MINUTES

UNIVERSITY FACULTY

and

FACULTY COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 6, 1972 - May 16, 1973

and

September 12, 1973 - May 15, 1974
After calling the meeting to order in Room 110 Ives Hall at 4:35 p.m., the President relinquished the Chair to the Dean of the Faculty. 82 members were present.

1. ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER

Responding to the motion passed at the May, 1972, FCR meeting instructing him to solicit names of persons to replace Prof. John Whitlock, who had declined to serve another year as Speaker, the Dean announced that the following had been forthcoming: Prof. Russell D. Martin, Communication Arts, Agriculture and Life Sciences and Prof. Paul Olum, Mathematics, Arts and Sciences. After referring to an initial misunderstanding on Prof. Martin's part as to whether he would be nominated as Speaker or Parliamentarian, and conveying Prof. Martin's apologies to the body for not being able to attend this meeting, the Dean read a portion of a letter he had received from Prof. Martin stating that he would be forced to be absent from the campus on several occasions this coming year because of a special assignment he had received for Cooperative Extension. The Dean added that Prof. Martin had told him he would try, if elected, to serve to the best of his ability on those occasions when he could be present. The Dean then placed the two names in nomination and asked for additional nominations from the floor. There being none, the nominations were closed and printed ballots circulated.

2. ELECTION OF RECORDER

While ballots were being completed and counted, the Dean read Section X, Item 4 of the FCR Organization and Procedures which requires that the Recorder be elected from the University Faculty. The Dean explained that under previous legislation Gould Colman, who is not a faculty member, was permitted to serve as Recorder, and that a "grandfather clause" in present legislation legalized the arrangement as long as Mr. Colman remained in office. Following his resignation the Review and Procedures Committee proposed as a temporary expedient
that the Secretary be elected Recorder for the time being in addition to his other duties, and that he be allowed to appoint an Assistant Recorder to perform taping of the FCR meetings and other functions performed by Mr. Colman. The Dean added that an obvious need exists to amend present legislation pertaining to the Recorder. He then nominated Prof. Robert Cotts and asked for, and received, unanimous consent to cause the Secretary's name to be entered on the minutes as Recorder.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

The Dean announced, as a matter of information, that in the absence of the Dean and the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chairman of the Executive Committee will function as Acting Dean. He cited that section of the Organization and Procedures which provides that in the absence of the Dean the Secretary shall assume the responsibilities of the Dean, and that if both are unavailable, the person then to assume the function of Acting Dean should be a person agreed upon between the Review and Procedures Committee and the President of the University. The Dean stated that the Review and Procedures Committee had consulted on this matter at his request, and that the Committee's suggestion that the Chairman of the Executive Committee be next in line had been agreed to by the President.

The Secretary then announced the results of the election of a Speaker: Prof. Martin was elected by a vote of 40 to 39.

The Dean asked for guidance from the body in resolving the dilemma created by the body's having elected a Speaker who was absent from the meeting. On a motion from the floor that Prof. Whitlock chair the rest of the meeting, the Dean requested Prof. Whitlock to do so and he consented.

4. REPORT OF NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (Appendix A)

The Secretary presented the report on the Committee's slate of nominees for the Executive Committee of the FCR which was distributed with the call to the meeting. He briefly described the system of staggered two-year terms for the membership of the Executive Committee, adding that normally the current
election would be to fill four vacancies, but that Prof. Peter Stein was going on leave, thus creating a fifth vacancy. He read the names of the present Executive Committee members and the year in which each member's term expires. He stated that the Nominations and Elections Committee prepared the proposed slate with the thought that it would be a good idea to get some "fresh blood" on the Executive Committee. He then read the slate.

The Chair asked if there were further nominations from the floor. The following were nominated: Prof. L. Pearce Williams, History; Prof. William Tucker Dean, Law. The Chair then assumed that nominations were closed without objections. The Secretary noted that voting will be by the Hare System and that ballots will be mailed from the Dean's office.

5. FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE DEAN

The Dean announced that over the summer the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty had become aware that a computer-based payroll system was in the final stages of preparation, on which a number of statistical reports are to be based. The Committee's predecessor, the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty, had expressed interest in studying salary differences in various units of the University on a rank-by-rank basis. However, there is a difference of opinion about the propriety of releasing such information. The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, asked the Dean to convey to the Administration its concern that a decision to survey salaries not be made by a programmer and that the computer system be capable of producing the information should the present policy change. The Dean reported that he had done so and learned that the payroll system is capable of producing the information if the policy changes. He said he was reporting to the FCR on the matter since the Executive Committee's "emergency" action had been taken without consulting the body.

6. LEGISLATION FOR FILLING COMMITTEE VACANCIES

The Dean moved a proposal, prepared by the Executive Committee and distributed
with the call to the meeting, that paragraph 7 of the Rules and Procedures for Governing Standing Committees of the Faculty Council of Representatives be amended to read as follows:

7. Temporary replacements for members unable to serve for periods of a year or less [than a year] may be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty.

(underlined material to be added; material in brackets to be deleted)

Speaking on the motion, the Dean pointed out that this year there are approximately six absences for the usual year necessitated by the normal year-long sabbatic. He therefore asked that the FCR allow him the same privilege of appointing a temporary year-long replacement that was the power of the previous Dean.

The motion passed on voice vote without opposition.

7. LEGISLATION ON EXCUSED ABSENces FROM CLASSES, EXAMINATIONS, ETC. (Appendix B)

Prof. L. Pearce Williams moved the proposed legislation on behalf of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning. He commented that the Committee had learned that a very small number of faculty members refuse to "give an inch" on what most people would consider to be reasonable grounds for excusing absences from class, and that rather than place the decision with a central authority such as the University, the Committee felt every faculty member should have the right to express his viewpoint among his colleagues where they would have the most chance of being heard. Therefore, the Committee decided to leave decision-making at the departmental level, thus guaranteeing the most equitable treatment of students and maximum freedom for the faculty.

A typographical error was pointed out (the word made should have read make in line seven of the text of the resolution). It was suggested from the floor that the resolution should make clear that the word department refers to the department sponsoring the class in question, not the department in which a student is registered.
The Chair suggested that it should also be made clear that the word department does not refer to a department head.

Speaking against the resolution, Prof. Robert Elias, English, said it was often very difficult for a department to decide ahead of time concerning some of the peripheral excuses given for not attending classes. He used the memorial service for slain Israeli Olympic athletes held that day as an example of a last-minute event which caused such difficulties. He added that he saw a greater evil in leaving such decisions to departmental vote than in putting up with occasional individual obstinancy on the part of a faculty member. For example, in voting within departments individuals can express concern or identify interest in a particular course by saying yes or no about the legitimacy of a cut in that course for a particular occasion; other departments may disagree, causing far more harm to students than a University-wide ruling would. He therefore hoped the resolution would be defeated or modified to remove the decision from departments.

Speaking against the motion, Prof. John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, said the Senate resolution very definitely was an expression of student, not faculty interest, and that it reflected the growing number of occasions which can be interpreted as legitimate reasons for not attending class. While sympathizing with students, he feared we may get into chaos, particularly in the area of religious beliefs, because of the many more possibilities there.

Prof. Isadore Blumen, ILR, said he had inquired of one of the University chaplains who is most intimately concerned with this problem historically, who said the problem hasn't existed since former Dean Arnold Hanson wrote a memorandum to the Faculty. Prof. Blumen suggested that therefore legislation may not be necessary on this point, but that what may be needed is a resolution supporting the Dean, or a memorandum from the Dean, which in effect says to the Faculty "We have a problem here, why don't you be reasonable." He then moved to refer the resolution back to the Committee. The motion was approved by voice vote.
Prof. L. Pearce Williams asked what effect the Senate Bill (SA-42) now has on the Faculty. The Dean replied that the Senate resolution is recommendatory only, and that if a response is required on the subject he would have to state that the FCR resolution was referred to Committee.

8. LEGISLATION ON GRADING

Prof. Kathleen Rhodes, Chairman, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, presented the resolution which accompanied the call to the meeting. During debate Prof. Elias said that while the resolution equates D+, D and D- with failure, a number of colleges and faculty members give such grades for credit, so that approval of the resolution would in effect say that the Faculty gives credit for work which may be unsatisfactory. Prof. Albert Silverman, Physics, asked if the resolution would be any different if Section E were left out. Prof. Rhodes replied that it really would not; the Committee hoped primarily to hear expressions of opinion on the first four points of the resolution. Prof. L. Pearce Williams asked if Section E would be returned to the schools and colleges for discussion and individual action once the FCR approved the resolution. The Dean said he had assumed the resolution would receive technical scrutiny by the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction, which is made up of representatives of the schools and colleges, before being referred back to the colleges for their comments. The Chair added that it believed the colleges have jurisdiction over the question. Prof. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Psychology, asked if there is any legislation now extant that requires a faculty member to give S or U grades, or can a faculty member decide not to give S and U if he so wishes. Prof. Rhodes said she understood the later to be the case.

Prof. Bronfenbrenner then concluded that if a faculty member gives S and U grades he will be bound by this legislation if it passes. The Dean pointed out that each school and college has its own so-called S-U option legislation, thereby resulting in confusion for persons outside each unit looking at a Cornell transcript. The purpose of the legislation, therefore, is to present a uniform
understanding of grades on transcripts without impinging too much on the individual prerogatives of the units. In a comment from the floor it was noted that the proposed legislation does not clarify the situation, since "unsatisfactory" or "failure" can often mean a D grade. Why would anybody elect to take a course in which you could get an unsatisfactory for D work? Prof. Blumen responded that the Committee was asked to examine this exact situation, viz: that some faculty members give an unsatisfactory grade even for B work. Prof. Robin Williams, Sociology, pointed out that not only does the range of interpretations of S-U grading vary, but that students are known to take courses in which they know they can benefit from the interpretation of the system used in that course. Prof. L. Pearce Williams asked if there are any colleges that have U above C-, in other words, what is the highest common denominator as well as the lowest? Prof. Rhodes replied that she understood this to be a question for individuals, not colleges. Prof. Bronfenbrenner asked the Committee why it did not take the alternative course, viz: that U is equivalent to failure? Prof. Blumen responded that this corresponds to the practice of using S-F as grades, and that some faculty members do not wish to use the letter F, which is synonymous with failure, for work that is unsatisfactory. He added that the Committee tried to put together legislation which would represent the views of the Faculty, not those of the Committee, and that the nearest thing the Committee could find to the Faculty's view is that C-, C and C+ are satisfactory. The question was asked if the Committee had considered recommending the elimination of the D grade entirely in order to make the new proposals consistent all along the line? The Dean reminded the body of the Committee's charge, to revise the Grading Committee's proposal, which contained U, L and S as grades, and confine itself only to S and U grades. So if a student elects S-U, he knows he may do D work and still fail. The Dean asked R. Peter Jackson, director of student records and finances, whether a person who receives a U grade may receive credit for it. Mr. Jackson said, "no". Prof. H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, pointed out that, to be
precise, faculty members must, under the proposed legislation, give a passing mark of unsatisfactory, which is confusing. The alternative, individual interpretations, is also confusing. He therefore recommended the resolution be defeated because of its ambiguity. Assistant Prof. Alvin Bernstein, History, said he did not see the confusion. In the Arts College and most other units his understanding is that if a student records consistently D+ he will not be awarded a degree, which is to say that the Faculty does not consider the D in any form to be a satisfactory grade. The only anomaly to this legislation is that he would get credit for a D. Prof. Rhodes said she thought the Committee recognized that C- is the lowest grade considered satisfactory in any unit. Prof. James R. McConkey, English, said that he thought one of the original reasons for instituting S-U grades was to permit students to take courses they would not normally take, that were, for instance, out of their academic field, to try something they might otherwise be afraid to do. So if the legislation passes, it would remove this opportunity. Another reason was to encourage those students who felt they didn't want grades. For the first reason given, at least, this legislation seems detrimental. Prof. Charlotte M. Young, Nutrition, moved the question, which was passed. The resolution passed on a show of hands (41-29).

RESOLVED, That

A. the S/U system have symbol equivalents which are uniform within the University: "S" means C- or above; "U" means D+, D, D-, or failure.

B. S/U options be chosen by the student during the first three weeks of the term.

C. the Announcements and/or supplementary course registration material describing each course include a description of the course grading options, particularly if the course is graded with an exclusive S/U. Any change in grading options must be announced by the instructor within the first two weeks of the term.

D. course requirements (required reading, term paper, etc.) be the same for students electing S/U grades as for those electing letter grades.

E. the FCR reassign to the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction point 5 of the Jackson memo, which reads:
That colleges and schools may require a minimum number of credit hours graded by the letter system (A through F), for graduation from a particular program of study and/or particular courses within that program of study, but the student may take as many S/U-graded credit hours each term as he wishes, provided he meets at least the minimum college or school requirements.

9. ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY

On being elected Recorder, the Secretary wished to announce the appointment of Joseph Leeming, assistant director of Radio-TV in the Office of Public Information, as Assistant Recorder.

10. LEGISLATION ON ATTENDANCE OF NON-FACULTY FCR COMMITTEE MEMBERS AT FCR MEETINGS

The Dean moved the resolution, which was included in the call to the meeting, and in support of it pointed out that there are a number of FCR committees in which membership includes both faculty and students such as the ROTC Committee and the Academic Integrity Boards. This resolution, he said, is designed to prevent the need for special arrangements when a committee report is being made. Prof. David L. Call, Nutrition, asked if a committee chairman who is a member of the Faculty but not of the FCR would have speaking privileges when a report is being made by his committee. The Dean replied, "Yes, if he is making the report on behalf of the committee". It was asked if the legislation applied to non-faculty persons attending FCR meetings to make statements or to just sit in attendance. The Dean replied that the intention was that they just sit in attendance unless such a person were the chairman of the committee, in which case by arrangement with the Speaker he would be permitted to speak. The motion was carried by voice vote.

RESOLVED, That whenever an FCR committee report, recommendation, or resolution is presented to the FCR, non-faculty members of such committees shall be entitled to attend the meeting while the item is under discussion. Such attendance shall not include speaking or other privileges, but special prior arrangements can be made with the Speaker in exceptional cases.
11. LEGISLATION ON FACULTY ADVISORY GROUP

The Dean presented, not for action, the resolution on a Faculty Advisory Group which was included in the call to meeting, and pointed out that it was prepared by the Review and Procedures Committee in response to the recommendation of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning that there be some such group to advise the Administration without speaking formally for the entire Faculty or the FCR.

It was asked why the FCR could not meet and serve as such a group when the need arose. The Dean said that notion crossed the minds of several FCR members during the Carpenter Hall incident, and it was felt then that to call the entire body together might have delayed matters and possibly not been as productive and as easy as assembling a smaller group. He added that the difficulty lay in the fact that the efficiency of any group is in inverse proportion to its size, while the "representativeness" i.e., the ability of the representative group to reflect the views of its larger constituency is enhanced by size, the group being more and more representative as it approaches the town meeting. Prof. Young asked if all those proposed to serve on such an advisory group were not duly elected by the Faculty and therefore reflective of the Faculty's views. The Dean said that was the reason for structuring the advisory group in such a manner: each person would be elected by the FCR or the entire Faculty except, as was pointed out from the floor, one faculty trustee who is elected by the students.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON FACULTY ADVISORY GROUP

WHEREAS, Recent events have suggested the desirability of having a faculty group to whom the Dean and the President can turn for advice and sentiment during times of disorder or in other emergency situations where matters of more than purely educational policy are concerned,

RESOLVED, That there be constituted a Faculty Advisory Group consisting of the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Faculty Trustees, together with the Dean and the Secretary of the Faculty. The Group shall offer such advice as seems warranted in the circumstances and shall also serve to facilitate the flow of information between the Faculty and Administration. Since the role of the Group is
advisory only, any actions taken by it or advice given shall not be regarded as formal actions or positions of the University Faculty, the Faculty Council of Representatives or of members of the Faculty other than members of the Group.

Adjourned: 5:45 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Appendix A

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

SLATE OF NOMINEES
September 6, 1972

FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FCR
4 tenured FCR members and
1 non-tenured FCR member to be elected

Tenured

*Elias, Robert H., Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, Arts and Sciences

*Jensen, Neal F., Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry, Agriculture and Life Sciences

*Kahn, H. Peter, Professor, Fine Arts, Arts and Sciences

Kretzmann, Norman, Professor and Chairman, Philosophy, Arts and Sciences

Lynn, Walter R., Professor, Environmental Engineering; Director, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Center for Environmental Quality Management

Young, Charlotte M., Professor, Medical Nutrition, Graduate School of Nutrition

Non-Tenured

Turner, James E., Associate Professor of Afro-American Studies, Director of the Africana Studies and Research Center

*Wilson, David B., Assistant Professor, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Arts and Sciences

Wright, Joan W., Assistant Professor, Community Service Education, Human Ecology

* Elected
* William Tucker Dean, Law, nominated from floor and elected
Appendix B

Proposed Legislation on

EXCUSED ABSENCES FROM CLASSES

RESOLVED, That any student at Cornell University who is unable, because of legitimate reasons as determined by the department concerned, to attend classes on a particular day or days, may be excused from or be allowed to postpone any examination or study or work requirements scheduled for that period. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty and of the administrative officials of Cornell University to make available to each student who is absent from school because of such legitimate reasons an equivalent opportunity to make up any examination, study or work requirements which he may have missed.

Comment - from the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning

The University Senate has passed a bill (SA-42) designed to protect students from being discriminated against by individual faculty members because of the student's observance of religious holidays. This is only part of a larger problem involving the absence of students from classes for a variety of reasons, such as, for example, athletic events, birthdays of heroes of various groups, or moratoria called to achieve some political or moral objective. In order to insure a minimum of arbitrariness without trespassing unnecessarily upon traditional faculty prerogatives, the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning wishes to propose the solution offered in the above resolution. Legitimate reasons for absence will be defined by departments, rather than by the individual faculty members as is presently the case. This would appear to guarantee maximum latitude of action consonant with the generally accepted educational values of Cornell.

9/6/72
The President called the meeting to order in 110 Ives at 4:34 p.m. 93 members and 3 visitors were present.

The President announced the death of the following:

Ruth J. Scott, Emeritus Professor of Textiles and Clothing
Jeremiah J. Wanderstock, Professor of Hotel Administration
Robert Brodie MacLeod, Susan Linn Sage Professor of Psychology
Leonard A. Maynard, Emeritus Professor of Nutrition and Biochemistry
E.Y. Smith, Associate Professor of Poultry Husbandry
Mary Eva Duthie, Emeritus Professor of Rural Sociology
Gustavus H. Robinson, Emeritus Professor of Law

The President relinquished the Chair to the new Speaker of the faculty, Professor Russell Martin, Communication Arts.

The Speaker called on the President for a report to the faculty.

1. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

After noting that the emotional level on campus was very much lower than it was last spring, the President praised the work of the Mayor's ad hoc committee, chaired by Mr. Matthew McHugh, to investigate causes of campus disturbances last spring, and said there had been substantial follow-up on that committee's recommendations. Mr. Randall Shew, director of community relations, and a communications relations committee had been hard at work over the summer. The issues, however, which led to the stresses of last spring still persist, he said, and he pledged to promote full and open discussion of such war-related issues as Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, questions of research on the campus, and the R.O.T.C.

He then turned to the financial situation facing endowed colleges at the University. The 1971-72 deficit will be substantially reduced from the $1.6 million originally budgeted, he said. The budgeted deficit for 1972-73 of $1.1 million will also be substantially reduced, in part because of a large bequest received by the University which has been capitalized for the purpose of producing income. Current planning for 1973-74 aims at no deficit. The President said he wished publicly to thank the faculty, college departments and administrative units of
the University whose cooperation has made progress in this area possible. Slow progress in faculty salaries, a large backlog of deferred maintenance projects, and restrictions on new academic programs are part of the price we pay for deficit reduction. The University has made an over-all 15% cut in administrative programs, and 10% in academic programs over the past three years. Such cuts cannot continue indefinitely. It is unlikely, because of the monthly running checks we make, that Cornell would encounter the same experience that recently occurred at Yale, where an anticipated $5\frac{1}{2}$ to $6$ million deficit turned into a $1$ million deficit when the final auditors' figures were in. However, projecting 18 months ahead, as is necessary when we present a budget for the coming year to the Trustees, is difficult. We cannot accurately predict final investment or gift income.

Accounting practices also change, making predictions unreliable. For example, unexpended departmental general expense funds are now carried over and re-appropriated to the next year, a practice not formerly followed. In addition, in accord with a standard adopted by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, Cornell now includes such activities as housing and dining in the over-all financial statement where formerly they were kept aside. Deficits in some of these activities are being carried over as negative reserves for the coming year in order to encourage the operations to reach break-even levels.

Commenting on the financial situation at the statutory colleges, the President pointed out that Cornell currently has a good working relationship with the State University of New York, but that SUNY and the State Budget Office have made "seemingly indiscriminate" budget cuts at Cornell because of their failure to recognize the special statutory mandates, particularly for research and extension, which rests at the colleges. As a result, statutory programs in the public service area have been seriously curtailed. Last year the Trustees formed an ad hoc committee, chaired by Trustee Morton Adams, which made recommendations concerning the relationship of the statutory colleges to the State, and this
is now a standing committee. The President has appointed Vice Provost Robert S. Risley to have general cognizance of the state relations area. He will be working with the President, the Provost and Controller Peterson in this regard.

Last year the public institutions of education in the state operated on a zero growth budget, and state support for private higher education was at a standstill, while inflation continued apace. Last year the State University and City University of New York experienced growth -- new students, new programs, new capital facilities -- but there has been no new money to support these programs. New York puts more money into higher education than any other state in the Union -- about $800 or $900 million total -- yet it stands 47th in the list of states as far as the fraction of the tax dollar which goes into higher education.

About $100 million of the annual total goes to private higher education through regents' scholarships, scholar incentive programs, categorical aid to medical colleges and dental schools, and through the so-called Bundy program which gave approximately $1.9 million to Cornell last year, about $1.5 million of which came to the Ithaca campus.

The President said he does not know how the state financial picture will come out. There has been much activity to develop a plan to increase state support for higher education, but public and private institutions cannot agree on a program that would be viewed as serving the public interest.

At the federal level, 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act established an important new principle, that of institutional aid as opposed to previous student aid or research support programs. The prospects for funding the new education amendments, however, are not bright.

A concept currently pervading discussion of public support of education, particularly private higher education, is that of "accountability" or "whether or not federal funds or state funds spent in the private side of higher education meet a public mission". This mission is apt to be equated with increased enrollment
to absorb part of the growing student body, with admission standards to take account of the need to admit intellectually disadvantaged students, and with space utilization. A State Education Department study last winter showed Cornell to be the richest institution in the state in terms of space utilization, with somewhere in excess of 300 square feet per student of classrooms, laboratories, offices, conference rooms, theaters, etc., after all living quarters had been subtracted. The statewide average is about 160 square feet per student and the worst of the City University campuses is approximately 30 square feet per student. As a result, Cornell is being pressured to accept larger numbers of students if it is to qualify for public funds.

Another word that enters this discussion at almost every turn is "productivity". Inflation in the education business has risen faster than in the economy generally, and there is a tendency to equate education to industry, where one can raise the price of workers faster than the price of the product because the productivity of individual workers can be increased. Education is not like that, the President said, and I fear it will be a long time before we succeed in reducing the inflation rate to that of the economy. Yet it is essential to do that one way or another. We may have to face the prospect of setting our own standards, risking the loss of public funds. I prefer to work with the total higher education community to find a solution.

All of this discussion points up the need for planning at a level and a degree of sophistication that we have never reached before, the President said. To this end, he reminded the faculty that he had appointed a committee in the spring of 1971, chaired by Prof. Edmund T. Cranch of the Engineering College, which was now on the verge of making its report.

The President said the Cranch Committee's report would be made publicly available and widely distributed. It will be referred to the appropriate faculty committees, the University Senate, and to the deans for study and advice. It will be presented to the Trustees and the Alumni Council at their October meeting.
The President said he had appointed an administrative committee, chaired the Provost, to coordinate inputs, and that he hoped to present a "distilled" plan to the Trustees next May. The object of this exercise, he said, is to keep Cornell one of the world's leading universities. He then asked permission of the Speaker and the Dean to turn the meeting over to Prof. Cranch to tell the faculty about the work of his committee.

2. REPORT FROM PROFESSOR EDMUND T. CRANCH

The committee's charge was a broad one, Prof. Cranch said, to assay the financial status of the University, to make some conclusions with regard to the academic consequences of this status, and hopefully to recommend steps that would allow the University to remain financially responsible and still have a vigorous academic program.

One factor the committee took into account is Cornell's diversity, with its combination of private and statutory units. This quality sets Cornell apart from other institutions, and is to be encouraged in future, but at the same time it makes Cornell complex to manage, and to understand.

Another consideration made by the committee is the conflict between "time constants" in higher education and the rest of society. The state of financial markets in relation to major gifts to the University, the nature of academic programs in relation to a student's professional accomplishments during his career, the pace of change in federal programs for research and graduate student support in relation to faculty recruitment, all proceed on different time scales.

A third factor is the accumulation of indirect costs within the University. It is common practice to overlook "externalities" such as administrative costs, library costs or graduate student costs in computing the total costs of projects.

Since the endowed units of Cornell, lacking state support, show the major deficit, the committee concentrated on them. The committee did not study certain operations areas either for lack of time, expertise or importance. It did compile a data base for operations at Cornell, but Prof. Cranch cautioned that
this was included primarily to help the faculty draw its own conclusions, not as a conclusive base. Data on institutions of higher education is very meagre, he said. Some over-all indices exist, but very few diagnostic studies, and these tend to combine research universities, so-called "comprehensive" universities, liberal arts colleges and junior colleges in such a way as to make it difficult to pick Cornell out from other institutions.

Prof. Cranch then presented some statistics on higher education in America: in the decade of the 1960s enrollment doubled while income and expenditures tripled. Higher education showed the greatest increase (1 to 2.4%) of any category in America's gross national product. But this growth concealed an over-all downward trend. It is estimated that in the decade of the 1970s there will be an over-all 50% increase in enrollment, in the 1980s no increase. There is a growth in importance of public higher education, as evidenced by the development of the State University of New York. The next step could be a trend from "mass higher education" (private and public institutions combined) to "universal higher education". It is estimated, for example, that in the next 10 or 15 years 95% of college students will live within commuting distance of a community college. A "sign of the times" on our own doorstep is TC3, which advertises education for $16.00 a credit hour if you register at the van in the shopping plaza. Prof. Cranch advised the faculty that forces in the public domain such as these will influence our future planning.

Turning to Cornell, Prof. Cranch pointed out that the undergraduate body in the endowed units rose 24% from 1960 to 1972, graduate enrollment rose 108%, and size of the faculty rose 75%. The ratio of support staff to faculty is 4. Total expenditures at Cornell increased 208% from 1960 to 1971. Some typical categories of increases were: organized research 347%, instruction and departmental research 244%, student aid 307%, safety division 363%, libraries 336%. Total income in the same period rose 202%. Student fees rose 169%, gifts 285%, investment income 305%, federal and state funding 380%.
About 1967 the University's deficit took a sizeable jump, Prof. Cranch said, and it was in 1970 that the University Trustees said Cornell must turn its financial situation around. The "time constants" previously referred to, however, make it difficult to turn the University around fast. Cornell's diversity and diffuseness, coupled with the fact that we are talking about differences of one or two percent in large budgets, make it even more difficult to control University finances.

In order to get a grasp on the financial picture at Cornell, Prof. Cranch said, his committee averaged income and expenditures at the University for the period 1960-70, then worked out a "finer average" for the years 1967-70. The committee selected these three years for study, Prof. Cranch said, because it also wished to compare Cornell's financial figures with those of other institutions of higher education. This was made possible by the publication of "The New Depression in Higher Education", a study performed for the Carnegie Commission by Prof. Earl F. Cheit of the University of California at Berkeley. Cheit's study covered the period 1967-70, and was used by the committee because of the paucity of available data.

Prof. Cranch made the personal observation that Cornellians tend to treat the University as separate from other institutions, perhaps because of its isolated geographic location. This "plagued" the committee, he said, but both he and the committee felt strongly that it is necessary "to get our understanding of ourselves" in hand sufficiently so that we can compare some of our programs with those at other universities.

Comparing the Cornell figures with the Cheit report, Prof. Cranch said that in most parameters Cornell falls into the category of universities "headed for financial trouble". Cheit's other two categories are those universities already in financial trouble, and those not in financial trouble.

The committee computed the rate of increase in expense per student per year at Cornell (1960-70) at 8.6% during the decade 1960-70. The same rate was 8.5%
The closeness of these figures in part was caused by the fact that the University ran a surplus during the first half of the decade. It its report, the committee attempted to come up with a "best judgment" approach to a projection of these two figures which would keep them roughly equal in future.

The committee also tried in its report to translate the financial figures to academic decisions, Prof. Cranch said. The goal was not a financial study but an educational program. The two are coupled, however, he said, and we cannot ignore the fact any longer.

The committee's recommendations show a "dire need" for planning at several levels, Prof. Cranch said. If the faculty takes no part in it, someone else will, and we will fall into a bureaucratic system of planning. At the same time, we must avoid the kind of planning that raises the spectre of centralization. We prize our diversity, our freedom to operate, it gives us a certain vigor and psychological impetus some of our colleagues don't have at other campuses, he said.

Some of the problems considered by the committee's report include capital facilities, the size of the nonacademic staff, the size of the faculty, the size of the student body, and the University's posture on financial aid. Prof. Cranch noted that the Cheit study found two diagnostic parameters which occurred at institutions that find themselves in financial trouble. These are 1.) large annual increases (as much as 20% in some cases) in the amount of financial aid given to students, and 2.) large faculty salaries. He added that by themselves they do not necessarily spell financial disaster for an institution. It is the orders of magnitude and the "difference it takes to avoid financial trouble" that control an institution's destiny. The committee had attempted to spell these factors out in its report.

Other recommendations made in the report include: working with the University Senate on determining if there would be financial and academic benefit from
establishing a year-round calendar, the role of graduate education, which is $2^{1/2}$ to three times as expensive as undergraduate education, the future of the tenure system (he added that this subcommittee conducted perhaps the deepest investigation of any of his subcommittees), and the need for continued flow from the lowest ranks up the academic ladder at Cornell.

Prof. Cranch expressed the hope that faculty, students and the administration will take the report seriously, and find it one they can use without the need for substantiation. The base, we believe, is there for serious consideration, he said. We want a Cornell free of financial deficits and a Cornell free to choose its unique educational program, and we hope this study will allow you to plan that in the next nine to twelve months.

He concluded by thanking his committee for its work.

3. REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Chair announced that, there being no quorum, the resolution prepared by the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty, which accompanied the call to meeting, would not be introduced at this meeting and would be referred to the FCR for action. He then called on the Dean of the Faculty to give a report on the activities of the FCR and its committees.

4. REPORT OF THE DEAN

The Dean reported the following activities:

Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Prof. S. Cushing Strout, chairman. In a discussion of the University's response to an AAUP inquiry about a termination matter arising on the New York City campus the committee considered the question of whether the University's relationship to the American Association of University Professors ought to be changed as a result of the AAUP's now being a bargaining agency for some colleges and universities, and concluded that our relationship ought to continue to be essentially the same.

Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, Prof. Kathleen Rhodes, chairman. The FCR has enacted the committee's grading proposal designed to provide
uniformity among the S-U systems on campus. The committee is now dealing with a proposal for a University Educational Policy Committee to handle independent courses which are offered by Centers. This proposal is about to be circulated to the Dean's Council and the administration. It is also considering several aspects of the Calendar Committee report of last year on the conflict during examination periods with outside activities.

Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids, Prof. Joel Silbey, chairman. It is almost ready to respond to the Senate's proposal on scholarships, and is in receipt of a study by Prof. Robert S. Smith, Agricultural Economics, done at the request of the Provost, on financial aid.

Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning, Asst. Prof. Andrew Sorensen, chairman. This committee presented a resolution at the last FCR meeting on excused absences from class. After considerable debate, it was referred back to the committee. It also presented proposed legislation on a Faculty Advisory Committee to assist the President during campus disruptions, which will be debated at the October FCR meeting.

Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, Prof. Edward S. Flash, Jr., chairman. It will have a proposal on faculty grievance procedure out soon; it is concerned with salary information being made available on a comparative basis; it has a subcommittee on faculty appointments and promotions; it is working on part-time extra- and inter-departmental compensation; it is also concerned with fringe benefits (college tuition, insurance, etc.) and has underway a study of performance evaluation procedures and the possibilities of early retirement.

Committee on Research Policies, Prof. Albert Silverman, chairman. This committee is studying three areas: disclosure of information about research done on campus, the rights and privileges of professional researchers supported with so-called soft money; research at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory.
Committee on Review and Procedures (a committee of the University Faculty) considered a proposal to discontinue the *Necrology* and determined to continue it, at least for the time being.

This committee also considered whether non-tenured faculty trustees should serve out their term on being given tenure, and decided that they should do so since they lose neither their "representativeness" nor their loyalty on being given tenure.

The FCR also enacted legislation giving the Dean the ability to fill committee vacancies for a one-year period.

The Dean concluded saying that his only regret is that at this meeting, as in those of last year, the faculty seems to have abdicated its interest in faculty business, at least as manifest by attendance at these meetings. This may reflect confidence in what we're doing, but frankly it makes me nervous.

Prof. Howard Evans, Veterinary, questioned the policy of including the three items in the *Policy Notebook* marked with an asterisk indicating that the FCR has not yet approved these matters. He questioned the policy of including legislation on which the faculty has not yet acted.

The Chair asked the Secretary if he wished to comment on the action taken on the resolution prepared by the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty. The Secretary said he thought the action taken at this meeting was appropriate. The Dean made the observation that it had been decided to give such legislation to the FCR whenever a quorum is not reached in this house.

Adjourned: 6:01 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
The President called the meeting to order in 110 Ives at 4:35 p.m. and relinquished the chair to the Speaker, Prof. Russell Martin, Communication Arts. 77 members and one invited FCR committee member were present. After introducing his Parliamentarian, Prof. Chester Freeman, Communication Arts, the Chair called on the Dean of the Faculty.

1. REPORT OF THE DEAN

a. New members of the Executive Committee.

The Dean announced the seating of Prof. William Tucker Dean, Law; Prof. Robert Elias, English; Prof. Neal Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry; Prof. H. Peter Kahn, History of Art and Assistant Prof. David Wilson, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, as members of the Executive Committee. Carry-over members are: Prof. Isadore Blumen, I & LR; Prof. David Call, Nutrition; Assistant Prof. Bruce Wilkins, Natural Resources and Prof. Robin Williams, Sociology.

b. Cranch Report

He then took up the question of eliciting Faculty response, through the FCR, to the recommendations in the report to the President of the Advisory Committee on Financial Planning, chaired by Prof. Edmund Cranch, Engineering (the Cranch Report). The President has asked for responses by January 1 or February 1, 1973, so that he can present the University's response and recommendations to the Trustees in late spring. The Executive Committee of the FCR will consider the matter at its next meeting.

Prof. Albert Silverman, Physics, asked if the Faculty will be informed of the President's recommendations to the Trustees. The President replied that transmitting his recommendations to the Trustees will present a complex problem. He will attempt to synthesize all responses into workable recommendations backed up by long-range projections, and will see that various points of view are put before the Trustees, whether or not the President agrees with them. He said he anticipates conflicting views on the report's recommendations and stands ready
to participate in discussion of them. The Trustees' action will certainly be made public.

Prof. John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, suggested that the FCR debate some of the Cranch Report's recommendations, rather than turning them over to committees. Prof. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Arts and Sciences, favored debate by the entire University Faculty and suggested that the FCR should consider its major charge the presentation to the Faculty the opportunity to discuss fundamental issues. Prof. L. Pearce Williams, History, preferred that the FCR, as a representative body of the Faculty, present its opinions to the President.

Prof. Paul Olum, Mathematics, cautioned the body against dealing with the report section by section. It is very important, he said, that the FCR discuss the meaning of the report in the larger sense of what it implies for the future of the University, and transmit this feeling to the President. Assistant Prof. Norman Uphoff, Government, expressed the need for a procedure whereby diverse positions on the recommendations are first considered by the FCR, then by the Faculty. The Dean agreed on the need to elicit the widest possible range of Faculty opinion, but said the FCR must operate under the organization and procedures that govern it. Prof. George H. Hildebrand, Arts and Sciences, recommended assigning sections of the report to an appropriate existing committee or one created for the purpose, which would document both individual areas of the report and its total orientation. Prof. John H. Whitlock, Veterinary Medicine, suggested that it is impossible to make constructive legislation with a body numbering 700 to 1,000 members, and that the FCR therefore must do what it can to arrive at a decision-making process. If it disagrees, the Faculty can overrule FCR proposals.

Prof. Hutchins urged that the FCR present a document, or a position, to the whole Faculty since some Faculty members feel they owe no allegiance to the University Faculty with the creation of the Senate and the FCR. The Dean suggested that outside Faculty members might be invited to participate in FCR discussions
of the report.

c. Segregation and Desegregation on Campus - Position Paper #15

Turning to Position Paper #15 issued by the Regents of the State of New York, which sets guidelines for racial segregation and desegregation on college campuses, the Dean reported that Vice President Gurowitz and Associate Dean of Students Ruth Darling had addressed the Executive Committee on the subject of Ujamaa Residential College, and that the Executive Committee is working with the Provost in trying to understand University policy on the question and provide input to the University's response to the Regents.

2. FACULTY ADVISORY GROUP

The Dean moved adoption of the proposed legislation on the Faculty Advisory Group as follows:

WHEREAS, Recent events have suggested the desirability of having a faculty group to whom the Dean and the President can turn for advice and sentiment during times of disorder or in other emergency situations where matters of more than purely educational policy are concerned,

RESOLVED, That there be constituted a Faculty Advisory Group consisting of the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Faculty Trustees*, together with the Dean and the Secretary of the Faculty. The Group shall offer such advice as seems warranted in the circumstances and shall also serve to facilitate the flow of information between the Faculty and the Administration. Since the role of the Group is advisory only, any actions taken by it or advice given shall not be regarded as formal actions or positions of the University Faculty, the Faculty Council of Representatives or of members of the Faculty other than members of the Group.

The Chair asked for continuation of the discussion started at the previous meeting. Prof. Whitlock, pointing out that the President clearly has the right to assemble any Faculty group at any time for advice, moved to strike out the phrase "faculty trustees" from the legislation. The motion was passed by voice vote.

*The words "and the Faculty Trustees" were deleted in the approved motion.
Prof. Elias asked Prof. Whitlock why he favors the resolution as amended, since he feels such an advisory group is undesirable. Prof. Whitlock replied that although he feels legislating such a group into existence is unwise, he was not prepared to disagree with the Executive Committee's desire to create such a group. Prof. Elias asked whether the President desired such a body. The President replied he certainly feels the need for some group to turn to during crises of the sort that took place last spring. At that time the Executive Committee did not feel it could speak for the Faculty, he said, and actions were taken on an ad hoc basis and often too late to be effective. Prof. Elias then asked if the Review and Procedures Committee is satisfied with the legislation as amended. The Dean, speaking as Chairman of the Committee, responded that he believed the Committee would prefer the proposition as originally offered, since the group would then include members elected directly by the Faculty, not vicariously by the FCR. Prof. Robert Pasley, Law, pointed out that the Executive Committee was originally conceived only as a housekeeping committee, and one to act in emergencies, not to speak generally for the Faculty. As amended, the resolution makes the advisory group consist only of the Executive Committee, the Dean and the Secretary, and therefore might represent a step in the opposite direction. The resolution passed, following a call for division by Prof. Whitlock, 38 to 30.

3. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Prof. Pasley, member of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, reported on the slate of nominees to fill a vacancy on the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning. The slate is as follows: Assistant Professor Morris R. Brownell, English, Arts and Sciences and Assistant Professor Joan W. Wright, Community Service Education, Human Ecology. There were no further nominations.

4. LEGISLATION ON COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC RECORDS AND INSTRUCTION

Prof. Cotts, on behalf of the Executive Committee and the Review and Procedures Committee, moved adoption of legislation establishing a Committee on
Academic Records and Instruction. (See Appendix A) Prof. L.P. Williams asked why members are appointed rather than elected. Members of the two committees this committee will replace are appointed, the Dean replied, and their task concerns primarily record-keeping. Since policy matters are referred to an elected committee, it was desired to avoid the election process. Prof. Elmer Ewing, Vegetable Crops, asked for examples of the kinds of decisions the committee might make. In reply the Dean cited the choice of lettering or language used on transcripts, paraphrasing FCR decisions on grading policy for use on transcripts, and devising a systematic scheduling and grading structure for examinations.

The resolution passed by voice vote.

5. AMENDMENT TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD LEGISLATION

The Chair called on Assoc. Prof. Thomas Scott, Agriculture and Life Sciences. Prof. James Morris, member of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, rose in Prof. Scott's place and moved adoption of the following amendment to section 1.c. of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board legislation:

The Chairman shall be elected from and by the membership for a one-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The Chairman shall have the right to vote.

The motion carried by voice vote.

6. REVISION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE

Prof. Morris then moved a revision of the Code of Academic Integrity. (See Appendix B & C.) Assoc. Prof. George S. Rinehart, Arts and Sciences, suggested deleting the sentence "The Appeals Board may not increase a penalty" from revised section 4 of Item B. inasmuch as it is redundant. Prof. Morris agreed, and the amendment passed by voice vote.

Prof. Pasley asked Prof. Morris if his Committee had considered the views of those schools which have internal honor systems, and is the proposed legislation consistent with those systems. The Dean pointed out that the enabling legislation of the Academic Integrity Code excepts those bodies having operative honor codes, and that the proposed legislation carries into the Code language passed by the
FCR last year in creating a new Academic Integrity Hearing Board and an Academic Integrity Appeals Board.

The question was then raised as to why the Code does not specify penalties. Prof. Morris quoted the original Academic Integrity Code as saying the Hearing Board may "suspend, expel, or adopt any other penalties with regard to those found in violation" of the Code of Academic Integrity. He added that both the Hearing Board and the Appellate Board have since elaborated a "long list" of additional penalties which they may or may not apply in a particular case. Prof. Robert E. Habel, Veterinary Medicine, pointed out that the report received by the FCR last spring on disciplinary action taken by the Academic Integrity Boards contained some examples which have never been discussed by the body and which he considers absurd. He read one example. The legislation carried by voice vote.

7. RESOLUTION FROM COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Prof. Cotts reported that the Membership Committee of the Faculty has in progress a study of changes required in the list of ex officio members of the Faculty. The Committee also has prepared suggestions for immediate changes to update the list for the current academic year, which are incorporated in the resolution and revised list distributed with the call to meeting. (See Appendix D.) He asked the body to strike item 15 (the Director of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc. at Buffalo) on the revised list, it being an error overlooked by the Committee, and offered the following resolution as so amended:

RESOLVED, That the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the list of ex officio members of the University Faculty for the year 1972-73 be the revised list accompanying the Report of the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty, dated July 11, 1972.

Prof. L.P. Williams asked what was the rationale for making the list. Prof. Cotts said it was to make the list more accurately represent current University offices equivalent to old offices. Prof. Bronfenbrenner expressed concern over the rationale, since ex officio Faculty members should be persons directly concerned with the academic functions of the University, who have a stake in
decisions made by the Faculty and who can contribute to these decisions. He asked if it was appropriate to raise the question at this time because if so he would like to know why a number of administrative offices are included on the list. Prof. Cotts replied that the only purpose of the list is to make corrections for the present academic year, and that Prof. Bronfenbrenner's question more directly concerns the Committee's study now in progress. Prof. Elias asked if a resolution was required, since ex officio Faculty members are listed in the Faculty By-laws. Prof. Cotts repeated his earlier point. Assistant Prof. Henry A. Alker, Sociology, asked if the study would take up the question of administrators serving as ex officio Faculty members. Prof. Cotts said the Committee had drawn up criteria for ex officio membership and would welcome suggestions from the body. Prof. Silverman asked if all ex officio Faculty members can vote. The Dean replied that they have the right to vote unless otherwise specified. The motion carried by voice vote.

The Dean reminded the body that failure to attend FCR meetings for 90 days could result in the absentee's seat being declared vacant, that a sign-up sheet is maintained, and requested the members to sign in at meetings.

Adjourned: 5:35 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
The Committee shall assume the functions of the Committee on Registration and Schedules and the Committee on Requirements for Graduation, which are to be discontinued.

Accordingly, it shall be the responsibility of this Committee:

1. to review the procedures for preregistration, registration, and scheduling for classes and examinations, and

2. to act upon requests for variations of requirements for graduation which are prescribed by University Faculty legislation, and

3. to administer the grading system (including maintaining the Grading Manual and making interpretations and minor adjustments) as prescribed by University Faculty legislation and to make recommendations for changes in the grading system, and

4. to advise the Registrar on the maintenance and reporting of academic records.

Recommendations of the Committee which have academic policy implications shall be made to the Academic Programs and Policies Committee and to the Dean of the Faculty.

The Committee shall consist of: the Registrar, ex officio; the Dean of the University Faculty, ex officio; the Secretary of the Faculty, ex officio; and members appointed by the President, in consultation with the Dean for terms of not more than four years so as to give representation to the University Faculty and the several schools and colleges.

The Chairman of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee from among the members of the Committee who are also members of the University Faculty. The Secretary of the Committee shall be the Registrar or his designee.

At the discretion of the Chairman, sub-committees may be appointed from Committee members or from other members of the University Faculty.

10/11/72
I. PRINCIPLE

Absolute integrity is expected of every Cornell student in all academic undertakings; he must in no way misrepresent his work, fraudulently or unfairly advance his academic status, or be a party to another student's failure to maintain academic integrity.

II. RESPONSIBILITY

The maintenance of an atmosphere of academic honor and the fulfillment of the provisions of this Code are the responsibilities of the students and faculty of Cornell University. Therefore, all students and faculty members shall refrain from any action that would violate the basic principles of this Code, in spirit or letter.

A. Student Responsibility

"Student" as used in this Code means a student registered in one of the undergraduate divisions of the University. However, the principle of this Code shall also apply to students registered in the Graduate School, or in one of the post-baccalaureate professional schools. Procedures applicable to students from these schools are outlined in Article IV-C of this Code.

1. A student assumes responsibility for the content and integrity of the academic work he submits, such as papers, examinations, or reports.

2. A student shall be guilty of violating the Code if he:
   a. knowingly represents the work of others as his own;
   b. uses or obtains unauthorized assistance in any academic work;
   c. gives fraudulent assistance to another student.

3. A student or group of students knowing of any situation in which a violation of the Code may have occurred or is likely to occur should bring this knowledge to the attention of the responsible faculty member or to the attention of a member of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

B. Faculty Responsibility

1. Each faculty member shall develop and maintain an academic atmosphere conducive to the spirit of free inquiry and academic integrity. He shall inform his students of regulations that apply to academic integrity in work in his course and made clear to what extent he will accept prior work, papers submitted for another course, collaborative effort, and the exchange or use of aid or information. He shall also indicate what he considers to constitute an act of plagiarism.

2. A faculty member who feels that a student's actions indicate that he lacks awareness of the meaning of academic integrity, or is insufficiently committed to its principles, shall try to improve the student's understanding of his intellectual responsibility.

(over)
3. In cases of suspected violation of the Code of Academic Integrity by an undergraduate, the alleged violation is to be reported to the Chairman of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board who will institute a hearing. If a course grade must be given prior to the hearing, an "INCOMPLETE" should be reported. After the Board's determination of guilt or innocence, the instructor shall give an appropriate grade for the course. Penalties for violating the Code of Academic Integrity are the prerogative of the Board which shall take into account all the circumstances of the case.

4. A student may request the Chairman of the Hearing Board to institute a hearing if an instructor assigns a grade or takes any other action against a student, based on an alleged violation, without following the procedures outlined in paragraph 3. The Chairman, after investigating the circumstances, shall institute a hearing if he believes it is warranted.

C. Joint Responsibility

1. A faculty-student committee on academic integrity (the Academic Integrity Hearing Board) shall be vested with primary responsibility for action in support of the principles stated in this Code. The responsibility shall include:

   a. The development of policies and procedures for encouraging and maintaining a climate of academic integrity in the University community.
   b. Hearing and deciding all cases brought before it involving alleged violations of this Code.

2. A faculty-student appellate committee (the Academic Integrity Appeals Board) shall be vested with the responsibility of considering petitions appealing decisions of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board and, as specified in Article IV-C, decisions by graduate and professional school committees.

III. ORGANIZATION

A. Jurisdiction

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board or, in the case of an appeal, the Academic Integrity Appeals Board, shall decide upon the innocence or guilt of students brought before it. A student found guilty shall be considered to have failed in his obligations to the University; such failure shall be grounds for expulsion, suspension, or such lesser penalty as the particular Board may decide.

B. Composition and Selection

1. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board and the Academic Integrity Appeals Board shall conform to procedures established by the Faculty Council of Representatives. (See Appendix I.)
IV. PROCEDURES

A. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board

1. The Board shall establish procedures necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

2. The Board shall maintain clear records of its proceedings.

3. The Board shall meet upon the call of the Chairman. The Chairman may call a hearing on his own initiative, on the request of a faculty member, or on the request of an aggrieved student.

4. Any accused student shall receive at least seven days in advance, written notice of the date, time, and place of hearing, and a written statement of the charges against him. The notice shall include a statement of his rights, including:

   a. The right to be accompanied by an advisor.
   b. The right to be present when charges and evidence are presented to the Board.
   c. The right to present his case and to challenge the charges or the evidence.
   d. The right to present witnesses on question of fact.
   e. The right to receive prompt written notice of the Board's decision.
   f. The right of access to all records of the proceedings of the hearing.
   g. The right to petition the Academic Integrity Appeals Board to hear an appeal.

5. A student accused of violating the Code shall appear to give testimony and answer questions of the Board. If the student refuses to appear, the Board shall have the authority to proceed in his absence.

6. All other principals and witnesses in the matter shall appear when requested to give testimony and answer questions of the Board.

7. The student and faculty members of the Board present at the hearing shall decide upon the guilt or innocence of the accused.

8. If the accused is found guilty, the penalty to be imposed for the violation shall be determined by vote of the members of the Board present at the hearing.

9. When time intervals prescribed in the penalty have elapsed, the Board will consider petitions for:

   a. Re-admission to the University in the event of suspension.
   b. Removal of any penalty statements that may appear on the student's transcript.

(over)
B. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board

1. The Board shall establish procedures necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

2. The Board will consider all petitions from undergraduates appealing decisions of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board. Ground for appeal will be limited to the denial of due process or the condition of procedural errors.

3. If the Board decides that there are sufficient grounds for it to entertain an appeal, it may review the findings of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board and the penalties imposed.

4. The Board may affirm or reverse a verdict, and may affirm, modify, or reduce a penalty, but may not increase it. The penalty fixed by the Hearing Board will be deemed presumptively reasonable and may be reduced only if the Appeals Board finds it grossly severe. New evidence will call for a new hearing by the Hearing Board.

5. Except as hereinafter provided in Article IV-E, all decisions of the Board shall be final.

C. Graduate and Professional Schools

1. In cases of suspected violation of the Code of Academic Integrity by a student in the Graduate School or one of the post-baccalaureate professional schools, the alleged violation is to be reported to the student's Special Graduate Committee or to the professional school in which he is registered. The appropriate committees within the graduate and professional schools have primary responsibility for the conduct of hearings in such cases.

2. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board will consider petitions from graduate students appealing academic integrity decisions by graduate and professional school committees, provided that the concerned school does not have an appellate procedure. For these cases, the three undergraduate student members will be replaced by three graduate student members, selected by procedures to be established by the Appeals Board.

D. Following final action by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, a summary report shall be transmitted to the student concerned, to his parents or guardian when appropriate, to his college or school, and to the faculty member bringing the charge.

E. The Faculty Council of Representatives retains the right to intervene to overrule actions of the Board on its own motion.

V. SCHOOL AND COLLEGE PLANS

Any school or college of the University may propose to the Academic Integrity Hearing Board a plan for dealing with cases of alleged academic fraud involving students registered in that school or college. If the Board finds
that such a plan is consistent with the spirit of this legislation and that cases may be handled more expeditiously and equitably by such a plan, it shall authorize the operation of such plan and, where authorized, the determinations made under the school or college plan shall have the same effect as if they had been made by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

Students who wish to appeal decisions of the school or college plan academic integrity committees or appellate committees will direct their petitions to the Academic Integrity Appeals Board.

The committee or other agency responsible for the operation of any school or college plan shall file a report of its operations with the Academic Integrity Hearing Board in June of each year.

Existing school honor codes, as in the Veterinary School and the Law School, are not governed by the foregoing legislation, but such a school shall be required to file a current copy of its Academic Honor Code with the University Academic Integrity Hearing Board at the beginning of each academic year.

1. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board

   a. Responsibilities. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board shall interpret and implement the Code of Academic Integrity, adopted by the Faculty, and may propose to the FCR changes in the Code.

      (1) The Board shall develop policies and procedures for encouraging and maintaining a climate of academic integrity in the University community.

      (2) The Board shall hear charges against students accused of Code violations, and shall hear the defense offered by the accused. It shall decide upon the guilt or innocence of those charged and shall be empowered to impose penalties. Violations of the Code shall be considered grounds for expulsion, suspension or such lesser penalties as the Board may decide.

      (3) The Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a person to serve as a non-voting Executive Secretary of the Board.

      (4) The Board shall determine its own procedures whenever provisions of the Code of Academic Integrity are not applicable.

   b. Membership. The Board shall consist of five faculty members with two alternates, and five students with two alternates.

      (1) Faculty members and alternates shall be elected for three-year terms by the University Faculty without regard to membership in the FCR.

      (2) Student members and alternates shall be chosen for one or two-year terms in a manner acceptable to the Faculty Committee on Nominations and Elections.

   c. Chairman. The Chairman shall be elected from and by the membership for a one-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The Chairman shall have the right to vote.

2. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board.

   a. Responsibilities. In accordance with procedures set forth in the Code of Academic Integrity, the Appeals Board will provide an avenue by which a student found guilty by the Hearing Board may appeal its decision on the basis that due process was not accorded or procedural errors were committed. The penalty fixed by the Hearing Board will be deemed presumptively reasonable and may be reduced only if the Appeals Board finds it grossly severe. The Appeals Board may not increase a penalty. New evidence will call for a new hearing by the Hearing Board.
b. Membership. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board shall consist of three faculty members with one alternate and three student members with one alternate.

(1) Members and alternates, other than the chairman, shall be chosen in the same manner and for the same terms as members of the Hearing Board.

(2) The Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a person to serve as a non-voting Executive Secretary of the Board.

(3) No member of the Appeals Board shall also be a member of the Hearing Board.

c. Chairman. The Chairman shall be elected from and by the membership for a one-year term and be eligible for re-election. The Chairman shall have the right to vote.
CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Adopted by the University Faculty on May 14, 1969. Revised to conform to resolution adopted December 1, 1971 and amended May 1972 by the Faculty Council of Representatives.

PRINCIPLE

Absolute integrity is expected of every Cornell student in all academic undertakings; he must in no way misrepresent his work, fraudulently or unfairly advance his academic status, or be a party to another student's failure to maintain academic integrity.

RESPONSIBILITY

The maintenance of an atmosphere of academic honor and the fulfillment of the provisions of this Code are the responsibilities of the students and faculty of Cornell University. Therefore, all students and faculty members shall refrain from any action that would violate the basic principles of this Code, in spirit or letter.

A. Student Responsibility

"Student" as used in this Code means a student registered in one of the undergraduate divisions of the University. However, the principles of this Code shall also apply to students registered in the Graduate School, or in one of the post-baccalaureate professional schools. Procedures applicable to students from these schools are outlined in Article IV-C of this Code.

1. A student assumes responsibility for the content and integrity of the academic work he submits, such as papers, examinations, or reports.

2. A student shall be guilty of violating the Code if he:
   a. knowingly represents the work of others as his own;
   b. uses or obtains unauthorized assistance in any academic work;
   c. gives fraudulent assistance to another student.

B. Faculty Responsibility

1. Each faculty member shall develop and maintain an academic atmosphere conducive to the spirit of free inquiry and academic integrity. He shall inform his students of regulations that apply to academic integrity in work in his course and make clear to what extent he will accept prior work, papers submitted for another course, collaborative effort, and the exchange or use of aid or information. He shall also indicate what he considers to constitute an act of plagiarism.
2. A faculty member who feels that a student's actions indicate that he lacks awareness of the meaning of academic integrity, or is insufficiently committed to its principles, shall try to improve the student's understanding of his intellectual responsibility.

3. In cases of suspected violation of the Code of Academic Integrity by an undergraduate, the alleged violation is to be reported to the Chairman of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Integrity] who will institute a hearing. If a course grade must be given prior to the hearing, an "INCOMPLETE" should be reported. After the Board's [Committee's] determination of guilt or innocence, the instructor shall give an appropriate grade for the course. Penalties for violating the Code of Academic Integrity are the prerogative of the Board [Committee] which shall take into account all the circumstances of the case.

4. A student may request the Chairman of the Hearing Board [Committee] to institute a hearing if an instructor assigns a grade or takes any other action against a student, based on an alleged violation, without following the procedures outlined in paragraph 3. The Chairman, after investigating the circumstances, shall institute a hearing if he believes it is warranted.

C. Joint Responsibility

1. A faculty-student committee on academic integrity (the Academic Integrity Hearing Board) [Regular Committee] shall be vested with primary responsibility for action in support of the principles stated in this Code. The responsibility shall include:

   a. The development of policies and procedures for encouraging and maintaining a climate of academic integrity in the University community.

   b. Hearing and deciding all cases brought before it involving alleged violations of this Code.

2. A faculty-student appellate committee (the Academic Integrity Appeals Board) [Appellate Committee] shall be vested with the responsibility of considering petitions appealing decisions of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee] and, as specified in Article IV-C, decisions by graduate and professional school committees.

ORGANIZATION

A. Jurisdiction

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee] or, in the case of an appeal, the Academic Integrity Appeals Board [Appellate Committee], shall decide upon the innocence or guilt of students brought before it. A student found guilty shall be considered to have failed in his obligations to the University; such failure shall be grounds for expulsion, suspension, or such lesser penalty as the particular Board [Committee] may decide.
3. Composition and Selection

1. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board and the Academic Integrity Appeals Board shall conform to procedures established by the Faculty Council of Representatives. (See Appendix I).

PROCEDURES

4. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee]

1. The Board [Committee] shall establish procedures necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

2. Each member shall have one vote with the exception of the Executive Secretary, who shall be without vote.]  

3. The Board [Committee] shall maintain clear records of its proceedings.

4. The Board [Committee] shall meet upon the call of the Chairman. The Chairman may call a hearing on his own initiative, on the request of a faculty member, or on the request of an aggrieved student.

5. Any accused student shall receive at least seven days in advance, written notice of the date, time, and place of hearing, and a written statement of the charges against him. The notice shall include a statement of his rights, including:

a. The right to be accompanied by an advisor.

b. The right to be present when charges and evidence are presented to the Board [Committee].

c. The right to present his case and to challenge the charges or the evidence.

d. The right to present witnesses on question of fact.

e. The right to receive prompt written notice of the Board's [Committee's] decision.

f. The right of access to all records of the proceedings of the hearing.

g. The right to petition the Academic Integrity Appeals Board [Appellate Committee] to hear an appeal.

5. A student accused of violating the Code shall appear to give testimony and answer questions of the Board [Committee]. If the student refuses to appear, the Board [Committee] shall have the authority to proceed in his absence.
6. [7.] All other principals and witnesses in the matter shall appear when requested to give testimony and answer questions of the Board [Committee].

7. [8.] The student and faculty members of the Board [Committee] present at the hearing shall decide upon the guilt or innocence of the accused.

8. [9.] If the accused is found guilty, the penalty to be imposed for the violation shall be determined by vote of the members of the Board [Committee] present at the hearing.

9. [10.] When time intervals prescribed in the penalty have elapsed, the Board [Committee] will consider petitions for:
   a. Re-admission to the University in the event of suspension.
   b. Removal of any penalty statements that may appear on the student's transcript.

   The Academic Integrity Appeals Board [Appellate Committee].

1. The Board [Committee] shall establish procedures necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

2. The Board [Committee] will consider all petitions from undergraduates appealing decisions of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee]. Ground for appeal will be limited to the denial of due process or the condition of procedural errors.

3. If the Board [Committee] decides that there are sufficient grounds for it to entertain an appeal, it may review the findings of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee] and the penalties imposed.

