons (Murphy and Warman) had tenure; fourteen more were awarded tenure between 1965 and 1978. Of these fourteen, only two have resigned, Snead and McCleary; both had held tenure for two years, or less and were at the Associate Professor rank, for three and two years respectively. Murphy retired in 1968 at 70; Warman in 1974 at 67, involuntarily. That's two retirements and two resignations in thirteen years from those holding tenure; a low rate.

Looking in the crystal ball, where will the School be in five years, demographically speaking? Even if the retirement age were reduced drastically, there are no predictable retirements in sight. Let us assume that there will be five resignations/deaths in the tenured ranks (unlikely from either experience or the state of the market, but remotely possible.) Assume further that these will be apportioned according to rank, or 3 fulls and 2 associates. Then assume, conservatively, that only two of the remaining three associates will become full professors within the next five years. Add Monmonier or any other full or senior associate (who would also be eligible for promotion in that period), and even with a heavy resignation rate we would still have a minimum of about half the department at the full professor level. Assume Monmonier, a lesser number of departures, and a greater number of promotions, and by 1983 (five years away) you have ten or more full professors. The university is either not going to support that (we'll all be deans), or it will cut back all junior slots, or both. (I reiterate my caution of Tuesday on the staff effects of a student cutback as well.)

The foregoing is the demographic context, as I see it, in which we must consider our present and any future appointments. Seen from the strictly demographic standpoint, a young appointment at a high rank (Monmonier's case) is the worst move we can make at this time/

I have yet a third reservation regarding the rank involved, so far as the cartography appointment is concerned. It seems to me that to bring in a senior appointee in cartography signals to the profession and to prospective graduate students that Clark is going into cartography as a field of specialization in a big way, or at least in a bigger way than it has ever done before. In Monmonier's letter and one of the supporting letters it is suggested that he too expects this to a degree; that ~~Clark will~~ ~~the move~~ will result in graduate students who will take their Ph.D.'s with him, which has not been the case at Syracuse (because of the dominance of historical-cultural geography, it appears!) We have never hitherto made an ~~initial~~ initial appointment in this field at a rank higher than Assistant Professor. (I exclude visiting appointments Raisz and Degani).

My question, before we commit ourselves irrevocably to a 35-year full professorship in this area, is this: Is that where we see ourselves going programmatically? Are we prepared to shift our departmental resources, financial and otherwise, that significantly that Clark would become, if not a Kansas, at least another Robinson's Wisconsin or Goode's or Leppard's Chicago, etc.?

Or do we have to say, given the cartographers available and our resources and programs, we must lower the priority of cartography (or keep it the way it is, really) - relying on part-time and visiting appointments and on low-level ~~appointments~~ appointments, that we consider cartography an adjunct rather than a Ph.D. specialization, that we service the undergraduates' needs and the beginning graduate students in whatever fashion we can and send any advanced students down to Judy Olson or have her teach one course in computer mapping or whatever, and then use the money we might have spent here in directions more appropriate to the programs in which we have a comparative ^{advantage} advantage?

If so, then the strategy is to hold off (until 1983[?] or longer) before making a tenure-track appointment, and then making a junior one from the whiz-kids said to be in the ^{more} pipeling.

As a ^{more} general proposition, in the light of the above demographic data (and quantitative methods ~~is~~ not all there is to life, I admit), we may have to restrict ourselves in all new appointments to the most junior levels and go through the agonies of reappointments, tenure, and visiting appointments for a large number of years. At least the evidence indicates we should so restrict ourselves until the possibilities of resignations from the tenured ranks about which we have been hearing for the last year or so are resolved one way or another.

I should like to see the general matter discussed, perhaps for a strictly time-limited period, before proceeding to the recommendation of specific candidates on Friday.

TABLE I

Tenured Faculty, 1978, by rank

<u>Name</u>	<u>Born</u>	<u>Age</u> *	<u>Clark</u> **	<u>Age/Rank</u> ***	<u>Yr/Ret.</u> ¹	<u>Yr/Ret</u> ²
Cohen	1925	53	1965	38 (BU) 40 (Clk)	1995	1990
Berry	1930	48	1969	35 (Dar) 39 (Clk)	2000	1995
Bowden	1935	43	1964	41	2005	2000
Karaska	1933	45	1969	36	2003	1998
Kasperson	1938	40	1969	38	2008	2003
Kates	1929	49	1962	39	1999	1994
Knos	1924	54	1970	45 (Kan) 46 (Clk)	1994	1989
Buttimer	1939	39	1971	34	2009	2004
Johnson	1943	35	1972	35	2013	2008
Koelsch	1933	45	1967	36	2003	1998
Lewis	1939	39	1970	31	2009	2004
Peet	1940	38	1967	32	2010	2005
MONMONIER	1943	35		30	2013	2008

Notes:

* Age calculated by year of birth subtracted from 1978, not by birthday

** Year of initial appointment at Clark (^{exam}Koelsch Visiting Assistant Professor 1963; Berry non-resident until 1971)

*** Age at attaining present rank, at Clark or elsewhere

1 Dates calculated on the basis of a seventy year retirement age

2 Dates calculated on the basis of a sixty-five year retirement age.

If retirement age is 70, only four of the dirty dozen (1/3) will retire at or before the year 2000; if sixty-five, the number increases to ~~half~~ seven, or just over one-half the present senior faculty. I have omitted Mary from the table, but obviously she's in the same ball park.

I also find it interesting to notice that the basic staff which will determine the character of the Graduate School of Geography in its third quarter-century was all appointed in one decade, 1962 to 1972, and will retire within two, either 1989 to 2008, or 1994 to 2013. May I request permission to teach a joint course with Kates on "Historical Futurology of the Visible and Invisible University"?