[4. delete - Each member of the Committee shall have one vote except for the Executive Secretary who shall be without vote.]

4. [5.] The Board [Committee] may affirm or reverse a verdict, and may affirm, modify, or reduce a penalty, but may not increase it. The penalty fixed by the Hearing Board will be deemed presumptively reasonable and may be reduced only if the Appeals Board finds it grossly severe. The Appeals Board may not increase a penalty. New evidence will call for a new hearing by the Hearing Board.

5. [6.] Except as hereinafter provided in Article IV-E, all decisions of the Board [Committee] shall be final.
C. Graduate and Professional Schools

1. In cases of suspected violation of the Code of Academic Integrity by a student in the Graduate School or one of the post-baccalaureate professional schools, the alleged violation is to be reported to the student's Special Graduate Committee or to the professional school in which he is registered. The appropriate committees within the graduate and professional schools have primary responsibility for the conduct of hearings in such cases.

2. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board [Appellate Committee] will consider petitions from graduate students appealing academic integrity decisions by graduate and professional school committees, provided that the concerned school does not have an appellate procedure. For these cases, the three undergraduate student members will be replaced by three graduate student members, selected by procedures to be established by the Appeals Board [Appellate Committee].

D. Following final action by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Regular Committee], a summary report shall be transmitted to the student concerned, to his parents or guardian when appropriate, to his college or school, and to the faculty member bringing the charge.

E. The Faculty Council of Representatives retains the right to intervene to overrule actions of the Board [Committee] on its own motion.

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE PLANS

Any school or college of the University may propose to the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Integrity] a plan for dealing with cases of alleged academic fraud involving students registered in that school or college. If the Board [Committee] finds that such a plan is consistent with the spirit of this legislation and that cases may be handled more expeditiously and equitably by such a plan, it shall authorize the operation of such plan and, where authorized, the determinations made under the school or college plan shall have the same effect as if they had been made by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Integrity].

Students who wish to appeal decisions of the school or college plan academic integrity committees or appellate committees will direct their petitions to the Academic Integrity Appeals Board [Faculty-Student Appellate Committee on Academic Integrity].

The committee or other agency responsible for the operation of any school or college plan shall file a report of its operations with the Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Integrity] in June of each year.
Existing school honor codes, as in the Veterinary School and the Law School, are not governed by the foregoing legislation, but such a school shall be required to file a current copy of its Academic Honor Code with the University Academic Integrity Hearing Board [Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Integrity (Regular Committee)] at the beginning of each academic year.

APPENDIX I

The following are the excerpts on Membership of the Academic Integrity Hearing and Appeals Boards as set forth in the legislation adopted December 1, 1971, and amended May 1972, by the Faculty Council of Representatives of the University.

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

a. (3) "The Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a person to serve as a non-voting Executive Secretary of the Board."

b. "Membership. The Board shall consist of five Faculty members with two alternates, and five students with two alternates.

   (1) "Faculty members and alternates shall be elected for three-year terms by the University Faculty without regard to membership in the FCR.

   (2) "Student members and alternates shall be chosen for one or two-year terms in a manner acceptable to the Faculty Committee on Nominations and Elections."

c. "The Chairman shall be elected from and by the membership for a one-year term and shall be eligible for re-election. The Chairman shall have the right to vote.

The Academic Integrity Appeals Board.

b. "Membership. The Academic Integrity Appeals Board shall consist of three Faculty members with one alternate and three student members with one alternate.

   (1) "Members and alternates, other than the chairman, shall be chosen in the same manner and for the same terms as members of the Hearing Board."

   (2) "The Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a person to serve as a non-voting Executive Secretary of the Board.

   (3) "No member of the Appeals Board shall also be a member of the Hearing Board."

(continued)
c. "Chairman. The Chairman shall be elected from and by the membership for a one-year term and be eligible for re-election. The Chairman shall have the right to vote."

Proposed amendment.

"At least one member of the Appeals Board should have served as a member of the Hearing Board."
APPENDIX  D

LIST OF EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (1972-73)

(1) The Provost and Vice Provosts
(2) The Vice Presidents
(3) The Dean of the University Faculty
(4) The Deans and Directors of the Colleges and Schools at Ithaca
(5) The Director of the University Libraries
(6) The Assistant Directors of the University Libraries
(7) The University Publisher
(8) The Registrar
(9) The Dean of Admissions and Financial Aids
(10) The Dean of Students
(11) The Director of Resident Instruction in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
(12) The Director of Cooperative Extension in Agriculture and Human Ecology
(13) The Director of the Experiment Station at Ithaca
(14) The Director of the State Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva
(15) The Director of University Health Services
(16) The Dean of Physical Education and Athletics
(17) The Director of the Office for Coordination of University Religious Affairs
(18) The President Emeritus

7/11/72
Passed as revised by the FCR 10/11/72
LIST OF EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (1972-73)

(1) The Provost and Vice Provosts
    Combines item (22) with item (1)

(2) The Vice Presidents

(3) The Dean of the University Faculty

(4) The Deans and Directors of the Colleges and Schools at Ithaca

(5) The Director of the University Libraries

(6) The Assistant Directors of the University Libraries

(7) The University Publisher

(8) The Registrar

(9) The Dean of Admissions and Financial Aids

(10) The Dean of Students

(11) The Director of Resident Instruction in the College of Agriculture

(12) The Director of Resident Instruction in the College of Human Ecology
    This office no longer exists in the College of Human Ecology.
    The functions of the office are carried out by Assoc. Dean Jean Failing who is a member of the University Faculty.

(13) The Director of Cooperative Extension in Agriculture and Human Ecology
    The word "cooperative" is added for clarification.

(14) The Director[s] of the Experiment Station[s] at Ithaca
    There is only one Experiment Station in Ithaca.

(15) The Director of the State Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva

(16) The Director of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc. at Buffalo

(17) The Director of [the Infirmary and Clinic] University Health Services
    The change reflects change in title of the office.

(18) The Dean [Director] of Physical Education and Athletics
    The change is due to a change in organizational structure.
    (Recommended by Vice President Gurowitz)

(19) The Director of [Cornell United Religious Work] the Office for Coordination of University Religious Affairs
    The change is due to a change in organizational structure.
    (Recommended by Vice President Gurowitz)

(20) The Secretary of the University
    This office has been eliminated in organizational structure of the University. For 1972-73, the Committee recommends that the Secretary of the Board, N. Stamp, be invited to University Faculty and FCR meetings as a guest.

(21) The President Emeritus

(22) The Vice Provost
    Combined with item (1)
The Speaker, Russell D. Martin, called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. 152 FCR and University Faculty members and 2 visitors were present.

The Speaker announced that this was a special meeting of the FCR to which the entire University Faculty had been invited. No votes would be taken, and after opening remarks by the Dean of Faculty, Norman Penney, the meeting would be turned over to Professor Edmund Cranch, Engineering, who would make a presentation. Then it would be thrown open for question and discussion. The Speaker called on the Dean for his remarks.

1. REMARKS OF THE DEAN

The Dean pointed out that this is the first of a series of meetings. It is intended to give faculty members an opportunity to pose questions to Professor Cranch and members of the Advisory Committee on Financial Planning, which he had chaired. FCR committees will hold hearings focusing on specific recommendations of the Cranch report for discussion and response. He urged the faculty to participate in these hearings, pointing out that if a member could not attend a hearing on a subject in which he was particularly interested, he could appear at another hearing and state his views there. He also urged faculty members to submit their views in writing to him in order to facilitate the gathering of responses and to increase their persuasiveness. He then turned the meeting over to Professor Cranch.

2. PRESENTATION BY PROFESSOR CRANCH (Appendix A)

Professor Cranch reminded the body of the charge by the President to his committee, to recommend, in light of the financial difficulties being experienced by higher education and Cornell in particular, how Cornell can preserve and strengthen its academic programs and at the same time maintain a stable and balanced financial position. In light of this charge, one can neither take an aloof academic position nor justify the hard-hearted view of the auditors, he said. He then grouped the Committee's recommendations into four categories.
The first is planning, particularly the need for over-all academic planning. To avoid the depersonalization that can result from such an exercise, a number of the Committee's recommendations place the responsibility for planning with the faculty. The high-priority need to reach a decision on a University calendar for at least the next five or ten years should be thought of within the planning concept, he said. The Committee could not reach a decision on this matter in the time available to it. Another planning need is to assess where the University stands in terms of new academic programs.

The second category of recommendations concerns orders of magnitude, i.e. size of faculty, student body, etc. To counter an opinion voiced on campus that the Committee neglected the area of campus life in its deliberations, Professor Cranch said the Committee had talked with representatives of the campus life area in the process of doing its work, and looked at pertinent University Senate reports. The Committee chose to outline existing alternatives rather than reach a decision, he said, and felt it was protecting students' interests by recommending that there be check points such as traffic, housing and health requirements, before continued growth in the University continue. He added that the study made by Professor Robert Smith, Agricultural Economics, on student financial aid is just the kind of response his committee hoped to encourage.

The third category of recommendations concerns academic quality. Under this category the Committee recommended continued high support of graduate education, and considered such questions as faculty salaries, improvement of instruction, etc. If financial pressures dictate a no-growth situation as far as faculty size is concerned, it is imperative that Cornell maintain a certain amount of seed money for educational innovation, he said. Another very important recommendation in this category concerns planning the promotion of assistant professors to tenured ranks. This continued flow is at the heart of maintaining Cornell's academic stature.

The fourth category of recommendations deals with the situation of "no or
limited growth at the University", Professor Cranch said. Recommendations in this category concern the need for improved effectiveness of the faculty in the performance of their academic duties, the need for counseling of faculty members by their department chairmen, annual reviews in the spirit of counseling with faculty members, pre-sabbatic reviews, and attention to promotion from associate to full professor. To illustrate the need for internal evaluation and innovation, he cited the review of the tenure system made by one of his subcommittees. Although it decided that tenure should be retained at the University, the subcommittee reviewed criticisms of tenure, recommended that the faculty propose changes in the present system, and listed a series of procedures the faculty might want to consider.

Professor Cranch also mentioned consequences of a no-growth situation in the support areas. Recommendation number 16 is intended to help the University utilize its cadre of support staff in a way that will strengthen the University and not overload it, he said. He also touched on the need to exercise care in expenditures for new buildings and for rehabilitation of existing facilities to make sure they support the academic purposes of the University.

Professor Cranch concluded that the committee's report was constructive and optimistic because its financial recommendations assume that Cornell can maintain and strengthen its academic qualities and at the same time meet its financial commitments. The margins are sufficiently narrow, he said, that with proper attention we can preserve Cornell as one of the leading universities in the world. It is time to turn our attention to planning activities, a process essentially of self-understanding, so that we can maintain that position.

3. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Members of the Cranch Committee then joined Professor Cranch before the body to receive the views of faculty members and respond to them. They were: Professor Donald F. Holcomb, Physics; H. Justin Davidson, Dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration; Professor Robert S. Morison,
Biological Sciences; Ronald Loomis, Director of University Unions; Professor David L. Call, Nutrition; Professor J. Saunders Redding, English; and Alfred E. Kahn, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Hans Bethe, Physics, made a statement endorsing some sections of the report, but expressing deep concern over sections 12 and 13 of the report, dealing with counseling and tenure. If the recommendations for terminating tenure were to be made use of frequently, it would be a great calamity, he said, because the need for discretion and secrecy would be impossible to observe. Moreover, he estimated that only about one percent of the faculty would be affected by such procedures, and this would not contribute greatly to the financial solvency of the University. He quoted the heading of section 12, dealing with counseling: "Strengthen academic effectiveness through such improved motivation, evaluation and management techniques". I don't want to be managed, said Professor Bethe. Management of the faculty is not in the tradition of this or any other university, he continued. The concept of annual counseling with a department chairman is particularly objectionable, he said, since faculty needing counseling usually seek it among their colleagues who are closest to their teaching or research work. It is also disagreeable to put the chairman in the position of a manager, he said, since in his opinion a chairman represents the departmental faculty, not the University administration. The implication of an annual review is that if you don't obey management orders, then you will be subject to termination procedures. There have to be cooperative goals of a department, but they should stem from consultation among all department members with the chairman directing discussion, not being a dictator. The managerial approach will not encourage greater motivation, but have the exact opposite affect. Greater motivation comes when every person pursues his own excellence, Professor Bethe said, and tries to contribute to the excellence of his department and thereby of the University. This striving for excellence would be severely handicapped by the managerial approach which runs through this section
of the report.

Dean Kahn responded that talking about "rewards", "incentives" and "plans" follows inevitably from a charge to make recommendations to the administration of the University in a situation of financial difficulty and from a concern for maintaining the quality of the University. To some degree the University is managed, he said. Questions about contract renewals, promotions, and raises cross his desk daily and often require lengthy discussion. To the maximum extent possible, those decisions ought to be made among colleagues. While the term "annual review" may be a wrong choice of words, can anyone argue against explaining departmental decisions to faculty members who are, or will be, affected by them? In addition, the University ought to have the right to encourage tenured faculty members to retool, he said, if they are operating in a field of diminishing interest. He also defended the University's right to dismiss incompetent people, and its need to counter external criticism of tenure as a protectionist device. While agreeing that internal motivation accounts for "99 percent of what we get of value," he argued that outside factors have some influence, and that the Committee thinks "they ought to be done with some reason and consideration." He concluded, "the managerial rhetoric used in the report clearly implies a degree of rigidity in respect to procedure and function which I for one did not have in mind."

Professor Robin M. Williams, Sociology, pointed out that faculty members who lived through the 1940's and 1950's remember keenly how easily some of their number were moved out of their positions under ideological and political pressures. "We do not wish to see the report capitulate to outside pressures", he said, "but would expect to explain and defend the tenure system on the grounds of the real value it serves. In this case, it is the language of record that we are talking about".

Professor Wolfgang Fuchs, Mathematics, said that his department had authorized him to state that "the Mathematics Department rejects the Cranch
Report as even a basis for discussion of the future of Cornell University, because it nowhere addresses itself properly to the real goals of learning and scholarship to which Cornell University must be committed. "The department's objection is mainly based on sections 12 and 13," he added.

Professor L. Pearce Williams, History, challenged the framework in which the Cranch Report was given to the faculty in that the financial future of the University appears to have improved since the Committee was formed. He formally requested the President and the Provost to make a financial report on the current state of the University so that the faculty might learn to what extent this might serve to modify some of the stringencies provided by the Cranch Report.

Professor Williams also pointed out that management has grown rapidly at Cornell since the pre-War period, when Cornell was essentially a steady-state university. For example, in 1927 there were \(2\frac{1}{2}\) supporting people in the office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to take care of a student body one half the present size. He said he believes there are now 26 support people in the Dean's office. "Can we not", he said, "find out how far this sort of proliferation has gone and what possibilities there might be to recommend similar measures for cutting back on these expenses?"

Professor Cranch replied that the Committee tried to project long-range rates of increase of income and expenditures for the University, realizing that the short-range financial situation was changing almost month by month.

Dean Kahn agreed with Professor Williams that administration has expanded more rapidly than the faculty, and invited Professor Williams to survey the Arts College administration. He also enumerated nine of the various functions which he said faculty and students have requested his staff to perform.

President Corson confirmed that the University has done better financially than expected, partly through the cooperation of the faculty in achieving goals that were set. Inflation in education, however, has risen higher than in the rest of the economy, he pointed out. "If we follow our present policies" he
said, "restricting salaries, deferring maintenance, continuing to cut programs (and they have been cut more in administration than in the academic area) and continue to have the same increases in investment income, we will have a surplus over the next two or three years. Following that, we will lapse again into a fairly serious deficit position because costs inflating at the rate they are outrun the prospects of increased income."

Responding to Professor Fuchs, Professor Holcomb said he hoped the Mathematics faculty would at least be willing to take the graphs and tables in the Cranch Report as being rhetorically neutral and deserving of study. He agreed that the report does not address itself to the fundamental educational goals and priorities of the University. A subcommittee chaired by Professor Arch Dotson, Government, had examined the question, he said, and decided that to attempt to formulate a statement in a way that would be useful for planning was beyond its capabilities.

Professor David Call, who had chaired the Cranch Committee's subcommittee on tenure, said that universities invite criticism of tenure because, unlike organizations such as the Civil Service system, they reveal how one gets tenure. His subcommittee also felt that undue importance is given to the tenure decision, which is only one part of the total system. Critics within the University attack this undue emphasis on promotion to tenure and the absence of procedures for controlling what happens after a person gets tenure. Cornell operates in essence without such procedures, he said. As far as the Committee could find, there is no University policy on termination of a tenured contract.

Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, said he was circulating a petition which closely parallels Professor Bethe's statement. He expressed dissatisfaction with Dean Kahn's response as saying "we didn't really mean what we said". If that is true, he said, why not delete all recommendations in the report addressed to the faculty? The Committee report does not propose annual counseling as a casual business of getting together for a talk, he said, but states that counseling of
a faculty member should deal with the "compatibility of his goals with those broader University goals which promote the common good". The report also informs us, he said, that every faculty member is entitled to the opportunity of an annual meeting to discuss his objectives with the person who determines his salary. True, the University must be run, he said, but with such monumental changes in the level of management and in the spirit with which that management is conducted as suggested by the report you will get a very different kind of faculty than you have now. As an indication of the depth of feeling on these points by faculty members, Professor Olum said, he has found almost no one who did not respond enthusiastically to the petition he is circulating and agreed to sign it.

He also replied to Professor Call that he believed the present system of tenure at Cornell is a far superior basis for discussion and forming a better system than the report's proposals. Finally, Professor Olum stated that a report made by Harvard University on tenure constituted a much better statement than the Committee report. Even better are excerpts from an annual report made by President Kingman Brewster of Yale. He read three excerpts from the report which described the damaging effect of tenure termination systems and periodic reviews.

Professor Cranch responded on behalf of the Committee that such abstraction of portions of the report and stringing them together as Professor Olum had done distorts the meaning of the report. The spirit of the report is to examine the question of how the University can move in new directions and handle natural aspirations of younger faculty members; it is also to some extent the need for recognizing departmental goals over individual goals.

Professor Olum responded by reading a sentence from the report: "The University must have some device for communicating these needs (for moving in new directions) to the individual faculty member and rewarding those who adjust."

Dean Kahn commented that the Sociology Department had recently communicated to him a new need for course offerings in the area of criminal justice. He said
he had replied to the chairman of the department that he could not help, but perhaps the department could consider ways in which department members with tenure might adjust to meet the needs that they had identified. As a result, the department had held a meeting on the matter and invited the Dean to attend. "It is very important to get across the idea that you can't just hire new people any more," the Dean said. He added that he has been ordered by the administration to approve salary increases on the basis of merit, that he has no objection to that order, and that salary raises are as a result given only after serious discussion with department chairmen as to the contributions of the faculty members involved.

Professor Morison responded to Professor Olum that he supports the report's recommendation that faculty members, particularly young ones, discuss goals and objectives annually with persons who control their salaries. Also perfectly reasonable, in his opinion, was the report's suggestion that faculty members be made aware of departmental goals and objectives. "However unpleasant it may be to discuss such matters," he said, "we are confronted with great mass problems of education in parts of which many men of good will do not spontaneously want to take part." He said the faculty and its representatives and deans have a responsibility to reward those who take part in such endeavors as teaching a first-year course in science.

Dean Davidson, B & PA, said the report recognizes that the University's effectiveness depends on individual faculty members, and that it attempted to focus attention on the fact that the individual faculty member doesn't always know what the rules of the game are. Not only should he be able to seek counsel, but a corresponding obligation exists to make sure counseling is there when he asks for it. The recommendations were conceived as trying to fill the need for information, not as imposing policy from above, he said.
Professor Albert Silverman, Physics, stated that while the committee may feel the report makes suggestions that are good for the University, the faculty seems to feel they are bad. They will not add to academic stature but destroy it. They are bureaucratic, restrictive and tend to limit the freedom of the individual.

Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, supported Professor Bethe's statement and said there exists a quasi-official document at the statutory colleges, an effort evaluation form, requiring faculty members to "renegotiate their contracts annually in order to properly allocate their efforts". While supporting the need for planning and for a system of public accountability in the statutory units, he said he feels ambivalent because he is very unhappy about the paragraphs in the Cranch Report, and he is told that the effort-evaluation form is an "incredibly bad" statement on the order of those to which the faculty is objecting today. This sort of thinking can destroy the University, he said.

Professor Call pointed out to Professor Olum that the Harvard statement on tenure formed a part of his subcommittee's report. He stated that basically his subcommittee accepted both the statement's defense of tenure and its suggestion that policies and procedures be put in writing for the guidance of non-tenured faculty members.

Professor Bethe commented that the main tenor of the remarks from the Committee seemed to be that they didn't mean what they said. Therefore, if this were a meeting where one could make motions, he said, he would move that the Committee rewrite sections 12 and 13 so that they say what they mean, rather than what they say now.

Assistant Professor David A. Singer, Mathematics, commented that as a non-tenured faculty member he feels coercion of tenured or non-tenured people toward the production of academic excellence is counter-productive. He said he prefers the present tenure system with its faults and pressures on younger
members. If we further degrade the tenure system, we are going to see the development of unionization, he said. He added that he believes that the Mathematics Department rejects the Cranch Report not just because of sections 12 and 13, but because the report attempts to seek solutions by directing attention to financial difficulties and measures to alleviate them. Any reasonable planning effort concerning the growth of Cornell must start from the point that Cornell must persevere as an institution of academic excellence. If finances contradict these goals, then the report should be "pulling in the other direction", he said.

In support of this view, he pointed out that students object most strongly to sections of the Cranch Committee's report dealing with expansion of the student body and elimination of small classes. Such recommendations involve increasing costs to the University and the community, he said. The Mathematics Department feels that unless the total cost picture, including "non-dollar costs", is considered by such a report, it is not valid.

Professor Cranch responded that the most useful thing the Mathematics Department could do is help the Cornell community identify some of the costs in such a way that they can be recognized and evaluated, and some alternatives can be determined. As far as small course proliferation is concerned, he said, the Committee did not recommend elimination of them, but pointed out the "enriched situation" in this regard at Cornell and the fact that, with no faculty enlargement, there is already room to accommodate the need for creating new areas of instruction.

Professor Morison said that if 45 percent of the teaching effort is in classes of less than 10 students, it means very small numbers of students are involved in these classes. The Committee hoped to focus attention on this point, he said, with a view to perhaps creating more courses involving 10 to 20 students, without loss of small class character and with no increase in teaching staff.

Adjourned: 6:10 p.m.  

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Full Text of the Cranch Report


Here is the text in its entirety:

PREFACE

It is ironic that the decade of the 1960s, an era of unprecedented prosperity, closed with a financial outlook for higher education that can only be described as very serious for most institutions and of crisis proportions for some. Cornell, certainly one of the leading universities in the country, with an educational responsibility of worldwide scope, emerged from the decade in a financial position which, while better than most, required stern measures. In the face of mounting deficits the University adopted a three-year program of budget cuts designed to bring its operating expenses into line with its income by the academic year 1973-74. It was clear from the outset that this program, even if it were successful, could provide no more than temporary relief. What was called for was a long-range planning effort, one that would help to chart Cornell's course far beyond the moment of a balanced budget. With this in mind, President Corson appointed an Advisory Committee on Long Range Financial Planning and gave it the task of assessing the financial state of the University, establishing guidelines for long-range planning in the light of this assessment, and evaluating the academic consequences of such planning.

The Committee gave most of its attention to the Endowed Colleges in Ithaca. Although the role of the Statutory Colleges is vital to the University's educational program, their "pay-as-you-go" budgetary operation effectively precludes deficits. Where the Committee found it advisable to consider factors which cut across State-Endowed boundaries, however, it did so freely.

The initial scope of the Committee's investigation covered a broad range of topics, but the range narrowed as it became clear that some topics were either beyond the capabilities of the Committee or were already being examined by other University committees. For example, testimony made it quickly apparent that full-scale studies of both Computer Services and the University Library System should be left to experts, and that in any case they fell within the province of committees already at work. Special in-depth studies of other areas commissioned by either the University Senate or the Faculty Council of Representatives were also under way, and our Committee saw no need of duplicating these efforts. Thus the Committee finally identified five areas and set up a sub-committee for an intensive study of each. A list of sub-committees and their members follows:

Academic Affairs
Barry Adams
Thomas Dyckman
William Gurowitz
Donald Holcomb, Chairman
Wayne Merkelson

Educational Goals and Priorities
Arch Dotson, Chairman
Malden Nesheim
Saunders Redding
Richard Seebass
Louise Shelley
Stanley Strauss

Academic Productivity
Nyle Brady
David Call
Justin Davidson, Chairman
Arch Dotson
James Gaylor
James Maas

Nonacademic Affairs
Jon Anderson
George Brooks
Elizabeth Corrigan, Chairwoman
Eugene Cramer
Paul Eldridge
Ronald Loomis

Tenure and the Reward System
Douglas Ashford
Jean Blackall
David Call, Chairman
Justin Davidson
Tucker Dean
Paul Feeny
Edward Kramer
Bernard Stanton
David Wilson

Each sub-committee, while bearing in mind the financial state of all areas, concentrated on discovering ways of vitalizing its area's contribution to the overall University program through a more effective use of faculty and staff resources, in spite of the limit on funds. The chairmen of the sub-committees were in continual communication with each other and provided liaison with the parent committee, whose overriding concern was the general welfare of the University. Meetings of the parent committee were marked by an open exchange of ideas focusing upon the working papers and reports submitted to it by the sub-committees. Differences of opinion were certainly present and counter opinions, which have appeared in this final report — but a cooperative spirit prevailed, and those who read this report should bear in mind that it represents the Committee's consensus that the financial constraints on Cornell are real and must be taken constantly into consideration as the University assesses its existing programs and attempts to develop new ones.

Finally, two things need statement here. First, though the University Administration was always cooperative when approached for information, it played no role in the ongoing work of the Committee. And, second, many groups and individuals gave the Committee the benefit of information, ideas and insights and lent moral support to a task that sometimes seemed overwhelming. It was support the Committee sought, even while it was
INTRODUCTION

Trends and Expectations

Cornell of the 1960s was part of a tremendous national educational boom. Enrollments more than doubled, until almost 900,000 students were enrolled in our colleges and universities; income almost tripled, as did expenditures; the level of financial support from government contracts and private foundations reached new heights. By 1970, 2.4 per cent of the GNP (amounting to some $24 billion) was devoted to higher education, as compared with about 1 per cent in 1960—a gain which exceeded that of any other sector of the national economy for that same period. The nation's demand for higher-education seemed insatiable. Hundreds of new institutions were established and building programs flourished. Higher education was extended to whole new social and economic groups as the nation moved rapidly toward a system of mass higher education.

This period of unprecedented growth has led us to a turning point in the history of higher education in the United States. Over the past 100 years, enrollment in institutions of higher education has, on the average, doubled every 15 years. Assuming the results of that growth will not be repeated. The following table, which is based upon projections of population trends for the remainder of the century (6) (numbers in parentheses refer to References cited at the end of the report), suggests the new dynamics of growth with which we must now contend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Changes in Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-70</td>
<td>Doubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-80</td>
<td>Increase by one-half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-90</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>Increase by one-third</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 of the appendix shows more detailed projections for the period 1970-1990. We know that higher education grew much faster than the population as a whole during the last hundred years: enrollment rates increased from about 2 per cent of the college-age group in 1870 to about 35 per cent in 1970. While predictions of future enrollments are not entirely certain, it is expected that the percentage of the college-age population in college will level off at about 50 per cent by the year 2000. Table 2 shows this prediction (6).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In planning for the future Cornell must take into account the dynamics of these enrollment trends, recognizing that the pressures for growth will diminish, especially as we approach zero growth in the 1980s.

The period of growth following World War II also witnessed a fundamental transition from an era in which higher education was an expectation of the privileged to one in which mass education was the norm. The movement toward mass higher education was accompanied by a change in the division of enrollment between the private and the public sectors. Figure 2 shows that in 1900 our private institutions accounted for about two-thirds of the student population, but that by 1950 each sector enrolled about 50 per cent, and that by 1970 the private sector enrolled only about 25 per cent. This change is a significant one, and as we move toward a situation in which 95 per cent of the population will be within commuting distance of a community college, the ultimate configuration becomes obvious: mass higher education is to be in the public sector, with private institutions playing a relatively small but vital role.

Although Cornell occupies a distinctive position by virtue of its ties to both the public and the private domains, we prefer in the present analysis to regard it as an essentially private institution, with its Statutory units and their special-purpose programs contributing a welcome diversity. Thus we believe that Cornell must define its mission not as meeting the demand for mass higher education but as providing the unique opportunities for excellence in teaching and research which have been traditionally associated with private universities.

We believe it is possible to align Cornell with the private sector without ignoring the legitimate claims of those groups which have in the past been denied access to higher education because of their economic status, their sex, or their race. It is obvious that youth from low-income families face serious financial obstacles in seeking a college education, and we note as well that enrollment rates for women are distinctly lower than those for men in the same age bracket (6). Our greatest concern, however, must be with providing educational opportunities for members of racial minorities. Although the number of black students in institutions of higher education rose from 234,000 in 1964 to 522,000 in 1970, this latter total represents only about 23 per cent of the black population in the college age group, as compared with a corresponding proportion of 36 per cent for whites. In the 22-24 age group likely to be enrolled in graduate schools, only 7 per cent of the black population in 1970 was in fact enrolled, compared with 15 per cent of the white population. Cornell has played a major role in improving this state of affairs, primarily through its COSEP program and its Africana Studies and Research Center.

In studying the problem of providing educational opportunities for minority students the Committee consulted with Professor Lisle Carter, who is currently chairman of a committee charged with reviewing the program of the Africana Studies and Research Center. It also sought the advice of COSEP Director Delridge Hunter. As a result of its deliberations the Committee was ...
The University will continue to move toward a goal of having minority groups represented in all educational areas at Cornell at levels comparable to the general population, with each of the colleges and schools contributing to the implementation of the goal in accordance with its respective policies on four-year, transfer, and graduate student emphases.

"Because of this institution's relationship with the State of New York, through the statutory colleges, and the need to coordinate our efforts with expanding State programs, the term 'general population' will be considered to be that of the State of New York, and encompass all sectors of the educationally disadvantaged minority population therein.

"However, it must be made clear that attainment of the goal of proportional representation is dependent upon a more balanced participation in the attendant costs. Cornell University is committed to maintaining the program at present funding levels for entering students which, for the current year, resulted in a minority student population of undergraduates (including transfer students) and graduate students of 8 per cent of the total incoming students. Because of the societal nature of the problem, our statutory unit composition, and the outlook for continued severe financial operating conditions, moving to a proportional representation level will depend upon the availability of substantially increased public funds.

"Too often, programs to assist minorities have been conceived with noble purposes in mind only to become the first to be cut back in periods of financial stringency. Although this is such a period of time, these efforts must not suffer such fate. To do so would be to impose a disproportionate share of reduction costs on a group that did not share significantly in earlier periods of budget expansion. More importantly, it would be retrogressive at a time when more than ever is needed a reaffirmation of commitment to American ideals of opportunity and equality. It is for this reason that there must be a commitment of students, faculty, support a development program which can make this plan a reality."

The complexity of Cornell as a living institution is reflected in its organizational structure. As the Committee examined the elements of this structure in detail, it soon realized that a comprehensive and exhaustive analysis was beyond its powers. It has therefore striven to understand the main forces at play within the University, to describe these at an appropriate level of specificity, and to identify those characteristics that seemed most pertinent to its charge. In presenting the results of its work it is painfully aware that much remains to be done. Even where it has analyzed some part of the University's complex organism to its own satisfaction, it has sometimes been forced to admit that there is precious little opportunity for deliberate choice between alternative responses to a given problem. Like any firmly established institution, Cornell is often at the mercy of forces beyond its control.

Yet the recommendations that follow are not the counsel of despair. Despite the many and powerful constraints placed upon its actions, the University can, we believe, make some important choices. In order even to make a beginning, however, it is essential that we set aside the overly literal reading of the Founder's most memorable saying, for it has become inescapably clear that no institution can possibly offer "instruction in any study." We cannot afford to use the comfort of the University's motto to avoid the difficult task of identifying priorities and making the hard decisions that follow. Only by understanding itself more fully and defining its special role more consciously than it has in the past can Cornell hope to remain a vital force in American higher education.

UNPLANNED UBQUITOUS GROWTH

Introduction

The impact on Cornell of more than a decade of growth has been pervasive. From 1960 to 1972 the number of Endowed Division undergraduate students increased 24 per cent and graduate students 108 per cent, resulting in a total increase of 42 per cent in the enrollment of the Endowed Colleges. In the Statutory Colleges undergraduates increased 59 per cent, graduate students 32 per cent, so that the total Cornell enrollment increase was 46 per cent. The number of faculty members in the Endowed Colleges increased 75 per cent while the Statutory faculty rose by 17 per cent. Support personnel grew in numbers at a rate essentially proportional to the total faculty, with a ratio of four support employees to each faculty member. The physical plant grew at a prodigious pace, with the cost of physical plant additions or major rehabilitation completed from 1960 to 1972 reaching about $100 million for the Endowed Colleges in Ithaca. Tuition and fees increased 110 per cent while student financial aid increased about 300 per cent. Faculty salaries doubled. Income from restricted fund grants and contracts increased 360 per cent. Figures 3-7 and Tables 6.11, 16, 19, 22, 26, 36 of the Appendix describe this unprecedented growth statistically.

It was a wonderful period — filled with enthusiasm, flexibility and new programs. Spurred on by seemingly unlimited public funds at both the federal and state levels, few people looked ahead and pondered the future. Beyond the increase in numbers, what were the consequences of this growth to be? Was the financial base sound? Did projections of society's manpower needs correlate in any consistent way with those being educated? What degree of control over their own destinies did the universities possess?

Growth conceals defects, and the symptoms of vulnerability began to appear about 1967. The amount of funds directed toward higher education could not possibly continue to increase indefinitely at the rates of the 1960s, but national economic growth coupled with a greatly expanded level of government and foundation grant activity masked the need for close scrutiny of the financial commitments which were undertaken. However, by 1967 governments at both the state and national levels were beginning to show signs of strain in meeting educational commitments and the public mood began to stiffen as expansion continued unabated. Driven upward by program expansion and the influx of federal funds, the annual increases in expenditures had far exceeded the historic rate of about 4.5 per cent (see Figure 3). When the rate of increase of income faltered, universities suddenly realized how thin their margins of safety had been. Inflation increased costs rapidly, and the simultaneous slowdown of the national economy and a leveling of governmental grant activity confronted higher education with financial realities which it had previously managed to avoid. Only then did we begin to realize that the 1960-1970 era was one of transition, rather than one whose happy trends could simply be extrapolated into the
that the financial specter would somehow vanish. Cornell was one of the earliest to perceive the dangers: in "Study of Rising Costs in Ten Universities" (24), published in 1967, it reported that "From 1961 to 1966 the group operated in the black with a constantly decreasing margin. About January 1, 1967, they crossed into deficit operation. Based on a cost and income projection the group showed an increasing deficit for the next five years." Trouble lay ahead, but it was not until 1970 that most universities, on the threshold of rapidly mounting deficits, realized that the future would be quite different from the past.

**Deficits and Endowments**

During the 10-year period 1956-66 the Endowed Colleges of the University at Ithaca showed an annual surplus in current operations, averaging about $433,000 annually. Beginning with fiscal year 1965-66, however, the Endowed units entered a period of substantial recurring deficits, as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowed Colleges Deficits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Ending June 30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Targets
**These deficits are from Current Fund operations, including net impact for related activities, 1971-74.

During the surplus years a Budget Stabilization Reserve Fund was established to cover possible future deficits. In 1966 it had a balance of $2,699,000. This was used to cover the deficits through fiscal year 1969-70, but was depleted during fiscal 1970-71. The total deficits shown in Table 3, both actual and anticipated, amount to $9,525,000.

The invested funds of Cornell are held in three fund pools known as the Endowment Fund Pool, the aggregate of these pools is called the Invested Funds. Of these funds, the so-called "Restricted" portions can be used only for certain specified purposes; the balance are unrestricted. Table 4 below shows how the value of the Invested Funds principal has grown since 1966.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested Funds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that a trend averaged over this period has been a persistent drive upward as investments appreciated in value and gifts were added to the principal. The average rate of increase for 1965-66 was 7.6 per cent while for 1969-71 the average dropped to 4.0 per cent, reflecting the marked decline and partial recovery of the stock market. Although Table 4 shows strong growth of the Invested Funds, it should be noted that the principal of these funds has also been used to meet annual operating expenditures, as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Used for Operating Expensesinvested Funds Principal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated
**Excludes funds liquidated to finance deficit.

The most important point to note from Table 5 is that approximately $2 million in excess of investment income is being liquidated annually to help meet operating expenses — a sum which, if retained, would be used to generate additional income. Since the financial viability of its Endowment, the growth of the Endowment must be protected.

Cornell is a well endowed university, but this brief account of its recent financial history shows how easy it is for even such an institution to slip into deficit financing. The Tables further reveal that once having slipped into this mode, sudden remedies are not available. The academic and financial momentum of universities makes rapid response to a deterioration of revenues impossible.

As Table 3 indicates, Cornell is currently committed to a program of deficit reduction designed to produce a balanced budget for the year 1973-74. It is important to bear in mind that the process of deficit elimination has required a 10 per cent reduction in the base of the academic budget and a 15 per cent reduction of the base of non-academic budgets. This program, if repeated again and again, would do serious damage to academic and support activities, further stave deferred maintenance, and make the initiation of even educational programs impossible. Thus, we must try to forge a new academic-financial balance which will obviate the need for continued deficit reduction.

The analysis of expense and income trends which follows is made for the period 1967-70. While this choice is somewhat arbitrary, the 1967-70 period was chosen partly because it coincided with that used for a national study by the Carnegie Commission, and partly because it was the most recent three-year period prior to initiation of the current program of deficit reduction. It suffers from the disadvantage of being a period of relatively high national-inflation and one in which the rate of increase of income slackened off, and it does not reflect the relative improvement in the relation of income to expense that has taken place since 1970. The point is, however, that improvement has been made possible in large measure by a series of program reductions — an effort that we hope will not be necessary to repeat. The purpose of the analysis is to compare the rates of increase of key Cornell expense and income categories with national and historical trends, and on the basis of that analysis to estimate reasonable target rates of increase for the future that offer the hope of avoiding deficits without having to repeat the 1970-74 across-the-board program cuts. In so far as national conditions change after 1974, or if the modifications made at Cornell during the 1970-74 program fundamentally alter the prospects, the projections given in this report would have to be re-evaluated. Thus, it will be important to follow both the experience of the current deficit reduction
aggregate were due to inflation — i.e. inflation accounted for 56 per cent of the dollar value increase in total University expenditures during that period. National inflationary influences, which are beyond the control of Cornell, have a manifestly preponderant influence on our financial well being.

In the analysis which follows, we will determine the fraction each category contributes to the 7.5 per cent average annual rate of total expenditure increase per student. The analysis is based on averages over the three-year period 1967-70.

Instruction and Departmental Research — To estimate the contribution of this category to the total 7.5 per cent increase, one multiplies the 8.4 per cent of Table 8 by the 29.0 per cent of Table 9 to yield 2.4 per cent. Thus, of the 7.5 per cent total increase, Instruction and Departmental Research accounted for 2.4 percentage points, or 2.4/7.5X100 = 32 per cent of the total increase. That is to say, while this category accounted for 29.0 per cent of total expenditures, it accounted for 32 per cent of the increase, because its rate of increase (8.4 per cent) was somewhat greater than that of the total.

Student Aid — Similarly for this category, one multiplies the 8.7 per cent of Table 8 by the 9.7 per cent of Table 9 to give 0.8 per cent. Thus, of the 7.5 per cent total increase, Student Aid accounted for 0.8 points, or 0.8/7X100 = 11 per cent of the total increase. So: Student Aid, amounting to 8.7 per cent of total expenses, accounted for 11 per cent of their increase in this period.

Safety Division — Although it now contributes but 1 per cent of the expenditures, this is shown as a separate category because Chieff (29) attributes special significance to campus disruptions as a cause in both expense and income. Campus disruptions cause added expenses for insurance, replacement and repair, legal fees, damages and defacement, losses of time due to building closure, diversion of staff time and the costs of disciplinary hearings. However, we have not attempted to break out these expenses for Cornell. The “Safety Division” category includes safety services, and the like, while it is not synonymous with “campus disturbances” it is the closest budgetary category and is certainly related to this problem. Table 8 shows that the 1967-70 average annual increase was 32 per cent, so using the 0.6 per cent from Table 9 one gets about 0.2 per cent. Thus, of the 7.5 per cent total increase, the Safety Division accounted for 0.2 points, or 0.2/7.5X100 = 3 per cent of the total increase. These figures are of the same order of magnitude as the lower bound estimate of Chieff (29), which resulted from a detailed analysis of campus disturbances at one university. The upper bound was about three times the lower bound figure: and if we were to take into account the other costs of campus disturbances mentioned above, the share would be significantly greater.

Remainder — with respect to the remaining total expenditures, we will follow the procedure of Chieff in order to get results comparable with those issuing from his study of other universities, even though his method in some ways appears irrational. We will try to point out those irrationalities as we go along. First, we aggregate the three remaining categories of Table 9, “Libraries,” “Organized Research,” and “Support Activities” as one unit, and determine the portion of their increase attributable to inflation, which averaged 4.2 per cent during this period. (We use the consumer price index here because that is what Chieff used. Actually, the use of the GNP deflator would not produce a significantly different result.) These remaining categories constitute 60.7 per cent of the total; hence, inflation in the Remainder accounted for 2.5 points, or 2.5/7.5X100 = 34 per cent of the total increase. (If one recognized that inflation was a factor in the growth of “Instruction and Departmental Research,” “Student Aid,” and “Safety Division,” as well, then this 34 per cent figure could be viewed as a lower bound on the contribution of inflation. The real contribution of inflation lies somewhere between 34 per cent and the previously calculated value of 56 per cent.)

Following Chieff's procedure, we now estimate how much of the 7.5 per cent rise in Total Expenditure W was accounted for by what he terms “growth of responsibilities and enrichment.” Table 10 shows the results and gives comparative data from the Carnegie Commission study. Column I shows the results of the previous analysis, listing the contribution of each category of expenditure and of inflation to the 7.5 per cent. The “New Responsibilities” category was determined simply by subtracting the sum of the first four categories from the total, 7.5. (See Appendix II, Note 1, for a commentary on Chieff's method of accounting for inflation and necessary "enrichment.”)

Column II shows a possible projection for Cornell on the assumption that general inflation in the economy at large is reduced from 4.2 per cent to 3.5 per cent. The annual rate of increase in instruction and Departmental Research is reduced from 8.4 per cent to 5 per cent, the Safety Division increase is reduced by one-half and the
The analysis of income parallels that given for expenses. The major income categories are identified and their likely rates of increase ascertained. Best-judgment projections are then made and compared with the expenditure values obtained previously.

Tables 11 and 12 present the basic data for income from the Cornell Financial Reports; they are analogous to Tables 6 and 7 for expenditures. The income statistics reveal some relatively large fluctuations from year to year, reflecting the receipt of major gifts, initiation, or termination of sizeable sponsored projects, or changes in national economic conditions. Because of these relatively large fluctuations, projections are based on experience averaged over a number of years.

As with expenses, the first thing to observe, in the bottom row of Table 11, is how large the percentage increases have been over the 11-year period. The 202 per cent increase in Total Income should be compared with the 208 per cent increase in Total Expenditures (see Table 6). This difference over the 11-year period is but 6 per cent and reflects the fact that in a given year the differences are relatively small — of the order of one-half to 1 per cent of the total operation. But, as Mr. Micawber observed, in such small discrepancies lies the difference between happiness and misery.

The category Student Fees includes income primarily from tuition and fees and net accessory instruction income derived from providing endowed college instruction to students in the Statutory Colleges. It accounts for about one-third of the total income, and it is the main category of income over whose magnitude Cornell can exercise some measure of control.

Gifts income of Table 11 includes both Unrestricted and Restricted gifts which come to Cornell each year and are used for operating purposes, but it does not include gifts added to endowment funds. An important component is annual alumni giving to the Cornell Fund, which recently has had the best record in the country and has enjoyed amazing success (35), even in times of adversity. The annual campaign now brings in over $3,500,000 from 30,000 loyal alumni.

Investment income comes from three separate groups of investments. The Endowment Fund Pool is a balanced fund in the sense that it is selected with an eye to optimum annual income and only modest gains in appreciation. The Capital Fund Pool consists of money unrestricted as to the use of either income or principal, and is managed...
The rates of increase per student known, we can now estimate the required increase in the number of students. The increase in the number of students required is about 1000 students in the Entended Colleges. (The details are given in Note 3, Appendix III.) This analysis is of course subject to criticism because of the estimates made along the way and possible inherent effects between income and expenditures. A brief discussion of the sensitivity of the results to various limiting assumptions is given in Note 4 of the Appendix III.

In conclusion, this analysis of expense and income is not so much intended to result in precise estimates, such as 1,000 more students, as it is to make visible the orders of magnitude involved, the rates of change, and above all else the interactive and complex nature of the system. Trade-offs are indeed inescapable and no amount of wishful thinking will obviate them. Although the above approach provides a quantitative overview of the University, it should be kept in mind that the University's goal is education, and financial matters only enable the University to pursue that goal. However, academic needs are coupled with financial necessities and the ability of a university to achieve its educational goals is certainly dependent on its financial well being.

**Summary of Expense and Income, Conclusions**

1. By the definitions of the Carnegie Commission Study, Cornell was in the "headed for financial trouble" category.

2. Because income growth permitted the University to substantially increase expenditures, the cost-income squeeze is due primarily to a decrease in the rate of income growth.

3. During the decade of the 1960s, all educational costs rose at record rates and no single expense category can be singled out as the cause; however, graduate studies, research, and program enrichment were major causes.

4. The pervasive nature of all cost and income factors, together with likely public policy trends and decisions, lead one to conclude that the basic financial problems will plague higher education for a considerable length of time.

5. It is imperative that the budget balancing plan in force be pursued vigorously, and that once achieved, deficit financing not be permitted to reestablish itself as a mode of operation. Continued deficit operation produces a demoralizing reaction leading to a psychology of reducing the University's endowment, thus eroding earnings of future income.

6. Because of the very limited controls over income, there is great need to effect controls over expenditures and to raise the general level of consciousness with regard to them. The cost-income estimates show that the costs tend to exceed income, so reducing costs is important for maintaining a balanced budget.

7. Inflation in the national economy is a critical element in increased costs. If inflation is not reduced below its recent relatively high rates, then educational expenditures are likely to rise at an average annual rate of at least 7 per cent per student. With a high inflation rate, Cornell would have to initiate very stringent measures to keep the average annual rate of expenditure increase per student to 6 per cent.

8. If national inflation falls to a level of about 3.5 per cent, then Cornell should be able to achieve an expenditure growth rate per student of about 6 per cent and balance this with a 6 per cent rate of increase per student in income. This would require careful controls on expenditures, but would allow for modest resource allocation for additional responsibilities.

9. A 6 per cent rate of increase of total income per student should be possible provided that on a per student basis

   - Gift income increases of 10 per cent can be maintained.
   - Investment income increases can be maintained at their long-time rates.
   - The University administration and faculty maximize income from public sources i.e., federal and state governments, sponsored research.
   - A greater fraction of income be derived from Student Fees, thus requiring an increased enrollment and higher fees.

10. The growth of Financial Aid to students must be carefully managed in order to meet both educational objectives and financial realities.

11. The greatly increased resources devoted to the Safety Division must be brought under control.

12. Cornell should not expect rescue from public sources. The best interests of the University will be served if we learn to stand on our own base and by the intelligent use of resources maintain a stable academic and financial program.

13. The cost-income margins at Cornell are sufficiently small that with determination and understanding by the University community, a stable financial operation can be maintained.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Need for Planning**

1. The President, Provost, Deans and Department Chairmen must make systematic academic planning their principal responsibility. Planning must be recognized and organized as a high level function, involving a coordinated approach to a whole series of substantive topics such as:

   1) Size and composition of the student body
   2) Size of the faculty
   3) Allocation and reallocation of resources
   4) Levels of student support services
   5) Size of support staff
   6) Role of graduate education and research
   7) Financial aid
   8) Faculty and support staff salaries and benefits
   9) Generation of income
   10) Academic and support buildings and facilities
   11) University versus contract services;

   *Equally important, the University Administration must organize itself for the effective implementation of these plans.*

1.1 Higher education is now emerging from an era in which academic planning in most instances has not been an activity consciously performed or understood by the University community. Cornell presently depends on the accumulated knowledge, intuition and good judgment of its administrative staff. But the pressures of the staff's daily responsibilities prevent it from developing a comprehensive and integrated approach to making our basic educational and financial decisions. Cornell must acquire the capacity to plan in a comprehensive manner.

1.2 The need for planning in a university poses a serious dilemma. The inherent tension between the need for an academic focus and the realistic need for centralized authority and momentum. Because Cornell is an institution in which academic purposes and academic achievement are highly prized, we envision any planning effort as requiring the involvement of Cornell's academic officers, students and faculty. Participation by the faculty must be assured at all stages if their responsibility for educational policy is to be maintained.
2.1 This recommendation is intended to emphasize the pivotal planning role of the basic academic units of the University. These units are usually departments, but centers, special programs, small schools and colleges, or groups of departments could be appropriate subdivisions.) It is primarily through unit plans that many of the parameters and topics discussed in this Recommendations will be defined. Again, the intention is to have these most directly involved in the process of education play an active role in planning.

2.2 The five topics listed in this recommendation are the main components of a unit plan and are necessarily interconnected. The ad hoc procedures of the past will not be adequate for the future. Understanding Cornell must begin with the basic units understanding themselves with 3-5 year plans.

Program purpose and scope — While it may appear that mission definition is a minor task based on easy extrapolation of current modes, such is not necessarily the case. The periodic, thoughtful exercise of reexamining the justification and direction of activities can (and often should) be a wrenching experience. The reexamination should include a review of the main thrusts of specialized activities, together with a determination of fractions of unit effort devoted to undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, research and scholarly activity, professional service and extension. It should include consideration of adjacent programs at Cornell as well as comparative efforts at other institutions. A well defined program purpose and scope can strengthen the basis for a cohesive effort.

Staffing plans — Because education as presently conceived depends heavily on the individual performer — the faculty member — staff development is at the heart of any unit planning effort. Specialization relative to program purpose and scope, size of unit faculty, age distribution and percentage tenured are factors which should be examined and clearly understood by all ranks in the unit. Good staff planning based on hard data is the route by which selective excellence is achieved.

Financial considerations — Budget projections for 2-3 years into the future should be prepared as part of a unit plan. At present it is not easy for most faculty to appreciate the financial implications of academic and staffing decisions; and it will be increasingly important for faculty to know and understand the economic factors which accompany academic choices. One way to increase faculty awareness of these factors is to make more and better financial information available. Only then can program and personal aspirations be reconciled with financial considerations. The ultimate incentive for staff participation in planning is the realization that the prosperity and welfare of a unit are heavily dependent upon the unit’s various resources and the uses to which they are put. The realities of resource allocation can have both a sobering and stimulating effect on decision-making. College administrators will have to lead in the difficult area of determining educational costs. Even indices, such as cost per student credit hour, can be misleading due to the complicating factor of joint costs: joint costs of undergraduate and graduate functions, joint costs of major and service roles, joint costs of teaching and research or extension, joint costs of academic and support roles, etc. Because of present complexities, greatly improved measures of program input and output costs will have to be developed. Progress in this direction might well require the following steps to be taken:

a) Program structure and accounting procedures adjusted to permit recording cost by program;

b) A procedure developed for analyzing faculty activity by program;

c) A system whereby joint costs can be allocated.

Performance and Evaluation — Unit plans conceived along the lines discussed above would necessarily include consideration of performance information which would be fed back into the system, thus modifying and refining the existing program. Self-evaluation could be complemented by periodic outside reviews of Cornell programs. It is difficult for faculty to be totally objective in assessing the quality of their own performance and an outside, nonadministrative review would be a valuable source of information for producing a balanced assessment. An important consequence of the process of unit planning should be an increased awareness by both junior and senior faculty of their individual responsibilities and contributions as unit members.

3. Proceed now to develop a modern measurement and information system which will provide:

a) An improved system of reporting academic efforts and results.

b) The data resource base for program planning and evaluation including cost indices of diagnostic significance in such areas as:
the Committee found only a few scattered administrative attempts at estimating the cost of instruction. It was only during the course of the Committee's deliberations that a factual compilation took form and was published in June 1972 as a "Factual Profile of Cornell University" (1). In spite of the massive effort which this volume represents, it does not contain the data or information necessary for the purposes either of planning or decision making. In support of the planning effort called for in Recommendations 1 and 2, it is essential that Cornell generate a reliable data resource base. There is no substitute for good data widely distributed and understood.

3.3 The diversity and independence of departments at Cornell have tended to encourage the proliferation of courses with little regard to the economic consequences. Course proliferation is accompanied by reduced student registration per course and so about 45 per cent of the courses offered have 10 or fewer students enrolled. While some argue that such small classes necessarily result in vastly superior instruction compared to appreciably larger classes, there is little evidence to support the claim (5). One suspects that in some cases virtue is attached to extravagant practice. The increase in the number of courses is also directly related to the growth of graduate education (2). Faculty members desire to give courses to suit their own specialized interests. The Committee has refrained from recommending that formal University-wide review procedures be established to justify each course offering. Ideally, College, School or Departmental units should take the initiative in exercising the required self-discipline and professional responsibility, and the Committee believes that the units should take leadership in this area. If that initiative is not forthcoming, the Administration should require the Colleges to sharpen their attention to this problem.

3.4 In spite of the obvious direct relation of faculty teaching load to productivity, no readily available data describes teaching load practice at Cornell. nor are there any widely recognized policies governing the subject. It is generally considered that a weekly teaching load of 12-15 contact hours is a full time activity and that this load, thought unconsciously heavy, does not permit simultaneous research and scholarly endeavor. But as Table 17 shows, 15 hours a week was the average teaching load in "research universities" forty years ago as compared with 5-6 hours today, when it is assumed that about half of each faculty member's time is devoted to research. Based on this assumption, the teaching load would be in the 5-6 hour range. The assumption is questionable, as regards Cornell, where, although flexibility in determining individual teaching loads exists, the practice of assigning the same teaching loads in a given unit has developed. This ignores the more basic problem of equity while it has the appearance of equality. How do the teaching loads of those faculty members not seriously engaged in research compare with those who are? What is their quality? How much of their teaching is devoted to research? To such questions and the open recognition of the actual state of affairs could have a salutary effect on both interpersonal relationships and departmental teaching effectiveness. Any system which pretends to treat teaching productivity and scholarly research seriously must come to grips with the questions surrounding teaching loads.

3.5 The lack of an adequate measurement and information system adds a further dimension to the familiar geographical isolation of Cornell. We cannot take advantage of studies and practices at other institutions if the knowledge of our own is deficient. This extends beyond mere measures of productivity and includes the need for sharpening the bases for judgments of quality. In a period when difficult choices have to be made, comparative information is invaluable. In fact, one cannot help but wonder whether the situation into which we have stumbled could not have been largely avoided had there been in existence, a modest measurement, information and planning effort which tracked Cornell's growth and enabled critical comparisons to be made. Not only would comparative information be useful in itself, but it would encourage the policy of opening Cornell to regular external review. If selective evidence is indeed to be the guiding principle, then comparative evidence is a concomitant necessity.

3.6 The Committee is mindful that a certain danger lurs in the development of a system of program planning and evaluation. An academic community is justifiably apprehensive that an administration might use in a heavy handed manner the controls, restraints, incentives and centralization which accompany planning and thereby poison the well-springs of academic excellence. The potential for abuse only emphasizes the great importance of self-generated faculty responsibility for the effective use of resources. In recommending the development of a rational system of program planning and evaluation, the Committee is not advocating the substitution of formula
The nature and complexity of the system are such that informed judgment will remain at the base of the decision process. Certainly, improved understanding of the interaction between academic and financial parameters can only assist in preserving academic values. The Carnegie Commission study (p.22) summarizes the nature of this concern as follows: "(1) Outputs are difficult to specify and quantity. (2) Many services are performed by many different people in many different combinations — the diversity of effort is almost infinite. (3) Morale is at the essence of the enterprise and it is founded on self-determination of effort and self-generated goals...

"The essence of the solution lies in conditions that (a) draw forth the maximum of voluntary effort at a high level of competence and (b) achieve effective use of resources. The artisan approach generally satisfies (a). Faculty members do hard work (a few abuses aside) and some of their contributions in teaching and research have been superb. This kind of performance can neither be controlled in detail nor coerced. It has been a productive form of mild anarchy — internal free enterprise. The spirit of the enterprise can be killed by driving the public utility approach farther and farther into the details of the operation. We support continued faculty responsibility for the essentials of academic life."

Orders of Magnitude

4. Institute the following overall guidelines of size:
1) The total number of faculty should not be increased.
2) Embark on a program of careful growth in the size of the student body, with the number of students rising to about 17,500 at the end of a five year period.
3) First-order controls on a system like a university are necessarily broad in scope and deal with the overall size of major components. The growth described earlier and shown in the Figures and Tables of the Appendix clearly indicate that the increase in numbers of faculty and support staff in the last ten years has far exceeded the growth of undergraduate students. Table 18 shows the number of Masters and Ph.D. degrees awarded by Graduate Field over the period 1960-61 to 1971-72. Also shown are number of degrees per faculty member. In this period the number of Ph.D. degrees per faculty member rose from 0.27 to 0.40, a 48 per cent increase, and the number of Master degrees per faculty member rose from 0.46 to 0.58, a 26 per cent increase. While higher education has not usually been thought of in terms of norms for graduate degree productivity, and the thought is abhorrent to some, one cannot avoid the question of norms when one is trying to optimize the allocation of precious resources. Recognizing that measures may vary between disciplines, and graduate degree productivity depends upon quality and educational approach, the Committee did not attempt to define proper norms for Cornell. However, in our judgment, the number of Masters degrees per faculty member could be substantially increased and a modest increase in the number of Ph.D. degrees per faculty member could be accommodated. It is in this sense that we believe Cornell has unused academic capacity at the graduate level. Faced with this situation, Cornell must either reduce the size of its academic and support staff or increase the number of students.
4. The increase of about 75 per cent in the number of Endowed Divisions faculty during the period 1960-72 is indeed appreciable. Its justification rests on the great expansion in both the number of academic disciplines and the degree of specialization within disciplines thought necessary for the proper education of students in a modern university. Cornell now has a diverse array of well staffed units. Comparison between the years 1960-61 and 1971-72 shows that in the Endowed Divisions the overall student to faculty ratio dropped 20 per cent while the national trend showed a definite increase in this ratio. (see Table 19). A downward drift of teaching loads occurred simultaneously with the proliferation of courses.
It is now estimated that in the Endowed Colleges (Law and B&PA excepted) about 45 per cent of the courses have ten or less students per class. Tables 20 and 21. together with Figure 8, show the details of this situation. Figure 9 shows the distribution by credit hours, and together with Figure 8 reveals that a relatively small number of students benefit from the great number of small classes. The Committee is mindful that in applying gross indices one slurs over many factors such as the uneven distribution of students and resources, the relative and changing attractiveness of different fields, and measures of quality. But from the respective trends in numbers of students and faculty and the relatively large number of small classes, it seems clear that further faculty expansion is unjustified.
4.3 Student body size inextricably involves questions of support facilities and services usually associated with the term "campus life", in spite of sometimes scant and conflicting evidence, the Committee has attempted to take into account these factors which bear on the quality of life at Cornell. In connection with a study (7) on the possibility of increasing the number of students to 20,000, the Office of the Vice President for Planning indicated that a conservative estimate of current classroom underutilization is 20 per cent. However, that figure does not refer to laboratories, libraries, utilities, and other components of the physical plant in some of which signs of strain now appear. These facilities have to be investigated case by case to determine whether difficulties would be encountered with additional, students, and if so, the degree of strain. University Senate Task Force groups (8) warn of impending saturation in health care services, housing, University unions, athletics and central campus parking facilities. The comments which follow are intended to identify some of the major constraints and trade-offs associated with an increase of about 2,000 students.
Dining — The dining system is operating below capacity and could handle at least another 2,000 students. However, regardless of any increase in the numbers of students, renovation in some food service facilities is badly needed.
Health Care — Specific data for planning are lacking in this area in which the bounds on rising expectations seem to perpetually increase. The inclusion of health services for student spouses will increase the load at the Gannett Clinic. The need may arise for satellite facilities closer to the centers of student housing. Future expanded national health care programs could have a major impact on the mode and extent of student health services. All trends indicate that expansion of health care will have to take place regardless of additional students, and their needs will have to be considered in that expansion.
Athletics — Due to uneven demand with respect to time, some athletic facilities are now utilized near capacity. Helen Newman Hall is underutilized compared with Teagle Hall, although a general shortage of gymnasium space exists. Opinions differ as to trends in facility usage by undergraduate and graduate students relative to underclass students. Possible relaxation of formal Physical Education requirements could shift the burden to greater recreational use and further crowd recreation periods. Cornell has a very diverse athletic program and plan where "any person can find instruction in any sport." The interest of women in athletic activities
4.5 The Statutory Colleges have programmed an annual increase in enrolment of 1,000 new students. As previously discussed, Cornell does not have a separate Board of Regents, and thus the increase in enrolment is not as significant. The increase in the number of students will occur in the endowment and academic activities, and could be attributed to the increased attractiveness of the university in the minds of prospective students. The increase in the number of students will be reflected in the increased income of the university. The increase in enrolment will have a direct impact on the number of students enrolled in the university, and also on the number of students who receive financial aid. The increase in enrolment will also have an indirect impact on the number of students who receive financial aid, as the increased enrolment will lead to an increase in the endowment and academic activities, which in turn will lead to an increase in the number of students who receive financial aid.

4.6 The recommendation to increase the number of students rests on the assumption that the increased enrolment will lead to an increase in the number of students who receive financial aid. The increased enrolment will also have an indirect impact on the number of students who receive financial aid, as the increased enrolment will lead to an increase in the endowment and academic activities, which in turn will lead to an increase in the number of students who receive financial aid.

4.7 As expected, the recommendation is based on the assumption that the increased enrolment will lead to an increase in the number of students who receive financial aid. The increased enrolment will also have an indirect impact on the number of students who receive financial aid, as the increased enrolment will lead to an increase in the endowment and academic activities, which in turn will lead to an increase in the number of students who receive financial aid.
resolve uncertainties, and should uneven distributions of students create “hot spots,” means must be found to alleviate difficult situations. In conclusion, the Committee’s overall understanding of the situation leads it to recommend that, with no increase in faculty size, Cornell should move to a level of 17,500 students in five years.

5. Adopt student financial aid policies which

1) Hold aid from unrestricted funds to a given percentage of tuition income - perhaps using 1970 as the base year.

2) Use increased student employment (summer and academic year) and stricter application of “need” criteria in the determination of a financial aid “package.” Consider putting some graduate financial aid on a need basis.

3) Press for maximum possible utilization of State and Federal sources of student aid.

4) Implement an effective student loan plan attractive to middle and lower income families.

5.1 The factors playing a role in the financial distress of universities are especially evident in the area of financial aid. The rapidly rising costs of higher education reflected in increased tuition when coupled with a heightened concern for equality of opportunity have converged to put severe pressures on private universities. Further, the tuition gap between the more selective private institutions and their public counterparts is well over $2,000. Thus, the private universities are in competition with large tax-subsidized institutions which have the full weight of government and public sentiment behind them. Financial aid is one of the first areas to feel the squeeze.

5.2 Tables 22 and 23 and Figures 10 and 11 show the growth in the components of financial aid. Cornell is largely a regional university (see Table 25) and hence is in competition with both well developed state systems of higher education as well as a variety of private institutions of high quality. As Table 24 shows, Cornell’s resources place it at a distinct disadvantage in its “admit-deny financial aid” position relative to several of its sister institutions. Table 24 shows that most of the other selected universities have enough financial aid to cover their “approved applicants with need.” Students in this category are offered a financial aid “package” sufficient to cover their need; i.e., no students are offered financial aid below their established need. Cornell’s “admit-deny” policy operates so applicants who qualify academically for admission are denied financial aid because sufficient funds do not exist. The real significance here is our position relative to the other schools listed. There is some evidence to the effect that a fair fraction of these “admit-deny” cases manage to attend Cornell anyway and do quite well academically. However, they continue to seek financial aid in their upperclassman years. A survey of (8) freshmen applicants for the classes of 1973-74-75 who were accepted at Cornell but matriculated elsewhere, shows that a) although about 50 per cent said that financial aid was not a primary consideration in the choice of College, almost 40 per cent indicated that it was a factor in the final school selection process; (b) the majority of students lost to other schools came from the $11,000 to $15,000 income group; and (c) our principal competitors were private universities, Ivy League schools, and small colleges, with the Ivy League and other private universities accounting for almost 60 per cent of the student drain for these three freshmen classes. Clearly, Cornell is having difficulty in maintaining economic accessibility for all students admitted and this can only result in the eventual reduction in the numbers of middle and low income students. Excepting only its Minority Education Program, Cornell is in a period of scholarship retrenchment for the overwhelming majority of its student constituents. The Committee sees no way to alleviate this situation without further use of unrestricted funds which would put additional pressure in the direction of an increased deficit. Thus, its recommendation for holding the use of unrestricted funds to a given percentage of tuition income.

5.3 Another aspect of the need to control the funds for financial aid is in the linkage between tuition and fees and financial aid. If the University increases Student Aid at a greater rate than Student Fees, then the rate of increase of net income contributed by the students declines. A kind of saturation effect occurs in that the net Student Fee income levels off. This is exactly what has happened at Cornell as can be seen from the relevant growth rates given in Tables 7 and 12. The effect is depicted in Figure 11. The gross curve is a plot of the Student Fee income column of Table 12 and the net curve is obtained by subtracting the corresponding Student Aid data of Table 7. Notice that the gain between gross and net widens with a definite leveling off of the net curve from 1967 until 1970. In the year 1970-71 the desired trend was restored, but the 1972 data shows a discouraging turn. As more students are added to the University, this aspect of net income must be controlled.

5.4 In responding to an acute national need, Cornell, together with several other universities, made a major commitment to equality of opportunity. While they did not expect full reimbursement for assuming this responsibility, they certainly anticipated an influx of State and Federal funds in recognition of their contribution to this national problem. Some funds have been forthcoming, but they have been meager relative to the need and give little institutional support. Even with the new U.S. Aid to Education Bill (10), there is little relief in sight. Cornell must be continuously alert to the possibilities of utilizing State and national resources for financial aid and must join with others for pressing its case.

5.5 The need for student aid funds is not apt to diminish in future years: indeed we can expect continued pressure for their expansion. In the previous examination of Expenditures, Student Aid was included as one of the cost components and the projections discussed there showed the nature of the trade-offs between the costs of instruction, support activities, libraries, etc. As one projects a manageable rate of increase in expenditures, one cannot ignore the need to balance the allocation of funds between categories. The University community must not lose sight of the fact that the need for financial aid is a reflection of a societal state of affairs whereby public forces are at work in the direction of universal higher education, but as yet the necessary supporting financial resources have not been provided. In cooperation with others, the University Administration must work toward devising plans, such as the voucher system, which will transfer the larger problem to the public domain.

5.6 In the mix of financial aid components, continued efforts should be made to expand student employment opportunities. It is interesting that this fraction of aid has fallen since 1958 and it is not apparent whether it is due to the expanded opportunities for scholarships and loans or a reflection of greater affluence. (See Figure 12.) In a recent study of student aid (15) it is estimated that $4,000,000 over and above what is identified as student aid in the printed budget, is administered by departments, largely in the form of wages, without any coordination with the Office of Financial Aid. At a time when funds available for financial aid are tight, it becomes increasingly important to administer all components of student aid, including salaries and wages, in a coordinated manner. If wages paid to one student can be counted as part of his financial aid, then the scholarship or loan funds offset by these earnings can be given to another student.

5.7. There is some evidence that the process of
while, on the average, family income continues to increase. We are cognizant that the individual student tends not to see the yearly tuition and fee increase in the perspective of national economic trends and their reflection in increased costs to the University. But the trends are real and Cornell is caught in the cost-income squeeze.

6.4 Increased tuition and fees is accompanied by the danger of income group "polarization" within the student body — the reduction of students from middle income families, leaving only those needing little, if any, financial aid and those needing heavy financial aid. There are indications that this effect is being seen at a few competing institutions, while at others more favorably endowed with financial aid funds the effect has not yet appeared (14). Traditionally, Cornell has drawn a significant fraction of its students from the middle income group and we recommend a continuation of this practice. Another serious question is whether there exists an upper limit for tuition and fees and as to whether, therefore, continuing increases will result in a falling off of applications? This question is related to the "style and aspirations" of the University as well as to national policies in areas such as taxation, wages and prices, and public subsidies to higher education. Thus, no long range answer is available and the Committee had to be guided by its overall assessment of the situation. It should be kept in mind that during the later 1970s and 1980s a drop and then a leveling off in the population of college age youth will occur. Cornell has observed a complete New York State system of higher education emerge in the brief span of a decade. The neighboring states from which Cornell attracts many of its students (see Table 25) have also expanded their systems. Certainly, if the gap between private and public charges continues to increase, there will be an erosion of attractiveness of the private institutions. In fact, in some metropolitan regions the competition is already taking its toll of the private institutions (29, 22). The warning flags are up and Cornell must proceed, knowing that at some stage it might well have to continue without the benefit of increased income from tuition and fees. Indeed, it must try to maintain sufficient flexibility in its options so that if this occurs it will not come as an unforeseen eventuality. The earlier analysis of income showed very clearly that if, in the face of continued national inflation, the University could not continue to increase tuition and fees, then we would face an extremely serious situation. The rate of increase of expenditures would diverge from the rate of increase of income, and the University would be left with little means at its disposal to control the situation. Overall, the recommendations of this report are directed toward getting the University on a basis of self-understanding and self-control so that it can anticipate and, hopefully, meet such future challenges to its financial stability.

7 Keep a strong competitive faculty salary position based on merit increases.

7.1 Salaries for instruction are the largest budgetary expenditure of the University. For the year 1970-71 salaries accounted for about $26,000,000 or close to 30 per cent of the total Current Fund Expenditures, or 56 per cent of the Educational and General Funds less Organized Research; see Table 6. Table 27 gives the nine month median faculty salaries by rank for the Endowed Colleges at Ithaca together with the percent increases over the previous year. National studies show the following trends (27). For the period 1930-50 the average annual rate of change of salaries in all industries exceeded that for faculty salaries by about 1 per cent. However, in the 1950s the averages rates of increase were the same for both, while during the decade of the 1960s faculty salaries rose more rapidly than did wages in other sectors of the economy. The comparative annual rates of increase for 1960-67 were 5.8 per cent for faculty and 4.0 per cent in all industry. However, during the three year period 1967-70, the average yearly increase for professors was 4.3 per cent, for associate professors 5.1 per cent, and for assistant professors 5.0 per cent. During this same three year period the average annual rate of inflation as measured by the consumer price index was 4.2 per cent. Thus, for this period, Cornell's faculty salary increases are on the average just kept up with or somewhat exceeded inflation. During this same 1967-1970 period the AAUP reports (31) the average national rate of faculty salary increase as 6.1 per cent. To determine the "cost push" on Cornell's budget due to faculty salaries, one multiplies the fraction of Current Fund Expenditures devoted to instruction (previously cited as about 30 per cent) by, the rate of increase of faculty salaries, about 4.7 per cent for all ranks, giving 1.41 per cent. From Table 6, the annual increase in Current Fund Expenditures for 1967-70 was 6.6 per cent. Hence, faculty salary increases contributed about 1.41/6.6-0.21 points, or about one-fifth to the cost increases during this period at Cornell. That is to say, although costs of instruction contributed 30 per cent to the total expenditures, they accounted for but 21 per cent of the rate of increase of those total expenditures. This conclusion is that Cornell's faculty salary increases have been just barely adequate when compared to national trends and there is a growing concern that serious erosion in our position will occur. It is little consolation that the most recent AAUP report (33) shows that serious salary erosion has begun and "for the fourth year in a row the economic status of the profession is worse than it was a year ago."

7.2 In looking to the future, it is not expected that the recent national rate of faculty salary increases will be maintained. The period of university expansion is over and consolidation has set in. In addition, during the 1970s and 1980s the supply of academic staff will exceed the demand in most disciplines; thus, the competition for staff of the 1960s on the buyer's side of the market will be greatly attenuated. Further, it is hoped that the rate of inflation will recede to about 3 per cent per year or less. All these factors mean that the rate of increase of faculty salaries is not expected to exceed the average wage trends in the rest of the economy.

7.3 Within the Endowed Colleges, salary increases in the past few years have been based exclusively on merit, while in the Statutory Colleges there has been a general tendency for the salary practice to become one of across-the-board increases. If this New York State policy continues, it will, in time, erode the base of the Endowed Colleges salary policy and make it very difficult to maintain an adequate salary structure. Thus, the Committee urges the Administration to use its influence in trying to convince the State authorities to move toward a merit system. One possible approach would be to use say half of any new funds available for merit increases. An incentive spread must be maintained if Cornell is to remain competitive and reward those faculty members who are making the greatest contribution.

Academic Affairs

9 Give continuing high priority to selective graduate education. Assert Graduate School leadership in the
student by various levels and types (science and non-science) of higher education given in Table 29 is additional evidence of the higher costs of graduate education. On the other hand, graduate education is accompanied by the following offsetting considerations:

a) Graduate students do a great deal of our teaching;

b) In some areas graduate students are supported by research contract monies to a multiple of the normal tuition rate;

c) In many areas we could not attract excellent faculty to Cornell if we did not afford them the opportunity to train graduate students;

d) In the sense discussed in section 4.1, Cornell has unused academic capacity at the graduate level.

Therefore, overall considerations point to a course of action which rejects any notion of an across-the-board cutback on our level of graduate education, but rather looks toward selective strengthening of existing excellence and identification of areas in which the incremental costs of adding graduate students is relatively low. Selectivity includes the identification of areas in which marginal programs should be eliminated when (a) they do not bring in outside financial support and/or (b) the quality of the program is not particularly high, and it would be better for Cornell to leave the field to other universities, and (c) the program can be abandoned without serious injury to our undergraduate program. Selectivity implies a knowledge of the capabilities of competing institutions; complementary and collaborative approaches should replace regional proliferation. Further, there is room for innovation in selectivity by broadening the scope of some of our Ph.D. programs to include a greater measure of the versatility needs of the real world as opposed to academic over-specialization.

8.3 Cornell's diversity and flexibility suggest possibilities which should prove attractive:

a) The integration of undergraduate programs, including those of transfer students, with well defined master's degree programs.

b) The creation of program combinations aimed at education for government, administration or service positions in which interdisciplinary roles are important.

c) The establishment of alternate degrees requiring a smaller time commitment. Faculty groups should exert themselves in the formulation, promotion and execution of such programs.

8.4 Because the ranking of universities is most frequently based on the capacity for high quality graduate work (9), Cornell should encourage outside opinions and comparisons in evaluating its programs. There is a tendency toward isolation, sometimes bordering on complacency, which should be overcome. This concern, which appears in other contexts in this report, is not without dissenting opinion on the Committee. A small minority feel strongly that in many fields, outside evaluation by so-called experts is more often than not meaningless and expresses itself in faddism or a kind of nonconstructive supercilious criticism. The majority feel that if one keeps alert to the possibilities for such distortions, they can be accounted for in the interpretation of results. Regardless of whether Cornell wishes to recognize the problem, we should not forget that the comparison continues daily in the minds of faculty and students at Cornell and other institutions.

8.5 While the cutback of graduate student support at the national level has been severe and an over-supply of Ph.D.'s in some fields is a reality, as more students enter higher education, we can expect an increasing number of them to be attracted by the intellectual challenge of graduate study. Cornell should adopt its graduate academic and financial resources and maintain a vigorous graduate effort. In a research university such as Cornell, the faculty must strive to obtain grants and contracts in support of graduate education. The administration must be aggressive at state and national levels for increased aid. Further, with a need for increased unity in the promotion of graduate education, there will be a need for close cooperation between the Graduate School and other academic units of the University.

9. A new Center, Program, Institute, Department or similar organizations should be created only if:

1) A clearly formulated unit plan exists which foresees its continued financial viability for a period of at least 5 years.

2) The plan includes an analysis of the cost to the University if it must be "absorbed" at a future date.

3) A clear and convincing case is made that the organization is not duplicative of existing functions or efforts at Cornell.

9.1 Program innovation is one of the most important yet difficult activities to stimulate in a research university. Perhaps the resistance to change is a consequence of the disciplinary expertise required for authoritative work, or the compartmentalization which naturally grows out of
The policy of selectively applied to academic structures in both financial and academic academic activities in spite of their added complexity, the economic structure of universities in terms educational materials or the constraints of a society having well established patterns of employment, or a belief that the investment of venture capital in things educational materials has been made a lasting impact on higher education.

9.2 Nevertheless, it is a major task for the curriculum to change, yet it is easier to start.

10.1 While the Cornell community is cognizant of the importance of the professional development of the academic calendar, which is quite lengthy, and difficult to review, the review of the academic calendar, which is quite lengthy, is quite demanding. It is clear that any system which would ensure a whole period of the academic calendar requires a comprehensive review of the academic calendar. The current academic calendar may be examined and the apparent lack of utilization justified. In addition, the various alternatives included within the academic calendar, which is quite lengthy, are difficult to review.

10.2 We realize that at other universities have failed (11).
Nevertheless, the expectations of students and society, as well as the professional urge for improvement, will drive faculty members to devote thoughtful attention to development of the most effective ways to communicate their disciplines. Educational research and development at Cornell is not likely to grow into a large-scale enterprise, nor do we suggest it should. However, as Cornell seeks to take up whatever slack may exist and improve the match of faculty to instructional needs, it will be particularly important to develop sound measures of teaching effectiveness and to know how to use limited resources wisely. A central agency such as the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIEU) seems the only conceivable way for an institution like Cornell to sustain a coherent program. We think of such an agency as a nucleus for this kind of activity. At the same time we should encourage separate, diverse efforts in a number of places, for if these new approaches are to take root and thereby have a lasting effect, it is the faculty groups within disciplines who are the ultimate instruments of change. But a core agency is important in providing a resource center for faculty members who wish to explore the world of educational R and D, but who cannot hope to find time to explore the background material in order to extract what they need. Collaborative arrangements can be made whereby the central agency participates only to a limited extent, while the larger effort is performed within the academic units. Thus, we recommend that the academic officers, the Provost and Deans, give serious consideration to a long-term commitment of stable funding for a central core agency, such as CIEU. Since educational R & D efforts can ordinarily be expected to have only a long-term payoff, they must be funded by long-term commitments and not simply on the basis of the success of a one-year project. These commitments might be carried through by a combination of outside grants, with a percentage of the instructional budgets assigned to educational R & D. Although we have not attempted to set a percentage figure, it need not be large; it should, however, have an element of stability built into it.

11.2 Some faculty members will, at various times, develop serious interests in improving the quality of instructional formats and educational materials in their disciplines, but those interests will probably be pragmatic and will have only a limited lifetime. It is particularly important, therefore, that there be mechanisms, for effectively capturing that interest, facilitating its immediate application, and accumulating a reservoir of knowledge and experience. While an agency like CIEU may be necessary for some of these purposes, there must also be provision for released time to allow individual faculty members to pursue these interests.

11.3 At the present time, there is considerable interest in the use of modern audio-visual aids — tapes, slides, films, cassettes — as well as in the use of interactive computer systems. Use of these expensive tools must be developed with discrimination. Controlled empirical studies, either at Cornell or elsewhere, which compare new teaching methods with the traditional and seek to find the relative advantages of each, are required. Communication systems which permit sharing of knowledge and experience among local experts in learning theory, developers of new technological assistance, and interested faculty members on the firing line are essential.

11.4 Accurate measures of teaching effectiveness are notoriously difficult to discover, and general agreement that a particular one is accurate is probably even harder to achieve. But the matter is so close to the heart of an educational institution that one must never give up the search for these measures. The very act of searching may well have salutary effects. Only with a continuous search are we ever to know the impact on instructional quality of such parameters as student/faculty ratios, senior/faculty/junior faculty ratios, and faculty/assistant ratios. The long-range financial implications are obvious.

12. Strengthen academic effectiveness through such improved motivation, evaluation, and management techniques:

1. Establishing a continuing post tenured evaluation system having the four components outlined below:
   (a) An annual review of each faculty member's achievements;
   (b) A regular review immediately prior to each sabbatical leave;
   (c) A more scrupulous review for promotion from Associate to Full Professor;
   (d) Increased use of early retirement.

2. Increase the effective length of appointments of department chairmen and provide adequate rewards and support.

3. For certain administrative purposes, consolidate small departments into ones having between 15 and 40 faculty members.

12.1 Increased academic effectiveness at Cornell depends ultimately upon each individual member of the faculty. Each faculty member evaluates on a continuing basis the goals he seeks to attain and his progress in achieving those goals. In the final analysis, no man can set another man's goals, or achieve his goals for him. Nevertheless, the institution can be of help to the individual in encouraging excellence and in evaluating progress. The current academic reward system at Cornell can be changed to increase motivation for setting and attaining high goals.

12.2 In theory all employees are subjected to continuing evaluation, but practice falls short of theory. Most attention has been given to the evaluation connected with the tenure decision itself, but the rest of the system, particularly post tenure evaluation, has been badly neglected. While the establishment of a more uniform, formalized system of continuing evaluation after the tenure decision would mark a major departure from existing Cornell policy or practice, we consider the lack of such a system at Cornell a serious deficiency.

Counseling — The system for counseling individual faculty members in setting their goals should be improved. Faculty members should and do enjoy considerable freedom in setting their research, teaching, administrative, and public service objectives. Yet goals of individual faculty members should, within a broad band of tolerance, be supportive of department, college, and university goals. Both in his own self-interest and in the interest of Cornell, the individual faculty member should be afforded counsel on the comparability of his own goals with those broader university goals which promote the common good. Counseling can be considered an important component of planning. The Committee believes that counseling at Cornell is at best an infrequent affair poorly executed. At the very least, every faculty member is entitled to the opportunity of an annual meeting to discuss his objectives with the person(s) who determines his salary.

Annual Evaluation Review — Just as the faculty member is entitled to counseling in setting his goals, he is also entitled to a clear evaluation of his progress toward meeting those goals. Any evaluation system must be based on a systematic review procedure. Hence the Committee recommends that a system of evaluating the individual's professional activities on an annual basis should be uniformly implemented throughout the University; some divisions already have an acceptable plan that does not impose hardships on either the faculty member or the administration. Counseling and evaluation should be performed by the Department Chairman, with the Dean and Provost available for additional counseling and review of performance.
1) Procedures which encourage continued financial growth.
2) Possible termination of the faculty under carefully controlled procedures.

1.1. The Committee views the Sabbatic leave as a unique opportunity for the University faculty. The faculty and the Sabbatic leave can provide changes in the educational opportunity for a faculty member, who then can be evaluated as a full-time member. The Sabbatic leave can provide a unique opportunity for faculty to benefit from a process that serves the needs of the institution.

1.2. The Committee notes that, as a result of the University's financial policies, the Sabbatic leave is a unique opportunity for faculty to benefit from a process that serves the needs of the institution.

1.3. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.4. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.5. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.6. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.7. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.8. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.9. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.10. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.11. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.12. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.13. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.14. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.15. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.

1.16. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Sabbatic leave be continued, but with a reduced seminar for promotion. The Committee proposes that more be available for early retirement or for a gradual shift from full-time to part-time.
The tenure system introduces a major restriction on academic and administrative flexibility for program planning. The tenure appointment is in essence an indefinite appointment leaving the University few options for program change for periods of as long as thirty years.

The granting of tenure is a self-protection device for those within the system: it discriminates against those with new ideas, enforcing conformity with established norms.

Six years is too short a period of time for an evaluation that often leads to a 30 year commitment. The only critical decision point in the system occurs too soon and those granted tenure may not live up to expectations.

Professors should not be guaranteed job security free of objective evaluation of performance when others in our society are constantly subjected to review and insecurity. This strikes at the notion of tenure as a guarantee of job security.

Several of these criticisms have not so much to do with tenure itself as with the overall administration of the tenure and reward system. For example, the loss of flexibility resulting from tenured faculty being unwilling to adapt to new needs is in part a reflection of the lack of adequate planning by the University. Tenure does not preclude termination when programs are discontinued.

Similarly, the notion of job security regardless of performance is not condemned by the AAUP or any other organization. The difficulty of course is in the nature of the educational system. Assessments are not precise, time scales of evaluation are long, and measures of quality are difficult to describe in objective terms. The result is that the system tends to provide unqualified job security, and it is this de facto protection which can lead to weakness. Several of the previous recommendations, especially those expressing the need for unit planning and academic evaluation, were aimed at meeting some of these criticisms, but additional measures need to be introduced.

The faculty member who enjoys tenure has a corresponding obligation to continue the intellectual growth that justified his being granted tenure in the first place. This is particularly important in view of the constant developments that take place at the frontiers of knowledge. This flexibility of the faculty member should be encouraged because, in periods of financial limitations, it replaces the previous practice of simply adding new staff every time the University wanted to strike out in new directions. In these circumstances, it is

Existing staff members who must assume the responsibility for redirecting the University's efforts by redirecting their own activities, rather than by merely continuing however excellently, to do what they have done in the past. The University must have some device for communicating these needs to the individual faculty member and rewarding those who adjust.

13.4 In its considerations of ways to encourage continued professional growth, the Committee examined alternatives to the existing promotion pattern which typically occurs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor with tenure</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consideration was given to a scheme having five ranks in which associate professor without tenure and distinguished professor would be added. While there are advantages to introducing the rank associate professor without tenure, the majority of the Committee opposed creating such a rank mainly because of problems created by the deferred decision process and competition with other institutions. The long period between promotion to full professor and retirement provides no change in status to stimulate the setting of high goals on a continuing basis. This effect, when coupled with the continued pressure to reduce salary differentials within ranks, led the Committee to consider a four rank professorial system:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- Distinguished Professor

The proposed title "Distinguished Professor," or a suitable alternative, would be awarded for distinguished teaching and research. The University might wish to further examine such a possibility.

13.5 Termination of Tenured Appointments. Much of the criticism of the tenure system has centered around the failure of the Universities to face up to the charges that tenure protects the incompetent. The current dismissal criteria of "malfeasance or misfeasance" are ambiguous and restrictive. Similarly, the AAUP guidelines which state that a person may lose tenure for "gross incompetence, gross neglect, moral turpitude or conviction for treason" are not very helpful in defining the ground rules for removal from a tenured position. The Committee prefers the phrase "inadequate performance of University responsibilities" for defining the grounds for dismissal. Given this definition the Committee believes a suitable procedure for termination of tenure could be developed. While a comprehensive formulation of policy and procedures would have to be made by the proper committee, the following considerations should be included:

1) Any dismissal procedure must provide for due process, including conventional provisions for jury of one's peers, and it must place the burden of proof upon the University.

2) The Academic Deans should concur in any actions contemplated and probably should provide the leadership.

3) The recommendation for termination should originate with the unit faculty. The Department Chairman, or his equivalent, would initiate the process, collect evidence, counsel with other faculty members, but should, not be viewed as the prosecutor.

4) The procedure, once it is determined by the Deans that there appears to be sufficient grounds for dismissal, should provide not less than two nor more than three years as a waiting period, or a period during which the faculty member has an opportunity to correct the deficiencies as identified.

5) When a two or three year warning is issued, the performance criteria which will be used to judge adequacy at the end of the period will be concisely defined and reviewed with the faculty member.

6) A warning should be issued in writing but confidentiality must be maintained extremely carefully.

7) The manner in which the unit faculty should be involved needs further discussion. If the Dean requires a vote, for example, the process could become controversial and confidentiality could be breached. On the other hand, if faculty are not involved the Chairman and Dean could encounter claims of bias and personality conflicts. The nature of the case will probably dictate the extent to which faculty are involved.

8) It is likely that the procedure will grow out of either an unsatisfactory sabbatical review or a negative decision on a request for promotion to full professor.

9) Before actual dismissal, at the end of the waiting period or earlier, there should be a provision for one external review by an expert group if requested by the faculty member. A procedure for selection (for example, one by the faculty member, one by the Dean, and one by those two) should be defined.
10) Unit plans should specify standards of faculty responsibility in such detail that any faculty member will have a clear idea of what is considered a minimum level of performance.

11) Such a dismissal procedure should be developed and put in writing in a manner similar to that now utilized for the tenure decision system, including its safeguards and appeals. Although we would expect this procedure to be invoked only very rarely, it seems to us important that it exist.

13.6 It should be emphasized that the recommendations and proposals of this section are not of themselves ends, but rather means toward a better working relationship between the University as an employer and the faculty member as a productive member of the community. A more effective reward system cannot operate without each faculty member being thoroughly familiar with the whole system, including information on standards of pay, budgetary limitations and choices, procedures for evaluation, and responsibilities for operation of the system. Retention of the benefits of the system is possible only if the faculty themselves are prepared to take time to make the system work and protect its standards. The faculty needs to be closely involved in the design and implementation of the reward system even though it might mean additional work for the Faculty Council of Representatives and its committees. We must make the collective effort to state explicitly what we have long treated as implicitly justifiable, thereby assisting the administrative process leading to the difficult decisions ahead.

14. Plan the distribution of faculty by rank to provide continued opportunity for the promotion and addition of assistant professors. Encourage the use of part-time appointments in all faculty ranks.

14.1 This recommendation is clearly aimed at maintaining the flow of new staff. During the previous period of growth renewal was easy to achieve, but the implicit assumption of continued growth meant that little attention was paid to either the fraction of faculty holding tenure or the age distribution of the faculty. When the tenure system is combined with a limitation on faculty size, the University is suddenly faced with a faculty configuration over which it has but very limited control. Tables 31-34 and Figures 13-16 give the relevant background information. Table 32 shows that during the period 1966-71 the average time to promotion from assistant to associate professor was appreciably below six years with the time of promotion from associate to full professor also less than six years. The short times to promotion are indicators of the competition for faculty and the relatively lax policies in effect. Table 31 indicates that a significant number of faculty were added at both the full and associate professor ranks from outside the University and suggests that if this outside source is curtailed a reasonable rate of promotion from within may be maintained. Although this recommendation is focused on the essential need to bring in new assistant professors, it is equally essential that some flexibility be maintained so that senior persons can also be added. Table 33 gives the data for the period 1967-71 on the number of professors who left as a result of resignation, death or retirement. From this information together with the retirement schedule one can compute estimated turnover rates which may then be used to manage the composition of the faculty. The following three examples are intended to illustrate the results of different policy approaches to the problem of faculty composition. There are, of course, numerous promotion models one could devise, but these three examples serve to illustrate the influence of various parameters and explore the degree of constraint from our existing configuration.

14.2 Example 1 — A Policy of Reduction of the Fraction of Tenured Faculty. If one focuses on the percentage of tenured faculty and decides that it must be driven down without regard to other consequences, then one could in principle adopt a policy of adding no tenured staff either by direct appointment or by promotion. Clearly, this is an extreme case. The curves shown in Figure 14 for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Engineering are based on scheduled retirements plus estimated loss through deaths averaged to give annual reduction rates of 6.5 for Arts and Sciences and 4 for Engineering. Resignations are excluded. The total number of faculty in each division is held constant and all departures from tenured ranks are returned to non-tenured positions, with no new, tenured appointments possible. The curves show that if this drastic policy were pursued for 10 years, the percentage of combined tenured faculty would be reduced to about 50 percent. One could of course put an additional requirement on the distribution between the ranks of associate and full professor. For the whole University the current distribution is 709:362:432 (Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors), giving ratios 1.64:0.84:1. If one wished 50 percent of the faculty to be tenured with a 1:1:2 distribution, then the numbers in the three ranks would be 376:376:751 and it is obvious that no promotions from associate to full professor could be made during the ten year period. The financial consequences of such changes in distribution can also be ascertained. For example, if today Cornell had a 1:1:2 distribution instead of 1.64:0.84:1, the difference in yearly salaries would amount to about a $3,300,000 reduction, or over twice the annual current deficit. This example is mainly intended to illustrate the time scale, required to appreciably alter the composition of the faculty. As a policy, it would be ruthless and would demoralize the academic community. However, it serves as a warning that we cannot continue in an unthinking manner or we could reach a point where only ruthless alternatives remain.

14.3 Example 2 — A Policy of Uniform Faculty Age Distribution. The policy suggested by this title assumes that the desired faculty composition is one whereby in the steady state the faculty are evenly distributed by age. The number of new assistant professors added each year equals the number of retirees. It implies that the number of tenured faculty is not a critical parameter. Consider the following hypothetical department of 40 faculty members having an even age distribution between ages 25 and 65. Assuming that non-tenured faculty are added at age 25 and that decisions on tenure are made 6 years later at age 31, it is clear that even if all non-tenured faculty who come up for promotion are promoted, one new assistant professor can always be added each year to replace the tenured retiring professor. Such a department would be 85 percent tenured yet would not stagnate as a result of not bringing in young staff. Table 35 shows the consequences for two Colleges of such an approach (25) with a calculation of the percentage of current assistant professors that could be promoted at the "ideal rate." In both cases the "ideal rate" is within the projected rate of subtraction of faculty (resignations included) and still permits promotion from assistant professor. This example is encouraging because it shows that the projected rate of subtraction is sufficiently large to permit an upward flow of faculty while pressing for a uniform age distribution. However, the financial consequences of moving to a uniform age distribution faculty are as follows: the accompanying ratios of 48:1:1 when compared to the present 1.64:0.84:1 distribution would mean a yearly salary difference amounting to about a $2,750,000 increase. Clearly, some tradeoffs would be
necessary because of financial considerations and the fact that each department is substantially nearer the hypothetical ideal distribution nor does it have sufficient size. From the point of view of providing faculty renewal, however, if transformed into policy guidelines, the uniform age distribution approach has some attractive elements.

14.4 Example 3 — A Policy of Mixed Constraints: In an absolute sense, the previous two examples are not ones that Cornell should embark upon precipitously. Rather, starting from the initial conditions of 1972, one seeks a projection which is feasible within the time financial and tenure constraints are likely to prevail. In keeping with the purposes of this recommendation, we seek a plan which will permit a sufficient flow of new staff to avoid stagnation and at the same time maintain a balanced approach to the other parameters. Figure 15a shows some examples of projections for the College of Arts and Sciences (26). As can be seen from the bases, the faculty size is fixed, and it is assumed that retirement attrition is replaced by non-tenured appointments. Curves I and II assume remaining attrition (due to resignations and deaths) is replaced by tenure staff, while Curve III permits 50 per cent of such attrition to be diverted to tenure positions. Curve I is the projection based on maintaining the recent practice of promoting 44 per cent to tenure with an average time of 4 years. Curve II shows that reducing the promotion fraction to 35 per cent and increasing the time to 6 years appreciably reduces the increase in the fraction tenured. By permitting additional non-tenure appointments according to Curve III, the rise in the fraction tenured can be further reduced. Figure 15b shows the number of new non-tenured professors permitted as a result of the various approaches described by Figure 15a. The results show a decline of new non-tenured positions without a drastic reduction. One can of course add the financial implications of such projections and thus arrive at an overall strategy. One concludes that a sensible strategy can be derived which will achieve the desired objective. Figures 16a and 16b show analogous results for the College of Engineering, only with a modified set of bases due to the higher percentage of tenured faculty. Here all vacancies in tenured positions are replaced by non-tenured appointments with Curves I and II for 70 per cent and 50 per cent promotion fractions from non-tenured positions. The percent age of change relatively little and the number of new non-tenured professors each year is essentially constant.

14.5 We conclude that if Cornell prudently manages itself, feasible policies can be adopted which permit the continued flow of new staff. We also recommend that the policy adopted have sufficient flexibility to permit the addition of tenured staff in senior positions so that such opportunities for significantly strengthening Cornell’s faculty are not precluded. The total process must be controlled, with the faculty conscious of the processes at work and the great importance of staffing decisions.

14.6 Partly as a result of its geographic location and partly as a result of its “full-time” concept of education, Cornell has not used part-time faculty to any great extent. The premises upon which this past practice were based appear to be outdated and may in some areas actually work to the disadvantage of the University. Several of the reasons for concluding that the University should encourage part-time options are listed below:

1) To facilitate the appointment and professional development and productivity of promising young scholars, both women and men;
2) To utilize the neglected reservoir of faculty wives of outstanding professional promise, who have traditionally not had access to part-time academic positions, their
to liberalize the hiring practices with regard to women;
3) To provide possibilities for young men who would, for various reasons, prefer the option of a part-time career pattern to that of a continuous one;
4) To achieve and sustain academic strength by obtaining the services of distinguished professionals and scholars who might not otherwise be induced to come to Cornell;
5) To avoid the need to establish and subsidize full blown academic efforts in esoteric disciplines at the expense of academic scope;
6) To maintain flexibility in overall staffing as we enter an era when the number of college-age students will level off;
7) To retain distinguished senior faculty already resident in Ithaca who would prefer time to money, or part-time work to retirement.

The Committee believes that the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty will increasingly depend on the possibility of attracting highly qualified couples seeking independent professional opportunities in Ithaca. Suggested guidelines for implementing a system of part-time appointments are given in reference (4).

15. Regard educational innovation as an essential aspect of long-range planning and set aside sufficient funds on a continuing basis for this purpose.

15.1 The expanding University budget was deceptive to the extent that it permitted the academic community to pay inadequate attention to questions of cost and allocation. The allocation of resources was merely a process whereby fresh new funds were distributed, leaving the old ones undisturbed. Thus the constraints inherent in the operation were ignored, so that today we have inherited an accumulation of effects previously described. Even the annual budget process as traditionally carried out leaves room for little flexibility, for there are few truly elective choices possible. The central Administration estimates income and expense for the following year. By extrapolation from existing bases the various College targets are established, the Deans determine the Departmental targets, and the Department Chairmen work out their budgets for the following year. Thus perhaps 95 per cent of the new budget is predetermined by the existing one. The process is incremental in nature and usually avoids policy considerations of major consequence. Or to look at it another way, real long-range commitments and matters of policy are indeed made, but made in relatively small pieces, so that it is the accumulated effect which confronts us at a later date and appears as a ponderous entity difficult to deflect to new purposes. For the foreseeable future, however, opportunities for change and innovation will have to rely heavily on the reallocation of existing resources.

15.2 We view the need for continued educational change and innovation as an essential and central aspect of long-range financial planning. Other recommendations have of course touched on various facets of this need. The provision for the flow of new staff, the encouragement of teaching reform, and the need for comprehensive planning itself are examples of recommendations to insure that we do not stagnate. But we must think beyond even these facets. As noted earlier, the rise of quality public higher education and the reduction in the increase of numbers of college-seeking youth mean that Cornell will find itself increasingly in direct competition with other institutions to attract students. This does not suggest that we must think of ourselves as a commercial enterprise, quick to alter its offerings in response to changing fashions. But it does suggest that the other extreme view is not supportable
In the current three-year budget reduction plan, we have been allocated a 15% cut in the support areas. This is due to the need for more efficient use of facilities and equipment. Although there are at least 10 areas that have not seen significant cost savings, the Committee has identified areas that are less critical to the overall mission of the institution.

To achieve this goal, we must reduce costs in several areas. The first step is to eliminate idle equipment and facilities. We have identified over 10% of the equipment as being unused. By removing this equipment, we can save over $100,000 annually. This is a significant reduction, but it is not enough to meet our budget cut.

In addition to eliminating idle equipment, we must also reduce our administrative costs. We have found that our administrative expenses are too high, and we must reduce our workforce by at least 10%. This will save us over $500,000 annually.

Finally, we must reduce our dependency on outside funding. We have been relying too heavily on grants and donations, and we must diversify our funding sources. We are exploring new avenues for funding, such as partnerships with industry and other organizations.

By implementing these strategies, we can achieve the 15% budget reduction and maintain our academic mission. It will require a great deal of effort, but we are committed to making it happen.
3) Give high priority to maintenance programs and critically review plans for renovation and rehabilitation.

17.1 The institutional capacity for physical facilities planning and research dates from the establishment of the University Planning Office in 1965. The Office of Planning has invested considerable effort in creating and implementing a plan which integrates the programmatic needs of the institution (18). Table 37 is one version of a program which contains the accumulated wisdom of those associated with the process. It gives the impression that a great many worthy and often urgent projects exist. The obvious concern in a period of financial stringency is that vital resources which could be used in support of academic programs not be drained off for "bricks and mortar." Although it is not always possible to make optimal academic use of our physical plant, Cornell already has classroom capacity for at least 17,500 students.

17.2 Buildings for academic purposes are usually considered as non-revenue producing and hence not self-amortizing. Funds for such buildings have traditionally come from gifts. Buildings which can be considered revenue producing are set up as self-amortizing, and the current practice is to borrow the capital for these enterprises from bonds sold by the New York State Dormitory Authority. The capital borrowed plus interest is paid back over a period of years. Cornell's total debt, including money we owe ourselves is about $54,000,000, spread over about 29 projects (4), with the outstanding debt currently about $47,000,000. Fifteen projects have been financed by outside borrowing, and Cornell has never borrowed outside directly from other than the Dormitory Authority. The annual debt service payment to that Authority rose from zero in 1962 to $3,755,000 in 1972-73. The 1972-73 debt service component for the Division of Campus Life is $2,147,000. Clearly, debt service is a large and has been a growing budgetary item, reflecting a major capital expansion program which was especially urgent in the Campus Life area.

17.3 The only externally financed project which was not set up on a self-amortizing basis was the Social Sciences Building, recently named Uris Hall. Only for this building is it now contemplated that the loan will be repaid from unrestricted funds. This recently completed facility is an example of the latent problems in the construction of academic buildings. Gifts to cover the $8,665,000 cost of this project have amounted to $3,340,000, including the $2,000,000 gift of Harold and Pety Urus. The balance of $5,325,000 has been borrowed from the State Dormitory Authority. Beginning with the academic year 1972-73 total debt service will be about $392,000 per year; in addition the total operating expenses are estimated to be $228,000 yearly for maintenance, custodial care and utilities. Without unraveling here the history leading up to the decision to construct this building, we wish to cite it as an example of the trade-offs involved in any such decision. There are very strong benefits derived from providing such a fine facility for the groups housed therein and these benefits are being traded off for the unrestricted funds referred to above. The point here is that before large sums of money are committed to non-self-amortizing purposes, Cornell must toughen up the decision process and be certain that the project can be fully justified.

17.4 The North Campus Dormitory complex is an example of an income producing facility whose financing is set up on a self-amortizing basis. Originally it was hoped that gifts would offset a substantial fraction of the cost of construction, and the Development Office instituted a promotional effort to that end. Donors have not been found and $17,489,000 has been borrowed from the State Dormitory Authority to cover the project cost. For the year 1971-72 debt amortization and service interest is $1,416,000. These carrying expenses exceed the room charges to the students living in the complex. Without rectifying the train of events which apparently involved some unwise thinking and changes of ground rules, we mention this case as another example of the trade-offs which are now apparent. Construction of expensive living facilities is expensive, and in planning for the housing of additional students, Cornell must carefully weigh the various alternatives.

17.5 In planning expensive facilities, attention should be given to possible multiple use for both academic and nonacademic purposes. For example, class and seminar rooms might be made more adaptable for extra-curricular meeting and conference rooms, and lecture halls be made adaptable as auditoria, with but minor and relatively inexpensive modifications in design. If at all possible, advantage should be taken of the latent flexibility involved.

17.6 Maintenance of both buildings and surroundings is one of the continuing problems associated with any institutional complex. Cornell's diverse physical plant requires constant maintenance and rehabilitation. In recent years, unmistakable signs of deterioration have appeared which, if allowed to
continue, will grow to serious proportions. Although it might appear tempting to reduce drastically the University's maintenance and rehabilitation program, experience shows that such a course is shortsighted. Contrary to common belief, in comparison with other similar institutions (19), Cornell's operating expenses for maintenance, custodial service, and utilities are not excessive. Further, considerable progress has been made in keeping these costs down. Cornell should not neglect the continuing needs for plant maintenance.

17.7 In capital expansion or improvement projects the combination of forces at play is complex and mitigates against categorical pronouncements as to future courses of action. However, Cornell should undertake such projects only after very careful consideration with justification based on clear policy decisions of urgent academic need. One of the central reasons why Cornell must create an academic plan is the need to integrate its requirements with those of physical facilities planning. In fact, a physical facilities plan should be made in conjunction with academic planning so that the interaction between academic program priorities and costs relative to capital outlays and debt service can be evaluated. Only in this way can the fundamental problems of selection and resource allocation assessment be rationalized.
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FIG. 1
ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION 1970-1990
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FIG. 2
ENROLLMENT IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY CONTROL UNITED STATES, 1900-1970
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FIG. 3
COMPARISON OF ANNUAL PERCENT CHANGE IN TOTAL CURRENT FUND EXPENDITURES
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FIG. 4
NUMBERS OF STUDENTS CORNELL UNIVERSITY INCREASE SINCE 1960
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FIG. 5
NUMBERS OF FACULTY BY RANK CORNELL UNIVERSITY INCREASE SINCE 1960
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### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>29,268</td>
<td>20,167</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>16,341</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>33,220</td>
<td>23,486</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>17,173</td>
<td>8,213</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>1.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>39,365</td>
<td>28,191</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>19,593</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>2.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>32,670</td>
<td>10,156</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>2.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>49,551</td>
<td>35,749</td>
<td>10,016</td>
<td>25,723</td>
<td>11,658</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>2.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>53,769</td>
<td>38,360</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>28,453</td>
<td>12,860</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>2.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>59,669</td>
<td>42,873</td>
<td>11,712</td>
<td>31,163</td>
<td>14,602</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>2.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>66,265</td>
<td>48,265</td>
<td>13,513</td>
<td>34,737</td>
<td>19,137</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>2.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>73,441</td>
<td>53,419</td>
<td>15,064</td>
<td>38,354</td>
<td>20,903</td>
<td>7,268</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>2.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>77,478</td>
<td>57,105</td>
<td>14,586</td>
<td>42,521</td>
<td>23,137</td>
<td>7,746</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>86,082</td>
<td>62,597</td>
<td>15,561</td>
<td>47,026</td>
<td>25,567</td>
<td>8,596</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>3.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>90,026</td>
<td>65,107</td>
<td>17,998</td>
<td>47,109</td>
<td>26,556</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>4.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change 1960-71</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>3634</td>
<td>3562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Educational &amp; General</th>
<th>Ed. &amp; Gen. less Org. Research</th>
<th>Instruction &amp; Dept. Research</th>
<th>Student Aid</th>
<th>Safety Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>8,61</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67 to 1969-70</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carnege Commission on Higher Education Study 1959-60 to 1969-70

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended June 30</th>
<th>Endowed Enrollment (000's)</th>
<th>Total Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Edu. &amp; Gen. less Org. Res. Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Instruction &amp; Dept. Research Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Student Aid Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Safety Div. Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>6,508</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>15,158</td>
<td>8,615</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>9,449</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>12,210</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7,426</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>12,330</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6,659</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9,626</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7,072</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Rate Increase 1960-70 Average Annual Rate Increase 1961-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Cost Factor</th>
<th>Extent of Campus Control</th>
<th>Cornell 1967-70 Analysis</th>
<th>Possible Cornell Projection</th>
<th>Educ. &amp; Gen. less Org. Res. Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Instruction &amp; Dept. Research Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Student Aid Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
<th>Safety Div. Expenditures per Student Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Columns III and IV data from Ref. (29) for 1967-70 period.
TABLE 17
MEDIAN FACULTY TEACHING HOURS PER WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1953-32</th>
<th>1964*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research universities</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other doctoral-granting universities</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive universities and colleges</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts colleges</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year colleges</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Research universities classified in category I of the Carnegie Commission Classification of Institutions of Higher Education in Appendix of New Student and New Faculty (1973), Ref. 6.
3. The 1953-32 data is for teacher's colleges and normal schools which were the predecessors of many of the comprehensive universities and colleges of today.
4. 1953-32 data is median class hours per week while 1964 data is median classroom hours per week.
5. There was no category, "public liberal arts colleges" in the 1953-32 survey, and the private category were grouped with private universities.

TABLE 18
GRADUATE DEGREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>MASTERS DEGREES</th>
<th>DOCTORAL DEGREES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>61 (32)</td>
<td>60 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>51 (11)</td>
<td>51 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>31 (5)</td>
<td>31 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>130 (22)</td>
<td>140 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Degrees/Faculty</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Degrees/Faculty</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Law and B.A. Professional Degrees.
Numbers in parentheses show percentages by Graduate Field.

TABLE 20
TOTAL NUMBER OF COURSES OFFERED
BY ACADEMIC YEAR
SELECTED ENROLLED DIVISIONS
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Art Planning</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>262(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1548(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>496(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Administration</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in parentheses are percent increase over 1962-63.

SOURCE: Taken from Master Course List, Office of Student Records and Finance.

TABLE 19
RATIOS OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS TO FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Universities 1</th>
<th>Cornell Endowed 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Adapted from Ref. 5, p. 65
2. Graduate enrollment weighted 3 to 1 compared to undergraduate based on estimates of relative cost at various universities. See Table 19.

TABLE 22
OPERATING EXPENSE & STUDENT AID
SUPPORTED BY UNRESTRICTED FUNDS
ENROLLED COLLEGES-TYASA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Operating Expense FUnds</th>
<th>Student Aid</th>
<th>Percent S.A. to O.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.36 (18)**</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1.69 (25)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.89 (12)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.33 (24)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2.51 (7.8)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>2.78 (11)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3.15 (13)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.24 (22)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>3.80 (17)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71*</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>5.25 (8)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Reference 15
*1970-71 figures budgeted; others are actual.
**Numbers in parentheses are percent increase over previous year.

TABLE 24
NEED OF 1971 APPLICATIONS
APPRISED FOR ADMISSION
SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Applicants Approved for Admission</th>
<th>Applicants Approved for Admission</th>
<th>Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.I.T.</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 90% of matriculants

SOURCE: Ref. 8
Interpret this table as follows: Consider all applicants to a given institution who are approved for admission. Remove those with no financial need - first in column 1. With those having need, give sufficient financial aid to meet need 2 in column 1. With those having need, give sufficient financial aid to meet need 2 in column 2. Balance represents students admitted but denied financial aid because of insufficient funds.
### Table 23
**Distribution of Courses by Size of Enrollment Given by Selected Endowed Colleges - Fall Semester 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses by College</th>
<th>Number of Students per Course</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-75</th>
<th>76-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>500+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Planning</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>196.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses are percentage of courses in a given category.

**Source:** Taken from Master Grade Distribution List, Office of Student Records and Finance

### Table 24
**Annual Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses are percentage increase over previous year.

**Source:** Reference 8

### Table 25
**Geographical Origin of Cornell Student Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. State or Region</th>
<th>Population 1960</th>
<th>Total 1962-63</th>
<th>Total 1970-71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9,454</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. &amp; New England</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. East Miss.</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. West Miss.</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foreign</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Reference 8

### Table 26
**Components of Financial Aid to Undergraduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Wages from Employment</th>
<th>Scholarships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In thousands of dollars</td>
<td>Percent of Total Aid</td>
<td>In thousands of dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These data include aid which has been received from sources both within and without the University. This includes New York State Regents and Scholar Incentive awards, National Defense Loans, etc.
* These data represent wages for jobs obtained through the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid. Money earned from jobs obtained independently by students are not reflected in these figures.
* Percentages were rounded off to whole numbers. As a result, the total percentages sometimes equal slightly less than 100.

**Source:** Taken from Master Grade Distribution List, Office of Student Records and Finance

### Table 27
**Median Salaries by Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Nine month salaries.
2. Numbers in parentheses refer to percent increase over previous years.

**Source:** Reference 8
### Table 28
**RATIO OF WEIGHTED ANNUAL EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS COMPARED TO COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 1967-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Educational &amp; General expense (less organized research)</th>
<th>Instruction and departmental research</th>
<th>Organized Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities</td>
<td>2.23 (1.69)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.56)</td>
<td>74.5 (22.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive colleges and universities</td>
<td>1.00 (0.94)</td>
<td>1.00 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Colleges</td>
<td>1.90 (1.94)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.12)</td>
<td>1.78 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td>1.18 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.06 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data in parentheses for public institutions

1. Includes instruction and departmental research; extension and public service; libraries; general administration; general institutional expense; student services; organized activities relating to educational departments; other sponsored programs and all other educational and general expense. In computing all averages, graduate FTE enrollment is given a weight of three, as compared to a weight of one for undergraduate FTE enrollment.

+ SOURCE: Adapted from U.S. Office of Education data and Carnegie Commission. See ref. 5 p. 38.

### Table 29
**PROMOTION PROFILE BY TIME IN RANK 1966-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time as Assistant Prof. at Promotion</th>
<th>Time as Associate Professor at Promotion in Full Professor \ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 16 20 15 15 6 1 1</td>
<td>1 6 10 17 19 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect, Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 2 1 4</td>
<td>3 2 3 2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Public Ad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2 3</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 3 8 26 26 35 7 4.7</td>
<td>1 1 7 18 17 19 16 8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses signify female

+ All cases exceeding 7 years for assistant professors and 10 years for associate professors omitted.

SOURCE: Minutes of the Meetings of Board of Trustees
TABLE 33
SUBTRACTIONS FROM TENURE RANK 1967-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resigned</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENGINEERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resigned</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: College records

TABLE 34
FACULTY DISTRIBUTION BY RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Asso. Prof.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Asst.</th>
<th>Inst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Endowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statutory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.I.T.</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (Urbana)</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (Ann Arbor)</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin (all)</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 35
SUPPORT EMPLOYEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Support Employees</th>
<th>Support Employees per Faculty Member</th>
<th>Students per Support Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>3382</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>3795</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>4837</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>5264</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>5692</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>6120</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 10
COMPENSATION OF UNIFORM AGE DISTRIBUTION

Arts and Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirement Interval</th>
<th>Raw Rate Retirement</th>
<th>Average Turnover Rate</th>
<th>Retirement Rate Corrected for Turnover</th>
<th>Projected Rate Subtraction from Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-75</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-80</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total size (1971) of Tenured Faculty = 279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured: 60</td>
<td>Ideal 34 Year Promotion Rate = 8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirement Interval</th>
<th>Raw Rate Retirement</th>
<th>Average Turnover Rate</th>
<th>Retirement Rate Corrected for Turnover</th>
<th>Projected Rate Subtraction from Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-75</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-80</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total size (1971) of Tenured Faculty = 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured: 76</td>
<td>Ideal 34 Year Promotion Rate = 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes no subtractions from tenured ranks due to turnover.
2. Turnover is the estimated subtractions resulting from death and resignations; see Table
3. Correction applied to account for possible turnover cases included in raw retirement. Assumes turnover occurs in all ranks at an equal rate; thus in each of six age brackets between 1971-2000 the rate is assumed to be 1/6 the turnover rate. Also assumes no faculty hired directly into tenure in these six age groups.
4. Sum of Average Turnover Rate and Rate of Retirement Corrected for Turnover.

TABLE 11
A 6-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 1, 1972
1972-73 through 1977-78

CAPITAL PROJECTS IN PLANNING, CONSTRUCTION OR UNDER CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. By Type of Project</th>
<th>No. Project</th>
<th>Est. Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$26,070,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>($11,025,000.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch, Art &amp; Planning</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>($1,200,000.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>($2,595,000.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>($1,000,000.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. Biol. Sciences</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>($8,140,000.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,300,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,905,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,568,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$175,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,050,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Capital Projects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$1,042,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOWED TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$37,310,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Reference 18 and Thomas Mackesey, Vice President for Planning.
APPENDIX III

NOTE 1: Commentary on Inflation and New Responsibilities

As already suggested, one fallacy in this line of reasoning is that it seems to assume that inflation had its impact only on the "Remainder" category of expenditures. This was not so! If, as we suggest in the text, the CPI provides a reasonable approximation of the impact of inflation on all categories (although strictly speaking different price indexes should be applied to each, depending on the varying composition of their respective inputs), then the figures in Column 1 of Table 10 would change as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Div.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Responsibilities</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second fallacy is to measure "enrichment and new responsibilities" that portion of expenditures in only the Remainder category not accounted for by inflation. That is clearly a gross oversimplification. The increase in expenditures for instruction not accounted for by inflation (if the latter were properly measured) would likewise represent "enrichment"; the same would in some perverse sense be true of the real (i.e. apart from inflation) expansion in the Safety Division and Student Aid where clearly the real growth in the Safety Division and Student Aid outlay represent the assumption of "new responsibilities." In a sense, therefore, the "new responsibilities" caption could embrace not just the 1.4 percentage points of our corrected figures above, but all the residuals (after taking out inflation) of the other three categories of expenditure, the 1.2, the 0.4, and the 0.3, or a total of 3.3 of the original 7.5. By this reasoning the entire 7.5 per cent would be explained solely by inflation (4.2 points) and the undertaking of new responsibilities (3.3 points).

But this kind of computation undoubtedly grossly exaggerates the contribution of real new responsibilities and enrichment. In the economy at large, wages typically increase more rapidly than the general price level and the difference is explained primarily by improvements in productivity. It is doubtful that productivity at Cornell, or in other universities (however measured), improved as much as in the economy generally in the particular period. A more reasonable guess might be that it did not improve at all. The difference between our 8.4 per cent average increase in instructional expense and the 4.2 per cent of the CPI is therefore almost surely explained in part by the fact that our improvement in productivity was smaller than in the economy at large. The same is true of Student Aid, a major portion of which is accounted for by tuition. Tuition went up about 8 per cent a year in this period and a large part of the excess over the CPI is explained precisely by our slower rate of productivity advance than in the economy generally; so more than 4.2 of the 8.7 per cent increase in this category reflected more price increase. On the other hand, undoubtedly some part of the increase did reflect "enrichment," including such services as the introduction of new courses, offerings and necessarily the more pervasive presence of the Safety Division.

To some extent these difficulties in Cheit's reasoning are offsetting: his failure to take into account the "enrichment" in all categories of expenditure, and the exaggeration of the enrichment component where he does measure it, tend to be offsetting — but to what extent and in which way the balance of error lies, we did not have the data base or resources to assess.

NOTE 2: Commentary on Degree of Stringency

We have tried an alternative computation of a reasonable goal, using the definitions set forth in NOTE 1 above. First, we reproduce the table given there in Column (1) of the following table, with the only difference being the assumption of a 3.5 rather than a 4.2 per cent rate of general inflation, and a corresponding 0.7 point decrease in the rate of increase in all categories of expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Div.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Responsibilities</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should not be surprising that in Column (1) above only the first line and the total change; the influence of inflation is by this method concentrated in the first line and removed from all the other categories of expenditure.

Their "real" annual rate of increase is therefore unchanged by our altered assumption concerning the rate of inflation.

We assume next that the residual increase in instructional expenditures, after general inflation is removed, of (7.7-3.5) - 4.2 per cent, which includes or reflects (1) real increases in programs (enrichment), (2) any excess in the rate of increase in input prices — main wages — in this sector than in the economy generally, and (3) the lower rate of productivity advance here than elsewhere, cannot reasonably be cut below 2.5 per cent. This cuts its annual increase to 6 per cent and it contribution to the increase in total expenses from 1.2 shown in the first column, to 0.7 + (2.5)(29.0).

We will be proposing that the growth in Student Aid be held henceforth more closely in line with the increases in total expenses. Since that total must be held to a smaller differential above economywide inflation in the future than in the past (7.5 minus 4.2), and since this effect will also moderate the annual increases in tuition — which in turn is an important determinant of the size of Student Aid, we think it realistic to assume a drop in the excess of Student Aid increase over inflation from 4.5 - (8.7-4.2) to 3.3 - (6.8-3.5). This reduces its contribution to the overall increase from 0.4 to 0.3 - (3.3)(10 per cent) — which would still leave it rising slowly relative to total expenses and income.

Finally, we retain the same hope expressed in the text, of halving the growth rate in the Safety Division expenses, and of holding "new responsibilities" unchanged. The result is an estimated expansion rate of 6 per cent in total expenses. Clearly, achieving the 6 per cent goal will require a strenuous effort.
NOTE 4: Commentary on Income Analysis

The approach we have used involves estimating income from the various categories that are less subject to university control, and on the basis of those estimates, determining policy targets with respect to the increase in income from Student Fees. Since the estimates in the categories other than Student Fees are, after all, only estimates, it is a reasonable question to ask how sensitive are the results we reached with respect to Student Fees to reasonable differences in those other controlling projections.

For example, if one took the position that all categories other than Student Fees income should be pushed to their limits of revenue yield, then one might obtain the following configuration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is derived by making much more optimistic estimates of Gifts, Investment Income, Federal and State Governments and Other categories and then working out the required annual rate of increase per student in Student Fees. Implicit in the numbers assigned is (a) a policy of raising charges in the "Other" category (for example, for housing and dining) high enough to convert them into profit-makers, (b) modest policy changes for sponsored research, or improvement in public support of higher education; (c) driving appropriations under "Investment Income" to a point at which we would be consuming our Endowment and (d) anticipating Gift income beyond reasonable expectations. Even with these assumptions, a rise in the rate of increase in Student Fees of over 3 per cent is required (as compared with our earlier 5.9 per cent estimates).

In this case, the goals set for Gifts and Investment Income are modest and probably not even reasonable lower bounds. Even so, notice that they involve the assumption we can increase these kinds of income by 8 and 9 per cent annually, respectively! Federal and State Government and Other are lower bounds. Here, the 37 per cent fraction of total income would require an increase of about 1,400 students and an 8 per cent annual rate of increase in Student Fees. This result would have serious ramifications because the 8 per cent increase could not be sustained and the large increase in the number of students would require major expenditures in the area of "campus life." But notice that the values assumed in this example and those used for the projector "best" estimate (see Table 13 and 14) differ by only one percentage point in almost all cases. This illustrates the narrowness of the margins and the critical role played by Student Fees.

There is another possible criticism of the approach we have used. Is there not some element of arbitrariness in pur having selected income from Student Fees as, in a sense, the residual variable that the University must manipulate to bring in income and expenses into balance? Might we not, at least in principle, have taken any one of the categories of Table 13 as the eventual residual, made various assumptions about the other ones, and then proceeded to determine the required rates of increase in that residual rather than Student Fees? The simplest answer to this objection is that the other income items are far less subject to University policy than the level of tuition and size of the student body. But it would in any event be instructive to try such an alternate approach. Let us assume, at the extreme, that we are determined to have no increase whatever in the income from Student Fees per student; and let us take Investment Income, instead, as our residual variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. &amp; State Govt.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case Investment Income would have to go up 21 per cent a year. This is clearly beyond any reasonable possibility: the rise from 10 to 14 per cent in the fraction of total income from this source would require an additional $3.6 million of earnings (hence requiring about a 40 per cent increase in Invested Funds principal) and a rate of increase in Investment Income per student approximately twice the ten year 1960-70 average. It is obvious that a similar result would have been obtained had Gifts been considered the residual or control variable.
This result is clearly unreasonable in its expectations of either Invested Funds or Gifts.
The above examples show the nature of the constraints and trade-offs, and give perspective on the values chosen for the projected "best" estimate.
The Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney, called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and introduced the acting Speaker, Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics. 81 members were present.

Minutes of the FCR meetings of October 11 and November 1 were approved with two changes in the October 11 minutes. These are: on page 2, line 3 of the resolution, there should be the term "and Faculty Trustees" inserted after "the FCR," because that is the way it was moved. On page 3, the sentences at the bottom of the second large paragraph should read as follows: "Professor Robert Pasley, Law, pointed out that the Executive Committee was originally conceived only as a housekeeping committee, and (not) one to act in emergencies, (. .) not to speak generally for the Faculty. As amended, the resolution makes the advisory group consist only of the Executive Committee, the Dean..." (new material underlined, deleted in brackets). The Speaker then called on the Dean for a report.

1. REPORT OF THE DEAN
   a. Referral of course advertisement matter to Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning.

   In response to a faculty member's objection to an advertisement in The Cornell Daily Sun for courses given by the Center for International Studies (CIS), the question as to the good taste and advisability of advertising courses has been turned over to the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning.

   b. Arts College Part-time Degree Program.

   Objection had been raised to the Arts College part-time degree program on grounds that granting degrees or (approving?) new programs is a function of the University Faculty. The Dean reported that the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies had studied the matter and concluded that no issues of University import are involved, while noting that "in residence" used to carry
the connotation of full-time presence on campus. W. Donald Cooke, Dean of the Graduate School, asked if the Graduate School part-time program might encounter similar objections. The Dean suggested he ask that question of the Faculty. Dean Cooke replied that the Graduate School Faculty had approved the program, and that he was willing to take his chances on the matter. The heart of the issue, the Dean said, was whether existing Faculty legislation was violated by creation of the Arts College part-time program. It apparently had not been violated because the original meaning of the term "residence" has evaporated over a period of time.

c. Research Policies Committee report on current status of CAL to be published in Chronicle unless objection to that procedure.

The Dean pointed out that the Research Policies Committee had pursued its mandate to make inquiries of the Administration on the background and current status of the situation regarding Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory and to have made public any information that might avoid misunderstanding or confusion in the community. The Committee has developed a report on other information about CAL's present status which it feels ought to be communicated, and now seeks to know if there is any objection to the report being published in the December 14 issue of Cornell Chronicle before being first communicated to this body. Professor John H. Whitlock, at-large member, pointed out that many parties such as the Securities and Exchange Commission were involved in this matter. The Dean assured him that the Committee had gone to extraordinary lengths to clear its report with the parties involved. Hearing no objection, he then assumed the body approved publication of the report. Professor Charlotte M. Young, Nutrition, asked how the FCR could approve publication of the report without having seen it. The Dean replied that he supposed it was a question of whether or not the FCR has confidence in its committee.

d. The President's concern about Faculty participation in University governance.
The Dean reported that the President is gravely concerned about the move on campus to abolish the Senate and about lessening Faculty participation both in Senate matters and in Faculty meetings. He said he had told the President he thought this did not necessarily indicate a lack of Faculty interest in such matters, and that if the issues are large the Faculty still turns out for meetings. He said the President plans, for the moment at least, to encourage Faculty participation in the Senate, and asked if there were any comments from the floor.

Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, said he served in the Senate last year and on the Senate's Internal Operations Committee this year. He does not think the President understands the enormous amount of work involved for both Faculty and student senators. The Senate is unnecessarily complex, he said, and it doesn't have the necessary skill or expertise to do its job. The result is interminable arguments and wasted time. He is told, he said, that the Senate is legislating without a quorum this year, having abandoned attempts to obtain one. He also feels it does not represent student opinion because the principal type of student senators are "activists." He concluded that the FCR should address itself at some time, perhaps next Spring, to the role of the Senate, the Faculty role in the Senate, and revising the Senate's structure, because it is too complex and its powers are too unspecified and unclear. "I know student interest is diminishing," he said, "and Faculty interest in my area at least is just about zero."

e. Proposal to eliminate Saturday class periods.

In response to a Faculty member's query before the meeting, the Dean informed the body of a proposal being studied by the Academic Records and Instruction Committee, formerly the Committees on Registration and Schedules and Requirements for Graduation. The proposal, made by a subcommittee, would extend class periods taught on Tuesdays and Thursdays to 75 minutes, thus
arguably allowing a three-hour course to be taught in two periods a week. It was generated by recognition that this practice is already being followed, illegally, on some parts of the campus.

A decision on the proposal is required, the Dean said, because a new computerized scheduling system is almost ready to begin operating and the programmers have asked what assumptions they should make. The Dean said his advice to the programmers had been to assume such a schedule revision only tentatively, because the Faculty decides on class scheduling. An FCR decision is needed to change the present system, and with Cranch Committee meetings scheduled in February, he didn't see how the FCR could take the matter up before March at the earliest. The proposal will be put before this body for action, he said, but probably not until midwinter or early Spring. He added that FCR members should contact their representatives on the Academic Records and Instruction Committee about the proposal, because it presents many and diverse problems.


The FCR committees are "well along" in their consideration of segments of the Cranch Report, the Dean said. The committees, which have been assigned specific recommendations of the Cranch Report for study, have held, or are about to hold, hearings on these recommendations.

Two FCR committees which had not been given assignments also held hearings on the Cranch Report, the Dean said. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, Chairman, concerned itself with Recommendation 13 of the Cranch Report. The Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning had scheduled a hearing today.

The object is to have all committee reports before the Executive Committee by January 5, the Dean said, so that the Executive Committee can prepare its synthesis of the reports for consideration by the FCR at its February meeting, to which the University Faculty will be invited so it can participate in discussion. Because of the shortage of time and the desire to communicate FCR
views to the full Faculty, the Dean asked if there was any objection to publishing the Executive Committee’s synthesis in Cornell Chronicle before the February meeting. Assistant Professor Henry Alker, Arts and Sciences, said his committee had wondered if its report could also be published in Chronicle, and how this could be done without creating confusion. The Dean replied that he believed the Executive Committee had suggested that its synthesis be circulated among committee chairmen before publication so their comments could be included in the published version. He pointed out that the expense involved in publishing all seven committee’s reports, as well as the Executive Committee’s synthesis, would be considerable. He agreed with Professor Alker that regardless of the Executive Committee’s response to committee reports the committees have the right to air their reports publicly.

Professor Isadore Blumen, at-large member, said that on one hand the FCR wants the Faculty to know what the committees have done, and on the other hand needs to be free to function as the decision-making body. Therefore, the only point at issue is whether to make a synthesis first and then present it to the Faculty, or to involve the Faculty at an earlier stage.

Associate Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Agriculture and Life Sciences, asked if the separate reports will be communicated to this body before the February meeting in some form other than publication in Chronicle. The Dean replied that, expenses notwithstanding, there is no reason the reports could not be reproduced for distribution to the FCR shortly after January 5. The Dean then suggested having reproduced enough copies of committee reports for FCR members plus some extra copies which could be obtained at his office by other interested Faculty members. This would be followed by publication of the synthesis in early February. The body assented to this suggestion.

The Dean reported that the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Executive Committee of the Senate had met on December 6 to discuss common problems in responding to the Cranch Report recommendations and had decided 1) to create
liaison committee for the two bodies in respect to Cranch Report deliberations consisting of three members of each body, the FCR representatives to be Professor David Call, Nutrition; Professor William Tucker Dean, Law; and the Dean; 2) to inform the leaders of each body of the names of people studying the different segments of the Cranch Report and encourage communication among FCR members and Senate members working on the same segments.

2. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

The Chair called upon Professor Albert Silverman, Chairman, Research Policies Committee, for his committee's report and recommendation. (See Appendix A) Professor Silverman said his committee wished to delete paragraph 2 of the resolution dealing with obtaining statements prepared by Department of Defense personnel for DOD sponsored research projects at Cornell and filing them, with statements prepared by principal investigators, in the Libraries. He said that Professor Robert E. Hughes, Chemistry, had informed the Committee that he had prevailed upon David Kaser, director of the University Libraries, to obtain descriptive documents from all agents sponsoring research at Cornell, specifically including DOD documents in this group. Professor Silverman added that his committee had recognized great concern over the second paragraph on two grounds. First, official FCR action calling for obtaining DOD documents, being limited by the language of the paragraph only to DOD documents, might constitute in some minds Faculty criticism of DOD sponsored research at Cornell. Second, committee members were concerned over the third sentence of the paragraph in that a comparison of statements of objectives made by DOD personnel and those made by principal investigators might be interpreted as harassment of principal investigators, if not a demand that they justify their research projects. The Committee intended neither of these interpretations of its recommendation, Professor Silverman said.
Professor Silverman then moved the first paragraph of the resolution. Before discussing it, he stated that the Committee assumed that Professor Hughes' request to Mr. Kaser would be honored, but that if for some reason the documents are not forthcoming, it would strongly recommend pursuing other means of obtaining the documents. He then returned to the motion as moved, saying the question of publishing information on grants and contracts was first raised by the Faculty Anti-War Group in a letter to Chronicle. Some members of the Group talked with his committee, Professor Silverman said, and the Committee concluded there are very good reasons for publishing such information. The reasons include Faculty members' present ignorance, in general, about research projects other than their own, the absence of a convenient means of learning about research projects underway at Cornell which might relate to one's own interests, the fact that Chronicle is a good way to communicate such information, and finally the possibility raised by some of the Committee's more optimistic members that fruitful interactions might result from such information being publicly available. The Committee felt that short statements by principal investigators are necessary, he added, because project titles seldom convey sufficient information to satisfy the needs outlined. Further, most research contracts contain abstracts of the purpose of the research being funded, and these can often serve as the basis of such statements.

Professor Silverman observed that he now sees an omission in the resolution's text which he hopes his committee will rectify. It limits itself to sponsored research projects. He sees no reason to limit the recommendation to that kind of research, he concluded.

Professor Walter T. Federer, Agriculture and Life Sciences, moved that the phrase "asked (but not required)" in the resolution be replaced by the word "invited." There was unanimous consent. Professor Blumen said he assumed the phrase "all grants and contracts" includes gifts so that the resolution is not limited to government agencies. Professor Silverman replied that the resolution
does not include gifts, which was an oversight, but that he saw no reason why it should not include gifts. He asked for Dean Cooke's opinion. The Dean said it might depend on how one defines gifts. If the Faculty included foundation gifts that came to Cornell through the Office of Academic Funding, he could arrange to include them, but gifts through other channels would have to be handled by someone else. Professor Blumen said he thought the handling of gifts was an administrative matter and not a problem for the Faculty. He said gifts should be included. There is a record, he said, that foundation gifts have been used for sponsored purposes, not all of which the Faculty would be completely happy with. He said he would like to make it clear that we want an open record here. He therefore moved that the word "gifts" be inserted in the resolution between the words "all" and "grants". The motion was seconded.

Dean Cooke stated that he thought the word "gifts" needed more definition. There is a "massive" list of all gifts to the University published each year, he said, including those as small as $2.73. He hoped the Faculty did not want the entire list included. Professor Mark Nelkin, Engineering, pointed out that the resolution limits gifts to those given for research and teaching. The Dean agreed that this wording presents no problem. There being confusion expressed over whether or not the resolution as moved contained the phrase "for research and teaching," the Chair read the resolution as already amended, which did contain the phrase in question, and asked if there was further discussion of the proposed amendment to add the word "gifts." Professor Silverman stated that his committee had concerned itself with the magnitude of effort involved in including contracts other than the "normal" ones. He hoped that including gifts would not swamp the system. Dean Cooke replied that adding gifts made through his office would be no problem. The amendment was carried by a show of hands.

Assistant Professor John K. Moffat, Agriculture and Life Sciences, asked if the Committee had considered making the list of gifts, grants and contracts
retroactive. Professor Silverman said it did not. Professor Moffat said it might prove advantageous to have a list of ongoing research in areas paralleling one's own in other units of the University. Professor Alker asked Professor Silverman if the proposal included contract renewals. Professor Silverman said he would assume these were included. Professor Whitlock commented that the number of gifts, grants and contracts received by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences alone is cause for concern that publishing a complete list might be impracticable.

Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Engineering, said it was now becoming clear that the present proposal might not answer the need in a uniform way, or might prove awkward. In the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, for example, there is the problem of listing contracts which come under the Hatch Act. In the Humanities there is undoubtedly research which is not being done under grants or contracts. Then too, would the list include major publications? Since the matter needs careful thought, he suggested rejecting the proposal without prejudice. The Dean asked if anyone could convey to the group the procedural details of the proposal, such as how many pages of Chronicle would be involved and the cost. Dean Cooke replied that the Committee had looked into such details, since the proposal had been in work long before the Faculty Anti-War Group had raised its inquiry. A sample run of contracts from federal and non-federal sources over a 10-day period showed 45 contracts received, he said. Based on this sample, a monthly list could be published in Chronicle at a cost of about $700 a year, the funding to come from his budget as Vice President for Research. He professed ignorance as to how research contracts funded by the State might be handled. Professor Ewing asked if anyone could explain whether or not all individual Hatch Act contracts would be included in such a list. He said he had worked with three of them that day, and including all of them would present a large problem.

Professor Walter R. Lynn, at-large, expressed approval of the intent of the Committee's proposal, but not the method outlined. It assumes individuals will
always have a roster, or a year's supply, of Chronicle issues for referral purposes, he said. There are other means available for obtaining information about grants and contracts, including a list regularly prepared by the Engineering College of grants in preparation. Moreover Chronicle already reports on some, but not all, proposals received at the University. He suggested that the Office of Academic Funding join with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and other campus units in compiling lists of research contracts, and that Chronicle publish notice that such information is available to those wanting to obtain it. Only a small fraction of the Faculty want to refer to such lists, he said. He then moved referral of the proposal back to committee, and this was seconded.

Professor Silverman said his committee had in mind only research contracts received through the Office of Academic Funding, and he, at least, had been unaware of the existence of individual Hatch Act contracts. Those interested in learning about research being done in departments other than their own have ways of finding out about them, he said, and all such information is available through the Office of Academic Funding. He added that he sees no need to stockpile Chronicle for a year, occasional reference being sufficient in most cases. Surely it is worth doing what one can about the problem rather than give in to it, he said. The Office of Academic Funding already provides a worthwhile means of supplying needed information.

Professor Seymour Smidt, B & PA, supported the motion to refer back to committee. The sense of the debate, he said, seems clearly to be that a mechanism is needed to enable Faculty members and others in the University to inform themselves more efficiently as to what is going on in research. Nothing that has been proposed, as he understands it, requires Faculty legislation. Putting the proposal into legislation would make it unnecessarily cumbersome. We need to experiment with ways of getting the information across in an effective
way. He therefore hoped that the Committee would encourage the Administration to set up a system for doing this and for monitoring it, and bring it back to the FCR only if satisfactory progress isn't being made. Professor Silverman commented that his committee had discussed with Dean Cooke the advisability of accomplishing its end administratively and the Dean had agreed to arrange it if so advised by the Committee. The Committee was reluctant, he said, to take such action without the Faculty's advice, and asked for guidance from the Dean of the Faculty and the Executive Committee. Since they put the matter on the agenda, presumably they assumed it was a worthwhile subject for faculty discussion. If the FCR encourages the Committee to solve the problem administratively, it would be happy to do so, he said.

The motion to refer back to Committee carried by a show of hands.

Adjourned: 5:43 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
RESOLVED, That the Faculty Council of Representatives make the following recommendations to the appropriate University authorities:

1. A list of all grants and contracts received by the University for research and teaching should be published monthly in the Cornell Chronicle. Information would include the project title, principal investigator, academic department, sponsor and duration. In addition, each investigator would be asked (but not required) to submit an abstract of about 50 words which would be published along with the other information.

2. The Library should obtain statements prepared by Department of Defense (DOD) personnel for DOD sponsored research projects at Cornell. These statements discuss the objectives of the research from the point of view of DOD. A copy of the DOD statement would be forwarded to the principal investigator and he would be given an opportunity to prepare his own statement which would be filed in the Library together with the DOD statement.

Discussion

Last Spring, (Cornell Chronicle, May 25, 1972) several representatives of the "Faculty Anti-War Group" urged, among other things, that the Chronicle publish:

1. a list and some description of all research proposals processed by the office of academic funding.

2. the DOD prepared statements about DOD sponsored research at Cornell.

Several members of the Anti-War Group met with our committee in July urging support by the committee for these and other proposals.

We have discussed the matters in detail, searching the opinion of many faculty members; and have decided to recommend the resolution you have before you.

We recommend the action in paragraph (1) of the resolution because we believe that spreading information about the research going on at Cornell is a good idea. There is considerable general interest in knowing more about what's being done at Cornell. The possible benefit to researchers in allied fields is obvious.

We considered quite carefully the suggestion that proposals as well as grants be published. Initially some members of the committee were quite favorable to this approach. However, we discovered widespread faculty opposition based on a wide variety of misgivings to this course and were persuaded to abandon it. We found almost unanimous approval for publishing information about grants.

(over)
We have also concluded that the DOD prepared statements should be easily available to those who wish to see them. They are public documents discussing research work at Cornell and are therefore of legitimate interest to Cornell faculty and students. We believe that it makes sense to have these documents in the Library.

We see no particular reason for publishing them in the *Chronicle*.

Finally, we feel that the principal investigator should, if he wishes, have the opportunity to comment on these DOD statements and to have his comments filed where they will be seen.

R.C. Baker  
C.L. Comar  
L.R. Hackler  
L.F. Hood  
T.R. Podleski  
J.S. Redding  
W.J. Visek  
D.B. Wilson  
A. Silverman, Chairman

November 14, 1972
Acting President, Dean David C. Knapp, College of Human Ecology, called the
meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and relinquished the Chair to the Speaker. 73 FCR
and 11 University Faculty members were present. The Chair called on the Dean of
the Faculty.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

   a. Special committee to consider financial status.

      The Dean announced the formation, at the President's request, of a special
committee to look into financial questions raised by the Report of the Committee
on Long-Range Financial Planning (Cranch Report). The committee members are:
Professor Harold Bierman, Jr., Business and Public Administration, Professor
Tom E. Davis, Economics, Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, and as chairman,
Professor David L. Ratner, Law. The Dean said he hoped the committee would
report to the FCR within a month.

   b. Proposed change in teaching schedule.

      The Dean reminded the body of the proposed change in the weekly schedule
(Chronicle, Feb. 1) and suggested that members look into the ramifications of
the proposal within their own departments, since the proposal may be included
in the March calendar.

   c. Recognition of standing committees and Executive Committee.

      The Dean thanked the FCR standing committees and the Executive Committee
for preparing the responses to the Cranch Report and the FCR response on schedule.
The Synthesis Committee was chaired by Professor William Tucker Dean, Law,
assisted by Professor Robert Elias, English and Professor David B. Wilson,
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.

2. SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER

      The Chair described the special rules governing this meeting. Following
presentation of the Synthesis Report and a motion for its adoption, there were
to be statements by non-FCR members who registered in advance. Since none registered, it appeared the body could then proceed to its regular business. At this point the Chair asked if any non-FCR members wished to register any statements in advance. There being no response, the Chair asked all non-FCR members who wished to participate in the debate on any particular recommendation in the Synthesis Report to write their names and the recommendations' identifying numbers on slips of paper handed out and return them to him. Otherwise debate would be limited to FCR members, he said. Following the motion to adopt the Synthesis Report, the Chair would entertain a motion that debate by any one individual on each recommendation in the report be limited to five minutes. The Chair then called on Professor William Tucker Dean.

3. PRESENTATION OF FCR RESPONSE

Professor Dean, on behalf of the FCR Executive Committee, presented the draft report, titled Long-Range Financial Planning at Cornell: The Response of the University Faculty, and moved that the FCR adopt its 13 recommendations. He noted that the report had appeared in Chronicle, February 1, 1973. The motion received a second.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to limiting debate by any individual to five minutes. There being none, he so ordered and opened the floor to debate.

Professor John G.B. Hutchins, Business and Public Administration, asked if this would be the final action or would the report go to the University Faculty. The Dean replied that it is final in the sense that the FCR is now constituted to take legislative action on behalf of the Faculty. However, the Faculty may postpone or nullify the action taken by following procedures spelled out in the Organizations and Procedures of the University Faculty. Professor Hutchins moved that visitors be allowed the same debating privileges as FCR members on grounds that those present are presumably the ones most
interested in the matter, and that this would be the best substitute for a meeting of the full Faculty on the matter, which he deemed desirable. The Dean pointed out that a report from the FCR would be made to the full meeting of the Faculty on February 14, 1973. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. DEBATE ON THE FCR RECOMMENDATIONS

Professor Hutchins expressed support of long-range planning, but said the University needs some form of cost-benefit analysis for departments which it does not now have. Harvard, for example, has put long-term budgetary constraints on each of its departments. The present report does not speak to this matter, nor did the Cranch Report speak effectively to it. Professor Hutchins also favored retaining the tenure system, but said he thinks the University needs four tenure ranks rather than three. Since the rank of instructor has been removed, he would like to see established the ranks of tenured and non-tenured associate professorships. He also opposed the idea of granting tenure to young, mobile teachers. He concluded by saying the report needs to address itself to maintaining the informal planning and control procedures that the University has had in the past, since the University is shifting from a collegial type of administration to a more structured one as its size increases.

Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., Business and Public Administration, called for more aggressive language in recommendation 1 of the report, saying standing FCR committees should take the initiative rather than waiting to be called on by the University administration. The crucial point is not whether the Cranch Report survives, he said, but whether the University, the Faculty and the FCR can make substantial impact on a host of decisions covering teaching, public service programs, development of facilities, allocation of reserves, etc. Professor Flash was also concerned with the phrase "more uniform throughout the University" in recommendation III, B. The University is so diverse that such a
phrase would only impel more procedural structuring and constraints. The goal should be to obtain excellence that will accord with or recognize the diversity that exists throughout various divisions of the University.

Professor David L. Call, Nutrition, moved to consider the 13 recommendations seriatim. The motion carried by voice vote.

5. **DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION I, A.**

We recommend that the University administration consistently make use of the standing committees of the FCR to secure Faculty participation in decisions affecting educational policy, and that in order to assure effective participation of the Faculty, it supply all information needed to appraise problems of educational policy. (See Appendix A)

Professor L. Pearce Williams, History, moved that the phrase "formally consult" be substituted for "make use of." The amendment carried by voice vote. The body adopted recommendation I, A, as amended.

6. **DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION I, B.**

We recommend that the FCR establish a committee, composed of Faculty members qualified through professional expertise, to undertake with the cooperation of the administration a continuing economic analysis of the financial strengths and weaknesses of the University. (See Appendix A)

Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, said that the explanation of recommendation I, B, given in Chronicle seemed to indicate that the proposed FCR committee would be called on to perform a more detailed and scrupulous examination of the questions than he thought it practical for a group of professors to be asked to do. If that were so, he could not support the recommendation. Professor Paul L. Hartman, Physics, said he and his colleagues in Engineering Physics had noted that the Cranch Report, which presumably based its recommendation on consideration of the University's financial aspects, had ignored a substantial portion of University monies, i.e. sponsored research funding. He said he wondered if the special Presidential committee announced by the Dean at the start of the meeting or the FCR committee proposed in recommendation I, B, would take this into account.
Associate Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, asked if passage of recommendation I, B, would establish the committee or would further FCR action be required, and would it be a standing or temporary committee. Professor Dean replied that he assumed passage of the recommendation would require further implementation in order to establish the committee. Professor Mark Nelkin, Physics, asked about the relation between this committee and the one announced at the beginning of the meeting. The Dean replied that the Presidential committee is a short-term one expressly concerned with the question of whether the University is presently in a financial crisis. Its purpose is to provide a common basis of understanding for making decisions envisaged by the Cranch Report. Recommendation I, B, he said, calls for a "continuous" committee, thus inferring that this committee would deal over time not only with the immediate question but with all the other kinds of questions dealt with in the explanation of recommendation I, B.

Associate Professor Peter J. Kahn, Mathematics, proposed inserting the word "standing" before the word "committee" in recommendation I, B, the intention being to insure that recommendation I, A, would apply to this committee. The amendment carried by voice vote. Professor Hutchins moved to add the following phrase to recommendation I, B: "with a view to advising those departmental heads and committees concerned with planning of the parameters within which their planning should take place." There was no second. The body adopted recommendation I, B, as amended.

7. DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION II, A.

We recommend that planning be instituted at the smallest academic-budgetary level.

Assistant Professor Henry A. Alker, Social Sciences, asked the drafting committee the intent of this recommendation. Professor Dean asked Professor Flash, as chairman of the committee which considered this matter, to respond.
Professor Flash said the committee had felt that planning should start at the department level rather than be imposed from above as envisioned by the Cranch Report. Professor Kahn, Mathematics, pointed out that there were a large number of recommendations in the committee reports and asked if today’s action was the only action contemplated. The Dean said yes, unless somebody wished to offer further recommendations from the floor. The Chair said these 13 recommendations make up a synthesis of the committee reports. Professor Alker asked if the entire substance of the committee reports was not being transmitted to vice president Cooke, along with the motions voted on at this meeting, it being impractical for this body to vote on all recommendations contained in the reports, and that therefore today’s action was not to be interpreted as voting "up or down" on the part of the FCR. The Dean agreed that the reports contained many recommendations, the Synthesis Committee’s purpose being to simplify them. As the committee reports were received, they were distributed to the entire FCR, including the President who is a member, plus copies to Dean Cooke. Action taken today on the 13 synthesized recommendations in no way reflects on the merits of the other recommendations, he said.

Professor Glenn W. Hedlund, Agricultural Economics, expressed approval of the recommendation, but not the language, saying its implication was that no planning had ever been done. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, agreed with Professor Hedlund and asked what would happen if the smallest academic budgetary level doesn't undertake any planning. Professor Isadore Blumen, Industrial and Labor Relations, said that the FCR is responding to the Cranch Report and that the 13 recommendations are not intended to be a complete guideline. The Cranch Report is "heavy" on top level planning, he said. Our position is that planning should start in the departments as a collegial matter and then move up, although admittedly this is not the only way it could be done.
Professor Kahn, Mathematics, moved to amend recommendation II, A by substituting the phrase "continue to begin" for "be instituted" and received a second. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, said there are many departments within the University where there has been no planning ever, and what recommendation II, A does is say this should end. Professor Kahn's amendment being defeated, recommendation II, A carried by voice vote.

8.

DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION II, B.

We recommend that high priority in the coming planning and decision-making processes be accorded to the proposed numbers and composition of the student body and of the Cornell Faculty.

Assistant Professor David A. Singer, Mathematics, asked if recommendation II, B implies that the Faculty does not approve the Cranch Report's recommendation to increase the size of the student body by 2,000 within the next five years, that is, that the Faculty feels further study of this recommendation is needed? Professor Dean replied that the Executive Committee felt no such intention was contained in the recommendation. It merely felt that this was a subject of considerable complexity on which the FCR would want to be heard after further consideration and study. The Dean interjected as a point of clarification that in at least one of the committee reports the thought was registered that rather than work from number calculations to their consequences, the process should begin with considerations of other matters and that the effect of the numbers should be worked into the deliberations at a later stage.

Professor Olum supported the recommendation, but remarked that the rate of increase already projected for the student body means that the University will shortly reach the size discussed in the Cranch Report. He hoped that passage of this recommendation would impress on his colleagues the need for prompt action on this matter. Professor Williams stated that the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences has submitted a report to the College, which, if accepted, directs the College admissions committee to hold the number of students constant. Other colleges might wish to take similar action, he said.
Dean Cooke stated that the press for increases in enrollments does not come from the top down, but from the bottom up, from departments to colleges and to the administration. This is certainly the case where requests for more graduate students are concerned. Professor Williams pointed out that this discussion concerned undergraduate students. Dean Cooke replied that he believes the point applies equally to both, and that this matter is one we shouldn't try to settle here but at least should get straightened out. Professor Alker asked if the committee which prepared the report actually took a stand in favor of or against the Cranch Report's proposed increase of 2,000 students. Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, said that it seemed to the committee from the information it had that a proposed expansion of so-called "underused areas" implied that new students would only come to the unused, and probably unpopular, areas. This struck the committee as inappropriate.

Professor Alker proposed amending recommendation II, B by adding the sentence: "We are not at this time persuaded by the Cranch Report's suggestion for student enrollment increases of 2,000 in the next five years." Professor Elias asked if the amendment was an addition or a substitute. Professor Alker replied that he was specifying an important matter about which the text is uncertain. Professor Elias said that the recommendation acknowledges that there has been a proposal to increase the student body and that this proposal is worth discussing. He did not see that it implied Faculty acceptance of the proposal. The amendment calls for further discussion, and that is already said in the recommendation. Professor Ewing asked if Professor Alker's amendment was an addition or a substitute. The Chair interpreted it as an addition. Professor Williams spoke against the amendment, saying that since an FCR committee had taken a position on the matter, adding the amendment amounted to making a decision without listening to the committee.

The Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, Physics, asked Professor Alker if his amendment means he favors a larger or smaller sized student body.
Professor Alker said it leaves open to the FCR the question of whether the student body should be increased or decreased in size. The amendment was defeated, and the body approved recommendation II, B.

9. **DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION II, C.**

We recommend that the administration work closely and cooperatively with the Faculty in developing and implementing a response to the imperatives set forth in the President's Statement of Minority Education and that the administration assist the Faculty in making the necessary decisions by supplying (1), detailed estimates of the costs of implementations and (2), an indication of how those costs can be met.

The body adopted recommendation II, C, without debate.

10. **DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION III, A.**

We recommend that the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and public service educational efforts, and the relation of his interests to his department's commitments, continue to be the primary bases for recommending promotion.

Professor Alker asked if the Synthesis Committee could explain why it dropped from its recommendation reference to administrative service to the Cornell community and the larger professional community as a basis for reward and promotion. Professor Elias responded that the recommendation only lists primary bases for promotion. In addition, the committee felt that discussion of all possible alternative bases would be too time-consuming to discuss at this meeting. Professor Alker moved to amend the recommendation by adding the following: "Administrative service to the Cornell community and/or the Faculty member's larger professional community are legitimate, if secondary, bases for reward and promotion." The motion being seconded, he then spoke to it, saying it is hard to secure Faculty participation in the Senate and other groups. The amendment is not intended to promote administrators rather than researchers and teachers, but to recognize that excellence in Faculty self government is as valuable to the University as is excellence in any other activity of the Faculty. Professor Hutchins supported the amendment on grounds
that although the President asked the Faculty to participate in the Senate, and its future is in doubt because of its members being overworked, yet the Faculty is not responding. Perhaps if Faculty participation in the Senate were recognized this problem could be solved, he said.

Professor Williams pointed out that service in the Senate, however worthy, hardly qualifies as a basis for promoting a Faculty member, and that the recommendation concerns itself with bases for promotion. Professor Flash supported Professor Alker's amendment. Professor Alker said he was quite willing to delete "and promotion" from his amendment. Professor Elias stated that he thought the problem lay in an idiosyncrasy of format. Recommendation III, A through III, C really constitute one broad recommendation regarding Faculty performance and rewards, so broad in fact that Professor Alker's intent had to be read into it as part of the whole picture. Professor Whitlock asked if Professor Alker's amendment wouldn't fit logically under recommendation III, C rather than under recommendation III, A. Professor Alker said he thought it was equally appropriate under either recommendation. Professor Hartman disagreed with Professor Williams, saying the Senate was structured to include non-tenured Faculty. To think of Senate service only in terms of reward penalizes those who do not serve in the Senate, and perhaps the solution would be to eliminate the non-tenured Senate constituency.

Professor Vinay Ambegaokar, Physics, said he would vote against the amendment because it was not substantive. Those people who survive, he said, will do so because of their own inherent strengths, and he saw no reason why the University should explicitly change its way of governing itself in order to artificially penalize those individuals who, without prejudice to the question, may or may not wish to adapt to the system. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 37 to 23. The body adopted recommendation III, A.
11. DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION III, B.

We recommend that the present tenure system be continued but that the selection procedures be strengthened and made more uniform throughout the University and that Faculty consideration be given to questions raised about post-tenure Faculty performance. (See Appendix A)

Professor Alker asked the Synthesis Committee to explain what it meant by the phrase "that Faculty consideration be given to questions raised about post-tenure Faculty performance." Professor Dean responded that the Executive Committee felt that most people recognize there is some abuse of tenure after it has been granted. Rather than just support keeping the tenure system as the Cranch Committee had done, the Committee sensed that most people are prepared to examine the extent to which there is abuse of tenure after it is granted and to consider whether, in its collegial way, the Faculty might be able to deal with that problem.

Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics, said he was concerned about the extent to which the FCR is expressing the Faculty's opinion of the Cranch Report. The closest the FCR will come, he said, to expressing some of the outrage felt by the Faculty over sections 12 and 13 of the Cranch Report is recommendation III, B, and he did not think that was strong enough. He moved to add to recommendation III, B: "No new post-tenure scrutiny of individual Faculty members should be instituted without this further consideration."

Professor Blumen suggested inserting "procedures for" before "post-tenure scrutiny". Professor Bernard F. Stanton, Agricultural Economics, said he assumed the intent of this amendment was not to end the process of promoting a tenured associate professor to professor. The amendment carried by voice vote.

Professor Olum moved to strike the phrase "and made more uniform throughout the University" from recommendation III, B, on grounds that Cornell has such diversity that it is extremely difficult to achieve uniformity. The
really operative phrase in recommendation III, B, he said, is: "that the selection procedures be strengthened." Presumably that means everywhere within the University. Professor Blumen asked if the phrase "throughout the University" shouldn't be retained and Professor Olum agreed. Professor Nelkin said that he understood recommendation III, B to mean that there are different procedures for granting tenure throughout the University, some good, some not so good, and that the good ones should be applied uniformly. The amendment passed by a vote of 34 to 25. Professor Alker then asked the Synthesis Committee to explain how it interpreted the word "strengthened" in recommendation III, B. Does it for example mean that non-tenured Faculty would be fired? Professor Elias said he didn't see how the word "procedures" could be interpreted as meaning to fire people. Professor John Doris, Human Development and Family Studies, said he found himself confused by the ambiguity of the proposed changes. He therefore suggested amending the recommendation by dropping out everything after "continued." There was no second. The body adopted recommendation III, B as amended.

12. DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION III, C.

We recommend that Faculty salaries be kept competitive, that merit increases be a part of the reward structure, that salary increases be based in part on the cost of living, and that the fringe benefit system be re-evaluated.

Professor Williams asked "with whom" the Synthesis Committee meant Faculty salaries should be kept competitive. Professor Dean answered that he guessed it meant the Ivy League. Professor Flash said the phrase was taken from the Cranch Report, and his committee interpreted it to mean the market within which the Faculty competes, for example the Cornell history department vs. a history department at another university. Mr. W. Jack Lewis, Religious Affairs, said he found the expressed intent of recommendation III, C confusing in light of this statement in the introduction of the committee's report: "We reject as insensitive and self-defeating the external, mechanistic, and negative
concepts of motivation and performance evaluation articulated in the (Cranch) Report." Mr. Lewis said recommendation III, C brings motivation into the picture, and it can be mechanistic because if the University does indeed face stringent financial difficulties, the Faculty's motivation will be called into question. Mr. Lewis wondered if the Faculty was taking the University's situation seriously enough. Professor Williams responded that most of the Faculty are convinced that the University is out of its financial problems and that therefore this recommendation makes a lot of sense. Professor Kahn, History of Art, supported Mr. Lewis' statement, saying it was disappointing to him that the recommendations showed no sentiment in the direction indicated by Mr. Lewis. The body adopted recommendations III, C through VII without further debate.

IV. GRADUATE EDUCATION

We recommend that the General Committee of the Graduate School continue its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs and their relationship to undergraduate education and public service.

V. NEW CENTERS

We recommend that a new Center be created only if it fulfills a clear academic need and that procedures be established to involve the University Faculty in a systematic way so that such a Center can be integrated into the University function without inhibiting program innovation and execution.

VI. CALENDAR

We recommend that a committee of Faculty and administration personnel be appointed by the President and provided with clerical support and reduction in normal responsibilities to collect pertinent information from other institutions presently or previously on full-year operation.

VII. STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

We recommend that there be a number of different kinds of loan programs and work programs supplementing existing scholarships.

13. DEBATE ON RECOMMENDATION VIII

We recommend that the administration report on possible economies in the non-academic programs of the University.
Professor Kahn, Mathematics, asked if this recommendation was strong enough to elicit information about possible administrative economies. The Dean replied that from what he had heard of the discussion by those who drafted the recommendation he hoped so. The recommendation was intended to do exactly that. Professor Alker said he thought it would be easy to misconstrue this recommendation as applying only to non-academic to support staff and not academic administrators. The Dean and Professor Dean assured him that academic administration was intended to be included in the recommendation. The body adopted recommendation VIII.

Professor Federer moved to add a 14th recommendation: "We find the whole Cranch Report distasteful." Professor Kahn, History of Art, said he did not think that was a recommendation. Professor Blumen said the President has "very thoughtfully" given the Faculty an outline which will enable us to avoid any sense of confrontation with the administration. However much he may agree with the motive of the proposed addition, he thought the language could only be misinterpreted. He therefore recommended that the matter be referred to an appropriate FCR committee for further action if the FCR desired it. Professor F.M.R. Isenberg, Vegetable Crops, agreed with Professor Blumen. At this point in our procedures, he said, "I conclude it would be bad-mannered to offend the administration, and I think we ought to vote this down."

Professor Williams, History, asked the Chair to rule that it was not a recommendation and that it was out of order. The Chair so ruled.

Adjourned: 5:57 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder

See list of approved recommendations Appendix A.
I. FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

A. We recommend that the University administration consistently formally consult the standing committees of the FCR to secure Faculty participation in decisions affecting educational policy, and that in order to assure effective participation of the Faculty, it supply all information needed to appraise problems of educational policy.

B. We recommend that the FCR establish a standing committee, composed of Faculty members qualified through professional expertise, to undertake with the cooperation of the administration a continuing economic analysis of the financial strengths and weaknesses of the University.

II. PLANNING

A. We recommend that planning be instituted at the smallest academic-budgetary level.

B. We recommend that high priority in the coming planning and decision-making processes be accorded to the proposed numbers and composition of the student body and of the Cornell Faculty.

C. We recommend that the administration work closely and cooperatively with the Faculty in developing and implementing a response to the imperatives set forth in the President's Statement of Minority Education and that the administration assist the Faculty in making the necessary decisions by supplying (1), detailed estimates of the costs of implementations and (2), an indication of how those costs can be met.

III. FACULTY TENURE AND REWARDS

A. We recommend that the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and public service educational efforts, and the relation of his interests to his department's commitments, continue to be the primary bases for recommending promotion.

B. We recommend that the present tenure system be continued but that the selection procedures be strengthened throughout the University and that Faculty consideration be given to questions raised about post-tenure Faculty performance. No new procedures for post-tenure scrutiny of individual Faculty members should be instituted without this further consideration.

C. We recommend that Faculty salaries be kept competitive, that merit increases be a part of the reward structure, that salary increases be based in part on the cost of living, and that the fringe benefit system be re-evaluated.

(over)
IV. GRADUATE EDUCATION

We recommend that the General Committee of the Graduate School continue its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs and their relationship to undergraduate education and public service.

V. NEW CENTERS

We recommend that a new Center be created only if it fulfills a clear academic need and that procedures be established to involve the University Faculty in a systematic way so that such a Center can be integrated into the University function without inhibiting program innovation and execution.

VI. CALENDAR

We recommend that a committee of Faculty and administration personnel be appointed by the President and provided with clerical support and reduction in normal responsibilities to collect pertinent information from other institutions presently or previously on full-year operation.

VII. STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

We recommend that there be a number of different kinds of loan programs and work programs supplementing existing scholarships.

VIII. THE NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT STAFF AND FACILITIES

We recommend that the administration report on possible economies in the non-academic programs of the University.

As passed by the Faculty Council of Representatives, February 7, 1973
The Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney, called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. 45 Faculty members were present.

The Dean announced the death of the following:

George S. Rinehart, Associate Professor of Mathematics
Ethel B. Waring, Emeritus Professor of Child Development and Family Relations
Harold L. Reed, Emeritus Professor of Economics
Elton K. Hanks, Professor of Extension

The Dean asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the meeting of September 15, 1972. There being none, the minutes were regarded as correct.

The Dean relinquished the Chair to the Speaker, who called on Professor William T. Dean, Law, chairman of the FCR Synthesis Committee.

1. REPORT ON THE FCR RESPONSE TO THE CRANCH COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Dean traced the development and enactment of the FCR responses to the Cranch Committee Report since the President first asked Dean Penney to ascertain the Faculty's response. The FCR held a special meeting on November 1, 1972, to which the entire Faculty was invited. Most members of the Cranch Committee were present and a lively discussion took place. The FCR Executive Committee then assigned the sections of the Cranch Report to various FCR committees for study and the development of responses. No FCR committee was barred from responding also to other sections of the Cranch Report than the ones assigned to it. The Executive Committee met with the Senate Executive Committee and formed a joint liaison group. As yet, the Senate has not issued a formal response to the Cranch Report. The FCR committees held public hearings to which the entire Faculty was invited, then submitted their responses in the form of reports to the Executive Committee, which distributed copies to all FCR members and made copies available to Faculty members. The Executive Committee then formed the Synthesis Committee consisting of Professor Dean as chairman,
professor Robert H. Elias, English, and Assistant Professor David B. Wilson, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, to express the basic approaches of the reports in brief compass. This was accomplished in the form of a series of recommendations followed by explanatory material and a separate section of additional background material. Following approval by the Executive Committee, the recommendations were adopted by the FCR with some changes at its February 7, 1973 meeting. The purpose of this meeting, Professor Dean said, is to receive comments from the University Faculty with respect to the recommendations formally approved by the FCR. He then asked if there were any questions. There being none, the Chair called on the Dean of the Faculty to report on FCR activities since the September meeting.

2. DISCUSSION OF THE LEGISLATION

Before giving his report, the Dean asked if there were any questions either about the method of preparation or the content of the FCR response to the Cranch Report. Associate Professor John F. Booker, Engineering, pointed out that the word "and" should have been inserted between "consistently" and "formally" in recommendation I, A. The Dean agreed. Professor Paul L. Hartman, Physics, noted with approval the unusual policy adopted by the FCR at its meeting the previous week of allowing visiting Faculty to rise and make comments without formal request. Mr. W. Jack Lewis, Religious Affairs, asked if there would be an opportunity to discuss the content of the explanatory section of the FCR response. Since it deals with philosophical questions regarding education and the mission of the University, areas in which the Division of Campus Life, for example, feels it is engaged in a complementary enterprise with the Faculty, participation in such discussion by various segments of the campus community would be advisable. The Dean replied that this section was purposely received, rather than adopted, by the FCR because it is of such broad character that it
would require many weeks of FCR debate for adoption. He suggested that a motion by an FCR member to adopt a section of the explanatory portion of the report might be a method of opening it up to debate. Mr. Lewis asked if an FCR committee might be asked to look into the matter of the mission of the University over a period of time. Although an extremely difficult matter to examine, he said he felt it worthy of the Faculty's attention. The Dean replied that the proper procedure would be to have a motion introduced in the FCR to form such a committee, this not being the house for such a motion.

Assistant Professor Henry A. Alker, Social Sciences, said he believed the President had appointed a commission, chaired by Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Development and Family Studies, to investigate the mission of the University. The Dean agreed. That being so, Professor Alker, continued, it would be fruitless to appoint another committee to do the same job.

Associate Professor A. Gerd Korman, Industrial and Labor Relations, asked what is the proper response of the Faculty to the recommendations, i.e. how can a criticism of part or all of the recommendations be acted on. The Dean replied that if a Faculty member feels a recommendation is wrong or improperly worded, he and a group of colleagues sufficient in number to equal the FCR membership (100 persons) could file a petition with the Dean who would turn it over to the Review and Procedures Committee of the FCR, the ultimate objective being to postpone or nullify that recommendation, or portion thereof, objected to. Professor Elias asked if there was another step, short of such a procedure, by which anybody could take action such as a sense of the body resolution. The Dean pointed out that the Faculty has no legislative power except as he had described, and asked Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, as a parliamentary expert, if a sense of the body resolution would be in order. Professor Olum doubted it would be, since a quorum was not present at this meeting. He urged
those present to say what they wished to about the recommendations, however, since FCR members present might profit from hearing it. Professor Korman responded by saying he considered the phrase "and the relation of his interests to his department's commitments" in the first sentence of recommendation III, A as unnecessary and presenting a challenge to the phrase immediately preceding it, "We recommend that the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and public service educational efforts..."

The Dean asked if a member of the committee which examined the Faculty tenure and rewards section of the Cranch Report would respond. Professor Elias said the phrase objected to by Professor Korman resulted from an attempt by a committee member to synthesize a number of comments made by several committees. "I think the result is not a good one," he added. The intent of the phrase about departmental commitment, he said, was to counter the situation in which a large department with many service commitments to other parts of the University hires a faculty member who agrees to teach freshman courses. "After awhile nothing could bore this person more than to carry out the department's commitments that he has presumably agreed to do," he said, "and the question arises as to whether his promotion is especially useful to the department. The phrase was not intended to encourage a philosophy of adjustment, or of 'being a good fellow on the administrative team'." Moreover, the verb "continue" in recommendation III, A was meant to offset the phrase, Professor Elias concluded, on the ground that commitment to department purposes has always entered into the theory of promotions, and should continue to do so.

The Dean opined that part of Professor Korman's objection stemmed from concern that the chairman of a research-oriented department at the University might select Faculty members at random to perform some research project of interest to the department. Professor Korman added, "and, as everyone knows, there are a number of departments within the University that do not have chairmen, but have department heads who do not function as elected chairmen nor do they have
power to act as they choose to." The Dean said that he believed Professor Elias had tried to point out that the recommendation is not intended to encompass such situations, but rather to allow for a department's need to teach freshman courses. He agreed, however, that the language left something to be desired.

Professor Max Black, Philosophy, said recommendation III, A, describes primary bases for recommending promotion, and asked what secondary bases are. The Dean replied that, as Professor Alker had effectively argued the previous week, one of the secondary bases was service on committees, the Senate, professional organizations, etc. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parisitology, asked Professor Dean if the Synthesis Committee would not be willing to reword the recommendation so as to eliminate the objection raised and bring it to the next FCR meeting. The Dean surmised that it would be in order to raise this question at the next FCR meeting.

Professor Maurice F. Neufeld, Industrial and Labor Relations, asked if there would be an equivalent of a legislative history of the FCR response to the Cranch Report. The Dean replied that such a history would consist of the committee reports on which the synthesis was based and the minutes of the FCR debate the previous week. Professor Neufeld asked if Professor Elias' interpretation of how the phrase in question had gotten into recommendation III, A, would be encompassed in the legislative history. The Dean replied that from a legal point of view, such statements made by participants in the drafting process do not form part of the legislative history. "Is the equivalent of Professor Elias' comment reflected in the debate portion of the legislative history?" Professor Neufeld asked. The Dean said he thought it was not. Then, Professor Neufeld said the body might want to entertain a motion to change the legislative history. The Dean apologized to Professor Neufeld for thinking he had asked if Professor Elias' statement at this meeting could become retroactively a part of the
previous week's debate. The answer to his question, that is, had the same sort of discussion taken place the previous week, is no, he said.

Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, said that on the basis of the Dean's description of what would comprise a legislative history, and the FCR's action in defeating a motion to have secondary considerations appended to the recommendation, it would seem that such considerations are now excluded from being secondary considerations. The Dean disagreed, saying that the minutes will show that in the debate the point made was that community service, etc., was still to be a matter of secondary concern, but that such secondary concerns ought not to be reflected in the legislation passed by the FCR.

Professor Whitlock reminded the Dean that he had asked Professor Dean if he would be willing to move to change the recommendation's wording to reflect secondary considerations at the next FCR meeting, and that he had not received a response. Professor Dean said he would be willing to do so and would hope for a second from Professor Elias.

Professor Michael C. Latham, Nutrition, pointed out that some tenured Faculty, himself included, belong to a school of the University but are not affiliated with any department, therefore the word "department" in the recommendation needs to be changed to reflect this fact. Professor Dean responded that the drafting committee in using the word "department" did so as a matter of shorthand and with the knowledge that the Law School, for example, also has no departments within it. The committee meant the word to be interpreted broadly so as to include whatever agency is responsible for passing on a person's promotion.

Professor David L. Call, Nutrition, pointed out that as he understood it, the intent now was to have the Executive Committee place certain minor amendments to the existing legislation on the agenda of the next FCR meeting. He informed the body that there was no certainty that such proposals would be passed.
3. REPORT OF THE DEAN

The Dean proceeded to give his report on FCR activities since the Faculty meeting in September. Five formal actions had been taken. These were:

a. Creation of a Faculty Advisory Group to serve in a consultative capacity in the event of a campus crisis such as the Carpenter Hall incident of the spring of 1972.

b. Legislation creating a Committee on Academic Records and Instruction, which succeeded to the responsibilities of the former Registration and Schedules and Requirements for Graduation committees. Should the Senate pass a bill recommending abolishment of the physical education requirement, it would come before this Committee.

c. Amendments to legislation of the Academic Integrity Hearing and Appeals Boards, and a revision of the Code of Academic Integrity.

d. Changes made in the list of ex officio members of the University Faculty to conform to title changes in the administration. The Committee, chaired by the Secretary, is now looking into the question of qualifications for ex officio membership in the Faculty.

e. Enactment of responses to the Cranch Report.

The Dean reported the following current committee activities:

a. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, chaired by Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, is considering several matters.

b. The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, chaired by Professor Kathleen Rhodes, Human Ecology, is at work on a new class schedule (Chronicle, February 1, 1973) which may come before the FCR in March. Substantial changes are anticipated, including increasing Tuesday and Thursday classes from 50 to 75 minutes in length and abolishing Saturday classes. The Committee is also working on changing grade symbols and making better use of the periods in the Fall and Spring when independent study period and examinations are compressed into a two-week period. The Committee is also looking into possible legislation regarding courses offered by Centers at the University.

c. The Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning, Assistant Professor Andrew A. Sorensen, Human Ecology, chairman, is about to make recommendations on the Senate Bill Against Discrimination RE Religious Holidays.
Committee members have met with Senate representatives on the matter. The Committee is also working on the Senate's Bill of Rights for Students. Two or three portions of the bill have not been approved by the FCR.

The Dean added that the Nominations and Elections Committee is currently receiving nominations for Faculty Trustee and at-large members of the FCR. The chairman of the Committee is Professor Jerry M. Rivers, Human Ecology. The Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, Associate Professor Edward S. Slash, Jr., Business and Public Administration, chairman, is about to propose legislation on Faculty grievances and is studying fringe benefits. The Review and Procedures Committee is about to suggest revisions in the so-called "Pasley document" and its legislation. The Dean asked for inputs on this matter, if there are any, from the Faculty. The Committee also has changed the title of the Necrology booklet to "Memorial Statements" and will shortly introduce legislation to change the time of FCR committee appointments from fall to spring in order to facilitate commencing work in the Fall. Finally, the Dean referred to the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships, Professor Charles D. Gates, Engineering, chairman, which has been kept busy with its responsibility of passing on ROTC courses in respect to their meeting academic requirements.

Adjourned 5:12 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney, called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. 81 members and three visitors were present.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

a. COSEP Advisory Committee

The Dean announced the formation of a COSEP (Committee on Special Educational Projects) Advisory Committee on which he will serve as the Faculty representative. He called this an auspicious development in that when questions concerning educational policy were brought before the Committee, he would be able, with the advice of duly constituted Faculty committees, to speak for the entire Faculty rather than contribute individually to a group decision.

b. Request for comment on Carter Committee Report

The Dean reported that the President had referred the report on the Africana Studies and Research Center, prepared by a committee chaired by Professor Lisle Carter, B & PA, to the FCR for comment and criticism. He read from the President's referral letter, dated February 16, "I shall expect to discuss the Report with the appropriate Faculty committees and with the deans to seek a means for development of the best possible long-range program." The FCR Executive Committee had referred the Report to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, the Dean said.

c. Request for comment on Equal Educational Opportunity Proposal

The Dean reported that a proposal made to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees in January by student trustee Gordon Chang had been referred to the FCR Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning for comment. The proposal reads:

"No University student shall be denied admission to, or otherwise prohibited from, registering in any academic course of the University because of such student's race, religion, ethnic origin, sex, or political activity."

Mr. Chang's concern in offering the proposal was over alleged discrimination, or use of racial bases, for enrollment in courses, particularly in the Africana
Studies and Research Center, the Dean said. The President recommended that the Executive Committee defer action on the proposal until such time as the FCR had an opportunity to comment on it. A proposal made by the Carter Committee is similar to Mr. Chang's proposal, the Dean added, with one exception which he called "a bone of contention," namely the additional proviso that individual professors be allowed to use "experiential" factors as a criterion for course enrollment. Accordingly, the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies and the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning are working together on the two proposals.

d. Request for Comments on State Education Department Desegregation Guidelines

The Dean reported that Acting Provost David Knapp had referred to the FCR for advice, the State Education Department guidelines for desegregation of facilities and programs to implement the Regents' position paper on minority access to, and participation in, post-secondary education. The University's response to the document is due June 1, the Dean added, and therefore the Executive Committee will refer the document to an appropriate committee shortly. He then asked if there were any questions.

Associate Professor Douglas E. Hogue, Animal Science, asked how large the COSEP Advisory Committee is and who are its members. The Dean replied that, with the recent addition of some students, there are approximately 15 members, and that the Committee includes the Dean of an endowed division, the Dean of a statutory division, a representative of the minority Faculty and himself. Each constituency will give independent advice as opposed to a Committee vote, he said, and the Faculty's position will therefore be clear. As to the purpose of the Committee, the Dean said it will advise the COSEP staff, principally COSEP Director Delridge Hunter, and that according to Acting Provost Knapp, it will serve principally as a sounding board for questions brought before it by Mr. Hunter. Issues may arise, however, calling for individual committee members to raise questions before the Committee, he said.
Professor Hogue asked who had chosen the Committee membership. The Dean said Acting Provost Knapp.

Elmer E. Meyer, Jr., Dean of Students, offered the information that he was also a member of the Advisory Committee and that the Committee had been talking with representatives of Latin American students about their perceived needs, and that Dean Alfred E. Kahn, College of Arts and Sciences, the Committee's Chairman, would be making recommendations to the Acting Provost on this matter.

2. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS*

Professor Robert S. Pasley, Law, submitted the following slates on behalf of the Committee. Non-tenured Faculty Trustee for a two-year term beginning July 1, 1973 (one to be elected):

Karen Arms (Feeny), Assistant Professor of Neurobiology and Behavior, Biological Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Byron Yaffe, Assistant Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

At-Large Member of the FCR for a three-year term beginning July 1, 1973 (three to be elected):

Joan R. Egner, Associate Professor of Education, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Norman Malcolm, Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy, College of Arts and Sciences
Anne McIntyre, Assistant Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Human Ecology
Rukudzo Murapa, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Africana Studies and Research Center
Benjamin Nichols, Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering
* Paul Olum, Professor of Mathematics, College of Arts and Sciences
Robert J. Smith, Professor and Vice Chairman, Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
Watt W. Webb, Professor of Applied and Engineering Physics, College of Engineering

The Chair asked for further nominations for Faculty Trustee from the floor. Professor Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, nominated Stephen E. Bloom, Assistant Professor of Cytogenetics, Poultry Science, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Associate Professor Peter J. Kahn, Mathematics, nominated Mary Beth Norton, Assistant Professor of American History, College of Arts and Sciences.

* Elected
The Chair asked for further nominations for at-large FCR members from the floor. Professor William T. Dean, Law, nominated Richard M. Phelan, Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, College of Engineering. Professor F.M.R. Isenberg, Vegetable Crops, nominated L. Pearce Williams, Professor and Chairman, History, College of Arts and Sciences. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, nominated Bruce T. Wilkins, Assistant Professor of Natural Resources, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Professor Isadore Blumen, I & LR, asked if there is a Political Science Department at the University. The Dean responded that the appointment of the nominee had been registered on University records as "Professor of Political Science in the Africana Studies and Research Center."

Professor Olum asked if the Hare System of balloting would be used in voting for members-at-large and Faculty Trustees. The Dean replied that its use is provided for whenever two or more candidates are nominated for a post, but that it is easier to use it in all elections because of the availability of a computer.

3. PROPOSED MASTER OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES (INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT) DEGREE

On behalf of the Graduate School, and at the particular instance and request of its Associate Dean, Paul Leurgans, the Dean moved approval of the following Graduate School's recommendation:

The Graduate School recommends the adoption of the Master of Professional Studies (International Development) MPS (ID) degree.

The motion carried without debate.

4. LEGISLATION ON FCR COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

The Dean moved, on behalf of the Rules and Procedures Committee, that the Rules and Procedures for Governing Standing Committees of the FCR be amended as follows: (new material underlined, deleted in brackets)

5. Regular elections shall take place [at the beginning of the fall term] during the spring term immediately after the elections for FCR membership.

8. The terms of elected members shall be three years...The terms of office shall begin on July 1 and end on June 30.

* Elected
The Dean explained that the amendment to paragraph 6 would insure that committee members are prepared to commence operations without delay at the start of the Fall term, and that the amendment to paragraph 8 filled a gap in FCR legislation since no clear date had been set for the beginning and end of committee members' terms. The motion (below) passed without debate.

5. Regular elections shall take place during the spring term immediately after the elections for FCR membership.

8. The terms of elected members shall be three years...The terms of office shall begin on July 1 and end on June 30.

5. GRADING SYMBOL PROPOSALS

a. Addition of WP, WF and W to Present Grading System

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Kathleen Rhodes, Community Service Education, moved adoption of the proposal originally drafted by the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction that:

The Grading Symbols WP (withdraw passing), WF (withdraw failing), and W (withdraw at a time when a judgment about passing or failing could not be made) be added to the University Grading System. In addition, the week of the semester in which withdrawal took place be included in the student's record.

Professor Rhodes referred the body to a one-page explanation attached to the text of the proposal which accompanied the call to meeting, and said several members of the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction were present to answer questions. To the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, the proposal seemed a "reasonable change," she concluded.

Associate Professor Antonie W. Blackler, Biological Sciences, asked whether the proposal originated within the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction or had been presented to it from without, and if so from whom. The Dean replied that he believed the proposal originated with Associate Dean Robert A. Scott of the College of Arts and Sciences. Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, said that as a point of history, the Faculty had debated this same proposal when the present grading system was established. It was "turned aside," he said, because of the difficulty of getting Faculty members to make a proper report. Instead, the
present system was adopted in which the Registrar enters a "withdraw" on receipt of proper forms and no judgment is required of a Faculty member one way or the other.

Professor Robert H. Elias, English, asked if the Committee had considered expanding the meaning of the WF grade to state concisely why a student had failed. At present, it implies that a student is not doing his academic work, he said, and is misleading because it does not provide for valid excuses, such as sickness, for failing a course. Professor Jean Failing, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Human Ecology, responded that the Committee had not addressed itself to a more precise interpretation of either the WF or WP grade, its principal concern being "to evolve as meaningful a (student) transcript" as possible. "The withdraw grade alone leaves one in some doubt as to an individual's status," she said, "and although one can still question the reasons behind giving a WP or WF grade in a given case, the Committee felt they provide a better cutoff than the W alone."

Associate Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, supported the validity of entering the date of a student's withdrawal from a course on his transcript, as well as whether he was passing or failing at the time of withdrawal, since the present system provides no permanent record of a student's connection with a course if he withdraws.

Professor Mark Nelkin, Applied and Engineering Physics, spoke against the motion, saying he saw no reason why any record should appear on a student's transcript unless he has tried to withdraw from a course at such a late date that it is effectively a failure. "Cluttering" a transcript with records of having attended courses which a student has not completed seems to confuse the issue completely, he said.

Assistant Professor Arthur L. Berkey, Education, asked if passing this proposal would change either the procedures or the amount of freedom students
Professor Elias asked how much the institution of the proposed grading system would cost. At the invitation of the Dean, Mr. Byron G. McCalmon, the Registrar, responded that his office could not attempt, either clerically or financially, to institute changes in the grading system without writing new computer "software," a process which he was engaged in doing for implementation in the Fall term of 1973. The Dean said he interpreted this remark to mean that the Faculty could approve any number of changes in the grading system, but that they would not take effect until new software existed in the Fall of 1973.

Professor Hogue asked what effect this process has on the transfer of money between the statutory and endowed units of the University. The Registrar replied that withdraws registered after the normal period in which course changes are allowed do not presently count in accessory instruction procedures. Professor Hogue asked if the transfer of funds based on accessory instruction is now made on the basis of those students who receive grades in courses. The Registrar said yes. Consequently, Professor Hogue said, if a student withdraws from a course on the last day, and would receive a WP or WF under the proposed change, no financial credit is transferred. The Registrar agreed, adding that this happens frequently with graduate students, and those departments teaching graduate students do not receive credit for teaching students who withdraw in mid-course.

Professor Isenberg moved to refer the proposal back to committee for further study and clarification of the points raised by the body.

Professor Hogue asked how the final count of enrollment in a course is determined. The Registrar replied that unfortunately under the present system he is unable to compile a final count of class enrollment until the end of a term, so the count is based on the number of students accounted for at that time. Withdrawals are presently expunged from all records. Under the proposed system there would be something left to count, if you wanted to count it, he said. Dean Failing commented that this motion, if passed, would have no effect on present methods of
computing accessory instruction charges. These charges fall under bookkeeping procedures, not grading procedures. The Registrar responded that it is currently the policy of both statutory and endowed units at the University to ignore withdrawals in mid-course as a factor in computing accessory instruction charges. The motion to commit carried by voice vote.

b. Termination of Changing Grading Symbol NA to an F

Professor Rhodes moved adoption of the following resolution:

That the present procedure of converting an NA to an F be stopped and the symbol of NA be printed on the grade slip and student transcript.

Professor Rhodes reviewed the explanation of the motion that accompanied the call to meeting. Professor Nelkin moved an amendment to the resolution, which read: "If a grade appear as NA on the grade slip, that no record of the course be included on the student's transcript." Professor Hogue asked if the amendment would allow a student who is failing a course to withdraw, knowing that no record of his having enrolled in the course will appear on his transcript. Professor Nelkin replied that this was not the case. A student must never have attended class in order to receive an NA, he said.

Professor Miller pointed out that the original reason for establishing the NA grade was that it was felt that professors working under end-of-term pressures could not be expected to determine why a student did not attend his course. Therefore, it was decided that he should have only the obligation to report "not attending," and it was left up to the Registrar to find out what had happened to the student. At the same time, it was left up to students who had valid reasons for not attending class to obtain an incomplete. An NA would be changed to an F only if a student failed to attend a course, but at the same time, the burden was left on the student to establish grounds for not changing an NA to an F. The Dean commented that the difficulty arose from the fact that the system permits students a "negative option," in that an NA becomes an F unless the student acts to prevent such an occurrence.
If an F appears on a grade slip, the Dean said, and the student does not act to change it, it will be transferred to his transcript. Frequently such actions occur because of errors in the registration process. The rationale behind the motion under discussion is to avoid penalizing a student by putting an F on his transcript as the means of forcing him to correct an error, since by the time correction is made, the transcript may be in the hands of graduate school admissions officers, etc.

Professor Whitlock pointed out that there seemed to be two definitions of an NA: Professor Miller's, which states that it is given when a professor does not know why a student missed some of his course work, and Professor Nelkin's, which states that an NA is given when a student has not attended any classes. Which is true?, he asked. Professor Elias asked the Dean why, if an NA results from clerical inefficiency, it should be made permanent by being entered on transcripts. The Dean replied that the "object of the game" is not to get an F on that transcript at all, and that Professor Nelkin's amendment is in keeping with the original proposal of the Committee.

Professor Miller asked the Registrar if it is still true that once a grade is entered on the transcript it can only be corrected on another line or be succeeded by a new, or corrective entry, but can never be removed or crossed out. The Registrar replied that if, under the present system, it is found that an NA has been changed to an F due to clerical error and not through a student's fault, the present system, and presumably the revised one, if the present motion is passed, would expunge all notation from the student's permanent record card and hence his transcript. However, he said, if it is found to be a case of non-attendance, instead of clerical error, and the student cannot justify changing the record, it would still remain in those cases only, on his permanent record card and hence the transcript.
Professor Booker said he found himself again confused by the dual nature of the NA grade symbol under discussion. He said he had run into cases where a student had not attended the last third of a course. "If I give him a NA," he said, "what is to force the issue and finally get me to give him an F?" The Registrar answered that he believed the Committee's intent in such a case was that the entry should be NA with an explanation that the student officially registered for the course, never took steps to withdraw and have it approved, and therefore an NA was awarded, but with certain connotations of F. Professor Hogue pointed out that such a situation again gives a failing student the option of just not attending a course for which he registered, and receiving an NA rather than an F. Professor Ewing asked if an NA would not be computed for those who compute grade point averages, and not appear at all if the amendment were passed. The Registrar said yes. Associate Professor Robert C. Fay, Chemistry, said it seemed that if Professor Nelkin's amendment passed, it would encourage non-attendance as a means of avoiding having an F reported on a student's transcript. Assistant Professor Henry A. Alker, Social Sciences, opposed the amendment on the ground that both it and the motion neglect the larger issue of avoiding giving students another option to keep their grade point averages as high as possible. "If the students want to play that kind of game, they should not have the opportunity to do so," he said, "but I would rather not see them play those games at all." Professor Nelkin said that in light of the clarification provided by the Registrar, on how a student is treated who is incorrectly registered for a course, he saw no need for the amendment and preferred to vote against the proposal. He therefore withdrew his amendment.

Resuming debate on the original motion, Professor Berkey questioned the point of entering NA on transcripts. If it is an administrative error, he said, it is expunged when the error is discovered. Otherwise, a student has the choice of
withdrawing with the consent of his college (at least this is the practice in the Agriculture College) or of accepting an F or whatever grade he earns in the course. Professor Karl Berkelman, Physics, said he originally thought he might have been tempted to vote in favor of the motion because he interpreted an NA to apply to a student who never attended a course. He said he now found from the discussion that there were people present who give an NA to a student who stopped attending a course two-thirds of the way through it. Therefore, he said, he would vote against the motion. Professor Blumen said that as a member of the original drafting committee, he felt this was a badly drafted resolution. He said he felt the Faculty agreed that it did not want F to appear on a student's record due to clerical errors, nor did it want students to have the opportunity to withdraw either without the permission of their college or with the possibility that to do so would result in an F grade. It would seem a simple matter to re-draft the resolution so as to accommodate the needs, he said, and therefore moved to refer the matter back to committee. The motion carried by voice vote.

6. **AMENDMENTS TO FCR RESPONSE TO CRANCH REPORT**

The Chair informed the body that the agenda contained two amendments to the FCR's recommendations in response to the Cranch Report (approved at its previous meeting) which would require the following procedure to be enacted: an FCR member who voted in favor of each of the recommendations involved must move to reconsider them. This would in effect cancel the vote taken earlier and the Chair would then entertain motions to amend. Professor Dean moved to reconsider Section III, Subparagraph A of the FCR recommendations.

The motion to reconsider being passed, Professor Dean moved to amend Section III, Faculty Tenure and Rewards, subparagraph A, as follows:

> We recommend that the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and public service educational efforts [, and the relation of his interests to his department's commitments,] continue to be the primary bases for recommending promotion. (deleted portion in brackets)
Professor Dean explained that at the meeting of the Faculty at which the FCR resolutions were presented, it was suggested that the portion to be deleted might be interpreted at department levels as equal in weight with teaching and research. The amendment and the resolution as amended (below) passed without debate.

We recommend that the quality of an individual's teaching, research, and public service educational efforts continue to be the primary bases for recommending promotion.

Professor Dean moved to reconsider recommendation VII, Student Financial Aid. The motion carried by voice vote. He then moved to amend recommendation VII as follows:

We recommend that there be a number of different kinds of loan programs and work programs supplementing existing scholarships. In addition we urge that high priority be given to finding ways to expand the amount of scholarship funds available. (additions underlined)

Professor Dean said the reason for amending the recommendation was to incorporate suggestions made in a letter to the Dean by Professor Joel H. Silbey, History, Chairman of the FCR Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids. Professor Silbey, who had requested permission to address the body, explained that in the considered opinion of his Committee, any useful University policy on financial aids must include, in addition to expanding loan and work study programs, some consideration of the possibility of expanding actual endowed funds available for scholarship.

Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, pointed out that perhaps three-quarters of the student body receives financial aid, some of these a great deal of aid, while the remainder pays the "full freight." The University cannot raise its tuition and then "rebate" a great deal of it, he said. While realizing the great need on the part of many students, he asked just who should pay for their education?

Professor Silbey responded that he is not sure University costs have increased because of scholarship aid. In the past three or four years, he said, the amount of scholarship funds available to students has been a sharply declining proportion of the total financial aid package, and the University has in fact halted any increase in scholarship aid for the past three years. The majority of funds paid
by students comes from loans, charitable contributions and money earned by working, he said. In addition, more reliance has been placed on loan programs, student earnings from work and additional parental contributions.

The amendment and the resolution as amended (below) carried by voice vote.

We recommend that there be a number of different kinds of loan programs and work programs supplementing existing scholarships. In addition, we urge that high priority be given to finding ways to expand the amount of scholarship funds available.

7. REMARKS ON CLASS SCHEDULE CHANGE PROPOSAL

The Chair called on Mr. McCalmon for introductory remarks on the proposal. Mr. McCalmon said a subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction had started looking into the question of possible revisions in the timetable for class schedules well over a year ago, prompted by suggestions from various sources including college offices, counselors and the Ombudsman's office. After extensive review and surveys of students and faculty, the subcommittee forwarded recommendations to the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction which essentially eliminates Saturday classes and recommends that the teaching pattern be changed on Tuesday and Thursday. The recommendations were forwarded to Dean Penney and then to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Rhodes, Chairman, as well as being printed in Chronicle in hopes of eliciting comments and responses from interested people in the community. A few comments had been received, he said, some of which centered around misinformation or a lack of sufficient information in Chronicle. A "give and take" session is probably required to accomplish what the recommended schedule changes propose, he said, and asked if there were any questions which he, Dean Failing (member of the Academic Records and Instruction Committee) or Professor Rhodes might be able to answer about what the timetable means and what its limitations and strengths are.

The Dean recited a series of rhetorical questions already considered by the Academic Programs and Policies Committee:
1. Will the timetable be used this coming Fall? Answer: No. The Colleges have already submitted their course section times to the Office of Computer Services for the new Courses and Time Roster and it is not possible to incorporate changes in time for the Fall of 1973.

2. If the new timetable is approved, will we be able to hold classes which last longer, or shorter, than the proposed limits? Answer: Yes. The only restriction is that classes start at one of the specified times. If desired a Faculty member could offer two 50-minute segments in the 75-minute "slots", but each would create a 25-minute "hangover period" each day.

3. Can we use the timetable this Fall even if it is not approved? Answer: No. Those who do so are operating outside the normal "frame." Presenting courses of differing lengths places students in the position of forfeiting two courses on the normal "frame" in order to take one 75-minute offering. In the crowded schedule situation now confronting both Faculty and students, this is arguably an unfair burden to put on students.

4. When could this timetable first be used? Answer: Fall of 1974, with registration on this basis the preceding Spring. The motion to change the timetable, which may be offered for adoption at the April meeting, would be for the implementation of the revised schedule in the Fall of 1974, with all preliminary work being done in the preceding Spring. If an obstacle to implementation of the new system arises, the present system could be continued in the Fall of 1974. Since a great deal of lead time is needed in order to implement the new system, there is a great deal of pressure to make a decision this Spring.

The Dean concluded by saying that he had communicated the imminentness of the new system to all interested parties and bodies on campus, including the University Senate. The Speaker of the Senate, Assistant Professor Mary Beth Norton, History,
had responded to the Dean on behalf of the Senate that this matter was sufficiently important that she hoped the FCR would not adopt it precipitously. He read from the letter: "Since it's hardly possible given this late date for any new schedule to be implemented next year, there seems to be little reason not to delay consideration of so major a change until the Senate, and members of the Faculty and student body in general, can be given a more leisurely chance to investigate and think about the consequences of accepting this proposal. We would urge the Faculty Council of Representatives not to act hastily." The Dean added that he had received other letters from groups protesting the change, including notification from the Veterinary College that it would seek exemption from the rule should the proposal pass.

Professor Pasley said that he had been instructed by his colleagues to oppose this proposal or if it is adopted to ask that the Law School be exempt. The Law School has already eliminated Saturday classes, he said, and does not schedule classes like the rest of the University on the Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday basis, but rather in blocks at the beginning and end of the week. Thirdly, the Law School schedule is so tight that it cannot afford to lose an extra 15 minutes between classes as is proposed in the new schedule. A basic reason for opposition, he concluded, is that the Law School has found that a 50-minute class works well and that a 60-minute or 75-minute class doesn't. Students don't have that much staying power, he said.

Professor Alker asked what were the Veterinary College's reasons for seeking exemption from the rule. Professor Robert E. Habel, Veterinary College, responded that there are just not enough hours in a six-hour day for the College's courses. We need the full nine hours in order to cover the curriculum, he said.

Assistant Professor Norman Uphoff, Government, took exception to Professor Pasley's argument, saying the same logic could be used to argue in favor of a quarterly system and against a semester system. Time periods are not as important
as how a course is done, he said. In his own case, he presents an undergraduate
course in two 90-minute segments. He also took exception to the Dean's point
about differing time lengths. If a course is scheduled from 2:30 to 4:00 p.m.,
it is not really cutting into many other course time periods. Moreover, if
instruction is by the Socratic method, 50 minutes is not a very efficient period
for teaching. He said he would very much favor the changes proposed because he
does not want to see the University locked into the rigid 50-minute schedule it
now has.

Professor Vernon H. Jensen, I & LR, asked if the proposed changes would
appear to those outside the University as though Cornell were taking a long
weekend, despite the fact that greater efficiency would result from the system.
The Dean replied that he had heard no such comments. As most of us know, he said,
most of the urban universities in the United States operate without Saturday
classes. Professor Charlotte M. Young, Nutrition, agreed with Professor Pasley
and said she was surprised that no arguments for or against the proposal had been
presented in offering the matter for discussion at this meeting.

The Dean recapitulated the argument for the system. As it originated in the
College of Arts and Sciences, he said, it holds that students are now confronted
with an enormous number of alternate courses. Thus there is a problem in squeezing
in the courses they want to take. There is a factor in course selections at work
which depends on Saturday offerings. Faculty do not like to teach on Saturdays
and students do not like to take courses on Saturdays. Thus there is an enormous
amount of downtime on Tuesdays and Thursdays because Faculty don't offer courses
then. Some Faculty, like Dean Alfred E. Kahn, Arts and Sciences, schedule courses
on Tuesdays and Thursdays only with 75-minute periods. As a Dean, he has given
himself permission to do this. (Responding to Professor Uphoff's argument that
there is no conflict between the existing system and longer classes if they are
offered in the afternoon, the Dean pointed out that a very real problem of conflict
does arise in courses offered between 11 A.M. and 1 P.M.) The point of the
exercise, he said, is to take advantage of what appears to be free time in
registrations and enrollments on Tuesdays and Thursdays by moving classes into
new "frames" providing more efficient use of classroom and schedule availabilities.
The system represents an adaptation to existing practices, he said (reminiscent
of the proverbial saying that if you want to lay out sidewalks intelligently on
the Arts Quadrangle, you follow the students around with a paving roller), which
requires that all Faculty members follow the system in order for it to result in
more efficient use of time.

Professor Robin M. Williams, Jr., Sociology, pointed out that he is an
inveterate Saturday-class teacher. He has been one for 27 years. But the problem is, he
said, that students won't come to class any more! Professor Miller said he
thought the Faculty could live with the proposed system, but he did not favor any
system which would imply that it is wrong to give a class on Saturday. In
particular, people who teach laboratory courses should feel free to schedule them
on Saturday. He said he could not see any evidence of such provision in the
proposed system.

The Dean replied that he believed the contention of the proposal was to
permit special cases, such as courses involving laboratory periods, to be
scheduled as the instructor saw fit. Such behavior (he cited a School of Hotel
Administration course in which the lecturer comes to Ithaca on Saturdays to teach)
would still be perfectly legal under the new system, he said. Professor Miller
asked if it would still be legal for a Faculty member to hold Tuesday-Thursday-
Saturday classes of 50 minutes duration if they were started at the time as other
classes. The Dean said he thought a Faculty member could still do this. "I
think he still will," responded Professor Miller.

Adjourned 6:00 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Acting Provost David C. Knapp called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and relinquished the Chair to the Acting Speaker, Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics. 61 FCR members and 7 visitors were present. Receiving no additions or corrections to the minutes of the special meeting of February 7, the Speaker declared them approved as circulated and called upon the Dean of the Faculty.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN
   a. Waiver of Visitor's Rule

   The Dean asked for, and received, a waiver of the visitor's rule for the following as resource persons for agenda items IV and V: Phillip Sperry, Registrar's Office; Robert A. Scott, Associate Dean of the Arts College; William Gurowitz, Vice President for Campus Affairs; Mrs. Ruth Darling, Associate Dean of Students; William D. Jones, Assistant to the Provost; Delridge Hunter, Director, COSEP Office; and Joseph Seale, COSEP Office.

   b. Ruling on Non-Tenured Faculty Trustees

   The Dean announced that the Review and Procedures Committee, in response to his request, had ruled that non-tenured Faculty Trustees who receive tenure after being elected may serve out the remainder of the current year of their Trusteeship, thus eliminating the need for reelectitions in mid-term. Assistant Professor Henry A. Alker, Psychology, asked if the ruling permitted such a Faculty Trustee to serve an entire year after receiving tenure, and was told that this would not normally be the case.

   c. Report of Election of Non-Tenured Faculty Trustee and At-Large FCR Members

   The Dean announced that Mary Beth Norton, Assistant Professor of History, had been elected non-tenured Faculty Trustee for a two-year term beginning July 1, 1973, and that Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, Assistant Professor Bruce T. Wilkins, Natural Resources, and Professor L. Pearce Williams, History, had been elected at-large
The report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections with respect to committee vacancies will be made at the May meeting, he said.

d. Intention to Refer Regents' Position Paper #15 to Two Committees

The Executive Committee's present intention regarding obtaining Faculty response to the guidelines issued by the Regents to their Position Paper #15 is to refer the matter to the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning and the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids, the Dean reported. The Dean added that he had consulted with the Executive Committee and the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies in regard to this matter.

e. Report on Special Committee to Consider Financial Status of University

The Dean announced that the Special Committee to Consider the Financial Status of the University (Professor David Ratner, Law, Chairman; Professor Tom Davis, Economics; Professor Harold Bierman, Jr., B & PA; and Professor Olum, committee members) was completing its report and that he planned to issue the results in the next issue of Chronicle and release them to other media unless there was objection.

2. PROPOSAL FOR NEW TIMETABLE FOR UNIVERSITY CLASSES

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Kathleen Rhodes, Community Service Education, moved adoption of a proposal to change the daily class schedule (See Appendix A, Proposal; Appendix B, Comment; and Appendix C, Chart, attached).

The Chair opened the meeting to brief questions about the proposal. Professor Walter R. Lynn, Environmental Engineering, asked if the intent of the wording in item 2, "all formal undergraduate class or laboratory exercises," was to exempt graduate classes from the scope of the proposal. The Dean replied that its intent was to exempt graduate exercises only from late afternoon time periods. Professor Robert H. Elias, English, asked what constitutes a graduate class under the new
numbering system in which numbers refer to classes equally for graduate students and undergraduates. Mr. Sperry responded that courses numbered 400 and above are intended to be for both undergraduates and graduate students, and courses numbered 500 and above should be considered professional and graduate courses, although one should be prepared to consider the general content of a course in making individual decisions. The Speaker added that, without a motion to the contrary, the word "undergraduate" in item 2 of the proposal should be taken to mean courses numbered 400 and below.

Professor Bernard F. Stanton, Agricultural Economics, asked why the Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday schedules could not be operated concurrently. The Dean responded that in that case a student taking a code 12 course (See Appendix C) would be barred, for example, from taking both a code 02 and a code 03 course, if they occur on the same day, because of the staggered relationship of the two schedules. Professor William T. Dean, Law, asked Professor Rhodes if the proposed schedule was designed to improve the quality of the academic program at Cornell. Professor Rhodes replied that this depends on one's point of view. Assistant Professor Keith Moffat, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, asked why Saturday classes had been reinserted in the proposed schedule. Professor Rhodes said many people had objected to eliminating Saturday classes because they wanted to arrange their classes at that time. The Dean added that the proposal's intent was to accommodate those who still wished to schedule Saturday classes, or attend them, despite evidence that their number is dwindling.

Associate Professor John F. Booker, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, suggested adding "or for Friday evening" to the last sentence of item 5 of the proposal for clarification purposes.

The Chair opened the meeting to debate in the interests of saving time. Professor Charlotte M. Young, Nutrition, asked if it would be possible under the
proposal to hold one-hour classes Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday. The Dean replied affirmatively, providing that the class last at least 50 minutes and allow 15 minutes "passing time" before the next scheduled class. Such an arrangement, he said, requires permission from the Dean of a unit.

Associate Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, pointed out a seeming inconsistency in item 1 created by the phrase "one of" in the last line. The Speaker said he would attempt to obtain an amendment that would clarify this part of the wording. Associate Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, asked if the proposal grants the option of operating on Saturdays with a Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule of 50-minute class periods. The Speaker replied that Professor deBoer should feel free to move an amendment to this effect if he wished. Professor Elias asked how double periods, lasting two hours or more, for graduate seminars could be accommodated in the Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday schedule. A great number of such seminars are held Tuesday and Thursday afternoons by the English Department, he said, and changing them to Monday or Wednesday would inconvenience students who are in the University orchestra and chorus. Professor Stanton said the proposed Tuesday-Thursday schedule change tends to legalize the existing practice on the part of some Faculty members of holding 90-minute classes on those days "in order to use their time as student time." He suggested reserving specific rooms for 90-minute classes on those days as a means of solving the problem. He also suggested making both the 50-minute and 90-minute schedules available on Tuesday and Thursday mornings, saying he felt students and Faculty could adjust to such an arrangement easily.

The Dean repeated his opinion that offering two overlapping course schedules in one day would limit a student's options in selecting courses even more than the present schedule. He agreed with Professor Stanton that a "mutual exclusion" situation presently exists because of scheduling discrepancies among the Faculty, but said that the proposal, if unanimously adopted, would remedy the situation.
Professor Williams asked if there was any statistical evidence of diminishing attendance at Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday classes to support the proposal. Dean Scott replied that he did not have figures with him at this meeting, but that the need to respond to student and Faculty desires to minimize classes on these days had been a "moving force" behind the proposal and had been put in the form of a recommendation to the Registrar's Office from the Dean's Council. He added that FCR members surely must have gathered from their experience with their own departments that a growing number of Faculty were rescheduling Saturday class sections to Monday through Friday sections.

Professor Wesley W. Gunkel, Agricultural Engineering, asked if any study had been made of students' ability to absorb information in three 50-minute periods a week as opposed to two 75-minute sections. Professor Rhodes said she knew of no such studies, but that she was sure the effectiveness of a class depends in part on the nature of the subject being taught. Professor Karl Berkelman, Physics, pointed out that students enrolled in a course with one lecture and two recitation sections per week might be tempted by scheduling conflicts to not attend one of the recitation sections if it were held on a Tuesday or Thursday. Professor Rhodes replied that such action would not be necessary if sections were scheduled during the first hour of classes. Professor Berkelman pointed out that one could not schedule one-hour classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays, to which Professor Rhodes replied that one could use up only one hour of a 90-minute scheduled period if one wished. Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics, asked if the Law School and the Veterinary College still objected to the proposal as it had been announced that they would be at the last meeting. Professor Robert S. Pasley, Law, replied that his School objected to 75-minute classes as being pedagogically unsound. If the proposal were adopted, he said, the Law School saw two options: (1) Schedule 50-minute classes within the 90-minute periods, thus reducing the number of periods available and possibly forcing Law Faculty to use Saturday periods; (2) Have the
Dean of the Law School exercise his option to reject the new schedule, thus placing the School out of phase with the rest of the University and imposing hardship on students electing to take courses in other colleges.

Professor Charles F. Wilcox, Chemistry, said that his department will probably have to request exemption from the new schedule because it presents severe problems. A morning laboratory session will consume the first three periods on Tuesdays and Thursdays, he said, and an afternoon laboratory will use up the last three periods. Thus, to offer certain courses that are much desired by students will require scheduling that overlaps codes 13 and 14 (Tuesdays) and 33 and 34 (Thursdays).

Professor Williams asked why there seemed a discrepancy between Professor Stanton's view that he could "live with" both 50-minute and longer class periods and Professor Pasley's view that classes longer than 50 minutes in length were unproductive. Professor Pasley responded that he had said the Law School could very easily schedule 50-minute classes within longer time periods, but that this practice would reduce the number of hours available for instruction in a week. Professor Stanton moved amending the resolution to permit two concurrent schedules on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday mornings (50-minute and 90-minute classes) with afternoon classes all conforming to the Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule. He added that he shared Professor Wilcox's view that all afternoon schedules should run on the same sequence. Professor Williams pointed out that under such a system, some students will enroll in a 10:10 class on one schedule and an 11:00 class on the other schedule, with obvious results. Mr. Sperry pointed out that the coding system which the Registrar's Office plans to use for recording the number of hours a course requires, offers the utmost flexibility providing the Faculty can agree on integral starting times for classes. The computer can accommodate any number of classes, starting times and days of the week, but overlaps such as those created by concurrent schedules will produce problems in the utilization of facilities.
Professor Isadore Blumen, I & LR, member-at-large, asked if the Chair intended to allow time for taking up remaining agenda items, and said that at 5:30 p.m., he would move that the body lay discussion of the new schedule on the table so that it could be taken up as the first item on the agenda for the next FCR meeting. Such action would allow the Executive Committee to consider today's suggestions at more leisure, he added. Assistant Professor Anne McIntyre, Human Development and Family Studies, spoke against the amendment on grounds that dual schedules would only systematize the present system which is not a successful one. The purpose of the proposal, she said, was to provide class time periods that would meet all needs of Faculty members, give students maximum choice of course options and utilize classroom facilities adequately, all without conflict. The amendment failed.

Professor Dean said he was uneasy about the Faculty taking action on the matter of class schedules without receiving a formal response from the Senate, which is the only body at Cornell that represents student opinions. He also pointed out that he had been made aware that the State University was "pressuring" Cornell to admit more students, and he feared that the proposal if passed would appear to indicate that Cornell has so few students that Saturday classes are unnecessary. He asked if the Committee had prepared a response to such a charge. Professor Williams said that the problem is not too few students, but too many students who do not want to take Saturday classes. Since the present system is demonstrably bad, he said, the Faculty should approve the proposal on grounds that it may represent an improvement and that it can be reviewed and changed in one or two years anyway. This would represent a "clear and neat" step. Professor Stanley Davis, Hotel Administration, pointed out that some students work at the Statler Inn Tuesday and Thursday evenings and therefore would not be able to take preliminary examinations those nights. He moved to amend item 5 of the proposal by deleting the last sentence of the first paragraph. Before debate
could proceed, Professor Elias moved to lay the question on the table. The motion carried.

3. REPORT BY THE ACTING PROVOST

Acting Provost David Knapp reported on disposition of the guidelines pursuant to the New York State Regents' Position Paper #15 relating to minority access to and participation in post-secondary education. The guidelines had been received in the first week of March, 1973, from the State Education Department. They have since been published in Chronicle (March 15 issue) and been referred for guidance to the FCR, the University Senate, the COSEP Advisory Committee and to administrators concerned with their content. The guidelines consist of three sections, he said. The first, desegregation of facilities and programs, required a report by June 1, 1973, to the Regents of the existence of segregated facilities or programs as defined in the guidelines. The second, non-discrimination in off-campus housing, requires that, beginning with the Fall semester of 1973, institutions should not list any facility for which such assurance has not been received. Cornell has had such a policy and is clearly in accordance with this section. The third section, enhancement of minority access, requires institutions to develop a plan and program in accordance with its institutional goals for the recruitment and retention of minority groups of students who meet regular admission criteria, and of Faculty members who meet criteria for appointment. The State Education Department had instructed the University to follow the guidelines rather than the text of Position Paper #15, the Acting Provost said. He added that he is reviewing President Corson's March, 1971, statement on minority education with a view to the University's long-range planning and conformation to the guidelines. He then offered to respond to questions. Professor Alker asked when the Acting Provost expected to appear before the FCR with recommendations and/or a judgment as to the University's compliance with the guidelines. This depends in part on when feedback is received from the FCR, Senate and other bodies, Provost Knapp replied.
Professor Blumen said that the University has had notice since last May that the Regents were upset about this matter. Do you believe that the University is substantially in compliance with the guidelines, he asked. Provost Knapp replied that he wished he had more data on hand, but that based on that which he has he believes that the policies governing Ujamaa and other residential living centers on campus are generally in accordance with the guidelines. If the Africana Center Faculty sees its program following recommendations of the Carter Committee Report, Provost Knapp said he thinks there will be an assumption that those policies are also in accordance with the guidelines as stated. He said there was some question in his mind regarding whether all provisions of the enhancement of minority access section of the guidelines were being met at Cornell.

Professor Elias asked the Provost if, in answering Professor Blumen's questions, he had in mind fraternities and buildings owned by the University, and did he also have in mind the University calendar, which by scheduling Saturday classes may deprive persons of certain religious beliefs, the opportunity to attend classes on Saturday. The Provost asked Mrs. Darling to respond. She said all fraternities and sororities are required to adhere to University policy relative to discrimination which was issued when the Saperstone Report was published. The Dean of Students Office bases its belief that no discrimination exists on the assurance it receives from fraternities and sororities, she said, and on the fact that it has received no complaints.

Professor Blumen confessed puzzlement over the Provost's response, citing what he termed a long, clear history of segregation at Cornell in both housing and access to courses, and describing one student's experience in a segregated dormitory as an example. "Ujamaa House grows from that particular environment," he said, adding that the House "has engaged in overt acts which are clearly designed to provide a segregated facility." A statement of policy on integration
is insufficient, he said. The Faculty, students and the community at large
deserve assurance from responsible persons in the University administration that
positive action for change is taking place in housing integration, admission to
courses and affirmative action programs.

Mr. Hunter commented that Professor Blumen's own college has not attempted
to employ Faculty members according to the egalitarian system he favors.
Professor Blumen called this statement "a terrible accusation against the Faculty
of the school that is, among other things, untrue Sir." The Speaker reminded the
body that he had asked for questions to the Provost or comments that would be
helpful to him in determining the University's response to the State Education
Department's guidelines. Mr. Hunter suggested that the body concern itself with
"the performing practices of the different departments" represented in the FCR
as well as those of COSEP which, he said, are not as described by Professor Blumen.
He urged the body to deal "realistically and specifically" with the fact that
Cornell has "only a handful" of minority and female employees, and the solutions
to problems accompanying this situation will follow.

Professor James E. Turner, Africana Studies, stated that the University seems
to have lost sight of the fact that "too many places on campus do not have black
Faculty members," and become absorbed instead in phrases such as "proportionate
representation." He therefore urged a "vigorous effort" to achieve an open society
at Cornell and all non-black institutions.

Professor Alker suggested that it might help the Provost if the FCR reviewed
recommendations made by its committees and agreed on their substance before they
were received by the Administration.

The Dean responded that since there remained only one more meeting of the
FCR during the current academic year, the only way to achieve this objective would
be for the committees to present their draft reports at that meeting. He suggested
also that the Provost's Office indicate to the committees the nature of its
intended response to the Regents as it became available, thus facilitating a coordinated response.

Professor Blumen pointed out that the FCR had requested, as long ago as last July, that the question of the University's response to the Regents' concern be brought before it at an early date. The Acting Provost replied that although the Position Paper had been received in May 1972, it was made clear at that time that the guidelines would be the controlling factor in determining the University's response. The guidelines were received during the first week of March and transmitted March 9 to the Dean.

The Dean announced a special meeting of the FCR on April 18 to continue today's discussion.

Adjourned 5:59 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Appendix A

University Schedules and Calendar

Daily Class Schedule

RESOLVED, That effective Fall Term, 1974 the Daily Class Schedule shall be:

1. All lectures, recitations, laboratories or similar exercises shall start on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday at 8:00 AM, 9:05 AM, 10:10 AM, 11:15 AM, 12:20 PM, 1:25 PM, 2:30 PM, or 3:35 PM; on Tuesday or Thursday at 8:00 AM, 9:30 AM, 11:00 AM, 12:30 PM, 2:00 PM, 3:30 PM; and on Saturday at 8:00 AM, 9:30 AM, or 11:00 AM. With the exception of the last class in the day, all lectures, recitations, laboratories, or similar exercises shall conclude at least 15 minutes before one of the starting times listed above.

2. On Monday and Wednesday, the hours of 4:25 PM to 7:30 PM, on Tuesday and Thursday the hours of 4:45 PM to 7:30 PM, and on Friday the hours after 4:25 PM shall be free from all formal undergraduate class or laboratory exercises.

3. Evening hours can be used for classes only on Monday and Wednesday and only when regularly scheduled and included in written college announcements or as recommended by the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction; evening lectures, recitations, laboratories, or similar exercises shall start at 7:30 PM. or 8:35 PM.

4. Evening hours on Tuesday and Thursday shall be reserved for preliminary examinations which shall be scheduled with the Examination and Room Coordinator in the Registrar's Office.

5. No exceptions to the above schedules including the provision for free time between 4:25 PM and 7:30 PM on Monday and Wednesday, after 4:25 PM on Friday, and between 4:45 PM and 7:30 PM on Tuesday and Thursday shall be allowed save by permission of the Dean of the College or the Director of the School concerned; such exceptions that are approved shall be regularly scheduled and included in written college announcements. No exceptions shall be approved for the Tuesday and Thursday evenings reserved for preliminary examinations.

and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That effective Fall 1974 this legislation shall replace that adopted by the University Faculty on April 13, 1966 in reference to the Daily Class Schedule.

April 6, 1973
Comment:

This legislation contemplates a class timetable essentially the same as that set forth in the February 1, 1973 CHRONICLE with the following changes or clarifications to reflect criticisms and suggestions received:

1. Saturday classes and laboratories are to continue as available and acceptable, but the change in the Tuesday-Thursday timetable makes possible a utilization of those two days for three-hour courses (a practice now widely followed) for those who choose to do so.

2. While the number of class hours are essentially the same as under the present timetable, there is greater flexibility. There is one more teaching sequence for a normal three-hour course made possible by the opportunity to schedule three-hour courses using the new Tuesday and Thursday longer periods.

3. The 4:40 - 5:30 PM class period on Monday, Wednesday and Friday (shown in the timetable published February 1) has been eliminated and a substantial band of afternoon and early evening time has been reserved for athletics and other extra curricular activities.

4. Laboratories are afforded flexibility to use 1, 2, 3 or even 4 of the regular class periods simply by commencing at any specified starting time and designating as many class periods as will be required to accommodate the laboratory, but leaving at least 15 minutes at the end of a laboratory session before the next class period begins.

5. The present rule regarding evening class hours is changed by reserving Tuesdays and Thursdays for prelims and eliminating Friday evening.

6. Other than with respect to 5, above, variations on the timetable may be made with approval of the appropriate Dean or Director.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:05 a.m.</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(05)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(06)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(07)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 p.m.</td>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- 9:05 a.m. (02) Starting Time Code
- No Undergraduate Scheduling
- Reserved for Evening Prelims

*Draft 4/6/73*
The Dean of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m. 64 members were present.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

a. Assignment of Regents' Guidelines to Committees

The Dean announced he had assigned portions of the New York State Education Department guidelines for responses to the Regents' position paper #15 to three committees for response. These are: (1) Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty (affirmative action regarding minority Faculty members), (2) Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids (affirmative action regarding students) and (3) Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning (desegregation of programs and facilities). The Committee responses are expected to be put to the body in May, the Dean said, so that the University can respond to the Regents in June.

b. Other Matters for the May FCR Meeting

Other matters expected to be brought before the FCR at its May 9 meeting include a proposal from the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty regarding grievance machinery; a proposal on S/U grading practices; a report on nominations and elections, plus nominations from the floor; a proposal from the Review and Procedures Committee to amend legislation of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility; a proposal for a new standing committee to deal with educational policy aspects of the academic calendar; reports from the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning on Trustee Gordon Chang's proposal for equal access to courses and on a proposal regarding "high holy days;" and a report on the Africana Studies and Research Center prepared by a special committee chaired by Professor Lisle C. Carter, B & PA.
The Dean added that the May 16 Faculty meeting might conceivably be convened as a joint FCR-Faculty meeting in order to permit the FCR to conduct business and to assure a Faculty quorum to vote on an amendment to FCR policies and procedures.

2. CONTINUED DEBATE ON A PROPOSED NEW CLASS SCHEDULE

A motion being made and carried to remove the proposal for a new class schedule from the table, the Secretary read the amendment moved at the close of the last FCR meeting by Professor Stanley W. Davis, Hotel Administration, which would delete the last sentence of item 5 of the proposal: "No exceptions shall be approved for the Tuesday and Thursday evenings reserved for preliminary examinations." Professor Davis reviewed his reasons for moving the amendment, and suggested that it might be made "more palatable" by replacing the deleted sentence with the following: "When exceptions are made for Tuesday and Thursday 7:30 p.m. classes, students in those excepted classes will be excused to take any preliminary examinations scheduled for them at these times." There being confusion expressed about the manner of proceeding with debate on the amendment, Associate Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, asked for, and received, unanimous consent that Professor Davis' additional sentence be included in the amendment. The amendment carried by voice vote.

Professor William T. Dean, Law, asked if the University Senate had expressed an opinion on the proposed schedule. Professor Kathleen Rhodes, Community Service Education and Chairman, Academic Programs and Policies Committee, said the Committee had met with Senate representatives who asked the Faculty not to vote on the matter until the Senate could study it further. Professor Dean moved to table the motion until the Senate had expressed its opinion. There being some question as to whether or not such motion made the Faculty dependent on Senate deliberations, and concern over the need to rule on the main motion, the Chair
ruled that Professor Dean's motion was to postpone until such time as the Senate reported on the matter. Professor Dean said he thought an expeditious resolution of the matter could be reached in conference with the Senate. Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, called on the Faculty to act rather than defer once more to the Senate. Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, asked Professor Rhodes if the Faculty's delaying action through the summer would postpone initiation of the schedule from Fall 1974 until Fall 1975. Professor Rhodes and Mr. Phillip Sperry of the Registrar's Office said this was their understanding. Professor Davis asked if the effect of Professor Dean's motion would be to delay action until the Senate had been heard from. The Chair said it would delay action but not discussion. A motion to postpone is amendable, he reminded the body. Associate Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, moved amending Professor Dean's motion to read: "postpone until the Senate has had time to report on the matter." Professor Walter R. Lynn, FCR member at-large, asked Mr. Sperry what was the deadline for taking action. Mr. Sperry stated that a decision would be required well before November 1973 in order to initiate the schedule change for the 1974-75 academic year. Professor Hutchins asked who has final authority over the schedule, the Senate or the Faculty. The Dean replied that the Faculty does, but that a political problem arises in this case because of the proposal's effect on students. Professor Seymour Smidt, B & PA, suggested the Faculty act on the matter and authorize either the Speaker or the Dean to delay implementation for one year if he thinks it advisable. Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics (Faculty Trustee), concurred, reminding the body that the Senate holds the power to delay implementation and urging courteous treatment of the Senate on general principles. Assistant Professor Arthur L. Berkey, Education, asked if not acting until the next meeting would delay implementation of the new schedule. Professor Rhodes said it would not, but urged action this Spring. Professors Berkey, L. Pearce Williams, FCR member
at-large, Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, and David L. Call, FCR member at-large, supported Professor Olum's view and Professor Call moved the question. Professor Ewing's amendment and Professor Dean's motion to postpone both failed, the latter by a vote of 35 to 15. Professor Jensen moved and lost a proposal to postpone the matter with instructions to consult with the Senate. Professors Hutchins and Lynn opposed the motion on the ground that the FCR had not yet made up its own mind; Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, supported it as a means of avoiding presenting the Senate with a "fait accompli."

At Professor Davis' request, Professor Rhodes described the Committee's present position on the matter: a vote by May at the latest is needed to permit initiation of the new schedule. Aside from amending item 1 as discussed at the April 7 FCR meeting and item 5 as Professor Davis had already amended it, the Committee thought the proposal should be left as is. She also recommended that the body hear the views of Professor Charles F. Wilcox, Chemistry, and Professor Charles F. Hockett, Linguistics and Anthropology, since they represent departments deeply concerned over the proposed schedule change and their views had reached the Committee after its latest meeting. Professor Jensen's motion to postpone lost by a vote of 42 to 12, and the Chair recognized Professors Wilcox and Hockett.

Professor Wilcox informed the body that freshman and sophomore Chemistry laboratory sessions had already been reduced because of high enrollment from two weekly sessions amounting to five and one-half hours per course to one three-hour session, and that the proposed schedule would reduce that session by 15 minutes, making it even more difficult for students to digest course information. The Dean then read a memorandum he had received from Dean Alfred E. Kahn, Arts and Sciences, expressing the College Educational Policy Committee's support for the proposed new schedule and offering some understanding, but not sympathy, for the hardships it would impose on Chemistry and other departments. The Dean commented
that the actual time spent by students in Chemistry laboratories had been almost halved by the compression into one session per week, and the new schedule would in fact reduce it by one-half. He also suggested that some Chemistry section lectures be scheduled in afternoons, making it possible for students in those sections to take laboratory in the morning, and questioned the validity of having as many as 500 students in lecture sessions. The Law School tries to limit maximum first year class size to 75 students, he said.

Professor Wilcox responded that the number of equipment lockers available to students limits laboratory utilization. Students charge out $200 worth of equipment at the start of a term and must return it at the end, he said. Professor Dean expressed concern over Dean Kahn's statement in his memorandum that the new schedule would only be observed by those who chose to do so, and said the Faculty should decide if it will observe a schedule before taking action to establish it.

Associate Professor Robert C. Fay, Chemistry, pointed out that some Chemistry laboratories are scheduled in mornings, but that they are seldom successful because students have conflicts with other University classes.

Professor Hockett said that before the meeting he had hoped to present an alternative that would resolve about 90 per cent of the present objections, but having heard Professor Wilcox's report he preferred to vote down the proposal. Professor Davis asked why the proposal could not include an extension of Chemistry laboratories on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons by 15 minutes. Professor Wesley W. Gunkel, Agricultural Engineering, said that in pursuing the question of pedagogical validity of 75-minute classes vs. 50-minute classes, he had found that Pennsylvania State University has scheduled 75-minute classes, although a number of the Faculty does not favor them. Professor Rhodes said she did not think any time length can be called "perfect," because the subjects being taught vary so much.
Professor Robert H. Elias, English, pointed out that the body will be asked to rule on a proposal giving equal access to classes, and that such a rule will probably provide exceptions for all Saturday classes. He asked if this matter would more appropriately be brought up as an amendment to the calendar or as an amendment to an equal access ruling. The Dean asked Professor Elias if Friday, a Moslem sabbath, would also require unlimited class exceptions.

Professor Miller supported Professor Wilcox's viewpoint on the ground of Chemistry's importance at Cornell. Professor Wilcox said nearly 80 per cent of the freshman class and about one-third of sophomores take Chemistry.

Professor Hutchins suggested scheduling 50-minute class periods throughout the week during the morning and leaving afternoons free for laboratories, seminars, etc. A motion to close debate failed. Professor Davis said the issue seems to be the conflict between Chemistry and the Faculty. Professor Ewing said that many people feel it is difficult to undo a major schedule change such as this one. Professor Richard M. Tallman, Physics, said he felt everyone knew how he wished to vote and the body should bring the question to a vote in order to find out the consensus. Professor Jensen disagreed, and suggested taking no action for a year. Professor Hutchins suggested that the Colleges make the initial move in instituting a class schedule change. Professor Williams said he was "appalled" by the exercise of a veto by special groups of a question concerning the Faculty, and amazed at the body's inability to act.

Professor deBoer moved to suspend the rules. The motion was defeated by a vote of 29 to 22. Professor Call moved the previous question, which also failed.

Adjourned 6:02 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Acting Provost David C. Knapp called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and relinquished the Chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin. 65 FCR members and 4 visitors were present. Receiving no additions or corrections to the minutes of the meetings of March 14 and April 11, the Speaker declared them approved as circulated and called upon the Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

a. Granting Speaking Privileges to Committee Chairmen

The Dean asked for, and received, consent to give speaking privileges to the chairmen of five committees to be heard from at the meeting: Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B & PA, Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty; Professor Joel H. Silbey, History, Admissions and Financial Aids; Assistant Professor Andrew A. Sorensen, Human Ecology, Freedom of Teaching and Learning; Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, Academic Freedom and Responsibility; and Professor David L. Ratner, Law, Special Committee on the Financial Status of the University. The body also adopted the following standing rule:

Committee chairmen, whether or not FCR members, be accorded speaking privileges whenever items originating in their committees are on the agenda.

b. Exchange of Remarks at April 11 Meeting

The Dean referred to page 6 of the April 11 minutes describing an exchange of remarks between Professor Isadore Blumen, ILR, and Mr. Delridge Hunter, Director of the COSEP Office, in which Mr. Hunter referred to the ILR Faculty's failure to attempt to employ Faculty members according to an "egalitarian system."

The Dean said that since Professor Blumen had felt that he and his colleagues at the ILR School were aggrieved by Mr. Hunter's statement, and since Mr. Hunter represented the Administration, it had seemed appropriate to ask Acting Provost Knapp to comment. He then read a memorandum dated April 16 which he had received from the Provost:
"With reference to last week's session of the FCR I find on checking with Dean McKersie that the School of Industrial and Labor Relations has, in the past year, made one offer to a prospective black faculty member in the Manpower area, and has considered and interviewed at professional meetings other prospective candidates from minority groups. Additionally, the School has, within the past two years, employed a minority person as Assistant to the Dean for Institutional Development. Hence, it is clear that Mr. Hunter's statement at the meeting on April 11th that the School had 'not made an attempt to employ faculty members according to the egalitarian principle,' was inaccurate. I believe that the record should be corrected."

c. Availability of HEW Letter

Faculty members have expressed a great deal of unhappiness, the Dean said, with the Administration's method of eliciting response to a letter received by the President from the regional office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicating activities on campus that may be subject to question by HEW. The unhappiness centers on the unwillingness of the President and his staff to make the entire letter available to those asked to respond to it. The Dean said he had told the President how he and some Faculty members felt about the situation, and had received the following letter, dated May 8, from the President:

"I regret the restricted circulation of the HEW letter concerning various complaints which were filed with the HEW Office of Civil Rights. There is no intent to keep the substance of the letter or our response confidential once the negotiations have been completed.

There are several directives in the letter which, if adopted, would require us to modify our present policies in ways which I, and I believe the faculty as well, do not consider appropriate. I believe that the HEW officials in the New York Regional Office and in Washington are amenable to negotiating these matters once our campus responses are formulated.

Everything I know about the manner in which such agencies operate, however, leads me to think that successful negotiation depends on keeping their initial positions confidential. Once such positions are made public the initial positions are likely to be frozen with no possibility of modification. Unfortunately, our recent experience indicates that if we distribute a paper labelled 'confidential' it is likely to appear in the public press - in some cases verbatim. Consequently, I have sought to assure the confidentiality of the HEW letter until after we have conducted the necessary negotiations."
I know that such measures are as distasteful to the faculty as they are to me. Proper response to the HEW directives requires faculty input which we are seeking to gain through consultations with several committees of the Faculty Council of Representatives and the University Senate. I hope that the faculty will bear with us while we shape the best possible reply."

The Dean added that the two FCR committees principally concerned with responding to the HEW letter are Admissions and Financial Aids and Freedom of Teaching and Learning. Professor William T. Dean, Law, asked if committee members approached by the Administration regarding the letter will be shown the entire letter. The Dean replied affirmatively, adding that it had been decided, in consultation with the Provost, that any member of an FCR committee which had been asked to respond to a segment of the HEW letter who had any question about whether the balance of the letter might concern his committee would be accorded the privilege of reading the entire letter. Professor Dean then asked the Dean to suggest to the Administration that in future such instances the proper course of action would be to present a given matter to the FCR Executive Committee which would decide to which committee(s) it will go. The Dean stated that he would be happy to discuss the contents of the HEW letter with any FCR member who so wished.

d. Report of the Special Committee on Financial Status of the University

The Dean described events leading to publication of the report of this Committee, chaired by Professor Ratner, in Chronicle of May 3, one week after news media published stories about the report. Because "serious gaps" in information available to the Committee, specifically the inability to identify a large amount of funds as restricted were found when the President and his staff read what was thought to be the Committee's final report, the deadline for the April 19 issue of Chronicle was missed, and it then developed that no Chronicle was scheduled the following week on April 26. The corrected report draft reached the Dean April 18, and he asked Mr. Richard Ramin, Vice President
for Public Affairs, how the report might be released to news media. Mr. Ramin arranged a press conference the next day. Further confusion occurred because the Cornell Daily Sun published some material treated by the report the day before the press conference took place, as well as a story about a similar report compiled by Professor Harold Bierman, Jr., B & PA, and Assistant Professor Thomas R. Hofstedt, B & PA.

e. Report of the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships

The Dean reported that he had received the annual report of this Committee, and that the Executive Committee had asked the Secretary to prepare a synthesis for publication in the May 10 issue of Chronicle. Legislation prepared by the Committee calling for cross-enrollment in ROTC, i.e., enrollment of students from other institutions, was placed on the agenda for this meeting, the Dean said, but had not been ready in time and would therefore appear on the next meeting's agenda.

f. Items Pending

The Dean reported that a petition to create part-time Faculty appointments which had been delivered to the Dean and the Provost by Assistant Professor Karen Arms (Feeny), Biological Sciences, on behalf of the Provost's Advisory Committee was referred to the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty. He said he had also received a student-initiated petition to abolish the physical education requirement, and would ask the Executive Committee to whom it should be referred. He also reported that the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty had drafted a proposal to raise the college scholarship tuition fee from $1,000 to $1,500. Additional items pending include the FCR reaction to the Carter Committee Report, a new committee for independent courses, the equal opportunity resolution offered by Trustee Gordon Chang, a proposal to change the Faculty's grievance machinery, a proposal on S/U grading, and the student bill of rights.
2. AMENDED PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CLASS SCHEDULE

On behalf of the Committees on Academic Programs and Policies and on Academic Records and Instruction, the Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, moved to substitute a revised new class schedule for the one discussed at the previous two meetings (see Appendix A).

The Secretary said he and the Dean had held a meeting with the following persons to revise the schedule: Mr. Byron McCalmon, Registrar; Professor Charles F. Wilcox, Chemistry; Associate Professor Francis W. Saul, Architecture, chairman of the University Senate's Committee on Academics; Professor Blumen, member of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies; Associate Dean Malcolm S. Burton, Engineering, and Associate Director, Resident Instruction, Earl H. Brown, Agriculture and Life Sciences, both members of the Committee on Academic Records and Instruction. Professor Saul had reported that the Senate Committee on Academics had no reservations about the proposal being offered. The Secretary said the proposal retains existing 50-minute class periods throughout each day of the week, but adds four two-hour periods, each corresponding to two 50-minute periods, on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Classes exceeding 50 minutes in length can start at any time within a two-hour period, he said, the time to be determined by the class and the instructor. Saturday afternoons and Sundays are specifically excluded from class times in accord with current practice, although such exclusion is not presently specified. The revised schedule changes the present rule regarding evening classes by reserving Tuesday and Thursday evenings for preliminary examinations and by eliminating Friday evening as class time. Present chemistry laboratory schedules can continue under the revised schedule, and all classes end at 4:25 p.m. Monday through Friday.

The previous question and the motion to substitute were passed unanimously. Professor Dean asked what assurance there was that some Faculty will not ignore the new class schedule as they have ignored the current one, and Professor
H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, pointed out that the new schedule legitimizes current practice, thus encouraging further deviations. The Dean replied that the object of the proposal is to legitimize current practice, but its proponents hope that Faculty members will not deviate from the two-hour "frame" it provides. Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, Faculty Trustee, asked if preliminary examinations given Tuesday and Thursday evenings would conflict with chemistry or biology laboratory sessions. Professor Wilcox replied that no evening chemistry laboratories are scheduled, and the Secretary said that since the time a new schedule was first proposed there had been no reaction reported from Biological Sciences. Discussion ensued about whether preliminary examinations were limited by the proposal to Tuesday and Thursday evenings. The Dean explained that the legislation intended, but did not state, that preliminary examinations may be scheduled any evening in which a class regularly meets, otherwise on Tuesday or Thursday evening by those Faculty members desiring to give evening examinations. The Secretary added that in practice preliminary examinations are not always given at times scheduled at the beginning of a term. Following several attempts to create wording for an amendment that would convey the legislative intent described by the Dean, Professor Walter R. Lynn, Environmental Engineering, moved to approve the resolution with instructions to the Committee to return with a further motion to perfect paragraph 5 of the proposal in accordance with the day's discussion. The amendment and main motion carried unanimously. The substitute motion carried with one dissent.

3. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The Secretary presented the slate on behalf of the Committee on Nominations and Elections for vacancies in both FCR and University Faculty committees (see Appendix B).

The following additional nominations were made from the floor:
NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS
Robin M. Williams, Jr., Henry Scarborough Professor of Social Sciences
J.L. Ozbun, Professor and Head, Vegetable Crops

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING
F.M.R. Isenberg, Professor, Vegetable Crops

4. COMMENT ON "CORNELL IN THE SEVENTIES"

Professor Dean reported that the President had submitted his long-range plan, "Cornell in the Seventies: Goals, Priorities, Plans," to the Dean with a request for Faculty comment on it by May 7. Because of time limitations, the FCR Executive Committee had submitted the plan to five committees for responses which were then sent to the President. As chairman of the Synthesis Subcommittee of the Executive Committee, Professor Dean recommended circulating these brief responses to the entire Faculty. His subcommittee, he said, had not felt it could prepare a synthesis of the reports in the time allowed, but had perceived several concerns not dealt with by the plan. These concerns include the possibility of Faculty being consulted with respect to the allocation of currently expendable funds as between endowments and current expenditures, affirmative action, and the library budget. Issuance of the Ratner Committee report, which indicates that the University's deficit may differ from the Faculty's original understanding of it, tended to lessen the immediacy of the first concern, Professor Dean said, and the fact that the Special Committee on Library Space had not yet reported tended to lessen the immediacy of the third concern. His subcommittee's general conclusion was that the FCR should not take formal action over the coming year on the President's plan, but should pay close attention both to it and the Cranch Committee Report on Long-Range Financial Planning.

5. REGENTS' POSITION PAPER #15 -- GUIDELINES REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B & PA, chairman of the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, commented on his Committee's
Affirmative action regarding Faculty recruitment and appointment was the Committee's chief concern, he said. The report was not definitive because the Committee lacked adequate information on current practices and because it recognized that negotiations are currently in process to revise affirmative action programs at the University. The Committee recommended that Faculty be enabled to participate in development of affirmative action provisions, that individual Faculty members be fully informed of ongoing practices as they are made operative within their departments, and that the University encourage the bringing of members of underprivileged or disadvantaged groups to the campus for the purpose of recruiting them for Faculty positions. Assistant Professor Henry A. Alker, Psychology, a committee member, stated that the Committee agreed on the importance of encouraging the development of graduate students who might become Faculty members at Cornell or elsewhere.

Professor Joel Silbey, History, chairman of the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids, apologized for the fact that his Committee had not been able in the time allowed to prepare a written report in response to the guidelines. The Committee felt, he said, that the substance of the guidelines and the HEW letter were so closely interrelated that it was impossible to respond to the guidelines until a response had been formulated to the HEW letter, a process now under way. He added that the Committee was drafting a letter to the President in response to the HEW letter, and that a copy would be sent to the Dean.

Assistant Professor Andrew A. Sorensen, Human Ecology, chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning, commented on the Committee's response to the guidelines: The Committee felt that experiential requirements
Course Enrollment

It is commonplace in the University to have other courses as prerequisites to admission to a particular course. It is not too widely recognized that other kinds of prerequisites are also used and have an academic function. This issue came to the attention of our Committee in connection with certain courses offered at the Africana Center for which there were experiential requirements (see Carter Report, p. 30).

Some have argued that such requirements may be illegitimate. However, in examining this issue, our Committee noted that instructors in many fields consciously use experiential prerequisites for their courses. For example, an instructor of a course dealing with different cultures and their interactions naturally chooses students whose backgrounds and experiences would be of most benefit to the subject; he might quite legitimately select a student from Taiwan rather than one from Topeka. Another instructor, whose course concerns the problem of drug addiction, selects certain students because of their personal experience with such a problem. In each instance, the primary purpose is to choose those students who not only would gain the most from the class, but would also contribute the most to it.

We conclude that experiential requirements may be (and clearly have been in the past) the basis of student selection for classes. To restrict an instructor's freedom of selection would not only be a restriction of his freedom as a teacher; it would hamper education itself. Thus, it seems to our Committee that to forbid the Africana Study Program from engaging in a method of selection widely used elsewhere in the University would be an act of discrimination of another kind altogether. However, it is important to stress that the criteria for selection must be substantive and not racial. Race alone must never be a prerequisite for any course at Cornell.

Residential Facilities

There is a tradition at Cornell that people who share legitimate special interests may further those interests not only by taking courses but by living together. Risley, for example, is a residential unit for people interested primarily in the arts. Living together enables them to plan special events and festivals, to engage in various artistic and performing activities, to meet in
informal "courses," etc. There have been many such units: Ecology House, the French-Russian Coop, etc. At one time a separate dormitory wing was set aside for students enrolled in NROTC.

Regents paper #15, on "Minority Access to and Participation in Post-Secondary Education," lists as one of the desirable components of a plan for minority access, "Plans for the sensitization of faculty, professional staff, and students to the diverse life-styles of the increasing numbers of minority group students being admitted" (point #4 on p. 11). The best way to implement this goal within the University's traditions is for students who share an interest in a minority's "life-style" to live together in order to explore these interests, if they wish to do so. It is entirely reasonable that a residence of this sort should be limited to persons who can bring some relevant experience or knowledge to the community. A living unit focused on music may reasonably require that applicants have some musical talent or training, and one for athletes might require some evidence of athletic participation or skill. Similarly a unit focusing on the African roots of black Americans should be able to require evidence of familiarity with Africa or with Black American Society. Although most of the residents at such a unit might in fact be black, it remains crucial to insist that prerequisites be experiential, not racial. Anyone who has relevant experience must be eligible for admission. (For example, one might imagine that civil rights work or certain kinds of "Ghetto" experience might be relevant to Ujamaa.) If a person believes himself qualified by experience to live in a residence of this sort but is denied admission, a grievance procedure should be open to him. (This procedure should be available to students who feel unfairly excluded from any University-sanctioned living unit whatsoever, new or traditional.) Clearly, the criterion which defines discrimination should never be the sheer proportions of different groups, but actual evidence that qualified persons were arbitrarily excluded.
are used throughout the University for admission both to courses and to residential facilities, he said, and its report spoke to the Africana Studies and Research Center since that Center will obviously be subject to questions on both aspects of the matter. Professor L. Pearce Williams, History, requested specific information about such experiential requirements exclusive of race, saying the Committee's report appeared to be an excuse for allowing present practices to continue and that he would not support any position that does not make it clear that racial segregation will not be allowed at Cornell. Professor Robert H. Elias, Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, a member of the Committee, said it would help the Committee if Professor Williams named courses which perpetuate practices that he does not like and indicate what specific experiences are being required that are unreasonable in his view and that are sanctioned by the report. He added that the Committee knew of more examples than were mentioned in the report but preferred to cite simple ones. Professor Williams cited an example of a student denied admission to a course given by the Africana Studies and Research Center purportedly because his motivation did not seem appropriate. The Faculty should not be in the business of reading minds, nor should it take it upon itself to decide whose motives are pure and whose are not, Professor Williams argued, adding that he suspected the fact that the student is white was one of the motives in question, and offering to bring documentation of the incident to the next FCR meeting. Assistant Professor Rukudzo Murapa, Political Science, Africana Studies and Research Center, suggested that Professor Williams was confusing experiential and motivational requirements, which are two quite different things. He said he is not aware of any experiential requirements for Center courses, teaches a course at the Center which contains more white than Africana students, and advises a number of white students. He expressed astonishment at Professor
Williams' allegation. Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, pointed out that students refused admission to colleges at Cornell are customarily notified that their motivation is insufficient, this being an example of motivational requirements imposed by colleges. The Dean said the crux of the problem seemed to be a few courses taught at the Africana Center on life in the ghetto. Those expert in this field argue that such courses cannot be taught effectively when some students have experienced ghetto living and others have not, and that a prerequisite course for non-ghetto residents would not work. Professor Williams replied that the solution is to leave the choice up to students rather than to impose the choice upon them. Professor Elias pointed out that in large courses selectivity is of minor importance to both students and the instructor. In small seminars, however, the intentions of the instructor and his desire for either homogeneous or heterogeneous interests on the part of students come into play. Professor James McConkey, English, supported this view, saying that in seminars he liked to interview prospective students and often accepted or rejected them on the basis of their previous acquaintance with and liking for specific novelists. In its concern to avoid discrimination, he said, the Faculty should not deny certain privileges to minority student groups that it presently enjoys.

Professor Olum suggested postponing debate on the substance of the matter until Trustee Gordon Chang's equal opportunity resolution comes before the body. He suggested also that student Trustees be invited as guests to take part in such debate when it occurs. The Dean responded that, having generated committee reports in response to the Provost's request, he thought that the disposition of the reports was now up to the FCR. The Provost commented that June 1 was the deadline for the University's response to both Position Paper #15 and to the HEW letter. The Administration had not sought to build its response without inputs from the Faculty, he said.
Professors Elias and Sorensen stated that the purpose of their Committee's report was to inform the FCR of the status of University operations in regard to discrimination and to elicit Faculty comments that would help the Committee make a more formal report. Professor Williams suggested that the committee members acquaint themselves with all experiential requirements imposed for courses at Cornell and determine that there are no such requirements based on race. Professor Sorensen replied that the Faculty has to address itself to de facto as well as de jure segregation. Professor Olum stated again that he opposed debating the substance of the matter at this time, not because it is unimportant but because it is too important, and raises subtle questions on both sides of the issue. Since shortage of time precludes a real debate on such a basic question, he said, the FCR should recognize that the committees will submit their reports to the Administration with the understanding that these are not Faculty reports. Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, commented that he had once taught a course limited to students who had spent at least 20 hours caring for an infant under one year of age, and that Professor Olum's remarks were very appropriate to the social sciences Faculty. He added that from a truly democratic viewpoint the Faculty should consider some courses necessary for certain kinds of students in order to further their education.

6. SENATE RESOLUTION SA-42

Professor Sorensen moved the resolution on Senate Bill SA-42 on behalf of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning (see Appendix C).

Professor Sorensen pointed out that his Committee had discussed the original Senate recommendation with Senate representatives and then selected paragraphs 3 and 5 for modification and presentation to this body. Professor Williams opposed the resolution in practice and principle. He asked if Faculty members are to give a student who has missed a week of classes three makeup lectures or
two field trips, and reminded the body that Cornell is a secular university and is so recognized by those attending it. Religious beliefs are not properly of concern to the Faculty, he said, which normally accommodates students' religious beliefs insofar as is practical. He opposed formalizing present practice, particularly in the terms of the resolution. Professor Sorensen replied that the resolution's intent was not to require Faculty to make up as many lectures or field trips as a student may have missed, but rather to avoid penalizing anyone because of his religious beliefs.

Professor Elias asked what state laws govern Cornell's statutory units in this regard. The Dean replied that pertinent provisions of the State Education Law do not apply either to Cornell or its statutory units, and that the resolution purports to give protection to students in these units equivalent to that provided students at other state colleges in New York. Nor do the University by-laws provide such protection, he added. Professor Lynn asked if the Committee planned to present the remainder of SA-42 to the body at a later date, and if there was any urgency attached to the Committee's action in presenting a portion of the bill for approval. Professor Sorensen replied that the Committee had considered paragraph 6 of the Senate recommendation superfluous, and that both the Committee and the FCR Executive Committee had objected to paragraphs 1-4. There was no urgency attached to presentation of this proposal at this time, he said, merely a desire to get it out of Committee after two years of deliberation.

Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, asked how one determines whether or not a person is a practicing religious person. Professor Miller stated that he had had occasion to comment to the Governor on an earlier version of the State Education Law, which concerns "devout" students only, and then and now considered it a very one-sided bill. While protecting students from Faculty members who do not act in good faith, it gives Faculty no protection from students who do not
act in good faith. He reminded the body that the University's charter provides that the Board of Trustees shall be so constituted as not to represent either a preponderance of any one religion or of no religion, a provision which Professor Miller interpreted as meaning that the University is sensitive to religious problems but is not dominated by them. The resolution failed.

Adjourned: 6:02 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
UNIVERSITY SCHEDULES AND CALENDAR

Note: Additions underlined, deletions [in brackets]

Daily Class Schedule

RESOLVED, That effective [September 1967,] Fall Term, 1974, the daily class schedule shall be:

1. All lectures, recitations, or similar exercises shall start at 8:00 a.m., 9:05 a.m., 10:10 a.m., 11:15 a.m., 12:20 p.m., 1:25 p.m., 2:30 p.m., or 3:35 p.m., and shall continue for 50 minutes[.], except that on Tuesday and Thursday the first and second, the third and fourth, the fifth and sixth, and the seventh and eighth periods may be combined to allow for meeting times of more than 50 minutes.

2. All laboratories or similar exercises which continue for 1 hour and 55 minutes or 2 hours and 25 minutes or 3 hours shall be scheduled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hour and 55 minutes</th>
<th>2 hours and 25 minutes</th>
<th>3 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:55 a.m.</td>
<td>7:30-9:55 a.m.</td>
<td>8:00-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10-12:05 p.m.</td>
<td>10:10-12:35 p.m.</td>
<td>10:10-1:10 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20-2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00-4:25 p.m.</td>
<td>1:25-4:25 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-4:25 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30-9:55 p.m.</td>
<td>7:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-9:25 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. [The hours of 4:25 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. shall be free from all formal undergraduate class or laboratory exercises.]

On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday the hours of 4:25 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., on Friday the hours after 4:25 p.m., on Saturday the hours after 12:05 p.m., and all day Sunday shall be free from all formal undergraduate class or laboratory exercises.

4. Evening classes shall be used only on Monday and Wednesday and only when regularly scheduled and included in written college announcements or as recommended by the [Faculty Committee on Registration and Schedules] Committee on Academic Records and Instruction; evening lectures, recitations or similar exercises shall start at 7:30 p.m., and 8:35 p.m. and evening laboratories or similar exercises at 7:30 p.m.

5. Evening hours on Tuesday and Thursday shall be reserved for preliminary examinations which shall be scheduled with the Examination and Room Coordinator in the Registrar's Office.

[5] 6. No exceptions to the above schedules including the provision for free time on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday between 4:25 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., on Friday after 4:25 p.m., on Saturday after 12:05 p.m., and on Sunday shall be allowed save by permission of the Dean of the College or the Director of the School [, or Head of the Independent Department] concerned; such exceptions that are approved shall be regularly scheduled and included in written college announcements.

and, be it further resolved that, effective [September 1967] Fall 1974, this legislation shall replace that adopted by the University Faculty on April 13, 1966 in reference to the daily class schedule.

(over)
Comments on Schedules and Calendar Legislation

1. This legislation differs mainly in one respect from the proposed new timetable for classes discussed at FCR meetings April 11 and April 18, 1973. Instead of substituting a schedule based upon 75 minute periods on Tuesday and Thursday, it is proposed that we simply make more orderly the use of 75 minute periods on those days.

The present 50 minute period timetable is kept intact. In addition, it is proposed that classes, recitations, etc. which desire longer meeting times, select one of four blocks of time on Tuesday and Thursday. These blocks of time overlap consecutive pairs of 50 minute periods starting with the first, as shown on the chart.

Each of these special blocks of time contains 115 minutes which could be used as appropriate for each class. For example, a 75 minute period scheduled in the earliest block of time could start as late as 8:40 a.m.

This proposal has been discussed with the Registrar and it has been determined that it presents no serious technical problems.

2. Time for Saturday classes and laboratories continues to be available as in the present schedule. To conform with current practice, Saturday afternoons and Sundays are excluded from class scheduling.

3. The present rule regarding evening class hours is changed by reserving Tuesdays and Thursdays for prelims and eliminating Friday evening.

4. Other than with respect to 3, above, present legislation is changed so that variations in the timetable may be made with approval of the appropriate Dean or Director.

5. The legislation is presented as a series of amendments to existing legislation. Additions to existing legislation have been underlined and deletions are shown in brackets, [ ].

May 2, 1973
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Starting Time</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>9:05 a.m.</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>12:20 p.m.</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>10:10 a.m.</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>(01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>9:05 a.m.</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>8:50 a.m.</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
<td>(09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
<td>(08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheduled Times for Classes, Recitations, Laboratories, etc.**

Dept. May I, 1973
Appendix B-1
April 30, 1973

Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections
Slate of Nominations
for FCR seats

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY - 1 tenured seat, 1 non-tenured seat

E Leopold W. Gruenfeld, Professor, Organizational Behavior, I&LR
Bertha A. Lewis, Associate Professor, Design and Environmental Analysis

E Dorothy M. Mermin, Assistant Professor, English
Timothy D. Mount, Assistant Professor, Agricultural Economics

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES - 1 tenured seat

Douglas E. Hogue, Associate Professor, Animal Science
E Eleanor H. Jorden, Professor, Linguistics
Robert L. VonBerg, Professor, Chemical Engineering

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AIDS - 1 tenured seat

E Jack L. Squier, Professor, Art
James E. Turner, Associate Professor, Afro-American Studies and Director, Africana Studies and Research Center.

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING - 2 tenured seats

Douglas E. Ashford, Professor, Government; and Public and International Affairs, B&PA; Director, Center for International Studies
N. David Mermin, Professor, Physics
Marion E. Minot, Associate Professor, Community Service Education
E S. Cushing Strout, Professor, English
E L. Pearce Williams, Professor and Chairman, Department of History

PROFESSIONAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY - 2 tenured seats

Clifford J. Earle, Professor, Mathematics
E Peter J. Kahn, Associate Professor, Mathematics
E Harold A. Scheraga, Todd Professor of Chemistry
Jason L. Seley, Professor, Art

RESEARCH POLICIES - 2 tenured seats

George J. Conneman, Professor, Agricultural Economics
E P.C.T. deBoer, Associate Professor, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
E Norman Kretzmann, Professor and Chairman, Philosophy
Mark Nelkin, Professor, Applied and Engineering Physics

(over)
Appendix B-2

Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections

Slate of Nominations

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY - 1 tenured seat

Benjamin Gebhart, Professor, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Michael Hugo-Brunt, Associate Professor, City and Regional Planning, Urban Planning and Development
Marjorie B. Washbon, Professor, Human Nutrition and Food

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD - 1 vacancy

Robert K. Finn, Professor, Chemical Engineering
J. Congress Mbata, Associate Professor and Coordinator of African Section, African and Afro-American Studies, Africana Studies and Research
Richard G. Warner, Professor, Animal Science, Assistant Director of Research, Assistant Director, Agricultural Experiment Station

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY APPEALS BOARD - 2 vacancies

Ralph Bolgiano, Professor, Electrical Engineering
Ivor Francis, Assistant Professor, Economic and Social Statistics, I&LR
David B. Lyons, Professor, Philosophy, Faculty Fellow, Society for the Humanities
George J. Staller, Professor, Economics

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES - 1 tenured seat

Michael G. Kammen, Professor, American History
Gilbert Levine, Professor, Agricultural Engineering
Mary A. Morrison, Professor, Human Nutrition and Food

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AIDS - 1 tenured seat

William C. Dilger, Associate Professor, Neurobiology and Behavior, Arts and Sciences
Donald T. Farley, Professor, Electrical Engineering, Coordinator of Graduate Studies

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING - 1 non-tenured seat

Davydd J. Greenwood, Assistant Professor, Anthropology
Lee Charlotte Lee, Assistant Professor, Human Development and Family Studies

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS - 3 vacancies

Judith Long Laws, Assistant Professor, Sociology and Psychology
Arthur J. McNair, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Robert A. Plane, Professor, Chemistry
Byron W. Saunders, Professor, Director, Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Director, Continuing Education Program
Norman Uphoff, Assistant Professor, Government, Chairman, Rural Development Commission
Helen L. Wardeberg, Professor and Chairman, Education
UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS - 2 vacancies

James E. Clancy, Professor and Chairman, Theatre Arts
Gordon P. Fisher, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Sidney Saltzman, Professor, City and Regional Planning, Policy Planning and Regional Analysis
Lemuel D. Wright, Professor, Biochemistry, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Nutrition

MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY - 1 vacancy

Kathleen Rhodes, Professor, Community Service Education
Alex Rosenberg, Professor, Mathematics
Shayle R. Searle, Professor, Biological Statistics, Biometrics Unit, Plant Breeding and Biometry

REVIEW AND PROCEDURES - 3 vacancies

K. Bingham Cady, Associate Professor, Applied and Engineering Physics
Esther G. Dotson, Assistant Professor, History of Art
Kurt L. Hanslowe, Professor, Law, Professor, I&LR
John E. Harding, Professor, Human Development and Family Studies
Daphne A. Roe, Associate Professor, Nutrition
John E.H. Sherry, Jr., Associate Professor, Hotel Administration

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS - 1 vacancy

Rose K. Goldsen, Associate Professor, Sociology
Lynne H. Irwin, Assistant Professor, Agricultural Engineering
Alain Seznec, Professor, Romance Studies, Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences
RESOLVED, That the FCR approves paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Senate Recommendatory Resolution to protect against discrimination due to observance of religious holidays (SA-42) as follows:

3. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty and of the administrative officials of Cornell University to make available to each student who is absent from school, because of his religious beliefs, an equivalent opportunity to make up any examination, study or work requirements which he may have missed because of such absence on any particular day or days, provided that the student informs the appropriate faculty of his intentions two weeks prior to the date of the religious observance. No fees of any kind shall be charged by the University for making available to the said student such equivalent opportunity.

5. In effectuating the provisions of this [section] bill, it shall be the duty of the faculty, [and of the] administrative officials, and students of Cornell University to exercise the fullest measure of good faith. No adverse or prejudicial effects shall result to any student because of his availing himself of the provisions of this [section] bill.

Note: New material underlined, deleted in brackets by Committee from original Senate bill.

Rationale by Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning

Upon closer examination of SA-42, we too concur with the Executive Committee of the FCR that there are several flaws in the "draftsmanship" of the original draft (attached). Therefore, we are recommending that only paragraphs 3 and 5 from the original draft be retained. Thus, paragraphs 1, 2, 4, and 6 would be deleted.

Although it is true that "religious beliefs" and "religious holidays" are not defined, to do so in such a way as to eliminate any equivocation would be, at best, enormously difficult and extremely complex. Since "religion" is used in many matters of legislation which are binding upon this university and is itself a term which is surely no more clearly defined than "religious beliefs" and "religious holidays," we feel that this flaw is less crucial than the others which you mentioned.

See attached Senate Bill SA-42
BILL TO PROTECT AGAINST DISCRIMINATION DUE TO OBSERVANCE OF RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

1. Whereas New York State law 224-a does not apply to the State of
   endowed colleges at Cornell University,

2. Whereas there exists no general policy guideline in this matter,
   the University Senate recommends that:

1. No person shall be expelled from or be refused admission as
   a student to Cornell University for the reason that he is
   unable, because of his religious beliefs, to attend classes
   or to participate in any examination, study or work require-
   ments on a particular day or days.

2. Any student at Cornell University who is unable, because of
   his religious beliefs, to attend classes on a particular
   day or days, be excused from any examination or any study
   or work requirements.

3. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty and of the
   administrative officials of Cornell University to make
   available to each student who is absent from school, be-
   cause of his religious beliefs, an equivalent opportunity to
   make up any examination, study or work requirements which
   he may have missed because of such absence on any parti-
   cular day or days, provided that the student informs the
   appropriate faculty of his intentions two weeks prior to
   the date of the religious observance. No fees of any kind
   shall be charged by the University for making available
   to the said student such equivalent opportunity.

4. If classes, examinations, study or work requirements are
   held on Friday after Sundown or on Saturday in conflict with reli-
   gious observance similar or makeup classes, examinations, study
   or work requirements shall be made available on other days,
   where it is possible and practicable to do so: No special
   fees shall be charged to the student for these classes,
   examinations, study or work requirements held on other days.
   This provision shall also apply to registration and pre-
   registration.

5. In effectuating the provisions of this [section] bill, it shall be
   the duty of the faculty, [and of the] administrative officials, and students
   of Cornell University to exercise the fullest measure of
   good faith. No adverse or prejudicial effects shall result
   to any student because of his availing himself of the pro-
   visions of this [section] bill.

[40] 6. Any student, who is aggrieved by the alleged failure of any
   faculty or administrative officials to comply in good faith
   with the provisions of this section, shall be entitled to
   maintain an action or proceeding in the judicial courts
   of the University.

ADOPTED BY THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY SENATE - February 11, 1971
Revised by the FCR Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning - 1/18/73

NOTE: New material underlined, deleted in brackets.
The President, Dale R. Corson, called the meeting to order in Uris Auditorium at 4:35 p.m. 91 Faculty members were present.

The President announced the death of the following:

Wayne L. Hodges, Emeritus Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations
Herbert A. Wichelns, Emeritus Professor of Speech and Drama
N. Arnold Tolles, Emeritus Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

The President asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the meeting of February 14, 1973. There being none, the minutes were regarded as correct.

The President relinquished the Chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, who announced that the minutes of this meeting would be distributed as soon as possible, and that if no additions or corrections were received in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty before July 1, 1973, the Executive Committee of the FCR would act for the University Faculty in approving them. The Speaker then called on the Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney.

1. RECOGNITION OF RETIRING UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEMBERS

The Dean made the following statement:

"This is the last Faculty meeting of the year, and as was the case last year we would like to use the occasion to honor our retiring colleagues. These men and women have given many years of their lives to the academic profession and to Cornell. We have all profited from their contribution and at this final meeting of our academic year we want them to know that they have our gratitude and respect. We hope that they will be able to continue their association with us in their retirement, and we look forward to being able to profit from their wisdom and their advice and companionship in the future. We wish them well and many years of enjoyment to do some of those things that they haven't been able to do quite as much as they'd like to do in the past, whether it be fishing or
lying in the sun, traveling, reading for pleasure rather than for academic pursuits, or whatever else it is that they would have liked to have more time to do."

Those present among the retiring Faculty members stood and received a warm round of applause from their colleagues as the Dean read their names. The retiring Faculty are:

Arthur H. Burr, Hiram Sibley Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Engineering
John C. Cain, Pomology and Viticulture (Geneva), Agriculture and Life Sciences
Randall K. Cole, Animal Genetics, Agriculture and Life Sciences
John F. Cornman, Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Louise J. Daniel, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Arthur E. Durfee, Cooperative Extension, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Mario Einaudi, Goldwin Smith Professor of Government, Arts and Sciences
John Einset, Pomology and Viticulture (Geneva), Agriculture and Life Sciences
Orval C. French, Agricultural Engineering, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Helen H. Gifft, Human Nutrition and Food, Human Ecology
James Hutton, Kappa Alpha Professor of Classics, Arts and Sciences
Vernon H. Jensen, Industrial and Labor Relations
Milton R. Konvitz, Industrial and Labor Relations
Ralph E. Krenz, Agronomy, Agriculture and Life Sciences
John W. Layer, Agricultural Engineering, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Pincus Philip Levine, Avian Diseases, Veterinary College
John W. MacDonald, Edwin H. Woodruff Professor of Law, Law School
James O. Mahoney, Art, Architecture, Art, and Planning
Jean T. McKelvey, Industrial and Labor Relations
Francis E. Mineka, Class of 1916 Professor of English, Arts and Sciences
Sidney Oldberg, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Engineering
Lyman G. Parratt, Physics, Arts and Sciences
Shailer S. Philbrick, Geological Sciences, Engineering
A. Frank Ross, Plant Pathology, Agriculture and Life Sciences
R. Lauriston Sharp, Goldwin Smith Professor of Anthropology and Asian Studies, Arts and Sciences
Evelyn E. Stout, Design and Environmental Analysis, Human Ecology
Bernard V. Travis, Entomology and Parasitology, Agriculture and Life Sciences
John West Wells, Geological Sciences, Engineering
Harold H. Williams, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Agriculture and Life Sciences
Stanley W. Zimmerman, Electrical Engineering, Engineering

2. REPORT OF THE DEAN

The Dean proceeded to give his report on FCR committee activities since the Faculty meeting in February:

a. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, chaired by Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, handled an individual grievance case and as a result proposed a change in its enabling legislation which will be taken up in the FCR meeting to follow.

b. The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, chaired by Professor Kathleen Rhodes, Human Ecology, proposed a new class schedule which was enacted at the last FCR meeting. A subcommittee is expected shortly to issue a report on the Carter Committee Report on the Africana Studies and Research Center. The Committee has generated a proposal for a new calendar committee to work on a calendar study as recommended by the President in his report. The Committee is also developing a committee on so-called independent courses, and has considered several grading proposal matters, including a new S/U legislation proposal.

c. The Committee on Academic Records and Instruction, chaired by Assistant Dean Paul L. Gaurnier, Hotel Administration, besides considering matters dealt with by the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, is at work on the new Student Information System, a computerized record-keeping operation about to be put into operation, and may soon receive a revised proposal for abolishing the Physical Education Requirement.

d. The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids, chaired by Professor Joel H. Silbey, History, has primarily been concerned with formulating reactions to the letter received by the President from the regional office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare pointing out matters of possible concern to the Department, and to the New York State Regents' Position Paper #15 which concerns desegregation of University facilities.

e. The Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning, chaired by Assistant Professor Andrew A. Sorensen, Human Ecology, has also been considering the HEW Letter and Position Paper #15. The Committee has developed a proposal on the University Senate's Bill SA-42 regarding excuses from class and makeups resulting from religious observances, and is at work on student Trustee Gordon Chang's equal educational opportunity proposal concerning the right of students to gain access to all courses regardless of race.
f. The Dean also mentioned the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty, chaired by the Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, Physics, which has prepared a new proposal on ex officio membership; the Committee on Nominations and Elections, chaired by Professor Jerry M. Rivers, Human Ecology; and the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, chaired by Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B & PA, which has been concerned with the following matters: a Faculty grievance memorandum which would set guidelines for grievance procedures in all colleges, a fringe benefits proposal coincident with the President's recommendation that the Faculty reconsider fringe benefits; a proposal to raise children's tuition scholarships; and a proposal by Assistant Professor Karen Arms (Feeny), Neurobiology and Behavior, chairman of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Women, to establish part-time Faculty positions largely designed to accommodate women.

g. The Dean also mentioned the Committee on University Research Policies, chaired by Professor Albert Silverman, Physics (Professor Cyril Comar, Veterinary Science, Spring Term); the Committee on Review and Procedures, chaired by the Dean, which has formulated legislation about to be considered by the body; and the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships, chaired by Professor Charles D. Gates, Engineering, which has published its annual report and developed a proposal for cross-enrollment in ROTC to be considered at the FCR meeting to follow.

3. AMENDMENTS TO ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Dean moved the first of two resolutions amending the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty and withdrew the motion because of the lack of a quorum. In response to a question from the floor, the Speaker said 91 of the needed 147 Faculty members were present, and the Dean commented that the next order of business at a Faculty meeting in which a quorum was present should be to reduce the quorum. He then asked any FCR members who had not already done so to sign in for the FCR meeting which was to follow. The Speaker announced that a quorum was present for the FCR meeting.

Adjourned: 5:20 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
The Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, called the meeting to order in Uris Auditorium at 5:20 p.m. 82 members and 2 visitors were present. The minutes of the April 18 meeting were approved as distributed.

1. RESOLUTIONS ON CORRECTING FACULTY LEGISLATION
   (deletions in brackets, additions in Italics)

   FACULTY TRUSTEE

   The Dean moved the following resolution which was carried unanimously:

   RESOLVED, That the legislation regarding the selection of nominees for the office of Faculty Trustee (previously adopted by the University Faculty and the Board of Trustees from December 12, 1951 through September 29, 1956) be revised as follows:

   1. Whenever a permanent vacancy ..., the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall canvass...

   2. After considering the results of the canvass, and taking into account the advisability of providing for representation in the Board of Trustees of the several colleges and schools and the probabilities as to retirement or as to the absence on sabbatic or other extended leave during the term to be served of the several nominees under consideration, the Committee shall choose a slate of not less than [six] three nor more than [nine] six members of the Faculty as nominees for the vacancy.

   3. A Faculty member who has served as Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees or as Faculty Trustee for more than one calendar year shall not be eligible for nomination for the office of Faculty Trustee for a term commencing less than two years after the expiration of his former term.... [Membership on the Faculty Council does not render a Faculty member ineligible for nomination. "If a member of the Faculty Council is elected Faculty Trustee, his unexpired term as an elected member of that committee shall be filled by the Faculty member among the Faculty nominees for Faculty Trustee not elected by the Board of Trustees who received the largest number of votes."]

   4. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall send copies of its slate to all of the members of the University Faculty with a notice of the Faculty Council of Representatives meeting at which it will be presented.

   5. After the slate of the Committee on Nominations and Elections has been presented at a Faculty Council of Representatives meeting, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall conduct a mail ballot... When supplying the Faculty with ballots, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall send...
6. After counting the ballots, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall report to the President the [names of the three nominees receiving the largest number of votes, stating that they are the candidates chosen by the Faculty for the office of Faculty Trustee, and requesting him to transmit their names, together with the number of votes received by each, to the Board of Trustees.] results of the election, including a report of the valid votes cast. The report shall also include the number of qualified voters on the basis of official University records.

8. Faculty Trustees who are not elected members of the Faculty Council of Representatives shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Faculty Council of Representatives.

SECRETARY OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Dean moved the following resolution which was carried unanimously:

RESOLVED, That Faculty legislation of April 10, 1957, records pp. 2856-57 and September 24, 1969, records p. 3769 be corrected to agree with O.P.U.F. legislation (VI,B) which states "The Secretary...shall continue with his present functions and duties."

1. The Secretary of the University Faculty shall be elected by that Faculty, from among its own members, by a mail ballot on a slate of candidates provided by the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

2. The Secretary shall serve for a term of three years, with the possibility of reappointment [for one further term of three years] by the Faculty Council of Representatives, for a further period of not more than three years.

3. The Secretary shall also serve as secretary and as an ex officio non-voting member of the Faculty Council of Representatives.

4. The duties of the Secretary shall be (i) to keep minutes of meetings of the University Faculty and of the Faculty Council of Representatives [with the assistance of a Recorder, appointed by the Dean], (ii) to keep records of the University Faculty and Faculty Council of Representatives, (iii) to supervise publications made in the name of the University Faculty subject to guidelines mutually agreed upon with the Faculty Council of Representatives, (iv) to assist the Dean of the Faculty at the Dean's discretion, serving as Acting Dean on appropriate occasions.

FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Dean moved the following resolution which was carried unanimously:

RESOLVED, That legislation regarding functions of the University Faculty (May 8, 1957, records, p. 2864) be revised as follows:

6. Questions may be brought to the [whole] Faculty Council of Representatives by its own members or committees, by college faculties, or by the Administration.
8. While much preliminary discussion and investigation of questions before the faculty will normally be undertaken by the [Faculty Council and other committees of the University Faculty] committees of the Faculty Council of Representatives, final responsibility for decisions resides in the Faculty Council of Representatives subject to postponement or nullifications by the University Faculty.

RULES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING COMMITTEES

The Dean moved the following resolution which was carried unanimously:

RESOLVED, That legislation regarding "Rules and Procedures Governing Committees" (January 12, 1949, Records, p. 2525 and March 14, 1956, Records, pp. 2822-3) be amended as follows:

In each of the [Standing] Committees of the University Faculty and the Faculty Council of Representatives, other than Standing Committees of the FCR, the following rules apply unless special exception is made in the legislation governing a particular committee:

a. The Dean of the University Faculty and the Secretary of the University Faculty shall be ex officio, non-voting members of each [standing] committee.

b. The [appointed] Faculty members of each committee shall be appointed by the President, upon recommendation of the Dean of Faculty. [who shall also designate the Chairman.]

d. Unless otherwise specified, all committee members are voting members and a simple majority of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum.

e. Each committee shall elect its own chairman annually. The chairman shall serve for a one-year term and may be re-elected. Each committee may appoint subcommittees from among its own members or from among other members of the University Faculty. Unless otherwise noted, the chairman shall be a Faculty member.

f. Committees shall report in writing to the Dean at least once a year. Each report shall include an abstract suitable for publication.

g. Where required, staff assistance will be furnished committee chairmen by the office of the Dean of Faculty.

h. Student members of appointed committees shall be selected or elected in a manner acceptable to the Faculty Committee on Nominations and Elections, unless otherwise stated. The term of appointment for student members shall be one year but a student member may be reappointed if the committee so recommends.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN LEGISLATION OF SIX COMMITTEES

The Dean moved, as a body, the following six resolutions:
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY RESEARCH POLICIES

RESOLVED, That the last paragraph in the legislation (adopted by the FCR 12/1/71) be revised as follows:

Membership shall be as prescribed in the Rules and Procedures... The Vice President for Research shall also be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS

RESOLVED, That the following sentence be added to paragraph 2 of the legislation (adopted 12/1/71 by FCR) as follows:

The term of office for student members shall be one year with the provision that they may succeed themselves.

The resolution as passed follows:

The term of office for student members shall be one year with the provision that they may succeed themselves for a one-year term.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

RESOLVED, That paragraphs b and f of the legislation on Committee on International Student Affairs (adopted by Faculty 5/8/63, p. 3037-38) be revised.

b. The Committee on International Student Affairs shall consist of fourteen members, of whom six shall be members of the University Faculty [appointed by the President]; four shall be students...

f. The Committee shall elect a chairman from among the faculty or student members.

UNIVERSITY LECTURES

RESOLVED, That paragraphs b and d of the legislation on University Lectures Committee (adopted by Faculty 4/19/33, p. 1793; 2/10/54, p. 2729; 11/12/47, p. 2478) be revised as follows:

b. ...The Faculty members are appointed by the President ... [and the Chairman is also appointed by the President.]

c. The Committee shall also have two students as members with full voting rights.

COMMITTEE ON MUSIC

RESOLVED, That paragraph b of the legislation on Committee on Music (adopted by Faculty 12/10/30, p. 1654) be revised and paragraph c added as follows:

b. It consists of the Professor of Music and four members of the Faculty [appointed by the President]...
c. The Committee shall also have two students as members with full voting rights.

MOSES COIT TYLER PRIZE

RESOLVED, That paragraph b of the legislation on the Moses Coit Tyler Prize (University Faculty and Board of Trustee legislation from 1942 through 1970) be revised as follows:

b. ...The chairman shall be the senior member of the Committee.

Professor Robert H. Elias, Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, moved to amend the resolution on the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships by adding "for a one-year term" to the sentence added by the resolution. Professor Elias explained that since the ROTC "problem" changes in response to student attitudes, there should be provision for some student turnover on the Committee so as to avoid the possibility of the Committee representing "consolidated student interest" over a three-year period. Professor Charles D. Gates, Engineering, chairman of the Committee, said that past experience indicated that it would be very unlikely that a student would wish to serve on the Committee for more than one year, but that he believed the Committee would have no objection to Professor Elias' amendment. The amendment was carried.

Associate Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Engineering, asked if the intent of the resolution on the Committee on the Moses Coit Tyler Prize was that the chairman should be the oldest member of the Committee in terms of years. The Dean replied that custom called for the member with most years of service to be named chairman, and that the resolution was intended to embody this custom in legislation.

The resolution as amended in respect of the University-ROTC Relationships Committee was carried, as were the other five resolutions.

2. COMMITTEE ON CALENDAR AND SCHEDULES

The Dean moved enactment of enabling legislation for a new Committee on Calendar and Schedules, as follows:
The Committee on Calendar and Schedules of the Faculty Council of Representatives (FCR) is hereby established to assume the functions of the Faculty Committee on Calendar.

Responsibilities
The Committee shall consider educational policy matters that may concern the University Calendar and Schedules during the academic year, including the hours scheduled in the day and the vacations granted during the academic year, and on the basis of their findings, make appropriate recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council of Representatives.

Membership
The Committee shall consist of members of the University Faculty, appointed by the President upon recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty, from each of the degree-granting colleges and professional schools, with one member from each. Members serve for four-year terms. The Dean of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, the Registrar and the Chairman of the Senate Calendar Committee or his designee, shall be non-voting, ex officio members.

The Dean explained that the legislation was proposed in response to the suggestions of the former Faculty Committee on the Calendar and the FCR Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, and to a request from the Senate Calendar Committee. The motion was carried unanimously.

3. AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATION - COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

The Dean moved, on behalf of Professor S. Cushing Strout, chairman, Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, the attached resolution (see Appendix A).

The Dean explained that the resolution comes directly from the experience of the Committee in handling its first grievance, which received some publicity earlier this year. The handling of this case under existing legislation proved somewhat cumbersome and difficult, he said. The object of this resolution is to enable a Faculty person who feels grieved and wishes to consult informally with the Committee or its chairman, without publicity, to do so, but once a written formal grievance is pursued, resulting in a proceeding and inevitably involving at least one other party, the Committee feels there should be some outcome and that this outcome, in at least summary form, should be made public. Therefore,
the Dean said, the legislation is designed to produce the routine production of some summary result of such a proceeding and in some cases the full judgment, or action report, of the Committee, and the communication of such documents routinely to the parties involved and in some cases to the President of the University. Communication to the President would occur in such cases where the President should know about the case and its disposition, or where the President is the only practicable means by which the decision might be implemented.

Associate Professor Richard N. Boyd, Philosophy, asked if the Committee legislation should not guarantee Faculty members charged with an offense that could result in dismissal the right to insist on full release of the Committee's report, whether the decision went for or against him. The lack of such provision seems to violate ordinary principles of due process, he said, which the Faculty should have a vested interest in preserving lest it fail to understand the details of a case that is properly controversial. The Dean replied that the proposed legislation does not supercede by-law provisions affecting dismissal, and that it is highly unlikely that the procedures outlined in the resolution would be followed in a dismissal case. If there is a case, he said, in which public airing of the results seems necessary for the protection of the person charged, the legislation provides that the results can be released at the discretion of the Executive Committee of the FCR. Professor Boyd said he still felt the Committee's enabling legislation was defective in not specifically guaranteeing the defendant in a serious case involving dismissal or punishment the right to insist on public release of the Committee's full report. Even if such a case is decided in the defendant's favor, he said, a perfunctory report might seem inadequate to answer questions which have arisen in the community. A defendant has an elementary right to insist on full disclosure when the consequences could be serious to him, he said.
The Dean suggested that Professor Boyd move an amendment implementing his wish so that the FCR can act on it in an orderly manner.

Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, asked if the second sentence in the third paragraph of the text added by the resolution i.e., "In exceptional circumstances, the Dean of the Faculty may decide to the contrary," should be taken to mean that the Dean may decide not to direct public release of the Committee's report. The Dean replied that that was an accurate reading of the meaning of that sentence. At the Dean's suggestion, Professor Boyd offered the following amendment to be added to the proposed legislation: "Whenever the case before the Committee is one which might result in dismissal of a Faculty member, or in some action detrimental to his position in the University, that party shall have the absolute right to require release of the full report."

Professor Bronfenbrenner said he could conceive of a situation where the Committee's decision was favorable to the defendant and where he might wish release of the full report, and asked if the amendment covered this situation. Professor Boyd said he believed it did. Professor Elias objected to drafting amendments from the floor on such a complicated issue in the absence of Committee members, and suggested that perhaps the legislation should be returned to Committee. Professor Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, identified himself as a Committee member and supported Professor Elias' view. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, member-at-large, expressed concern that the subject under discussion might create confusion over the Committee's jurisdiction. He said he understood that if a charge is raised in a Committee hearing which places a Faculty member in jeopardy of dismissal, that the Committee's jurisdiction immediately stops when the decision is made as to whether or not to place charges, and that the by-law provisions take over. If such is the case, he said, the present discussion in effect sets up a "minor court" to deliberate such cases.
before bringing the matter into normal dismissal proceedings. The Dean responded
by asking if it were not conceivable that Professor John D. Hartman, Vegetable
Crops, a party to the dismissal case then pending, might not have wished to
initiate a grievance to the Committee before any action was taken by his
department or college. In other words, if a person anticipates action that might
subsequently be a ground "arguendo" for dismissal, the Faculty should preserve
his right to obtain, in essence, a declaratory judgment from the Committee which
would shield him from further action on the part of "the authorities." Professor
David L. Call, Nutrition, said that as a drafter of the original enabling
legislation he agreed that the area of confidentiality was indeed ticklish, and
moved to refer the matter back to Committee with Professor Boyd's amendment for
study and recommendation. The motion was carried.

4. RECOMMENDATION TO ENROLL NON-CORNELL STUDENTS IN CORNELL ROTC PROGRAMS

The Dean, on behalf of the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships,
moved approval of the following motion passed by the Committee:

The Faculty Committee on University-ROTC Relationships recommended that
there be established a University policy that would enable any qualified student, registered in one of the schools in the region, but without
previous enrollment in any ROTC program, to enroll in an ROTC program at
Cornell University with the objective of gaining a commission. Cross-
enrolled students would be charged no cost or a nominal fee for registration in military-taught courses.

Professor Elias asked if having an outside clientele that depends on the
maintenance of military courses at Cornell would delay the orderly transferral
of ROTC commission requirements from the military to the civilian Faculty and
the moving of purely military activities off campus, a process which he believed
the Committee was engaged in and which the Faculty had resolved to facilitate
several years previously. Professor Gates replied that the Committee felt there
would have to be military-taught courses available for some time to Cornell
students, and that the anticipated number of outside students would be so small
as not to affect seriously the rate at which such a transition might take place. The Committee's recommendation, he said, conforms with a recent resolution of the American Association of University Presidents calling on universities with ROTC programs to make them available to students at nearby institutions not offering such programs. Professor Bronfenbrenner questioned making the Committee's recommendation University policy. In light of the fact that other universities have divested themselves of ROTC on policy grounds, such a policy decision might cast the Faculty at Cornell in an unfavorable light, he said, and suggested that the Committee continue its present ad hoc policy in regard to applications for cross-enrollment. Professor Gates replied that both Vice Provost Robert F. Risley, who had made the first decision to accept a non-Cornell student in Cornell ROTC on the ground that the student had previously been enrolled elsewhere in an ROTC program, and the Committee felt "uneasy" about proceeding on an ad hoc basis, primarily because it was not in accord with the Faculty's wishes. Professor Robin M. Williams, Jr., Sociology, member-at-large, said he thought the body was devoting too much energy to a simple request to regularize an existing procedure.

Professor Mark Nelkin, Applied and Engineering Physics, proposed amending the Committee's recommendation to read as follows:

It is recommended that any qualified student, registered in one of the schools in the region, but without previous enrollment in any ROTC program be allowed to enroll in an ROTC program at Cornell University with the objective of gaining a commission. Cross-enrolled students would be charged no cost or a nominal fee for registration in military-taught courses.

Professor Robert D. Miller, Agronomy, asked to whom the recommendation was addressed. The Dean said he thought this would become Faculty policy addressed as a recommendation to those in charge of ROTC programs, including the Committee on University-ROTC Relationships. Would it take the form of instructions to the
Administration, i.e., Vice Provost Risley. Professor Gates asked. Professor Whitlock responded by asking if this was the Committee's goal, and Professor Gates replied in the affirmative. The amendment passed.

Professor Elias asked if failure to approve the Committee's recommendation would deny students at other institutions an opportunity to enroll in ROTC, and was told by Professor Earl J. Heberling, Lt. Colonel and Detachment Commander, Aerospace Studies (ROTC), that it would. Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics observed that once a conscious policy was established there might be a sizeable increase in the number of applications for cross-enrollment. Professor Gates replied that at present the number of students seeking ROTC commissions seemed to be declining across the country. Assistant Professor Keith Moffat, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, asked why the Faculty could not require outside students to enroll in ROTC as extramural students. Professor Gates replied that both Dean Martin W. Sampson, Summer Session and Extramural Courses, and Mr. Ralph Roger Barnard, Assistant University Counsel, had advised that such enrollment was inconsistent with the intent of extramural enrollment, which applies to individuals who live in the immediate area, are normally employed, and who seek to gain course credits towards an academic degree.

Professor Talman stated that he could not support a recommendation which in effect volunteered Cornell as a regional ROTC center. Does this not imply a lesser degree of concern for accommodating students, Professor Gates asked. Professor Miller asked how cross-enrolled students might receive all credits required for an ROTC commission if they are unable to take non-military-taught courses at Cornell as ROTC members and cannot enroll in such courses through the extramural program. Professor Gates replied that they would receive non-military instruction at the institutions in which they are enrolled. Then, Professor Miller said, the number of cross-enrollment applications might be small since
some former military-taught courses in the ROTC program are now being taught by civilian instructors in college departments.

After division was called, the amended resolution carried by a vote of 31 to 13. The Chair received unanimous consent to take up item VIII on the agenda before item VII.

5. AMENDMENT TO S/U GRADING LEGISLATION, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The Dean moved the following resolution on behalf of the College of Arts and Sciences:

RESOLVED, That the following amendment to the S/U Grading Legislation of the College of Arts and Sciences be approved.

Within the 120 hours required for the A.B. degree, a minimum of 80 hours must be in courses for which the student has received letter grades. The present restrictions on the number of courses a student can take S/U in a given term are hereby withdrawn.

The Dean reminded the body that during the previous year the ad hoc Special Commission on Grading, chaired by Mr. R. Peter Jackson, Director, Student Records and Finance, had recommended changes in S/U grading procedures, and that two items had been referred to committees. The Committees on Academic Records and Instruction and Academic Programs and Policies had studied the items and were considering proposals to amend standing S/U legislation, but were not yet prepared to present their proposals to the body. The College of Arts and Sciences, however, had amended its own S/U legislation in April, 1972, and issued course material for the 1973-74 academic year on the assumption that the FCR would take action by the end of the current term. Both FCR committees approved the College's amendment, he said, and the present resolution is intended to support the College's action. His motion was seconded and carried.

6. RESOLUTION ON CHILDREN'S TUITION SCHOLARSHIP PLAN

Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B & PA, chairman of the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, presented the following resolution passed by the Committee:
It is recommended that Part I - 1 of the Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship Plan be revised to provide for Scholarships that are approximately half the tuition for endowed divisions of the University, i.e., $1,500 for 1973-74.

Professor Flash pointed out that the Plan currently provides $1,000 towards scholarships at institutions other than Cornell, and that when this figure was established in 1966, tuition and fees at Cornell's endowed units was $2,050. The resolution would restore that relationship in present terms. The cost of this Plan to the University is sizeable, he said. At present, 676 Cornell children are attending institutions other than Cornell at an approximate cost of $550,000, and 316 are attending Cornell at a cost of $450,000, making the total program cost about $1,000,000. The Committee's rationale for passing the resolution is that there is an increasing disparity not only between benefits given Faculty children attending Cornell and those attending other institutions, but also between the $1,000,000 total cost of the program and the increase in tuition and fees at other universities. The Committee is aware that the proposed increase will incur a greater total outlay by the University, but believes that the total will not increase by a full 50 per cent, he said. Rather, it should reduce the number of Faculty children applying to Cornell, making it increasingly possible to admit other than Cornell children who would be paying the full tuition in the divisions of the University that are under admissions pressure. The Committee feels it important to reduce the current disparity between payments and tuition charges, he said, despite the fact that the increase in costs must come from other fringe benefits or from salaries, and despite some inequities involved in that the Plan benefits Faculty members who have children versus those who do not, and benefits those who now have children versus those who will have them in future or have had them in the past. Professor Jensen asked if there are any colleges who have less than $1,500 tuition. Professor Flash replied that the provision is to pay one-half the
tuition, but not more than $1,500 per year. Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B & PA, asked which rules, one-half of tuition or $1,500? Professor Flash replied that presumably as tuition increases, benefits should increase. The Committee is trying to establish a relationship with total tuition charged in endowed divisions at Cornell. He added that endowed tuition for 1973-74 will be $3,180 of which a Faculty parent will pay $695, making the amount waived under the Plan $2,485. In the statutory units, a Faculty member will pay $695, but the waiver is $655.

Professor Hutchins asked if the resolution should stipulate "approximately half" the tuition in endowed divisions, omitting the $1,500 figure entirely. Professor Flash said that sounded perfectly acceptable. Professor Miller said that he understood that the cost of the Plan in the statutory colleges is borne by college funds, not from regularly endowed funds, and asked if statutory college financial officials had informed the Committee whether or not they could manage such an increase, since their freedom is greatly restricted compared to what it used to be. Professor Flash agreed that state monies have to be made available for the Plan at statutory units while in the endowed units waiver of tuition under the Plan is in effect a "paper transaction."

Professor Bronfenbrenner asked if the Plan applied only to colleges and universities and not to technical schools or other forms of education that University employees might wish. Professor Flash replied that under current regulations, the University does support junior colleges, so presumably that arrangement would continue. Professor Miller repeated his question. Professor Flash replied that neither financial officials at the statutory units or in the endowed colleges had registered an opinion on the proposal, nor were they asked to do so. The resolution is in effect a recommendation, he said, from the Faculty to the Administration. The resolution was carried.

Adjourned 6:02 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant recorder
Resolution to amend legislation  
Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility  
Appendix A-1

April 26, 1973

RESOLVED, That the legislation for the Committee on Academic Freedom and  
Responsibility be amended as follows: (Deleted material is in brackets,  
new material is underlined — see attachment for text of legislation  
preceding the first deleted paragraph.)

[After reviewing a complaint, the Committee or subcommittee shall recommend  
a course of action to the Executive Committee of the FCR and to the Dean of  
the Faculty.]

Nothing in the foregoing shall be taken to conflict with, or supersede any  
provisions for the protection of Faculty rights in dismissal or other pro-  
cedures set forth in the University Bylaws or in Faculty or Trustee legislation.

[When dealing with any question of a personal nature the Committee or subcom-  
ittee shall at all times maintain strict confidence. The confidential nature  
of the discussions precludes dissemination or reports except as noted above  
without the written approval of the individuals involved and the concurrence  
of the Dean of the Faculty.]

The Committee, or subcommittee, shall at all times maintain strict  
confidence in the handling of individual cases. The confidential nature of  
testimony precludes dissemination of reports except as noted below:

After reviewing a written complaint, the Committee, or subcommittee, shall  
prepare a written report of its findings and recommendations for action, sending  
it to the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Dean of the Faculty. Copies of  
the report shall be sent by the Executive Committee to the individuals directly  
involved in the complaint and, at the discretion of the Committee on Academic  
Freedom and Responsibility, to the President of Cornell University. Such reports  
are to remain confidential unless the individuals primarily involved give their  
written permission to publicize them and the Dean of the Faculty concurs, except  
that the Executive Committee of the FCR, at its discretion, may direct the release  
of the reports.

In the ordinary case where the public release of the report is not directed,  
a brief public announcement consisting of a summary of the Committee's concluding  
judgment with respect to academic freedom, improper discrimination, due process,  
and recommendation for future action shall be made. In exceptional circumstances  
the Dean of the Faculty may decide to the contrary. In this event, his written  
decision is to be appended to all copies of the report, including those sent to the  
individuals involved. A complainant should be advised when initiating a com-  
plaint that such announcement of the results (not the details) of the Committee's  
deliberations will ordinarily be made.
Committee rationale

We have come to these conclusions about the need for the changes stipulated above:

All individuals primarily involved in a dispute are entitled as a matter of fairness to full knowledge of the committee's findings and of any actions taken by the FCR and the Dean of the Faculty.

It is necessary that the President have knowledge about matters of fundamental importance to the University. Therefore, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility should send to him reports it judges to be serious enough for his attention. As a practical matter, furthermore, he may be the only authority by which a specific committee recommendation can be implemented.

The provision for the Executive Committee of the FCR to override the ordinary limitations of confidentiality imposed on the reports is needed for those exceptional circumstances, such as widespread serious doubts about the fairness of the system's procedures, when the Executive Committee of the FCR may conclude that the public interest requires full publication of the Committee's reports.

Brief public announcement of the Committee's conclusions (not the details of its findings) is required, as an ordinary procedure, if the campus community is to feel that a system of inquiry and judgment is functioning in a regular and judicious way. It is desirable for the sake of clarity with respect to responsibility to have one person determine whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify suspension of even this routine form of minimum publicity. The Dean of the Faculty is in a position to be sensitive to both Faculty and community concerns and is the designated spokesman of the Faculty. Therefore, we think he should have this responsibility.

In light of the proposed changes in legislation it is only fair that petitioners be advised that brief public announcement of the Committee's concluding judgment will ordinarily be made.
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COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility is hereby established. It shall have the following functions:

1. The Committee shall concern itself with policies and procedures in the area of academic freedom and responsibility except as explicitly delegated by the FCR to other standing committees. It shall, when directed by the FCR, make studies and prepare reports and recommendations in its area of concern for action by the FCR. It shall provide an initial screening of formal proposals with respect to policies and procedures in this area from FCR committees or others, reporting its findings to the FCR if it feels that further study is desirable. It shall keep itself informed of developments with respect to academic freedom and responsibility which may affect the Cornell University Faculty, reporting significant developments through the Executive Committee to the FCR.

2. The Committee, or a subcommittee, may designate, shall receive and review written complaints brought by a Faculty member with respect to matters involving academic freedom and other matters that might adversely affect his professional reputation, impair the execution of his professional and University responsibilities, adversely affect his economic status, lead to his dismissal, or otherwise alter terms of his employment. It, or a subcommittee, shall also review written complaints against a Faculty member of actions against him that might have the same effects. When appropriate, such subcommittees shall include members of the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty and of the Committee on University Research Policies.

It is expected that established appropriate procedures in colleges or other academic units shall be first utilized for such reviews; in such cases, this committee or subcommittee may act as an appeal body. However, Faculty members or others may present their cases to the Committee through the Dean of the Faculty if they feel that the established procedure is not appropriate or adequate to their situation.

After reviewing a complaint, the Committee or subcommittee shall recommend a course of action to the Executive Committee of the FCR and to the Dean of the Faculty.

Nothing in the foregoing shall be taken to conflict with, or supersede any provisions for the protection of Faculty rights in dismissal or other procedures set forth in the University Bylaws or in Faculty or Trustee legislation.

When dealing with any question of a personal nature the Committee or subcommittee shall at all times maintain strict confidence. The confidential nature of the discussions precludes dissemination or reports except as noted above without the written approval of the individuals involved and the concurrence of the Dean of the Faculty.

Appendix

Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom

(1) Resolved, That this Faculty hereby adopts the following statement of Principles of Academic Freedom applicable to the Faculty of Cornell University:

Academic Freedom for the Faculty of Cornell University means:

Freedom:
—of expression in the classroom on matters relevant to the subject and the purpose of the course and of methods in classroom teaching;
—from direction and restraint in scholarship, research, and creative expression, and in the discussion and publication of the results thereof;
—to speak and write as a citizen without institutional censorship or discipline;

and

Responsibility:
—to perform faithfully the duties of the position;
—to observe the special obligations of a member of a learned profession and an officer of an educational institution to seek and respect the truth, to be accurate in expression, and to give consideration to the opinions of others;
—to make it clear that utterances made on one's own responsibility are not those of an institutional spokesman.
MINUTES

UNIVERSITY FACULTY

and

FACULTY COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 12, 1973 - May 15, 1974
The President, Dale R. Corson, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Approximately 155 Faculty members were present.

The President announced the death of the following:

DeForest H. Palmiter, Professor Emeritus, Plant Pathology, Geneva, November 4, 1972
C. Delmar Kearl, Professor, Agricultural Economics, June 28, 1973

The President relinquished the Chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, Communication Arts, who announced that because of a lack of a quorum at that time the body could not take up the two pieces of University Faculty legislation on the agenda. He called on the President for some remarks.

1. ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The President reviewed major goals of the document, "Cornell in the Seventies," which resulted from efforts of the so-called Cranch Committee last year. The report was prepared by W. Donald Cooke, Vice President for Research, and adopted by the Trustees in May.

The President listed the following principal goals referred to in the report:

1. To keep Cornell one of the major graduate and research universities in the country as well as a major undergraduate university.
2. To maintain Faculty excellence.
3. To maintain diversity of the student body.
4. To create and maintain administrative and academic flexibility in a time of limited or no growth. This requires change by substitution, the President said, a process hard to achieve.
5. To reexamine Cornell's role as the land-grant institution of New York State.
6. To move as far as possible toward the "one university" concept, crossing the dividing line between endowed and statutory colleges. This process is also difficult, the President said, but one in which it is possible to make some progress.
7. To try to rebuild the sense of community which the University lost, to some degree, during the troubles of the last several years. In this regard the President noted that having Faculty serve on the Board of Trustees and the presence of the Cornell
University Senate make development and maintenance of a sense of community easier. Particularly gratifying to him, he said, was the creation of The Joint Planning Board combining the University Planning Committee, appointed by the President, and the Senate Planning Committee. The Board has resolved the argument over the width of the sidewalk in front of Sibley Hall, he noted, and has decided to make a grassy glade of the site of the former tennis courts across East Avenue from the Statler Inn.

Regarding Faculty-administrative rapport the President noted that the Dean of the Faculty had been invited to meet with the Academic Deans' Council, and encouraged the Dean to accept this invitation.

Budget priorities become increasingly important when the University is in a steady-state operation without the growth it has enjoyed in the past, the President said. He anticipated that University budget officials would meet with appropriate FCR committees shortly to discuss options available and to seek help in arriving at decisions in this area. Unhappily, he said, so much of our expense is predetermined that there is no opportunity for movement. The Administration will try to budget so that there is some reserve for starting new programs or strengthening old ones.

The President announced the appointment of a Faculty committee to study the University's land-grant mission, and listed its members: Professor Robert A. Plane, Chemistry, Chairman; Professor Lisle C. Carter, B & PA; Assistant Professor James W. Converse, Rural Sociology; Associate Professor N. Bruce Haynes, L.A.M.O.S.; Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art; Associate Professor William H. Kaven, Hotel Administration; Assistant Professor Jane E. Knitzer, Human Ecology; Dr. Allyn B. Ley, Clinical Director of Health Services; Professor Norman Malcolm, Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy; Professor Peter W. Martin, Law; Professor Royse P. Murphy, Plant Breeding and Biometry; Professor Paul R. McIsaac, Electrical Engineering; Professor Maurice F. Neufeld, I & LR; Professor Emeritus Isabel J. Peard, Education; Professor Jason L. Seley, Art; Mr. Mark Barlow, Vice Provost; Mr. Thomas L. Tobin, Coordinator of State Relations, Secretary; Robert F. Risely, Vice Provost, ex officio. To continue to be the land-grant institution of New York State will require examination of possible new thrusts in areas of activity that the University should be in, the President added.
Turning to the University's finances, the President noted the impact at Cornell and elsewhere of the report issued in the spring of 1973 by a Faculty committee chaired by Professor David Ratner, Law. The University's accounting procedures are in accord with standards set by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, he said. The Association will be incorporating new accounting procedures developed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants which the University hopes to adopt next year. The President added that he hoped to make the University's annual financial report more understandable and more readable.

Because of questions raised by the Ratner Committee, the President, the University and its auditors are presently in doubt as to whether the $300 thousand Morrill Hall renovation, paid for out of the Centennial Fund, should be considered current fund expense or capital fund expense. If it is treated as a current expense, the 1972 deficit will amount to approximately $375,000. If treated as a transfer to capital funds, the deficit will be about $70,000.

Another point rightfully raised by the Ratner Committee, the President said, is that the University could have made its stated deficit for 1972 any figure desired according to how it spent unrestricted gifts, which last year included a $2.7 million gift and $6.7 million bequest. Under its present rules, the Board of Trustees treats such gifts as endowment. Endowment income is barely able to keep up with growth in the University's expense budget, he said, and this is achieved only by using some of capital gains as payout from the endowment fund. If no gifts were placed in the endowment fund, we would "rapidly run ourselves into the ground," he said, since investment income would grow at a slower rate than operating expenses.

The University will undoubtedly finish the current year with a balanced budget, the President said, one reason being that the Legislature increased the so-called Bundy Plan Formula by a one-vote margin last spring. The increase amounts to about $1 million per year at Cornell.

Planning for the future is made more uncertain by inflationary increases, he said. The Bundy Formula is surely not here to stay. New York State will undoubtedly find some other way to fund higher education. Federal support, particularly for graduate education, is unclear. Since 1967 the University has lost about $4.5 million per year in graduate student support, the bulk of it from federal sources. The President said he had recently met with the Director of the National Science Foundation whose outlook was neither
particularly rosy nor negative. There are some indications, he said, of better reception in Washington for support of graduate education, although support of education in general is in a state of turmoil.

There are reasons for optimism, however, he said. The Cornell Fund made its $4 million goal in unrestricted gifts last year, while other universities did not reach their goals. The past year set an all-time high for total gifts to the university, perhaps in the range of $30 million. Such confidence in the university from its various constituencies fortells a good future, he said.

The President also noted that research funds available at Cornell were 18 percent higher in 1972 than in 1971. Although 10 percent of this increase went to the Arecibo operation, it still represents an 8 percent increase in research funds at a time when research funds at other universities are declining. He also noted that the emphasis in research support has changed in recent years, and that many Cornell Faculty members undoubtedly had felt the effect of this change.

The President then briefly described the Boyce Thompson Institute and the history of negotiations regarding its affiliation with Cornell. He reported that major points of the agreement had been resolved satisfactorily, that the Executive Committee of the Cornell Board of Trustees had approved the agreement, as had the Chancellor of SUNY and the New York State Budget Director, and that Boyce Thompson Institute's Board of Directors had that day voted that they preferred the Institute to join with Cornell rather than the University of Oregon at Corvallis. The President noted that such an affiliation would bring 200 more people onto the campus, would preempt valuable real estate on the upper campus, and would place a load on Mann Library, but said that he felt the benefits far outweighed the price. Coupling the Institute's programs with those of plant scientists at Cornell would make the University preeminent in the field of plant science.

The President concluded by noting two problem areas. Of immediate concern is the University's computing program, he said. Present equipment is saturated and outmoded, and we have to move ahead rapidly. The University Computing Board presented various alternatives to him, and recommended purchasing an IBM 370/168 computer which would increase the University's computing power by a factor of three or four. It would cost approximately $3 million after selling the University's present computer. The amortization would increase our computer expenses by one-half to three quarter million dollars per year. The President
said he felt the University badly needed to take the steps recommended by an
ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Geoffrey V. Chester, Physics, which
endorsed the UCB's recommendation.

The second problem area has to do with Cornell's library capacity. The
shelves will be full by 1975 or 1976, and the University will not build another
library on the Arts Quadrangle. A solution to this problem will be required in
the near future.

2. CHANGES IN EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Speaker announced that a quorum had been reached and asked if there
were any objections to taking up the two agenda items. There being none, he
called on the Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, Physics, as Chairman of
the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty to present the first
motion. Professor Cotts read the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the University Faculty recommends to the
    Board of Trustees the following changes in the ex
    officio Membership of the University Faculty.

and listed the proposed changes. (Deletions in brackets [], additions underlined)

(1) The Provost and Vice Provosts
(2) The Vice Presidents
(3) The Dean of the University Faculty
(4) The Deans and Directors of the Colleges and Schools
    at Ithaca
(5) The Director of the University Libraries
(6) The Associate Director and the Assistant Directors
    of the University Libraries
[(7) The University Publisher]
(7) The Director of Student Records and Finance
(8) The Registrar
(9) The Dean of Admissions and Financial Aids
(10) The Dean of Students
[(11) The Director of Resident Instruction in the College
    of Agriculture]
(11) The Dean of the Division of Summer Session and Extramural
    Courses
(12) The Director of Cooperative Extension in Agriculture and
    Life Sciences and Human Ecology
(13) The Director of the Experiment Station at Ithaca
(14) The Director of the State Agricultural Experiment Station
    at Geneva
The Director of University Health Services
The Dean of Physical Education and Athletics
The Director of the Office for Coordination of University Religious Affairs
The President Emeritus

These are: (1) add Associate Director to the Assistant Directors of the University Libraries, (2) delete The University Publisher, (3) add the Director of Student Records and Finance, (4) delete The Director of Resident Instruction in the College of Agriculture, (5) add The Dean of the Division of Summer Session and Extramural Courses, (6) change The Director of Cooperative Extension in Agriculture and Life Sciences and Human Ecology (addition underlined) so as to reflect the College's new title. Carried.

3. AMENDMENTS TO ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

The Speaker called on the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, Law, as Chairman of the Review and Procedures Committee. The Dean moved the following two amendments to the ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY as recommended by the committee:

RESOLVED, That all reference to the Recorder be omitted from the ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY and that the various sections of this document be renumbered and relettered as required, in consecutive order.

The sections are as follows: (deletions in brackets [], additions underlined)

PART TWO., III. Organization of the University Faculty, D. Other Officers.
[4. The Recorder] [5.] 4. Such other officers ...

PART TWO., VI. The President and Other Officers of the Faculty.
[E. Recorder. The Recorder shall keep the minutes of the meetings and other proceedings of the Faculty. He shall be selected by, or in the manner provided by, the Review and Procedures Committee.]
[F.] 4. Other Officers.

PART THREE., X. Officers and Committees of the FACULTY COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES A. Officers.

[4. The Recorder, who shall be in charge of the minutes and records of the Council and who shall assist the Dean at the Dean's discretion. He shall be selected by the Council of Representatives, by majority vote, from among the University Faculty. If not an elected member of the
Council of Representatives, the Recorder shall have no vote nor shall he speak to matters other than those pertaining to the office and its duties. The minutes of each meeting shall be distributed to all members of the University Faculty.\[5.\] 4. Such other officers ... 

RESOLVED, That paragraph VIII, H,2, of ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY be amended as follows:

(deletions in brackets [], additions underlined)

[If a member (of the FCR) is granted leave for one or two semesters an alternate shall be elected in a special election to take the absent member's seat for the period of the leave.]

If a member is granted leave for one or two semesters, an alternate shall be appointed by the Dean of the College to take the absent member's seat for the period of the leave. In the case of an at-large member, the Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a replacement.

The Dean explained that present machinery requires an election to replace FCR members on leave, which is a burdensome process, and the references to the Recorder are being eliminated since that title is no longer necessary. Carried.*

Adjourned: 4:40 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary

*The referendum count on Appointment by Deans to FCR

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on Elimination of Recorder

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, both proposals are deemed adopted and the ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY is amended accordingly.
The Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, Communication Arts, called the meeting to order at 4:45 p.m. 81 members and 8 visitors were present. The Speaker called on the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, Law.

1. ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER

The Dean announced that Professor Martin had agreed to be a candidate for Speaker for the coming year, offered his name in nomination and asked if there were other nominations. There being none, the Dean moved that a single ballot be cast for Professor Martin. Carried. The Dean asked for and received consent to place the computer issue third on the agenda, to insert legislation concerning Lecturer and Senior Lecturer titles in fourth place on the agenda and to move the Class Schedule legislation to the bottom of the agenda.

2. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

The Speaker called on the Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, Physics, who presented the following slate of nominations:

University Faculty Election

**Academic Integrity Hearing Board**

1 to be elected - 3-year term

Berger, Toby, Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering

* Fox, Raymond T., Associate Professor, Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture

**Nominations and Elections**

3 to be elected - 3-year terms

Dyckman, Thomas R., Professor, Business and Public Administration

* Evans, Howard E., Professor, Veterinary Anatomy

Galenson, Walter, Professor, Economics and Industrial and Labor Relations

* Purchase, Mary E., Professor, Design and Environmental Analysis

* Saunders, Byron W., Professor and Director, Industrial Engineering and Operations Research

**FCR Election - Non-Tenured**

**Executive Committee**

2 to be elected - 2-year term

* Moffat, John Keith, Assistant Professor, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology, Agriculture and Life Sciences

Possen, Uri, Assistant Professor, Economics

* Shively, James N., Associate Professor, Veterinary Pathology

Stidham, Shaler, Jr., Assistant Professor, Operations Research

*Elected
FCR Election - Tenured

Executive Committee
3 to be elected - 2-year term

Doris, John, Professor, Human Development and Family Studies
* Ewing, Elmer E., Professor, Vegetable Crops
* Lynn, Walter R., Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Director, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Sack, Wolfgang O., Professor, Veterinary Anatomy
* Wilson, David B., Associate Professor, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology, Arts and Sciences

Admissions and Financial Aids
1 to be elected - 2-year term

Blackall, Eric A., Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of German Literature
* Parrish, Stephen M., Professor, English

Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty
1 to be elected - 2-year term

* Conneman, George J., Professor, Agricultural Economics
Talman, Richard M., Professor, Physics

There being no further nominations from the floor, nominations were closed.

The Dean announced that Assistant Professor Alvin Bernstein, History, had resigned from the FCR and the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, and asked permission to request nominations of his successor from the floor rather than appointing a successor for the remainder of the present year and scheduling an election for the following year. Response was negative and he withdrew his request, announcing that he would fill the vacancy for the coming year by appointment.

3. NEW DEGREE RECOMMENDATION

The Speaker called on the Dean who moved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Council of Representatives approves the granting of the degree Master of Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.).

Carried.

4. REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE COMPUTER ISSUE

The Speaker called on Professor Geoffrey V. Chester, Physics, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee on the Computer Issue, to present a report. Professor Chester began by noting that, due to an error on his part, footnote (5) to Table I on page 4 of the printed report should have stated that about $70,000 (not $200,000) of services was sold to off-campus users during 1972-73. He pointed out that the members of the ad hoc Committee were all Faculty members

*Elected
who are "heavily involved" in computing. The report stemmed, he said, from the Dean's and the FCR's desire to inform the Faculty in general terms about the issue ... raised in July when the University Computing Board (UCB) recommended to the President that the University acquire a new IBM machine which would require a substantial increase in expenditure on computing. The report is in two parts, the first a simple description of the problem for the majority of the Faculty not involved in computing, the second a more detailed discussion of the UCB's recommendations for the perhaps 20-30 percent of the Faculty who require deeper treatment. The report limits itself to the academic aspects of the issue, he said, since there was insufficient time to take up administrative aspects. Nor could the Committee address itself to over-all University policy. It did try, however, to present a "restrained" argument that the computing sector of the University badly needs an infusion of funds.

Missing from the report, Professor Chester said, are reasons why computer users feel computing is important. This, he felt, could be more effectively said than written down. To the 20 or 30 percent of the Faculty who use them, computer resources make up a vital ingredient of their existence at Cornell. In the Engineering College and the B & PA School, for example, you must teach students how to use a computer, so thoroughly have computer techniques invaded these fields. Researchers in engineering and the physical and social sciences face a continual escalation in sophistication of computing techniques as well as in the use of computers in research. Frontier research in these fields now requires high quality computing resources.

The UCB's reason for recommending purchase of the IBM 370/168, perhaps the most powerful machine available for the varied uses that would be required of it at Cornell, is that demand for computing at Cornell is outstripping resources. Considering all the different things the University will try to do with its computing resources, if it gets them, the Committee felt the UCB's recommendation was the wisest compromise at this time. There is too much diversity of application on the campus, he said, for a single solution to satisfy everyone's needs.

More machine power does not make a good computing center or good services, he said. You need high quality staff as well as machines. Present computing services at Cornell have too much paper work and administrative red tape to accommodate "small scale" users. The Committee estimated that if the 370/168 is purchased and a serious effort made as well to improve the quality and scope of services, the present worth of academic computing supported by University funds would approximately double to reach $1.2 million per year.
Professor Chester emphasized in conclusion that the Committee felt the University's future investment in computing must exceed past expenditures, which had been inadequate.

Professor Stephen M. Parrish, English, asked Professor Chester if separating administrative from research and instructional computer uses would change one's view of the problem. Specifically, he said, the report indicates that as much as 60 percent of the money involved might be going to administrative use of the computer. Professor Chester replied that in terms of actual hours on the machine, administrative use is not considerable. However, the Administration does use considerable "non-machine" time, and since computing power increases at a faster rate than "straight proportion" to the number of dollars invested, administrative use provides much needed financial support. Although the Committee favored decentralization of computing, he added, it felt the best present policy would be to remain centralized, if only because Cornell would be in a better position to share its computer resources with other institutions if this should become feasible. The central economic problem, he said, is that if you spend the fixed sum made available by the University on decentralized computer resources, your total computer power decreases.

Professor Robert H. Elias, Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, Member-at-Large, asked if costs "per student" for academic computing on various campuses shown in Table II on page 5 of the Committee's report meant "per student user" or "for the total student body," and was told the latter was the case. Professor Chester said that to estimate expense per Faculty user at Cornell, for example, the Faculty figure in the Table should be multiplied by approximately 4, making the figure $1,600 or thereabouts. Professor Elias pointed out that since the present Cornell computer is saturated the option is not between keeping the present machine and buying a new one but what new machine to choose. Professor Chester agreed, adding that the University is essentially forced to buy the IBM 370/168 because of the requirement that a large part of the University's capacity be IBM equipment. Associate Professor John F. Booker, Engineering, asked if the 370/168 would help solve present time-sharing problems. Professor Chester replied that with the addition of funds they might be solved but that any notion of seriously sharing resources is some years away. Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Applied and Engineering Physics, said that the main question seemed to be whether or not purchasing the computer would preempt funds
available for expansion of the library system, and asked if the FCR shouldn't hear a report from "the Library Committee." Professor Chester agreed and said his Committee was not equipped to investigate this question.

Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if funds for the new computer would come from University funds or a computing grant. Professor Chester replied that since there was no possibility of federal support, the money would have to come from the University. Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics, asked if the Committee, the UCB or officials at the policy-making level had considered limiting the present computer to teaching and administrative uses and leaving Faculty members involved in computer research to decide if present facilities were adequate. Professor Chester replied that the Committee and the UCB had addressed this question but that it was extremely complex. A large part of the present teaching and research system was designed to be compatible with IBM equipment. Moreover, the present computer is obsolete, in part because of IBM's marketing strategy. Professor Walter R. Lynn, Director, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Member-at-Large, asked if the relative increase in intensity of computing use among teaching, administrative and research users since the present computer was installed could be easily estimated. Broadly speaking, Professor Chester replied, University funded research has not increased in recent years. Externally funded research has dropped, probably by 25 or 30 percent, basically because the Physics Department obtained its own machine for analysis of experimental data and because of shortages of funds available for larger programs in physics and chemistry. University funded instruction by computer has increased dramatically in the past two years, he said, and administrative computing has at least doubled.

Professor Isadore Blumen, I & LR, Member-at-Large, said that the FCR Executive Committee felt obliged to present a resolution on the matter to the FCR for consideration. He therefore moved on behalf of the Executive Committee,

"That the FCR accept the report of the ad hoc Committee on the proposed increase in computer capacity and recommends it to the Administration as a basis for decision."

Speaking to the motion, Professor Blumen said that the Executive Committee had wished to present the Faculty with more information and to draft a comprehensive statement for it to consider, but that within the time limits available this would have been extremely difficult.
Professor Elias offered an amendment substituting "discussion" for "decision" in the motion's wording, saying that it was clear from the questions raised that there are many competing demands the Faculty should consider before urging the Administration to move towards a larger computer and that the Administration should receive opinions from non-Faculty portions of the University before deciding the issue. Professor L. Pearce Williams, John Stambaugh Professor of History, Member-at-Large, asked if there was still time for discussion before the Administration acted. The Dean replied that he understood the University was required to send a letter of intent to the vendor this month, and therefore the President had asked for Faculty input by September 15, while the contract for the computer would not be entered into until November. Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, asked if Mr. Giles F. Shepherd, Acting Director of the University Libraries, would give his view of the problem. Mr. Shepherd said that in all fairness he must remind the group that the Libraries are reliant on computing adequacy and that the excellence of the library system depends on availability of computer resources although its usage is smaller in dollars than administrative and research costs.

Professor Williams asked again if there would be time for the Faculty to discuss the issue if it defeated Professor Blumen's motion. The President replied that the timetable presented by the UCB required the Trustees to act at their October meeting and the computer to be ordered by November if it is to be installed in the summer of 1974. His deadline, he said, is to inform the Trustees adequately by early October so they can act. He asked Mr. John Rudan, Director of Computer Services, to comment on considerations raised by the letter of intent. Mr. Rudan said the lead time on ordering a computer varied from 15 months to two years, and the University had already placed several computing configurations on order with IBM. We must decide in September, he said, which configurations we are specifically interested in, so that IBM can gear its production schedule accordingly, and we must confirm an exact equipment order by November if we are to install the equipment by August 1974.

Professor Blumen pointed out that his motion treated the ad hoc Committee report as the basis for decision, not as a recommendation for any one decision, and Professor Elias replied that if this is the case then his own amendment appeared to embody what Professor Blumen had in mind. Professor John H. Whitlock,
Parasitology, Member-at-Large, asked if delivery of the computer would be jeopardized by not sending a letter of intent or, if it were sent, could the decision be changed by November. The Dean said he understood the letter of intent must be sent in September.

Professor Elias' amendment was brought to a vote and defeated.

Professor William Tucker Dean, Law, Member-at-Large, expressed four concerns. First, he said he had shown the UCB report to a friend involved in suing IBM who commented that it read as though it had been written by the IBM Sales Department. Second, while book purchases are being cut back by the University, the Faculty is considering spending over $3 million of unrestricted funds on the computer. Third, the FCR is faced with this issue suddenly, in part because of its own shortcomings and in part because the basic hearings were held "without the three million dollar label attached."

Fourth, as Professor Blumen had pointed out, the FCR Executive Committee had referred to the FCR Research Policies Committee the question of structuring FCR committees so they can decide questions of priorities, such as whether to spend $3 million on this computer now, spend less on a different computing facility, or spend more money on the libraries. He noted that obstacles to network or regional computing arrangements had been described by the ad hoc Committee report as "procedural," "economic" and "political," and asked if such problems will ever be resolved if the computer users can always persuade the University to buy "the latest and the biggest" and have it right here on campus. He opposed Professor Blumen's motion and stated his readiness to offer a substitute motion if it were defeated.

Professor Robert S. Pasley, Law, asked how the University could send a letter of intent to IBM in September and expect a meaningful decision from the Trustees in October, saying he thought a letter of intent was a contractual commitment. Samuel A. Lawrence, Vice President for Administration, said it is conventional in the computer business to place a letter of intent with a manufacturer simply to indicate potential interest. Such action would release IBM from any concern that the University might want to purchase a different model from the 370/168, but would not bind the University to acquire a 370/168.

Professor Williams again asked if the Faculty had any alternative course to take at this meeting, or was it limited either to approving Professor Blumen's motion or doing nothing. The President replied that he would like to be guided by the Faculty's wisdom, pointing out that the UCB had put
enormous effort into its study of the situation, and that its members were
dedicated to the view that the University vitally needs computing facilities
of high quality. Without adequate facilities the University might lose some
Faculty members, he said, particularly in the social sciences. He praised
the expertise of Professor Chester's ad hoc Committee not only in defining
the need for more equipment but in considering how to get the most out of
it, and concluded that he saw no way to avoid large-scale expenditures in
computing.

Professor Blumen spoke for his motion as a Faculty member involved in the
social sciences and statistics, saying that progress in research in these
fields depended on expanded computer facilities. He stressed the need for
expanding high quality staff support in the computer area, as pointed out in
the ad hoc Committee's report in order to provide computer users easier
access to the machines. Professor Bronfenbrenner suggested that the Executive
Committee might pursue the mater of the implications of a decision at this
time at higher levels, or ask an administrative representative to address the
body on this subject, as a means of providing the Faculty with some sense of
the University's position regarding other matters of equal importance before
final commitments were made.

Professor Dean moved his substitute resolution:

RESOLVED, That the immediate need for additional computer
capacity be met by one of the less costly alternatives
suggested in the report of the University Computing
Board and that immediate and vigorous efforts be made
to enter into regional or network computing before
making a financial commitment such as the 370/168.

Professor Elias commented that Professor Blumen's motion as he defined it
amounted to telling the President that the ad hoc Committee report was "worth
reading," and asked if Professor Dean's substitute motion meant that it is
worth thinking about cheaper alternatives. Professor Williams allied himself
with the views of Professors Bronfenbrenner and Dean, saying he recognized the
need for greater computing capacity and asking what the Faculty had to give up
in providing it. In effect the Faculty is being asked to decide the issue
without knowing what it is doing, he said, and asked if there were no mechanism
whereby the Faculty could get an informed report as to the consequences of a
given decision.

The Dean said he had received a memorandum from the President asking him
to designate a committee to work in the budgeting process, and asked the
President if that vehicle would be appropriate for informing the Faculty on the issue and if there would be time to answer the present question. The President agreed it was an appropriate vehicle and said such a committee would have to be convened right away, adding that he had discussed "tradeoff" aspects of the computer issue the day before with some Trustees and offering to present raw figures to such a Faculty committee. To Professor Williams he responded that one of the things the Faculty's action would be doing would be setting the tuition rate for students since that is one of the flexible sources of income. Mr. Lawrence stated that in gathering material for the President's report, "Cornell in the Seventies" last spring, his office had attempted to project University financing in a variety of areas and geared to rates of increase in items such as inflation. Although no attempt was made to sequence capital outlays or large commitments of funds, allowance was made for an increase in computer use which would be supported by some reasonably rapid increase in the application of the University's current funds. The computations were consistent with the rate of increase recommended by the UCB, he said, and with the ad hoc Committee's comment that the University is gearing towards a level of expense some $500,000 over the present level, which would be averaged over the next five to seven years. Among future uncertainties, he said, are to what extent research computing which is now going off campus will return with the purchase of a new computer, whether or not it could absorb computing work now being done on free-standing equipment, and to what extent other universities might cooperate in using Cornell's facilities. An optimistic view would place projected increases in computer expenses brought about by purchase of the IBM 370/168 within the "Cornell in the Seventies" projections, he said, while a pessimistic outlook would make such expenses appear to exceed them.

The Speaker tried to bring the two motions to a vote and failed. After discussion of whether suspension of the rules in order to continue discussion would be in order, the Dean called a special FCR meeting for September 19 at 4:30 p.m. in 110 Ives, and informed the body that in the absence of a ruling on what committee should represent the Faculty in priority discussions he would impress the FCR Executive Committee to act for the Faculty in respect to the matter under discussion.

Adjourned: 6:03 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary
The Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, Communication Arts, called the special meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. 76 members and 5 visitors were present. Professor William Tucker Dean's (Law, Member-at-Large) alternate motion on the computer issue being on the floor, the Speaker recognized in order the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, Law, and Professor Geoffrey Chester, Physics, as chairman of the ad hoc Committee on the Computer Issue.

1. REPORT FROM THE DEAN ON THE COMPUTER ISSUE

Questions had been raised about how the proposed purchase of an IBM 370/168 computer fit into the University's over-all range of choices over the next five to seven years, the Dean said. On Monday, September 17, the FCR Executive Committee met with the President, Dale R. Corson, Acting Provost W. Donald Cooke and Vice President for Administration Samuel Lawrence to solicit information. Mr. Lawrence spoke on the budgetary problems and, in response to the Dean's request, had put his views into a two-page memorandum which had been distributed at this meeting. In summary, the computer's cost was estimated at $3.7 million, he said, to be paid for over a period of years at an annual average expenditure in the neighborhood of $500,000. Annual payments would not be equal but on a stepped up basis starting with $150,000 the first year. In what context do we weigh such a demand on the University's resources?, the Dean asked. Experience indicates that approximately $6,600,000 in discretionary funds would continue to be available each year to the University. This figure was reached after allowing for predetermined expenses, the current manner of budgeting, and assuming prudent budgeting practices.

Assuming inflationary adjustments such as salary increases (the current price control guideline figure is 5.5 per cent), Social Security payments, increased cost of utilities, etc., will consume about $4 million per year of discretionary funds, other new specific needs take another $1.6 million, that leaves a margin of $1 million on which there are a number of demands from other areas than computing. The principal competing demand in the interests of maintaining academic excellence is the University Libraries, the Dean said. Accordingly, he read the following memorandum submitted to him on September 19 at his request on this subject by Acting Provost Cooke:

"I am writing in response to your request for clarification of Cornell's attitude toward the Library. It is most difficult to talk in terms of five or ten years. Over a period of ten years those making present decisions will in
all likelihood not be involved, and even the mechanism for decision making is unknown.

Perhaps the only way to extrapolate Cornell's commitment is from past and present attitudes. There have been two supplementary appropriations to the Library system during the budget reduction period which amount to $200,000 from the Mellon grant. An annual appropriation of $32,000 was added to the base budget in 1971-72 to shore up sagging acquisitions in the Humanities area, and this is to be continued indefinitely. An additional special appropriation of $100,000 for a three year period was added to the Library budget to compensate for acquisitions in other areas which were in difficulties.

For comparative purposes expenditures for the Library system from appropriated funds were $4.3-million in 1970-71, $4.2-million in 1971-72, and $4.4-million in 1972-73. For the Office of Computer Services the equivalent dollars are $1.0-million, $1.0-million, and $1.0-million, respectively.

Another special appropriation of $100,000 for additional acquisitions was discussed with the Director some time ago. This appropriation was approved but there was some uncertainty as to when it would be implemented.

Another major financial impact involving some millions of dollars will be forthcoming in the construction of new Library facilities."

Professor Harold A. Scheraga, Todd Professor of Chemistry, asked what fraction of the Office of Computer Services' (OCS) annual $1 million budget was derived from academic computing as opposed to administrative computing. Mr. Lawrence replied that academic computing supported by the University's endowed program amounts to about one-third of the OCS budget, or $350,000, versus $600,000 for administrative operations on the computer. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, Member-at-Large, asked if a large part of the predicted $500,000 annual payment was not expected to be amortized rather than come from available funds. Mr. Lawrence concurred, saying that as an enterprise operation OCS must realize approximately $500,000 over the next seven years in income in order to amortize against its budget the $3,700,000 capital outlay for the computer. Income will come from charges to the University's academic departments and its Administration, he said, and is expected to be "staged" so as to reflect income as it becomes available. The Dean added that, assuming a $500,000 payment per year, two-thirds of that payment might be expected to come from endowed college budgets, and one-third from charges to outside contracts.
Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B&PA, asked if it were not true that about $200,000 in additional new funds would be needed to operate the enlarged computer facilities each year. In light of the President's remark at the September 12 meeting that purchase of a new computer would affect future tuition rates, he wondered how these increased expenses might affect tuition and whether a tuition increase would be applied to all students. He also asked to what extent administrative use of the new machine might reduce the cost of clerical processes. The President responded by describing his previous remarks on tuition as "frivolous" in that tuition is only one source of unrestricted income to the University. As stated in "Cornell in the Seventies," the University intends to gear tuition increases to increases in the rate of disposable family income, or about six per cent a year, he said. As far as reducing clerical costs is concerned, he stated as his belief "you never save money in going a route such as this." He cited the installation of computerized data processing equipment in the library acquisitions department, which shortly cleared up a three-months backlog of 25,000 uncatalogued volumes. This illustrated another part of his beliefs, he said, that you do have the potential to vastly improve services.

Mr. Lawrence pointed out in response to Professor Hutchins that the approximately $200,000 per year increase in operating costs indicated as needed by the University Computing Board (UCB) had been included in the estimate of $500,000 annual payments. Not included, however, are costs of increasing the computing staff as suggested by Professor Chester's Committee.

Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, Member-at-Large, asked what incremental claim might be made each year on the endowed college budgets, to which Mr. Lawrence replied $110,000 to $160,000, assuming that endowed departments spend that much to purchase OCS computing services. Professor Whitlock cautioned his colleagues against speaking in public about computer costs in relation to tuition increases. He said he believed that present student use is a very small part of the cost of computing at Cornell, and that such remarks would produce a major public relations problem. The Dean said he believed the President had corrected the record by making it clear that acquisition of a computer would not affect tuition, and only tuition. Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Applied and Engineering Physics, pointed out that the last time the University bought a computer it ordered an IBM 360/67, then found that it didn't exist, and had to accept an IBM 360/65. Does the 370/168 and associated software exist? he asked. Also, he said, since the amortized value
of a computer is negligible, it will require payments of $700-800,000 per year to amortize the $3,700,000 computer over five years, to which must be added $200-300,000 to make it work efficiently, making a total annual expense of $900-1,000,000. Based on the ad hoc Committee's figures, he said, the need for this computer is almost entirely administrative, not for research and teaching. Current philosophy holds that administrative computing is base-loaded, i.e., it can't be changed. This is the wrong philosophy. The Faculty should tell the President that it wants research and teaching computing to be base-loaded and, if there is additional capacity available, the Administration could use the facility to obtain further information.

Mr. John Rudan, Director, Computer Services, replied that the IBM 370/168 and associated software does exist; one was installed that week at the University of Chicago. Since the software embodies some that is currently in use at Cornell, he recommended continuing to use this until the new software system arrives.

2. REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN, AD HOC COMMITTEE ON COMPUTER ISSUE

Professor Chester responded to what he termed "serious financial misunderstandings" in what Professor Cady had said, pointing out that if you subtract $1,000,000, which is the UCB's estimate of the IBM 370/168's worth five years from now, from the $3,700,000 capital outlay, you can amortize the outlay easily over five years at five or six percent interest per year. To Professor Cady's response that the $1,000,000 market value of the IBM 370/168 would have to be subtracted from the purchase cost of its successor just as the $400,000 value of the University's present computer was applied towards the cost of the IBM 370/168, Professor Chester replied that the trade-in value can be applied in any manner desired, changing only the time span. Thus, applying $500,000 of the IBM 370/168's market value in five years would stretch the period required to pay for it to seven years, or applying $600,000 would take six years.

In addition to the capital outlay, he said, which he thought could be reasonably estimated at $500-700,000 per year over five to seven years, the Committee wished to emphasize the need for additional funding to improve the quality and availability of computer services.

Professor Cady asked if the University planned to recoup some of its gross outlay from outside funds such as the present support by the National Science Foundation. Mr. Rudan replied that out of the present $2,000,000
OCS annual budget about one-third is recouped from outside funds. Professor Chester said one could reasonably expect a third of the expanded OCS budget (with the new computer) to be recouped from outside, especially if one considers the statutory colleges as well as the endowed colleges as outside users. He added that the UCB intends to control use of the computer so as to harbor resources and control expansion. He supported the IBM 370/168 recommendation on technical grounds, pointing out that both OCS and the UCB had tried to obtain all possible opinions and saying that the public hearings, although held at a late hour, were well advertised and took place at a time when the Faculty were on campus to teach. The question of support for the Libraries versus computer support, he said, is not a valid one to those of the Faculty who use the computer in teaching and research. The University must have both an excellent library and an excellent computer to remain a first-class institution heavily oriented to science and technology. The present number of Faculty using the computer is "ridiculously small," he said, and must expand. Library funds cannot be used for this purpose, so the funds for the computer must come from some other source.

Professor Chester termed less expensive alternatives to purchasing a large computer "utterly miserable," since they would prolong the unstable computing conditions Cornell has experienced over the past six years and degrade the quality of research. The purchase of a large machine, he said, will with reasonable management usher in a period of stability in computing, an unprecedented situation that will probably benefit computer users more than any other factor.

Professor L. Pearce Williams, John Stambaugh Professor of History, Member-at-Large, asked if any assessment had been made of the recent judgment against IBM in the courts. The President replied that, in a recent conversation with an IBM official about the more than $300,000,000 fine levied, he had been told that IBM has a cash account of $1 billion.

Professor Dean spoke for his substitute resolution, saying the UCB recommendation was too costly a commitment in view of the need to seriously explore regional and network computing. It will never be explored, he said, so long as computer users hold that, as the ad hoc Committee phrased it, "economic and similar factors militate against it." The Faculty had not been given enough time to evaluate priorities, he said, pointing out that the UCB report discussed a number of less costly alternatives to buying the 370/168,
one of which might carry the University through a two-year period in which the Faculty could respond more meaningfully to the proposal before it. Professor Olum spoke against the Faculty taking any action on the computer issue, it being only a small part of the University's over-all budget but one with large financial ramifications to the Faculty. He would be happier, he said, if the Faculty could mandate in many areas of University policy. Professor Williams objected to several aspects of the proposal to purchase a large computer, principally to the argument by social scientists that they require IBM equipment because they are already using its language. He supported Professor Dean's substitute motion as indicating Faculty priorities to the Administration. Professor Robert H. Elias, Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, Member-at-Large, said that the main motion made by Professor Isadore Blumen, ILR, Member-at-Large, on behalf of the Executive Committee at the previous meeting did not require the Faculty to take a position relative to expenditures other than for the computer, but simply to support the ad hoc Committee report as the basis for a decision. He said he thought the Executive Committee had been assured by the Administration that it would be kept informed of proposed expenditures and that the Faculty would be given an opportunity to examine a projected budget and formulate its opinions on priorities before a legal contract with IBM was approved by the Trustees. "If that assurance is reliable," he said, "then it seems that passing Professor Blumen's motion has far fewer implications than some of us might fear."

The Speaker called on the Dean who asked for and received permission to read the following excerpt from a letter sent him on September 19 by Professor Robert Hughes, Chemistry, an FCR member forced to be absent from the meeting:

"It strikes me that there are two points to be dealt with. The first is to solve the immediate problem of providing some faculty input into the decision-making process concerning computing at Cornell. The second is to establish a long-range mechanism to provide similar input on issues of university-wide importance.

In the current situation, I strongly endorse the combined positions of Professors Blumen and Elias. Time is short. A decision cannot be avoided; even a postponement would be a de facto decision in that it would drastically affect Cornell's position in the IBM queue. The Ad Hoc Committee,
as Professor Chester observed, was not charged with considering the larger issues of university-wide priorities and it did not attempt to do so. What it did do was to provide an excellent analysis of the views of those faculty groups with academic, intellectual or professional commitments to computing. It should be possible to find a way to communicate this analysis, derived from a faculty point of view, to the Administration while making it clear that it does not necessarily reflect the view of the FCR as a formal legislative body."

Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, said he was distressed by the Faculty being divided into users and non-users of computers, as it emerged in the argument, and asked if any Faculty member present who was involved in computing had any objections to the proposal before the body. Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics, suggested that natural scientists had not commented on the defects of the IBM 370/168 because the ad hoc Committee report had implicitly assumed that despite the fact that some natural scientists looked with disfavor on the computer, the decision to buy it was a good one. He accounted for the general lack of criticism by saying natural scientists were aware of the deeper defects of IBM equipment while social scientists were aware of its superficial defects. Mr. Giles Shepherd, Acting Director of the University Libraries, said that the Libraries are already part of a State University of New York computer network which is about to be expanded to accommodate several more large data banks such as ERIC and Sociological Abstracts, and that already he was being asked where the money would come from for terminals in the Libraries.

Professor Blumen said that until very recently the Faculty had not been involved in any major policy decisions, and had had no input on educational policy matters. "Now we have our nose under the tent," he said, adding that he would like to see the Faculty show some cooperation with the Administration. The Faculty should respond to the Administration's action, he said, by saying in effect: "Given the time allotted and the expertise we have been able to muster, we think the proposal seems to make enough sense so that we don't want to say no." In reference to Professor Dean's motion, he said that if computer capacity permits, Cornell might possibly find itself in the position of being a vendor, or even one of the central points of a regional computing network. Professor Robert S. Pasley, Law, expressed concern over the University being "locked into" IBM, and that most input to the argument had
come from computer users. Aside from Mr. Lawrence's memorandum, he said, he missed adequate consideration of the over-all business and budgetary implications of the proposal.

A vote to substitute Professor Dean's motion for Professor Blumen's was defeated 61-6. Abstentions, counted at the request of Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, were 10. Professor Paul J. Zwerman, Agronomy, pointed out that should the University experience financial difficulties maintaining the excellence of its Libraries and computer services, alumni might be persuaded to raise funds in support of these facilities. Professor Williams said that any sign of Faculty support for the proposal would result in the computer being purchased by the Administration, and urged the FCR to recommend purchase of the IBM 370/168. At the Dean's suggestion he moved to amend Professor Blumen's resolution by adding and approve after "accept." Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, said that Professor Blumen had brought an important perspective to the discussion; this was the first time the Faculty had been brought into a discussion of so important an issue. Lacking a history of approving or disapproving such issues, the Faculty should, he thought, hold with Professor Blumen's motion and indicate its desire to be in a position to intelligently vote on motions to approve or disapprove.

Professor Williams' amendment was defeated. Professor Blumen's motion

That the FCR accept the report of the ad hoc Committee on the proposed increase in computer capacity and recommends it to the Administration as a basis for decision.

was carried. The body unanimously approved a motion by Professor Vinay Ambegaokar, Physics, to thank the ad hoc Committee for its efforts on the FCR's behalf.

3. **ESTABLISHMENT OF SENIOR LECTURER AND LECTURER TITLES**

The Speaker called on Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B&PA, as Chairman of the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty. Professor Flash offered his Committee's proposal to establish Senior Lecturer and Lecturer titles for FCR review.

The Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty recommends that the Faculty Council of Representatives approve establishment of two academic titles: Senior Lecturer and Lecturer. These titles may be used at the discretion of individual appointing units of the University in cases where professorial titles are not appropriate and in accordance with the conditions set forth below.
1. **The Senior Lecturer**
   a. Appointment to positions with title of Senior Lecturer reflects professional qualifications of experience and/or education generally comparable to those of Associate Professor or Professor.
   b. Appointment will be for a period of not more than five years and is renewable.

2. **The Lecturer**
   a. Appointment to positions with the title Lecturer reflects professional qualifications of experience and/or education generally comparable to those of Instructor and Assistant Professor.
   b. Appointment will be for a period of not more than three years and is renewable.
   c. In accordance with current practice in some divisions of the University, the Lecturer title may be conferred on junior faculty members having teaching and research responsibilities while they are completing the fulfillment of their doctoral degree requirements.

3. **Conditions Applicable to Both Titles**
   a. Except as set forth in Paragraph 2c above, responsibilities will be primarily if not entirely in teaching; research responsibilities are not expected to be included.
   b. The period or length of appointment will be stipulated at the time of offer and acceptance of the appointment. Consideration of renewal and the decision of whether or not to recommend renewal will be at the discretion of the appointing unit.
   c. Persons holding either of these titles:
      1. would not be granted tenure;
      2. would be eligible to participate in retirement, insurance, and the Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship programs;
      3. would be non-voting members of the appropriate college faculty; and
      4. would not be eligible for sabbatical leave.

4. **Limitations in Use of Titles**
   The Senior Lecturer and Lecturer titles shall not be used:
   a. To fill faculty positions, the teaching and research nature of which appropriately calls for professorial appointments;
   b. as a substitute for tenure appointments or appointments that would normally lead to tenure; and
   c. as a means of the appointing unit circumventing the commitments and obligations associated with the tenure appointments.
5. **Provisions Governing Transfer to and from Professorial Appointment**

   a. Persons holding Senior Lecturer or Lecturer appointments may be considered for transfer to professorial rank when the assumption of both teaching and research responsibilities makes such consideration appropriate.

   b. Persons holding professorial appointments may not be transferred to Senior Lecturer or Lecturer positions as a means of maintaining the employment of persons who have not qualified for retention via tenure appointment in accordance with criteria and procedures governing such appointments.

6. **Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer Title**

   a. Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer shall be based on standards of teaching excellence appropriate to the individual's assigned responsibilities and comparable to standards applicable to evaluation for professorial promotion.

   b. Consideration for promotion shall follow procedures consistent with those followed in making tenure appointments and promotion except that it need not involve review outside the particular appointing unit.

7. **Impact on Those Currently Holding Lectureship Titles**

   The appointments of persons currently holding the title of Lecturer will either be continued at that title or elevated to title of Senior Lecturer in accordance with the provisions of Paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

The proposal responds to the increasing need for specialized teaching positions in various parts of the University, Professor Flash said, and for increasing the number of options available to departments. It is designed to protect the interests of individuals to avoid their being exploited, and to be consistent with the tenure system and the development and maintenance of professorial staff. He proposed changing Section 3, Subsection c., line 3 of the proposal in accordance with the University Bylaws to give Senior Lecturers or Lecturers permission to vote on issues relevant to their particular interests.

Professor Williams requested specific wording of the change. Professor Flash responded as follows:

3. **Conditions Applicable to Both Titles**

   c. Persons holding either of these titles:

   3. would be non-voting members of the appropriate college faculty; except that they may be granted the right to vote on any question deemed by the appropriate faculty to be relevant to the Senior Lecturer and Lecturer position.
Professor Williams opposed the proposal on grounds that machinery exists for establishing part-time lecturers, that it implies that research is not an extension of teaching, and that it does not include teaching evaluation for renewal of appointments. The proposal, particularly with the addition of voting status, would create a parallel Faculty to the regular Faculty, made up of persons lacking required teaching qualifications, he said. Before many years it may be incorporated into the regular Faculty, further diluting the strength of the University. Professor Elias supported the proposal, saying that not all departments have machinery such as that alluded to by Professor Williams. Moreover, there is a great deal of uncertainty, not to say inequity, involved in temporary Faculty appointments and present renewal procedures which inhibits professional growth. He said he was disturbed by the proposal's provison for renewal after three years, since departments may vote to discontinue the rank of Lecturer, thus violating an oral agreement. He asked if the Committee had considered wording the proposal to say an appointment "may be" renewable.

Professor Flash said the Committee considered this point but because departments sometimes encounter factors beyond their control, felt it could not include explicitly in the provision anything that would amount to a contract for a particular period of time. It preferred to rely on the good will of both parties involved. In response to Professor Williams, Professor Flash pointed out that the proposal offers an option to any given department, not a requirement, to appoint Lecturers. There are about 100 persons holding lectureship positions at present in the University, he said, most of them in the Arts College. The Committee felt this number will increase, especially in professional schools such as B&PA where practitioners are often brought into the classroom on a temporary basis, and that the proposal offers the best device for meeting this need. Professor Strout supported the proposal, saying that his wife, a lecturer in a Cornell college other than his own, had persuaded him that without such an arrangement the University cannot meet its obligation to make use of available talents in the community. It is not only a matter of fairness to women and others in view of past inequities, he said, but more importantly a matter of the University serving its own best interests.

Professor Blumen opposed the proposal on grounds that it seemed to apply to lecturers qualified to teach more than "routine drill" but not up to regular Faculty levels. It does not provide for the appointment of specialists in a
field who are available to the University for a limited time. Although it may be a viable way of bringing Faculty wives into the academic community, he said, it should clearly establish professional requirements such as the possession of a Ph.D. for such appointments.

A motion to cease debate was defeated 29 to 27.

Adjourned: 6:05 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary
The Acting President, Vice President W. Donald Cooke, called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and relinquished the chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin, Communication Arts. 68 members and 4 visitors were present. The minutes of the meeting of September 12, 1973, were approved as distributed. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, Member-at-Large, asked if the question raised at the conclusion of the September 12 meeting concerning whether or not suspension of the rules in order to continue discussion would be in order, had received clarification, and was told by the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, Law, that the question was still under study. The Speaker called on the Dean of the Faculty for a report.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

The Dean made the following announcements:

a. Since the University Senate had provided for FCR representation on its Policy Study Group II: Physical Education and Athletics, the Dean had asked Professor Scott B. Elledge, English, senior member of the President's Council on Physical Education and Athletics and one of three members elected to the Council by the FCR, to serve on the Senate committee.

b. In accord with amendments to the **ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY** carried at the September 12, 1973 University Faculty meeting, the position of Recorder has been abolished and Mr. Joseph Leeming's title changed from Assistant to the Recorder to Assistant to the Secretary. Also, the Deans can now appoint members to fill FCR vacancies for one year or less.

c. In anticipation of an imminent series of meetings between Administration budget representatives and various Faculty members scheduled for the near future, the FCR Executive Committee will be asked to represent the FCR in these meetings.

d. Business referred to Committees:

1. Hartman Hearing Panel's recommendations on procedures for informing Faculty members about tenure provisions, to Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

2. A question raised regarding University policy on identification by race, to Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty.
3. Governance of University computing operations on a long-term basis and a proposed new University Libraries Board, to Research Policies.

4. A new proposal to establish the position of Associate Professor Without Tenure, to Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty.

5. Proposal for a Committee on the Financial Condition of the University, to Review and Procedures.

6. Apparent contradiction between the 1969 Trustee policy forbidding the University to discriminate regarding admissions on the basis of race and the President's 1971 statement that the University would achieve racial balance by seeking to enroll students from underprivileged groups, to Admissions and Financial Aids and Academic Programs and Policies.

7. A petition to the Dean last spring from 1,500 students to abolish the Physical Education requirement, to a joint subcommittee of Academic Programs and Policies and Academic Records and Instruction.

2. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF SENIOR LECTURER AND LECTURER TITLES

The Speaker received general consent for Associate Professor John F. Booker, Engineering, to move the following modifications to the original proposal of September 6, 1973 (new material underlined, deleted in brackets):

1. The following sentence is added to 3.a.:

3. a. Except as set forth in Paragraph 2c above, responsibilities will be primarily if not entirely in teaching; research responsibilities are not expected to be included. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are regarded primarily as teachers in relatively specialized areas of instruction.

2. No. 3.c.3. is rewritten as follows:

3.c.3. would be non-voting members of the appropriate college faculty [;], except that, in accordance with Article XIII of University Bylaws, they may be granted the right to vote on any question deemed by the appropriate faculty to be of interest to the Lecturers and/or Senior Lecturers of that college; and
Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B&PA, Chairman, Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, spoke to the Committee's proposal. He pointed out, for clarification, that the proposal does not replace the present lecturer position but assumes its continuance, adding the position of senior lecturer and setting forth conditions regarding both titles which parallel those currently affecting the positions of research associate and senior research associate. The proposal attempts to meet the need for specialized teaching skills throughout the University, he said, and to represent the interests of persons with specialized talents. It sets forth the two lectureship positions taking into account that there are presently 58 senior research associates at the University and 226 research associates, as well as the fact that 58 percent of current lecturers are deemed qualified in terms of their teaching and other experience to become senior lecturers. It does not establish a new career ladder, but attempts to formalize one which, with research associate positions, already exists in addition to the professorial one. Ten of the University's 11 divisions currently use lecturers, he said, major users being Arts and Sciences, Agriculture and Life Sciences, Human Ecology and Hotel Administration. There are currently 137 lecturers (77 $3/4$ full-time equivalents) including 56 full-time lecturers, 73 female lecturers and 64 male lecturers with an average length of appointment of 3 1/3 years. The possibility of abuses of the system should diminish when criteria are articulated and full communication established among departments, lecturers and professors, he said. He also pointed out that the proposal gives departments the option of using or not using lectureships as they see fit. He concluded by saying the proposal came to his Committee and was not originated by it, and that committee members were not unanimous in supporting it.

Associate Professor Ross J. MacIntyre, Biological Sciences, said he had been asked by his colleagues to inform the body that creation of the senior lectureship position would be an appropriate device for appointing directors of laboratory in biology courses. Professor Robert H. Elias, Goldwin Smith Professor of English Literature and American Studies, Member-at-Large, supported the proposal because of the tentative nature of the present appointment system, saying that giving departments the freedom to commit themselves regarding appointments would improve relationships within departments. Professor Gerald B. Kelley, Chairman, Modern Languages and Linguistics (non-FCR), stated that his Department currently employs 24 lecturers, and that he favored the proposal since he would like to give them more job security.
Associate Professor Richard N. Boyd, Philosophy, asked what the difference is between lectureship and professorial qualifications. Professor Flash replied that the primary difference is the absence of research duties for lecturers. Professor Eric A. Blackall, Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of German Literature, supported the proposal on grounds that the present system does not recognize loyal service to the University over a long period of time and that the proposal offers an opportunity to expand the Faculty's academic function by procuring the services of distinguished artists, musicians, etc. He suggested that it would be impractical to implement paragraph 3.c.3. of the proposal, however, and moved to amend it to change the word "non-voting" to "voting." He also suggested deleting paragraph 2.c. of the proposal because it encourages research skills for lecturers and asked for a definition of the phrase "Faculty members" in that paragraph. Professor Flash acknowledged the inconsistency raised by paragraph 2.c., but said it was included in the proposal in recognition of the fact that there are presently junior members of the Faculty who are working on graduate degrees. Paragraph 3.c.3., he said, was purposely worded to accord with University Bylaws. The Dean pointed out that he believed the Bylaws deny instructors Faculty voting privileges. The Speaker obtained a second for Professor Blackall's amendment. Professor Whitlock said that the Bylaws deny instructors the vote only if they are working for a degree, and Professor Elias added that the Bylaws do permit instructors to vote if they are working for a degree from an institution other than Cornell.* Professor Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked what the voting status is of other non-Faculty groups such as Cooperative Extension personnel. Professor Flash read Article XIV.1. of the Bylaws:

"Each college or school faculty may, in its discretion, grant voting or non-voting membership to lecturers, counselors, and other professional personnel for whom such membership is deemed appropriate by such faculty."

*The relevant sections of the University Bylaws that cover this point are Article XIII.2.:

"No member of the University Faculty may be a candidate for a degree administered by Cornell University."

and Article XIV.2.:

"No voting member of a college or school faculty may be a candidate for a degree administered by Cornell University."
Professor Blackall asked Acting President Cooke, in his capacity as former Dean of the Graduate School, if graduate students are permitted to join the Faculty and if instructors can be graduate students. Acting President Cooke replied that graduate students could be instructors but could not be members of the University Faculty. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if there was not an inconsistency between paragraphs 2.a. and 3.c. of the proposal. Professor Flash replied that paragraph 2.a. constituted an exception to previous practice. Professor Elias and Professor Clifford J. Earle, Mathematics, suggested striking paragraph 3.c.3. from the proposal since the Bylaws already provided for the question of voting membership and 3.c.3. would deny colleges the right to apply the Bylaws. Professor Flash accepted this view on behalf of his Committee since their intent, he said, was to make the proposal consistent with the Bylaws. Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, asked if lecturers affiliated with departmental faculties would, without exception, be considered University Faculty members. The Dean replied that this was a present problem in a number of departments and that he knew of no answer to it. (The answer, since examined, is "no". N.P.) Professor Elias said that if Professor Blackall's amendment were defeated, he would move to delete 3.c.3. from the proposal. Professor Blackall withdrew his amendment, saying he was doing so on the basis of Professor Elias' statement. Professor Elias moved to strike 3.c.3. from the proposal and it carried.

Professor Robert E. Habel, Veterinary Anatomy, asked what was meant by the phrase "junior Faculty members" in paragraph 2.c. of the proposal. Professor Flash said that in some University units such as the B&PA School, Faculty members who have not yet completed their degree requirements are considered junior members. Assistant Professor Rukudzo Murapa, Africana Studies and Research Center (non-FCR), asked if the word "junior" referred to a person's age or his experience. Professor Flash replied that it referred to a person in an early stage of his career. The Dean suggested that the FCR should consider the phrase "junior Faculty members" as referring solely to teaching personnel at the University, and paragraph 2.c. as an exception to general rules concerning Faculty members which was inserted to allow for the completion of degree requirements. Further discussion on the ambiguousness of the phrase "junior Faculty members" and the need for substitute wording ensued. Professor Elias moved to substitute "persons." Carried. Professor Federer moved to omit paragraph 2.c. from the proposal. Carried. Professor Isadore Blumen,
I&LR, Member-at-Large, asked if the phrase "appointing unit" in paragraph 6.b. was meant to refer only to academic departments. Professor Flash replied that it referred to colleges, departments, centers and other academic units of the University, and Acting President Cooke added that appointments initiated by colleges are subject to Presidential approval. Professor Blumen said some centers at the University such as the Center for Religion, Ethics and Social Policy can make appointments without further approval. It is not clear, he said, according to a previous study in which he had taken part, whether or not all centers have such authority. An exception is the Africana Studies and Research Center which was given such authority by the Board of Trustees. He asked if the proposal would admit new lecturers to centers without approval from above. Professor Walter R. Lynn, Director, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Director, Center for Environmental Quality Management, Member-at-Large, said that the charters of three centers with which he is affiliated specifically define appointment procedures. Acting President Cooke confirmed Professor Lynn's view, and the Dean pointed out that the proposal under consideration in no way enlarges upon existing legislation. Professor Robert S. Pasley, Law, moved to recommit the proposal to Committee. Defeated. Professor Flash's proposal was carried as amended.

PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHING
TITLES OF SENIOR LECTURER AND LECTURER

The Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty recommends that the Faculty Council of Representatives approve establishment of two academic titles: Senior Lecturer and Lecturer. These titles may be used at the discretion of individual appointing units of the University in cases where professorial titles are not appropriate and in accordance with the conditions set forth below.

1. **The Senior Lecturer**

   a. Appointment to positions with title of Senior Lecturer reflects professional qualifications of experience and/or education generally comparable to those of Associate Professor or Professor.

   b. Appointment will be for a period of not more than five years and is renewable.
2. **The Lecturer**

a. Appointment to positions with the title Lecturer reflects professional qualifications of experience and/or education generally comparable to those of Instructor and Assistant Professor.

b. Appointment will be for a period of not more than three years and is renewable.

3. **Conditions Applicable to Both Titles**

a. Responsibilities will be primarily if not entirely in teaching; research responsibilities are not expected to be included. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are regarded primarily as teachers in relatively specialized areas of instruction.

b. The period or length of appointment will be stipulated at the time of offer and acceptance of the appointment. Consideration of renewal and the decision of whether or not to recommend renewal will be at the discretion of the appointing unit.

c. Persons holding either of these titles:

1. will not be granted tenure;

2. will be eligible to participate in retirement, insurance, and the Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship programs; and

3. will not be eligible for sabbatical leave.

4. **Limitations in Use of Titles**

The Senior Lecturer and Lecturer titles shall not be used:

a. To fill faculty positions, the teaching and research nature of which appropriately calls for professorial appointments;

b. as a substitute for tenure appointments or appointments that would normally lead to tenure; and

c. as a means of the appointing unit circumventing the commitments and obligations associated with the tenure appointments.

5. **Provisions Governing Transfer to and from Professorial Appointment**

a. Persons holding Senior Lecturer or Lecturer appointments may be considered for transfer to professorial rank when the assumption of both teaching and research responsibilities makes such consideration appropriate.
b. Persons holding professorial appointments may not be transferred to Senior Lecturer or Lecturer positions as a means of maintaining the employment of persons who have not qualified for retention via tenure appointment in accordance with criteria and procedures governing such appointments.

6. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer Title

a. Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer shall be based on standards of teaching excellence appropriate to the individual's assigned responsibilities and comparable to standards applicable to evaluation for professorial promotion.

b. Consideration for promotion shall follow procedures consistent with those followed in making tenure appointments and promotion except that it need not involve review outside the particular appointing unit.

7. Impact on Those Currently Holding Lectureship Titles

The appointments of persons currently holding the title of Lecturer will either be continued at that title or elevated to title of Senior Lecturer in accordance with the provisions of Paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

3. AMENDMENT TO CLASS SCHEDULE LEGISLATION

The Speaker called on the Secretary, Professor Robert M. Cotts, Physics, who offered the following resolution on behalf of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies:

RESOLVED, That paragraph 5 of the Daily Class Schedule be amended as follows:

(Deletions in brackets [ ], additons underlined)

5. Evening [hours] preliminary examinations which are to be given outside of normal class hours may be scheduled on Tuesday and Thursday [shall be reserved for preliminary examinations which] evenings only, and all such examinations shall be scheduled with the Examination and Room Coordinator in the Registrar's Office.

Explanation: At the May 9, 1973 meeting of the FCR, the Daily Class Schedule was amended with the provision that paragraph 5 would be returned to committee for revision. The above revision is the result of that charge.

Carried.
4. LEGISLATION ON COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT COURSES

The Speaker called on Professor Philip J. McCarthy, I&LR, Chairman of the Academic Programs and Policies Committee, to offer the following legislation:

The University Faculty Committee on Independent Courses is hereby established.

1. The principal function of this Committee is to review and to report on those independent courses offered for credit in which undergraduates may enroll. The purpose of this review is to provide adequate and timely information about such courses to the schools and colleges in order to help them make their decisions with regard to the granting of credit to their students for these courses. The Committee itself has no authority over the granting of credit and may not approve or disapprove the granting of credit by the colleges.

A secondary function of the Committee shall be to act as liaison with the administration and the schools and colleges in the maintenance of administrative mechanisms for independent courses (e.g. the listing, numbering and announcement of such courses).

2. Independent courses are defined as those courses, in which undergraduates may enroll, offered by Centers, Programs and other non-degree granting bodies in the University which are neither part of a school or college for course offering purposes nor supervised by another body designated by the University Faculty. Independent courses also include courses offered through a school or college primarily as a service to non-degree granting bodies where the current content of such courses have not been reviewed by the educational policy committee (or equivalent) of the approving school or college.

3. The Committee on Independent Courses shall consist of nine members of the faculty selected for staggered three-year terms by the Dean of the Faculty, who shall be an ex officio member. The members of the Committee shall be chosen with the advice of the respective educational policy committees of the undergraduate schools and colleges. The committee shall include at least one member from each such school or college and shall be as balanced as possible with respect to subject matter areas and academic rank.

The committee may make use of external subcommittees with expertise in the course topics.

4. All new independent courses shall be submitted to the Committee in sufficient time for prompt review before the term in which the course is to be offered. Existing independent courses shall be reviewed only if a review is requested by the President or by a school or college educational policy committee.
5. The review report of the Committee shall:

a) assess the academic quality of the proposed course, including its strengths and weaknesses,

b) indicate whether the subject of the course is within the jurisdiction of the sponsoring center or program as that jurisdiction is defined by the University Faculty or Trustees,

c) determine that the title is appropriate and that credit and academic content of the course are commensurate with accepted standards at Cornell University,

d) indicate whether college, school or departmental structures for providing such a course have been explored and found inadequate, and

e) shall state whether the course is to be directly supervised by a member of the University Faculty in whose general area of competence its subject lies. It is recognized that under extraordinary circumstances an appropriate instructor will not be a member of the University Faculty; in this case, his qualifications will be included in the review.

6. The review reports of the Committee will ordinarily go to the school and college educational policy committees and the body sponsoring the course. The Committee may make review reports available to the President and to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.

Professor McCarthy pointed out that the original proposal for a committee on independent courses originated in a subcommittee of the Deans' Council in May 1972 and was referred to his Committee by the FCR Executive Committee. In attempting to gauge reaction to the proposal in various schools and colleges, he said, the Committee met with two arguments against it. The first objection was that only a small amount of business would be brought before the University Faculty Committee on Independent Courses and therefore it seemed unwise to create such a committee. One cannot forecast what will happen in this respect, Professor McCarthy said. The second objection was that creating such a committee would stifle innovation. Neither his Committee members nor any educational policy committee members with whom the proposal had been discussed have any such intent, he said. He closed his presentation saying his Committee did not unanimously support the resolution and inviting Committee members to speak against it if they wished.
The question was asked why the educational policy committees cannot evaluate independent courses without outside help. Professor McCarthy deferred to Professor Herbert L. Everett, Plant Breeding and Biometry, Director, Resident Instruction, Member-at-Large, as a representative of the Agriculture and Life Sciences Educational Policy Committee, who said he thought it was better for information on independent courses to be disseminated to all colleges and schools simultaneously than for the educational policy committees to gather such information independently as is now the practice. Professor Murapa spoke against the proposal as imposing a bureaucratic restriction on educational policy committees, which he felt should communicate among themselves. He also felt the proposal constituted harassment in the sense that the Committee on Independent Courses might influence some educational policy committees against giving credit for a course.

Professor Lynn asked if the proposed Committee's function was merely to gather information, since credit granting is a function of the Faculty. Professor McCarthy replied that the proposal's intent is to create a "sounding board" for independent course proposals and to evaluate them. Professor Elias spoke against the proposal as creating "one more ineffectual powerless committee" and being worded ambiguously. Associate Professor Peter J. Kahn, Mathematics, supported Professor Elias' view, adding that he opposed having the new committee "predigest" material which educational policy committees ought to process themselves. Associate Professor Marion E. Minot, Community Service Education, supported the proposal, citing the difficulty of obtaining information about new courses offered by numerous centers at the University and obtaining sound evaluation of such courses. Professor Murapa asked if the proposal gave educational policy committees the option of consulting the new Committee or required them to do so. Professor McCarthy replied that recourse to the Committee would be optional, but that it would be mandatory for centers to submit courses to the Committee for evaluation. Professor Jensen asked Professor McCarthy if his committee had considered using representatives of the educational policy committees to make up the new Committee rather than using separate personnel. Professor McCarthy said his committee had originally considered having one member from each educational policy committee serve on the new Committee, but had decided to leave selection of committee members to the Dean of the Faculty and educational policy committees in order to provide greater flexibility in this area.
Professor Strout asked Professor McCarthy if he judged from their written responses to the proposal that the Director of the Center for International Studies and the former Provost, Professor Robert A. Plane, Chemistry, could possibly have been suffering from paranoia on this subject. Professor McCarthy replied affirmatively regarding the Director of the Center, but said he couldn't tell about the Provost since he had experienced trouble interpreting his response. Professor Strout commented that such difficulties indicated an "unhealthy" environment for the proposal. Professor McCarthy pointed out that a possible cause for concern about the proposal lay in its second paragraph describing the Committee's secondary function of acting as liaison with schools and colleges in maintenance of administrative mechanisms for independent courses.

The Speaker tried but failed to bring the question to a vote.

Adjourned: 6:00 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary
The Dean of the Faculty, Norman Penney, called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and relinquished the chair to the Acting Speaker pro tem, Professor Paul Olum. 56 members and no visitors were present. The minutes of the meetings of September 19 and October 10, 1973, were approved as distributed. The speaker called on the Dean for a brief report.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN

a. The Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty has recommended approving promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor without tenure, a new title. Two professional schools, B&PA and Law, are concerned and interested in such promotions, the Dean said, and no ByLaw provision applies to the situation. He said he was forwarding the Committee's recommendation to the Acting Provost and informing the FCR of the matter so it could take action if it so desired.

b. An ad hoc committee has been formed to evaluate the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education on the conclusion of its first three years of operation. The committee chairman is Professor Raphael M. Littauer, Nuclear Studies. Members are Professor William T. Keeton, Biological Sciences, Assistant Professor Dennis Regan, Psychology, Professor Richard Ripple, Rural Education, Assistant Professor Barbara Koslowski, Human Ecology, and Professor Gilbert Levine, Agricultural Engineering. Professor Levine will also serve as liaison with the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.

c. The Committee on Academic Records and Instruction recommends, subject to FCR approval, granting the New York State Veterinary College's request for exemption from FCR legislation on new classroom schedules regarding final examination scheduling.

d. The Dean announced he was referring the report of the ad hoc committee on International Studies to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.

e. The Dean asked for and received consent to invite Mr. George Peter, Research Engineer, Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, to attend the meeting with speaking privileges and to answer questions during discussion of agenda item VI, a proposal to add a University employee to the Board of Trustees.
Following the announcements made by Dean Penney, two members of the body expressed concern over the proposal for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure. Professor Mark Nelkin, Engineering, asked if the recommendation would change the six-year requirement for granting of tenure and was told it would not. Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Engineering, expressed concern about this procedure being implemented without a full report to the FCR and an opportunity to debate the proposal. After determining that other members of the FCR shared Professor Cady's concern, the Dean agreed to refer the matter back to the Committee on Professional and Economic Status to be put in the form of a resolution and report for consideration by the FCR.

Professor William T. Dean, Member-at-Large, asked the Dean to inquire into the matter of certain courses advertised in the Cornell Daily Sun as being offered without credit. He also asked the Dean to investigate formation of a committee to evaluate the Learning Skills Center in light of recent disclosures about its program. The Dean agreed to obtain information and report to the FCR on both matters. Professor Peter C. Stein, Physics, inquired about the status of the student petition to abolish the Physical Education requirement, and was told by the Dean that the petition had been referred to Academic Programs and Policies which had formed a special committee, chaired by Associate Professor Richard H. Rand, Engineering, to look into the matter.

2. CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT COURSES

The Speaker opened the floor to continued discussion of legislation proposed by the Academic Programs and Policies Committee at the previous meeting. Professor Isadore Blumen, Member-at-Large, spoke in favor of the legislation, pointing out that Center-sponsored courses have been a long-standing source of complaint and that the problem was created by the fact that, under University ByLaws, individual schools and colleges bear responsibility for approving such courses. The Deans' Council at one time examined the problem, he said, and proposed restrictive measures to control Centers and their courses. The matter was not at that time discussed with Academic Programs and Policies or any other recognized Faculty body, he said. The University needs a central evaluative structure not only to evaluate independent courses but to control solicitation and advertising procedures. The legislation tries to impose order on the system without restricting the richness of Center-sponsored courses, and to create a single screening device under Faculty control without containing or envisioning punitive action. Under the legislation the various Faculty units of the University retain authority to grant credit for independent courses.
Assistant Professor Norman Uphoff, Government, stated that if a clearing-house is needed for such courses, this function can be performed by a set of procedures and a secretary. If the need is for a means to assess academic quality of such courses, this is too great a burden for one committee and clearly falls within the province of educational policy committees at the schools and colleges. Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large, opposed the legislation saying it creates a process of dual review by a "super committee" and the educational policy committees, many of whom will proceed without sanction from the committee on independent courses. He also objected to the phrase, "accepted standards at Cornell University" in section 5.c. of the legislation, calling determination of such standards "mind-boggling" and saying they had never been defined. He termed the chronology of the legislation's evaluation procedure burdensome and frustrating of innovation and recommended giving the Deans' Council the role of a clearing-house with responsibility for deciding which EPC should evaluate particular Center-sponsored courses. (As corrected by Professor Elias at 12/12/73 meeting.)

Professor L. Pearce Williams, History, supported the legislation, saying it would not block innovative teaching since Center-supported courses are not those normally taught by Faculty members. The committee on independent courses would serve to prevent educational policy committees from approving unacceptable courses, he said, thus filling a needed watchdog function.

Professor Robin Williams, Sociology, also supported the legislation, saying educational policy committees have not adequately performed their functions. Under the legislation the committee on independent courses will have adequate access to the advice it needs in order to evaluate new offerings. The question was called and the motion carried.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT COURSES
The University Faculty Committee on Independent Courses is hereby established.

1. The principal function of this Committee is to review and report on those independent courses offered for credit in which undergraduates may enroll. The purpose of this review is to provide adequate and timely information about such courses to the schools and colleges in order to help them make their decisions with regard to the granting of credit to their students for these courses. The Committee itself has no authority over the granting of credit and may not approve or disapprove the granting of credit by the colleges.

A secondary function of the Committee shall be to act as liaison with the administration and the schools and colleges in the maintenance of administrative mechanisms for independent courses (e.g. the listing, numbering and announcement of such courses).
2. Independent courses are defined as those courses, in which undergraduates may enroll, offered by Centers, Programs and other non-degree granting bodies in the University which are neither part of a school or college for course offering purposes nor supervised by another body designated by the University Faculty. Independent courses also include courses offered through a school or college primarily as a service to non-degree granting bodies where the current content of such courses have not been reviewed by the educational policy committee (or equivalent) of the approving school or college.

3. The Committee on Independent Courses shall consist of nine members of the faculty selected for staggered three-year terms by the Dean of the Faculty, who shall be an ex officio member. The members of the Committee shall be chosen with the advice of the respective educational policy committees of the undergraduate schools and colleges. The committee shall include at least one member from each such school or college and shall be as balanced as possible with respect to subject matter areas and academic rank.

The committee may make use of external subcommittees with expertise in the course topics.

4. All new independent courses shall be submitted to the Committee in sufficient time for prompt review before the term in which the course is to be offered. Existing independent courses shall be reviewed only if a review is requested by the President or by a school or college educational policy committee.

5. The review report of the Committee shall:

a) assess the academic quality of the proposed course, including its strengths and weaknesses,

b) indicate whether the subject of the course is within the jurisdiction of the sponsoring center or program as that jurisdiction is defined by the University Faculty or Trustees,

c) determine that the title is appropriate and that credit and academic content of the course are commensurate with accepted standards at Cornell University,

d) indicate whether college, school or departmental structures for providing such a course have been explored and found inadequate, and

e) shall state whether the course is to be directly supervised by a member of the University Faculty in whose general area of competence its subject lies. It is recognized that under extraordinary circumstances an appropriate instructor will not be a member of the University Faculty; in this case, his qualifications will be included in the review.
6. The review reports of the Committee will ordinarily go to the school and college educational policy committees and the body sponsoring the course. The Committee may make review reports available to the President and to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.

3. **RESOLUTION ON ACCESS TO COURSES**

The Speaker called on Professor Elias as a member of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning to offer the following resolution on behalf of the Committee.

**RESOLVED, That the following statement be published in all Cornell University Announcements:**

All academic courses of the University are open to students of all races, religions, ethnic origins, ages, sexes, and political persuasions. No requirement, prerequisite, device, rule or other means shall be used by any employee of the University to encourage, establish or maintain segregation on the basis of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, sex, or political persuasion in any academic course of the University.

Carried without dissent.

4. **SENATE PROPOSAL FOR EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION ON BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

The Speaker called on Associate Professor David B. Wilson, Biological Sciences, who moved FCRC approval of a constitutional amendment voted by the University Senate reducing the number of persons from outside the University serving as Trustees from four to three and adding one University employee elected by the employees for a two-year term as Trustee.

**ENACTED, That the Senate proposes that the Constitution be amended as follows:**

**ARTICLE III - REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT**

e. Up to three [four] persons from outside the University, to be elected by the Senate for four-year terms, the initial three to be elected one each year for three [four] consecutive years.

f. One employee elected by the employees for a two-year term.

Furthermore, the Senate recommends to the faculty that this amendment be placed on the agenda of an early meeting of the University Faculty and urges its approval.

The Speaker recognized Mr. George Peter, chairman of the Senate Committee on the University as an Employer, to speak in support of the amendment. Mr. Peter said the Senate recognized, in passing the amendment, both the need to provide
input to University governance from all parts of the organization and the fact that employees have more longstanding connections with the University than students and some Faculty members. Professor Uphoff asked how many employees were at the University, and Mr. Peter replied about five thousand. Professor Francis M. Isenberg, Vegetable Crops, asked if electing an employee to the Board of Trustees would violate the State Labor Law, and Mr. Peter replied that according to the Senate's research it would not. Mr. Peter was asked how the employee trustee would be elected and said he believed election would be by the Cornell community in the process of a regular Senate election. Professor Stein asked if the term employee is well defined in the Senate amendment, and are research associates included. Mr. Peter said there is a clear Senate definition of employees which includes research associates. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if the amendment did not take away from the Faculty a portion of its control over the University. He asked the Dean to comment on whether the proposal would represent a reduction of Faculty influence over academic affairs. The Dean replied that in his experience there are not many universities with Faculty serving on the Board of Trustees. The existence of the FCR shows that the Faculty is active in University governance, he said, and placing one employee on a 69-member Board which includes townspeople and students does not offer a threat to the Faculty. Carried, with one dissenting vote.

Adjourned: 5:40 p.m.

J. Leeming, assistant to the Secretary
The Acting Provost, W. Donald Cooke, called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and relinquished the chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell Martin. 52 members and 2 visitors were present. The minutes of the meeting of November 14 were approved with one correction offered by Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large. He said he had not recommended giving responsibility for Center-sponsored courses to the Deans' Council, as stated at the bottom of page 2 of the minutes, but rather that the Council should serve as a clearinghouse for consideration of such courses, and offered to provide amended wording for that portion.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

The Speaker called on the Secretary and Acting Dean of the Faculty, Professor Robert M. Cotts, for a report.

a. On December 11 the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the PCR's recommendation dealing with freedom of access to academic courses which was passed at the meeting of November 14.

b. As a result of deliberations at the November 14 meeting, the Executive Committee has referred the proposal to establish a new position, Associate Professor without tenure, to the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty with instructions to consider the proposal for the University as a whole rather than just professional schools.

c. The Executive Committee elected Professor Walter R. Lynn, Member-at-Large, Chairman for spring and summer 1974 to replace Professor William T. Dean, Member-at-Large, who will be on leave.

d. The Secretary reported on recent discussions by members of the Research Policies Committee concerning development of the affiliation agreement with Boyce Thompson Research Institute of Yonkers, N.Y. (BTI). The proposed move to Cornell has been under development since July 1973 when the New York State Legislature appropriated $8,500,000 to build a laboratory building and greenhouses and to acquire land on the Cornell campus, he said. The University Counsel has been preparing an affiliation agreement which would require approval by Cornell, BTI and New York State's Director of the Budget, and supplying the Dean of the Faculty with copies as changes are incorporated,
the latest being received November 13. Research Policies has examined the agreement without taking the entire agreement up for serious study. The Committee has expressed concern over wording regarding possible restrictions on research publications, specifically in contracts BTI might make; in institutional restrictions on BTI scientists when publishing their work; and, because of the nature of some fraction of BTI's research, in restrictions on Cornell Faculty or graduate students who might join in BTI research. Professor Willard J. Visek, Animal Science, Chairman of Research Policies, met with other principals involved, and a draft affiliation agreement consolidating the Committee's concerns and acceptable to BTI appears fairly imminent. Agreement among all parties is expected by January 1, 1974, the Secretary concluded, although the Internal Revenue Service must rule on some aspects of the agreement before legal steps can conclude.

e. In response to the question raised at the November 14 meeting by Professor Dean regarding Learning Skills Center courses, the Secretary said that the Committee on Special Educational Projects (COSEP) is offering courses to its students in four subjects at the pre-college level in lieu of tutorial help. The subjects are chemistry, biology, physics and composition, and students were told the courses would be granted three hours of credit. The departments involved have endorsed, but not sponsored, the courses and in most cases have supplied instructors who have been working as tutors with COSEP or are experienced teaching assistants or who hold post-doctoral positions. Average enrollment is eight to ten students, the Secretary said, and the credit being granted has been approved by the Arts College Educational Policy Committee and does not apply to graduation. The arrangement is understood to have been made for a single year and is being reviewed by the principals involved and departmental representatives.

f. At the Secretary's request, Professor Dean reported on the Executive Committee's role in 1974-75 budget planning. Professor Dean said he believed this was the first time the
President had invited the FCR to participate in advance budget discussions. The Committee's first concern was how the FCR was to proceed within the time allowed it. The budget was first referred to the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty for study of provisions within its purview, and that Committee's report was received and forwarded to the President. During meetings with the President, the Acting Provost, the Vice President for Administration and other administration officials, the Executive Committee did its best to familiarize itself with the process, recognizing it lacked machinery to deal adequately with so complex and evanescent a subject as the budget for a period one year hence. The Committee concentrated on so-called nonmandated, or discretionary funds, Professor Dean said, which represent a small portion of the budget, and reached a consensus that priority should be given to the Libraries and Museums and to items pertaining to postponed maintenance of buildings and grounds. The Committee also proposed that the FCR's Review and Procedures Committee consider what committee structure would enable the FCR to respond adequately to future such invitations, the President having indicated that he wished FCR participation in budget discussions to become an annual procedure. The Committee informed the President of its concern regarding discretionary funds, indicated that it would be necessary for the FCR to respond not only to the endowed college budgets, as it did this year, but to the statutory budgets as well, and suggested that it would be helpful if some idea could be given to the FCR of "tradeoff" procedures in budget making. It is essential, he said, in order to make any serious recommendation, for the FCR to know what other departments are deprived of funds when additional allocations are made to the Libraries. Professor Dean concluded by inviting questions from the floor.

Professor Paul Olum, Member-at-Large, asked Professor Dean if the Executive Committee had been able to influence the amount of discretionary funds made available for 1974-75, and was told that within the time allowed the Committee felt it could
not do so. Professor Olum stated that determining how much is available to spend is the crucial question in the budget-making process. Accepting a predetermined amount of discretionary funds means accepting a budgeting matrix into which priorities must be fit. If the Faculty is to have any real influence on budget matters, it must present priorities to budget officials at an early stage, and convince them of the need to make money available for priority items rather than fitting priorities into available income. Otherwise there will be inevitable erosion of quality at the University. Professor Peter Stein, Physics, said he welcomed the Administration's invitation to the Faculty to take part in budget discussions and considered this to be an important Faculty function. He suggested that the FCR appoint a committee to study the budget process and views such as Professor Olum's. Professor Dean was asked if copies of the report of the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty would be made available to the FCR and the Secretary agreed to distribute copies to the membership.

The Speaker asked if there were any questions for the Secretary.

Professor Stein requested clarification of the Secretary's comments on BTI research and asked if such research was classified. The Secretary replied that the affiliation agreement makes clear that there be no classified research conducted by BTI on campus. His and the Research Policies Committee's original concerns in this regard stemmed from a lack of information, he said, plus the fact that BTI conducts research for private corporations and may enjoy the equivalent of a classified research status so far as such corporations are concerned. BTI is a public service nonprofit research institute, he said, and is obliged by its charter to publish its research results. It is anxious to do so, he said, adding that the final draft affiliation agreement should dispel these concerns.

2. RESOLUTION ON COMPUTER GOVERNANCE

The Speaker called on Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Engineering, who on behalf of the Research Policies Committee moved the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That the Dean of the Faculty request of the Provost the privilege of having a Faculty member, representing the FCR, serve as a voting member on the University Computing Board, the representative to be selected in a manner approved by the FCR.
Professor deBoer spoke to the motion, saying that following the FCR's discussions of funds for a new computer earlier in the academic year the Executive Committee passed a resolution calling for changes in FCR governance to enable the Faculty to prepare itself for the next major expenditure in this area. The Research Policies subcommittee which drafted the present resolution recognized the need to prepare for many decisions involving such questions as computer purchase versus joining a regional system, improvement of computer services and distribution of computer time between academic and instructional computing. The University Computing Board, appointed by the Provost, consists of Faculty members expert in computer science. Although its members feel the Board is responsive to Faculty opinion, Professor deBoer said, the difficulty is that basic questions originate with the Board and despite the best of intentions are not always brought before the Faculty because the Board has no direct relation to the FCR. Implementation of the resolution can be achieved either by having an FCR member appointed by the Dean to serve on the Board, or by an election, Professor deBoer said. The subcommittee feels the member should be elected by the body and should be an FCR committee member so that he may obtain FCR reaction to his ideas without having to bring them to the attention of the main body.

Professor Elias referred to the list of decisions facing the University Computing Board distributed with the call to meeting, and in reference to the last item on the list, "Questions regarding invasion of privacy by the establishment of 'personal data banks,'" asked if such banks exist and the only question is avoiding invasion of privacy, or if the creation of such banks is contemplated, the scope of which is as yet unknown. Professor deBoer replied that the only such bank contemplated is the Student Information System, which does not affect the Faculty, but that there is a tendency to move in the direction of such banks and the Faculty should keep in touch with developments. The Acting Provost added that confidential information on persons is already on computer tape in the form of payroll figures and student grades. The question, he said, is what kinds of technical safeguards must be established regarding such information. Professor Elias asked who decides what goes into data banks. The Acting Provost said that he didn't know, but guessed such decisions were made individually by various colleges and schools at the University. Professor Robert Pasley, Law, stated that in regard to the Student Information System being set up the Provost had appointed a Faculty-student committee to determine guidelines for entering information in the System. He
said he believed similar data of a limited nature was being collected on faculty members, requiring another committee to be appointed to make policy on the matter. The Secretary conveyed to the body the Dean's understanding that, as part of the legislative intent of the resolution, the FCR member who served on the Board should be someone knowledgeable regarding computers. The resolution carried.

3. AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Speaker called on Professor Jason Seley, Architecture, Art and Planning, a member of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, who moved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That IV.A.9 of the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity and paragraph 2. of the examples of ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD be amended as follows:

(deletions in brackets [], additions underlined)

IV. PROCEDURES
A. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board
9. When time intervals prescribed in the penalty have elapsed, the Board will consider petitions for:
   a. Re-admission to the University in the event of suspension.
   b. Removal of any penalty statements that may appear on the student's transcript[] including in the case of suspension or dismissal Registrar's notations indicating the action and the reason for the action.

ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board determines the actions which it may impose. Should a person be found guilty of a violation of the Code, he may have several actions imposed simultaneously.

These are examples of actions which may be taken by the Board:
1. Expulsion from the University.
2. Suspension from the University. Suspension may be for a limited period, e.g., one term, or for an indefinite period. In the latter circumstance, readmission will be granted only through successful petition to the Board. Notation of the suspension appears on any and all transcripts until graduation or successful petition to have the record of his action removed.
3. A record, "Declared guilty of ... by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board", is placed on the student's academic record card. This notation appears on any and all transcripts until graduation, formal withdrawal from the University, or successful petition to have the record of his action removed.
Professor Seley explained that the Board interprets IV.A.9.b. of the Code of Academic Integrity as referring to the record of penalty, not to any notation of action taken and the reason for such action which may be added to a student's academic record card by the Registrar. By the amendment, he said, the Board is asking for the power to remove the Registrar's notation as well as the record of action taken by the Board from a student's card upon successful appeal of the action. Professor Robert E. Habel, Veterinary Science, asked the difference between expulsion and dismissal, the latter term having been used in the amendment but not in related sections of the Code. Professor Seley said he supposed either term could substitute for the other. Professor Stein said he thought it a mistake, in view of the seriousness of suspension from the University, to expunge notation of such penalty from a student's record. Professor Seley replied that the Board merely wished to be able to remove the Registrar's notation of the reason for suspension and asked if it seemed appropriate for the Registrar to "embroider" upon information supplied him by the Board. Associate Professor Richard N. Boyd, Philosophy, asked if the Registrar's notations followed standard procedure or varied from case to case. The Secretary replied that he understood from the Dean that the notation does not vary and does not describe a student's crime, but that it makes clear the reason for suspension by attributing it to action of the Board. A principle argument made for removing notation of suspension after successful appeal, he said, is to provide action corresponding with that taken for lesser offenses where the Code requires that notation appears on a student's record "until graduation, formal withdrawal, or successful petition to have the record of action removed." Keeping notation of suspension on a student's record may hinder him in obtaining employment after he is readmitted to the University and graduates from it.

Professor Olum pointed out that notation showing the lifting of suspension is now added to student record cards, and asked if the Board wished to remove all record of suspension when this occurs. Professor Seley replied in the affirmative, noting that a suspended student, having successfully appealed to gain readmittance to the University, may be hindered in applying to graduate school if his record continues to show the actions taken until he graduates from the University. Professor Robin M. Williams, Jr., Sociology, pointed out that the FCR was being asked to empower the Board to take action, not to mandate what that action should be. Professor William F. Mai, Plant Pathology, asked how the Registrar receives information as to a student's crime if it is
not supplied by the Board, and Professor Seley replied that the Registrar's notation reads: "suspended by action of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board," and acknowledged that he may have erred in indicating that the Registrar supplemented information supplied by the Board. Associate Professor Toby Berger, Engineering, asked if the amendment would result in completely removing all notations of the penalty of suspension having been imposed as well as of it having been lifted. The Secretary replied that he assumed such would be the case since the amendment uses the phrase "any and all transcripts."

Professor Richard M. Talman, Physics, said it was difficult to understand the subject being discussed, and asked if, in regard to entering notations of penalties on students' records, the Registrar exercised any function other than recording the Board's decisions. Professor Elias said his understanding of the point at issue was that at present notation of all penalties are removed from a student's record when he graduates or withdraws formally from the University or succeeds in petitioning for removal of such notation, with the possible exception of records of suspension and expulsion, and that the Board is asking for power to remove notations before a student graduates rather than having the removal occur automatically upon graduation. Professor Seley concurred in this description. Professor Stein disagreed, saying that the amendment's language provides for automatic removal of notation of suspension upon graduation. The Secretary replied that the decision to hear a petition could still be made at the Board's discretion. Professor Mark Nelkin, Engineering, asked if all notations of penalties including suspension are removed from records upon graduation. The Secretary replied that a record of suspension is not automatically removed upon graduation, whereas records of lesser penalties are removed. Professor Elias moved to recommit. Carried.

Adjourned: 5:28 p.m.

J. Leeming, Assistant to the Secretary
The Acting President, W. Donald Cooke, called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and relinquished the chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell Martin. 76 members and 4 visitors were present. Minutes of the meeting of December 12 were approved as distributed.

1. **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEAN**

The Speaker called on the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney. The Dean noted the presence of three visitors, Mr. Byron McCalmon, the University Registrar, Mr. Richard Stumbar, Law 1974, Executive Secretary of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, and Mr. Warren Smith, administrative intern in the President's and Provost's office. He announced that his three-year term as Dean was in its third year and that he would shortly convene the Nominations and Elections Committee of the University Faculty to solicit nominations for his successor to be elected within approximately one month.

For the benefit of the Faculty, the Dean reported on the status and contents of the affiliation agreement being made with Boyce Thompson Research Institute (BTI). The latest draft of the agreement ran to at least 30 pages, he said, and might be signed as soon as the coming week. A bill passed by the State Legislature in July 1973 provided $8,500,000 for construction of a 65,000 square foot research laboratory and greenhouse on the campus as well as 25 acres of land for experimental plant research. New York Governor Wilson had been very much involved in the effort to persuade BTI to stay in the State, a fact which had some impact on the handling of the agreement. The Dean wrote the President in August stating his concerns about research provisions and restrictions in the agreement as well as the impact of BTI's move on the campus, the Faculty and University facilities. The President discussed the agreement at the September Faculty Meeting and had a copy of the draft agreement sent to the Dean, a summary of which was made by the Secretary and printed in the Cornell Chronicle issue of October 4. The Dean then summarized the agreement. First it defines research facilities and support services to be provided BTI by Cornell from State appropriations so that BTI would pay no rent to the University. Second, it describes the BTI program commitment in terms of its research program and the planned opportunities for collaboration and cooperation with Cornell staff in research. Opportunities for Faculty and graduate student research are anticipated. Third, the agreement defines the independence of BTI as a research institute and sets out its management structure. The board
of BTI is to be reorganized so as to include a substantial Cornell involvement. Fourth, it identifies certain research restrictions. No classified research will be permitted on campus. Plans for publication of research jointly decided by investigators and management are described. All research is to be publishable. In joint BTI-Cornell efforts, controls on publication are to be determined by each individual's primary employment status, and where necessary agreement on publication controls will be worked out in advance by those individuals. The agreement also spells out principles of patent and copyright agreements and other points including an understanding on the use of the corporate names of each institution. The agreement is to be for 20 years and can be renewed or canceled after that time on proper notice.

The Faculty, the Dean said, through its Research Policies Committee, expressed concern over the section of the agreement dealing with research restrictions, specifically the understanding on Faculty and graduate student research participation and the employment contract between BTI management and the professional staff. Representatives of the Committee, University administration and BTI management met, and a version of the agreement drafted in January appeared to meet the Committee's concerns. Early in January the Committee summarized its position on research restrictions in a statement to the University Counsel. The Committee concentrated on areas within its province, and did not make an extensive study of the agreement, the Dean said. Final approval requires agreement among the University, State University of New York, BTI and the New York State Director of the Budget. A ruling by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service is also needed. The Dean concluded by saying that the Research Policies Committee had effectively insured that BTI's move to Cornell would be in keeping with Faculty concerns, this despite the fact that complicated negotiations with BTI had been set in motion in such a way as to prevent bringing each issue before the University Faculty for discussion on a program basis.

The Dean pointed out that Professor Willard Visek, Animal Science, Chairman of the Research Policies Committee, and the Acting President, who had been involved in BTI negotiations, were present and asked if there were any questions. Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B&PA, asked what the University's liabilities were for operating budget and capital so far as BTI was concerned. The Dean said the agreement limits operating liabilities to funds the University receives from State appropriations. The impact on endowed units would only affect such common facilities as the libraries. He added that he knew of no capital expenditures the University was subject to except the land provided BTI.
Professor Hutchins asked if the Faculty could expect a request from BTI that its staff members become members of the Faculty. The Dean replied that provision for Faculty membership was clearly spelled out in the agreement, and that about 30 BTI staff members qualify for courtesy Faculty appointments (Adjunct appointments) which would be made under the same controls and procedures as regular Faculty appointments and be subject to invitation from the appropriate deans. They are to be called adjunct professors, he added. Professor Peter C. Stein, Physics, asked if BTI expected to interact with University computer facilities. The Acting President replied that BTI would not be on campus for three years, and that he could not answer any question about computer operations three years hence.

2. **AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The Speaker called on Professor Francis M.R. Isenberg, Vegetable Crops, member of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, to present the attached resolution (see Appendix A, 1 and 2).

The Secretary explained that the words "or dismissal" had been deleted from IV.A.9.b. of the amendment since the last meeting as being redundant. It had fallen on him, he said, to clarify the amendment pursuant to the FCR's request at its last meeting, and accordingly a new explanation of the legislation had been distributed with the call to this meeting. The legislation deals with two actions arising from academic infractions, he said. The more severe one is suspension. Less severe is what is known as a penalty statement, which states that a student has been found guilty of a misdemeanor or other minor offense by action of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board. Action in the latter case is limited to the statement, i.e. the student is told of the Board's decision and the Registrar is directed to place the statement on the student's transcript. According to the present Code of Academic Integrity, that statement appears on the transcript until a student graduates, formally withdraws from the University or petitions to have it removed. When a student is suspended for a definite or indefinite period, on the other hand, the Registrar is not specifically directed to note the action although such notation is being made under current practice. One purpose of the legislation is to clarify the Code so that the Registrar is indeed asked to make such notation. The second part of the legislation is intended to state the conditions under which notation of suspension could or would be removed from the transcript, thus making the situations affecting suspension and a penalty statement parallel
each other. The amendment defines conditions under which notation of suspension could be removed, namely by graduation of the student who had returned to the University by means of some understanding or perhaps by applying for readmission, in which case removal would be automatic, or upon successful petition to have the action removed. This might occur after a student returned to the University and before his graduation. In this latter case the Board retains the power to decide whether or not to remove a notation of suspension. The Secretary added that he had brought with him examples of both the Board's statements asking the Registrar to place notations on transcripts and the Registrar's notations if the body wished to see them.

Professor Isenberg commented that the Board thought it desirable that it have authority to hear petitions and be able to remove suspension principally because many suspended students who return to the University do well academically and want to send transcripts to professional schools prior to graduation. He said he thought such records should be a matter of internal administration and he was reluctant to see confidential records leave the University without the Board's control.

Professor Thomas A. Sokol, Music, asked if, in the case of a second infringement of the Academic Integrity Code by a student whose first suspension had been completely erased, the Board would take the first suspension into account in its deliberations on the second offense. Professor Isenberg said this had never happened, but that he thought the Board would judge the second case on its merits and give an appropriate penalty. The Board would know about the situation from its own records, he said. Professor Stein read from the amendment (paragraph 2. of examples of actions which may be taken by the Board): "Notation of the suspension appears on any and all transcripts until graduation or successful petition to have the record of his action removed." That statement, he said, implies absolutely that notation of suspension is automatically removed upon graduation. However, the Secretary seemed to say otherwise in his summation. The Secretary replied that currently a notation of suspension does not automatically "disappear" upon graduation, but that the purpose of the motion is to have this occur. Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, asked if transcripts of students' records are sent only to graduate schools. Professor Isenberg said this was not the case, and that transcripts were sent to all professional schools requesting them. He added that if a student were unaware of a notation being made on his record, he
might not see such a notation on examining his record under glass, since it
would be on the reverse side of the transcript. Professor Bronfenbrenner
inquired as to the meaning of the phrase "under glass." Mr. McCalmon
explained that the normal record card does not have data entered on the back
side, but any sort of penalty notation is entered in a "Comment" section on
the back. When a request to furnish a transcript is received, a copy is made
and the notation entered on the front of the copy. The net result, he said,
is that if the Registrar's Office errs it is in the student's favor. When a
student attends the University for more than 12 terms, the Registrar's Office
begins entering data on the back of the permanent record card, and only then
would there be occasion for a student to turn his record over while reviewing
it. The Registrar added that his office asks students to come in at their
convenience and review their permanent record cards each term. Professor
H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, asked why the record was shown to students
under glass. Mr. McCalmon replied that this is done in an attempt to keep
permanent record cards clean. Handling them tends to cause smudges, and in
some cases, particularly during summer session, computer printouts of grades
are of such poor quality that as much as fifty percent of the cards must be
redone. Professor Hutchins asked the Registrar how he responds to requests
from outside the University as to whether or not a student has ever been
suspended or otherwise penalized after the record of such penalty has been
removed from the transcript. Mr. McCalmon explained that his office releases
transcripts only in response to subpoenae or with a student's consent, and
that his response to such requests is to refer the party to the student
concerned or to recommend legal means of obtaining the information. Professor
Isenberg pointed out that if the notation had been removed, viewing the
transcript would not reveal a student's previously receiving a penalty.
Professor Paul Olum, Member-at-Large, pointed out what he called the moral
issue underlying the discussion, i.e., he understood that a student is only
suspended under extraordinary circumstances, and there is reason to believe that
when this event occurs notation of the reason should be kept permanently on the
student's record. Therefore, he asked, why is it so urgent to enable the
Registrar to remove such notation? Mr. Stumbar said that determining the
extremity of a violation is a subjective process. The Board does not primarily
look upon itself as supplying retribution, he said, but often rehabilitation,
and it needs the flexibility to be able to decide if it is in a student's best
interest to spend a term away from the University. The Board still has the
right to keep a penalty notation in a student's record until graduation, he said. He also pointed out that the Registrar's action in noting a penalty statement on a student's record is an internal administrative procedure, done without the Board's authority, and that the Board was not aware of the practice until recently. Such action takes away from the Board's flexibility, he said. Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, asked if, upon passage of the amendment, all penalty notations would be removed upon graduation. Mr. Stumbar replied affirmatively. Mr. McCalmon informed the body that the Educational Policy Committees of schools and colleges give far more suspensions than does the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, and that those notations cannot be removed without the permission of an EPC. If a student returns to the University and his record does not show a previous penalty, the re-admitting educational unit of the University notes his or her readmittance, thus starting a process which would alert interested parties to the fact that the student had previously attended the University.

Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Engineering, said it seemed overly complicated to keep records of the fact that a penalty has been removed. He therefore suggested that a decision be made as to who owns information on record cards, that penalties be noted only on the backs of cards, and that it be made policy to reproduce only the fronts of transcripts for sending outside the University. Such a procedure would establish that a student shares ownership of the information on his permanent record card with the University. Professor Stein also spoke against the motion, saying he was unhappy with the "distortion" of records, i.e., entering a penalty and then removing it. Also he opposed the concept of removing all evidence of cheating. He said that although he was shocked by cheating it nevertheless is a fact of life, just as failing a course is, and erasing such events from the record in no way changes the fact that they occurred. Professor Isenberg also spoke against the motion on the ground that many infringements of the Academic Integrity Code stem from stupidity rather than dishonesty, and a record of such infringements should not be allowed to enter the public domain by being disseminated by the University. Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large, said he believed the point at issue was whether the Faculty wished to treat suspension like lesser penalties or as a special case. If the Faculty felt suspension is like lesser penalties, then it should discuss the whole penalty procedure. A vote against the amendment meant suspension was considered
separate from lesser penalties. If the Faculty passed the motion, this would mean there are two kinds of suspension, one that can be removed by petition and one that cannot. It would also mean that all suspension penalties would be removed automatically upon graduation and might be removed earlier by petition, although a student might not succeed in petitioning for removal. Associate Professor Richard N. Boyd, Philosophy, said the Academic Integrity Hearing Board seemed to be arguing that infractions committed in early undergraduate years have no effect on later academic performance and should not be considered a bar to admission to graduate school. However, the automatic removal of penalty notations works against this argument. He therefore moved to divide the question so that the Faculty could vote first on whether or not all suspensions should be automatically removed upon graduation, and second on whether or not the Board should be empowered to have some suspension notices removed either prior to or after graduation. The motion was seconded and carried. Professor Elias asked for a reading of the first question, i.e., that part of the amendment dealing with automatic removal. The Secretary suggested amending paragraph 2. of examples of actions which may be taken by the Board by deleting the phrase "graduation or" from the last sentence. Professor Elias asked for a verbatim reading of that portion of the main motion that the Secretary was trying to amend. The Speaker asked Professor Boyd if he could supply wording for this part of the amendment that would satisfy him as the mover. Professor Boyd said the easiest way to divide the question might be for him to withdraw his motion to divide providing the Secretary moved to delete the words "graduation or" from paragraph 2. Professor Douglas E. Hogue, Member-at-Large, suggested dividing the question so as to vote first on whether or not suspension notations can be removed upon graduation, and second, if it is decided that suspension notations can be removed before graduation, whether or not a student can petition for such removal. The Speaker obtained a rescinding of Professor Boyd's motion to divide and Professor Boyd then moved to delete the words "graduation or" from paragraph 2. Carried without debate.

In debate on the amendment as amended, Professor L. Pearce Williams, Member-at-Large, agreed with Professors Stein and Olum. It seemed clear, he said, that the Academic Integrity Hearing Board members have both the judgment and the discretion to distinguish between student "capers" and wilful infractions of the Code, and that the Board will only suspend a student who has violated the Code so badly that he cannot avoid suspension. Therefore, the record should show such suspension, and a Faculty devoted to the search for truth should not
go on record as being willing to cover up the truth when it is petitioned to
do so. Professor Elias asked the Executive Secretary of the Board if what
professor Williams had said was factually true, i.e., that the only suspensions
given by the Board are for blatant violations of the Code. Mr. Stumbar replied
that he would like not to think so. The Board acted according to each student's
situation, he said, and had perceived situations where suspension for a lesser
infraction seemed proper. Professor Stein said he had learned by talking with
his colleagues that the Board had apparently not given out any suspensions
recently, and he had been told of several examples of infractions committed
which seemed deserving of suspension but received lesser penalties. Suspension
is apparently applied only to multiple infractions, he said. Moreover,
detecting cheating is extremely difficult, and talk of "reforming" students is
nonsense. What happens then, he said, is that a student found guilty of
multiple infractions in his sophomore year is suspended, but "reform" means
that he returns to the Board as a senior and says that he is applying to
graduate school and has not been caught cheating since he was suspended, there-
fore he wishes to have his suspension removed. If the Board is not to react
to the request in a random or capricious manner, it must grant the petition.
Therefore, he said, he thought the Board should not have the power to remove
suspensions. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked
why suspension should not be considered a serious penalty if only because a
suspended student forfeited his fees and expenses for board and room for the
remainder of the term in which he was suspended. Mr. Stumbar pointed out that
there had been several suspensions during the past two years, and that they
were not given for multiple infractions of the Code. Suspension does not
present financial problems to a student, he said, because it takes effect
during the term after it is given. In one recent case where a student was
already in financial difficulties, the Board had considered suspension a less
damaging penalty than having a mark on his record for the rest of his academic
career. Having a term off to do some work and think about his position seemed
preferable.

Professor Philip J. McCarthy, ILR, asked if the body could see examples
of notations on student records in order to see if they illustrated situations
unlike those described by Professor Stein. Mr. Stumbar said that one student
had been suspended for plagiarism in his freshman year, but had returned to
the University and done excellent work. The record of suspension was still on
his transcript when he applied to graduate school, and this case made the
Board realize that it had not known the record was still there, thus causing
the amendment to be brought before the FCR. Professor Isenberg said he thought it would be extremely difficult to suspend students, given the present composition of the Board, roughly half students and half Faculty, if suspension were to remain permanently on a student's record. Moreover, he said, a student petitioning to remove a suspension notation must present testimony from his advisor and others showing that he is rehabilitated. The Board feels it should have the right to remove a suspension if the student succeeds in demonstrating his rehabilitation. "We are not a punishment Board," he said, "but a rehabilitation agency". Professor Robin Williams, Sociology, pointed out that the body was not voting on the morality of the question but simply whether or not the Board should be enabled to act in those rare cases where it feels suspension is no longer justified. Associate Professor David B. Wilson, Biological Sciences, Arts, inquired as to the wording of a notation of suspension, saying it might help the body understand why such notations could be removed while notations for academic failure could not. Professor Isenberg said that notations of academic failure appear along with notations of academic proficiency and thus might not seem serious. A notice of suspension, however, appearing with no offsetting notation, might appear to be more serious. Asked if notices of readmission to the University appear along with suspension notices, he said he did not know since readmission is handled individually by the schools and colleges.

Professor Olum asked Professor Isenberg if he was saying that a suspension notice contains only the word "suspension" rather than giving the reason, in this case academic cheating. The Secretary showed the body an example of a suspension notice which read as follows: "Action: Suspended from the University for the spring term 1973 due to a finding of guilty of a breach of the Code of Academic Integrity. September 27, 1972. Academic Integrity Hearing Board."

Mr. McCalmon said that the notation is copied from the "Comment" section on the back of the permanent record card and reproduced on the front of each transcript made of that card. Professor Sokol asked "how automatic" the Hearing Board's granting of petitions to lift suspensions actually is, i.e., how frequently does the Board refuse to grant such petitions and on what basis. Professor Isenberg replied that the answer depended on the composition of the Board at any given time, on the circumstances surrounding the giving of suspension, the individual's record since he was suspended, testimony of
witnesses, etc. Professor Roger H. Farrell, Mathematics, asked if it would be proper for a suspended student who had not been reinstated to petition to have his record changed. Professor Isenberg replied that such a petition is proper. Associate Professor Toby Berger, Engineering, asked what determines the time interval between the Board's suspending a student and allowing the student to petition for removal of suspension. Professor Isenberg replied that it varied with the student. A student suspended in his freshman year would probably have to wait until he was a junior, while a student suspended in his junior year would have to petition for removal within a year's time. He added that he suspected the Board would treat upperclassmen more severely than freshmen simply because they would be expected to "know better." Professor Bronfenbrenner asked Mr. Stumbar if he happened to recall how many petitions to remove suspension had been denied during his two years in office. Mr. Stumbar replied that the Board was seeking, through the present legislation, a more effective means of handling such petitions. It has not had the power to remove a suspension notice from a student's record, he said.

The question being called, Associate Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Engineering, moved that the word "including" in IV.A.9.b. be changed to "excluding" and that the phrase "until successful petition to have the record of his action removed" be deleted from paragraph 2. of examples of actions which may be taken by the Board. The Code of Academic Integrity would thus be made more specific and reflect the meeting's discussion, he said.

Professor Elias said he believed the deBoer amendment would reverse what the body was about to vote upon, leaving the Faculty where it was at the beginning of the meeting. He suggested voting on what was before the body, and if it failed it would achieve the same affect as the deBoer amendment. Professor deBoer pointed out that according to the explanation of the amendment circulated with the call to meeting one purpose of the amendment was to make it clear that notation of suspension appear on the transcript. The amendment before the body would not make this clear while his amendment would.

Professor John H. Whitlock, Member-at-Large, asked if an amendment that reverses the sense of a motion is illegal. Professor Isadore Blumen, Member-at-Large, asked for a ruling of the Chair. The Chair ruled that the amendment was in order but that the ruling could be appealed. Professor Isenberg appealed the ruling. The Chair being overruled by vote, the amendment was declared not in order. The following motion, as amended, passed by a vote of 34 to 27:
RESOLVED, That IV.A.9 of the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity and paragraph 2. of the examples of ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD be amended as follows:

(new material italicized)

IV. PROCEDURES

A. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board

9. When time intervals prescribed in the penalty have elapsed, the Board will consider petitions for:

   a. Re-admission to the University in the event of suspension.

   b. Removal of any penalty statements that may appear on the student's transcript, including in the case of suspension Registrar's notations indicating the action and the reason for the action.

ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board determines the actions which it may impose. Should a person be found guilty of a violation of the Code, he may have several actions imposed simultaneously.

These are examples of actions which may be taken by the Board:

1. Expulsion from the University.

2. Suspension from the University. Suspension may be for a limited period, e.g., one term, or for an indefinite period. In the latter circumstance, readmission will be granted only through successful petition to the Board. Notation of the suspension appears on any and all transcripts until successful petition to have the record of his action removed.

3. A record, "Declared guilty of ... by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board", is placed on the student's academic record card. This notation appears on any and all transcripts until graduation, formal withdrawal from the University, or successful petition to have the record of his action removed.

Adjourned: 5:57 p.m.

J. Leeming, Assistant to the Secretary
RESOLVED, That IV.A.9 of the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity and paragraph 2 of the examples of ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD be amended as follows:
(deletions in brackets [ ], additions underlined)

IV. PROCEDURES
A. The Academic Integrity Hearing Board
9. When time intervals prescribed in the penalty have elapsed, the Board will consider petitions for:
a. Re-admission to the University in the event of suspension.
b. Removal of any penalty statements that may appear on the student's transcript[.], including in the case of suspension or dismissal Registrar's notations indicating the action and the reason for the action.

ACTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board determines the actions which it may impose. Should a person be found guilty of a violation of the Code, he may have several actions imposed simultaneously.

These are examples of actions which may be taken by the Board:
1. Expulsion from the University.
2. Suspension from the University. Suspension may be for a limited period, e.g., one term, or for an indefinite period. In the latter circumstance, readmission will be granted only through successful petition to the Board. Notation of the suspension appears on any and all transcripts until graduation or successful petition to have the record of his action removed.
3. A record, "Declared guilty of...by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board", is placed on the student's academic record card. This notation appears on any and all transcripts until graduation, formal withdrawal from the University, or successful petition to have the record of his action removed.

Explanation attached
PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENT TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE

Explanation

The Code of Academic Integrity authorizes the Academic Integrity Hearing Board to take actions to penalize a student found guilty of violation of the Code. The actions taken vary in severity. In current practice two actions are recorded on the student's transcript. For one of these actions, the Code authorizes the recording and, under certain circumstances, the removal of the notation from the transcript. For the second action, the Code is not clear on authorization for recording and removal of the notation. The purpose of the amendments is to clarify the Code.

As one action (paragraph 3) the Board directs the Registrar to record a "penalty statement" on the student's transcript, e.g. "Declared guilty of. . .by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board". This action is limited to recording the statement of guilt on the transcript. According to the Code, such a notation appears on the transcript until graduation, formal withdrawal from the University, or successful petition to have the notation removed.

The second, and more severe action is suspension from the University. According to present practice, the Registrar makes a notation on the student's transcript of "suspension from the University" when the Board takes such action. The Code does not at present specify the conditions under which the notation "suspension from the University" could or would be removed from the transcript.

The purposes of the amendments are (1) to make it clear that notation of suspension appear on the transcript, and (2) to state the conditions under which the notation of suspension could or would be removed from the transcript.

The amendment to paragraph IV.A.9.b. allows the Board to consider a petition for removal of the Registrar's notation of suspension or dismissal from the student's transcript.

The amendment to paragraph 2 of the "Actions of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board" is intended to conform to the petition process contemplated in paragraph 3 and to remove any negative implication that petitions for removal are not contemplated for suspension actions. The added language parallels the language in 3, save for the elimination of the language "formal withdrawal from the University." It was felt that a student should not be able to eliminate, on his own initiative, such a notation by effecting a withdrawal as is the case with respect to the less onerous penalty statements.
The President, Dale R. Corson, called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m. Approximately 65 Faculty members were present. The President announced the death of the following:

Eugene D. Montillon, Emeritus Professor of Landscape Architecture, September 24, 1973  
John E. Perry, Emeritus Professor of Civil Engineering, October 7, 1973  
Clyde B. Moore, Emeritus Professor of Rural Education, November 4, 1973  
Morris G. Bishop, Kappa Alpha Emeritus Professor of Romance Literature, November 20, 1973  
Albert Wilhelm Boesche, Emeritus Professor of German, November 30, 1973  
John Clarence McCurdy, Emeritus Professor of Agricultural Engineering, December 10, 1973  
Doris Turnbull Wood, Associate Professor (retired) Administration, Human Ecology, January 27, 1974  
Neil M. Brice, Professor of Electrical Engineering, January 31, 1974  
Howard N. McManus, Jr., Professor of Mechanical Systems and Design, Thermal Engineering, February 6, 1974

The President relinquished the Chair to the Speaker, Professor Russell D. Martin. Minutes of the September 12, 1973 meeting were approved with the following clarifying additions proposed by the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, at the suggestion of Mr. Samuel A. Lawrence, Vice President for Administration: page 3, last paragraph, seventh line, "The amortization (and other associated costs, including the impact of inflation,) would increase our computer expenses by (an average of) one-half to three quarter million dollars per year (over a five to eight-year period)." (Additions in parentheses)

1. REPORT BY THE DEAN

The Dean summarized recent FCR activities. Academic Programs and Policies will shortly offer proposals, he said, on continuation of the Physical Education Requirement for the degree and on an evaluation of the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education. It is also studying the report of a special ad hoc committee on the Center for International Studies and seeking Faculty views on this matter, and has in work a consideration of S/U grading. Freedom of Teaching and Learning has dealt with the question of open access to courses, and the Trustees passed a revised policy statement on that matter. The Committee is currently addressing itself to the question of a community Bill of Rights which is primarily the responsibility of the Senate but requires FCR approval.

Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty is considering a question raised within certain colleges concerning furnishing information on race and
sex in response to questionnaires from the Administration or outside agencies. Other matters under consideration by this Committee include half-time appointments with tenure (a matter of particular interest to women, he added), a forthcoming draft of a grievance procedure which will be discussed at open hearings, proposals by the so-called Keast Commission, and fringe benefits. The Administration rejected the FCR's recommendation to raise annual tuition scholarships for the children of Cornell employees from $1,000 to $1,500, the Dean reported, with the suggestion that it be considered further in the context of the larger fringe benefit question.

Research Policies dealt with issues raised in connection with the University's purchase of a new computer and recommended appointing a Faculty member to the University Computer Board. It did most of the work on the affiliation agreement with BTI (Boyce Thompson Institute). It is now working on a proposal regarding the newly reconstituted Library Board and is consulting with the Provost, W. Donald Cooke, on the difficult problem of Library expansion. In simplest terms, the issue is whether to enlarge campus facilities or create off-campus facilities.

In general, the Dean said, the Faculty and its representative bodies have become more involved in major University decisions than in recent years, e.g., the computer acquisition, BTI, interaction with University Centers which culminated in the Committee on Independent Courses, and specific Center review questions given the FCR such as the Africana, C.I.U.E. and C.I.S. evaluations. For the first time this year the Faculty was involved in a "brave try" at helping to determine the University's annual budget despite shortages of time and information. The means to enable the Faculty to deal with long-range budget priority questions is being discussed. He added that the Library was one of the highest priority items Faculty members indicated as deserving support in their short-range budget recommendations. Coping with the increased volume of business generated by working with the Administration is becoming difficult, the Dean said, and will require limiting such issues to those on which the Faculty can bring judgment to bear. Also, the Faculty's relationship with the Administration is complicated by the presence of the University Senate. Although the Faculty has succeeded in interrelating with the Senate so far, it has not been without conflict over such matters as the academic calendar, interrelations with the University Hearing Board and how the Faculty runs its business. A real jurisdictional problem arose, for instance, in the matter of opening Teagle Hall athletic facilities to women students. The possibility of some Faculty
members being subjected to $250 fines by a court made up of students and employees for dereliction of their official functions is a real one, he said. Another difficulty, he said, arising from the University's financial situation, is how the Faculty can represent its younger members' interests in the economic context while carrying on its official functions. There is a fine line, he said, between being a manager or policymaker on one hand and a collective bargaining agent on the other.

Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Development and Family Studies, asked how his activities as a scholar and teacher might result in his being fined $250. The Dean replied that, as an example, the statement of student rights, which the President has supported, provides that Faculty members must furnish certain evaluations to students in response to examinations. Arguably, failure to perform adequately under that provision might result in a Faculty member's being summoned before the University Hearing Board by a student. The Dean of Students, Mr. Elmer Meyer, pointed out that that section of the statement of student rights, and several other "asterisked" sections, would not become operative until they had been approved by the Faculty. The Dean was asked by Associate Professor John W. Wilkins, Physics, at what stage the Faculty was supposed to exercise its role in making major University decisions. In the computer acquisition matter, for example, it appeared that the Faculty was not brought into the discussion until late in the game. The Dean agreed that the decision to acquire a new computer was largely made before the Faculty became formally involved, in part because the Faculty failed to exploit an earlier opportunity offered in the form of public hearings on the matter. As a result, FCR participation was limited to creation of the ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Geoffrey V. Chester, Physics, and the forwarding of that committee's report to the Administration in lieu of a formal Faculty recommendation. Professor Bronfenbrenner asked if, in describing the part-time Faculty appointment, the Dean had meant to limit its application to women, and the Dean replied in the negative. Professor Paul Olum, Mathematics, said that he thought the Dean's statements had implied that the Statement of Student Rights posed a danger to the Faculty, and that he saw no possible such danger. The so-called Bill of Rights must be passed by the Faculty, he said, and both the Dean and he had attacked it on the Senate floor with very great vigor, leaving no doubt in the Senators' minds that it must pass this body. As far as academic matters are concerned, he added, the statement would have no valid force on this body. The Dean responded that as a result of his and Professor
Olum's presenting the Faculty position on the statement of rights, the Senate had referred it to its Executive Committee which was working with the FCR to improve the situation and perhaps even draft a new bill. One issue that had come up in connection with the case of opening Teagle Hall athletic facilities to women, a "non-asterisked" issue, concerned admission to courses. The Dean said he had argued before the University Hearing Board in that hearing that although the issue might concern students and the Senate, it was also an expressly delegated function of the Faculty and therefore had no standing as operative language without the Faculty's assent. He was quite prepared to say, the Dean said, that had the matter not been withdrawn the case probably would have been decided on that ground even so, and then the matter would have had to be determined by a higher authority.

Professor Wilkins asked the Dean if the FCR's long-range study of fringe benefits was particularly directed to equalizing the imbalance in fringe benefits among the various colleges that make up Cornell. The Dean said he could not believe that this imbalance would not enter the discussion, but that the study would also address itself to other forms of imbalance such as that inherent in the college tuition program which benefits only those Faculty members with children. Perhaps, he said, a "package" of fringe benefits, from which each Faculty member could choose those applicable to him, would emerge from the study.

2. ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The President presented a broad survey of the University's academic accomplishments in recent years including Faculty honors, teaching innovations and the development of interdisciplinary programs. He reminded the Faculty that despite budgetary difficulties the University Libraries had received infusions of $100,000 each year for the past three years, and expressed the hope that during the 1974-75 academic year routinely budgeted Library funds would increase by a quarter-million dollars, the amount of increase expected before financial difficulties set in. He added that expanding library facilities was a major problem and that he expected to be hearing from appropriate groups designated to advise on this matter before the end of the current academic year.

He commended the Division of Biological Sciences for its growth and academic effectiveness, noting that there are approximately 1500 biology majors at the University and that perhaps 30 percent of entering freshmen indicate an area in the biological sciences as their intended profession. The Division
suffers heavily from inadequate space, he said, and the search for funding support is going slowly. He noted attempts to start a program in biophysics, a field in which Cornell has all the ingredients to be distinguished.

Following a period of little growth in program, he said, the Law School under its new Dean, Roger C. Cramton, has moved vigorously to improve its curriculum and recruit new Faculty members.

He noted the development of new patterns of majors for undergraduates, particularly in the Arts and Engineering colleges, and said that providing students opportunities to build on their strengths, to receive recognition for previous work, and to work with individual advisors is particularly significant at a time when secondary school students are perhaps better prepared than ever before.

He mentioned the recent growth in interest in the classics, noting the difficulty of increasing Faculty size in a given department when the University is in a "steady state" situation. He and the Provost had been meeting with departmental groups in the Arts College, he said, and would be meeting with representatives of other colleges and schools. He also noted experiments in undergraduate teaching such as those initiated by Professor Kenneth Greisen, Physics, Associate Professor David W. Henderson, Mathematics, and Professor Arthur L. Ruoff, Engineering, as well as some "spectacular" accomplishments, particularly with film, achieved at the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education under its director, Associate Professor James Maas, Psychology. He said he hoped it would be possible for the Faculty to learn more about such experiments.

The President made note of interdisciplinary programs such as the proposal by Dean Cramton and Dean Alfred E. Kahn, Arts and Sciences, to provide instruction to society and law, the core faculty concept initiated in the Center for Environmental Quality Management, by Professor Walter R. Lynn, Engineering, and the Program on Science, Technology and Society, directed by Professor Raymond Bowers, Physics. He expressed confidence that such "outreach" programs as the Labor College run by the School of Industrial and Labor Relations in New York City and Cornell Alumni University would grow in number in response to public demand. He said he anticipated receiving a report during the current semester from the Special Committee studying the land-grant mission at Cornell, chaired by Professor Robert Plane, Chemistry, and that he expected the report to be a far-reaching one pointing out the opportunity and the obligation of the University to reach "beyond its walls" to serve the public.
The President reviewed the list of new and renovated buildings on campus, and reported that several donors had provided maintenance funds for buildings, a fact not unnoticed by other donors. Efforts to find funds to replace Rockefeller Hall are continuing, he said, and means are being sought to replace some of the oldest buildings on the Agriculture Quadrangle -- East Roberts, Roberts, Stone, Comstock and Caldwell halls.

The President cited the University's need to add named professorships to its present number, particularly in the physical sciences, and reported that a trust fund had been established to provide ultimately for a professorship for a woman member of the Arts College Faculty.

Turning to Faculty salaries, the President said this matter deserved the highest consideration so that the University might recruit and keep the best Faculty possible. In a period of no Faculty growth, and disregarding the effect of inflation, the amount of money budgeted for salary remains constant, he said, and in order to double his purchasing power over the course of a 35-year career at the University a Faculty member must receive a two percent salary increase per year. In the same period a three percent annual increase would be required to triple purchasing power, and a four percent increase to quadruple it. The same percentage rates apply if one adds inflation, he said, therefore a five percent inflation rate requires a seven percent per year increase to double purchasing power in 35 years, an eight percent increase to triple, etc.

For the three-year prior to June 30, 1973, the salary increase rate in the endowed colleges had been about 1.5 percent higher than inflation, the President said (the inflationary rise since that date had been "incredible," he added, which means that the University will lose ground during the present year no matter what it does).

Over-all increase of endowed Faculty salaries in the three years prior to 1973-74 was 18.7 percent or on an individual basis a compound rate of 5.9 percent a year, the President said. The compound rate on the Consumer Price Index for the same three years was 13.7 percent or 4.4 percent annual compound rate (1-1/2 percent faster than inflation). The University will do better in 1975-76 than in 1973-74, he concluded, but unless the economy improves there will be cause for grave concern.

He cited a Columbia University study of salaries at ten major private universities which placed Cornell's Arts College sixth in most categories, behind Chicago, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Yale and Rochester, ahead of Columbia,
Princeton and Washington University at St. Louis, and tied with Stanford. At the full professor level, he said, Cornell ranked fifth in the humanities and social sciences and eighth in the natural sciences. Among associate professors, Cornell ranked third in the humanities, fourth in the social sciences and fifth in the natural sciences. Among assistant professors, Cornell ranked fourth in the humanities, third in the social sciences and seventh in the natural sciences.

The President concluded by discussing the question of tuition increases. Although the current increase, which averaged out to eight percent across the University, appeared to be less than the 1973 increases in personal and disposable family incomes, and applications for admission continue to increase, he said he questioned whether the University could continue to increase tuition and hope to maintain the kind of student body it now has. At the present increase rate tuition will reach $10,000 per year in a few years, he said. Will prospective students apply to Cornell, or will they turn to the public institutions which for emotional and political reasons are fighting to keep their tuitions down? The problem concerns all the Faculty, he said, and the answer depends a great deal on what one thinks education does, whether it benefits the individual or society. He concluded by saying that he had written the Dean suggesting that before the present academic year ended the Faculty should begin to have discussions about the problem.

Professor Robert H. Elias, English, asked the President what action the Trustees were taking to remove the censure action taken by the American Association of University Professors in April 1973 regarding the Medical College. The President replied that the Medical College no longer gives professorial titles to short-term appointees and that all appointments are recorded in writing. Conversations with AAUP regarding a monetary settlement of the case or revising procedures at Ithaca and at the Medical College to conform with AAUP standards are continuing, he said, but the AAUP has not yet revealed how the case can be settled. He indicated that it would be at least a year before the matter was resolved and said the Trustees share the Faculty's concern.

Adjourned: 6:00 p.m.

J. Leeming, Assistant to the Secretary
The Speaker, Professor Russell Martin, called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m. Sixty-four members and approximately 6 visitors were present. The Speaker requested and received speaking privileges for Miss Laurie Zelon, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Academics, and Dean Robert J. Kane, Physical Education and Athletics, and visiting privileges for Mrs. Martha B. Arnett, Director of Women's Athletics, Mr. Jon T. Anderson, Director of Physical Education and Athletics and Mr. George D. Patte, Director of Physical Education. The minutes of the meeting of February 13 were approved as distributed.

1. REPORT BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

The Dean reported that the proposal to promote assistant professors to the position of Associate Professor without tenure, discussed at an earlier meeting of the FCR, had been withdrawn because of concern among the Faculty. Following discussion by Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, the Deans' Council and the Dean, it had been decided to revert to present practice by which such a promotion may be made in any school or college of the University when special circumstances exist.

The resolution to ask the Provost to appoint an FCR member to the University Computing Board, passed at the previous meeting, caused initial concern over such an individual's voting status on the Board, the Dean reported. He had now been advised, he said, that the Provost will appoint to the Board a member with computer expertise nominated by the FCR, and that until such appointment Professor Geoffrey Chester, Director LASSP, would attend the Board's meetings as an observer.

The Dean reported that the problem of expanding Library facilities had been placed with Research Policies and that the Committee planned to meet later in the week with Professor Thomas W. Mackesey, Vice President of Planning, to discuss the matter.

The Dean said he wished to relay to the body concern expressed to him by Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large, regarding an "open access" program proposed by Chancellor Ernest R. Boyer of the State University of New York. Under the program, University Libraries would enter reciprocal loan arrangements with SUNY libraries throughout the State. The Dean read aloud a letter dated February 25, 1974, from Professor Robert F. Risley, Vice Provost, to Chancellor Boyer in reply to his letter of January 30, 1974, proposing the program.
February 25, 1974

Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer
State University of New York
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

Dear Chancellor Boyer:

We have discussed with appropriate members of the Cornell University Libraries the proposal in your letter of January 30 regarding open access to State University Libraries.

All agreed that Cornell should participate in the plan and, in spite of a natural concern over the impact of the program, it was agreed that the open access program should be applied to the total Cornell Library System rather than restricting access to the libraries of our State-supported colleges.

We do have several modifications in the procedures described in your letter because of concerns over the impact of this new service. In particular, we expect that heaviest use will occur during holidays and vacation periods when our circulation and reference services are minimally staffed.

For this reason we feel constrained to begin the new service on an experimental basis with the intent of evaluating impact at the end of the current calendar year and again at the end of the 1974-75 academic year.

In order to alert the campus community of the new service and make necessary arrangements, we also would like to move toward implementation at a slower pace than proposed in your letter. For Cornell, we suggest that the new open access privilege go into effect April 1 of this year. We also consider it essential that identification of the users from other SUNY units be provided by the libraries of the user's home institution. We suggest that this be accomplished by issuing a special standardized card to be made out by the user's home installation. We would, of course, issue similar cards to those at Cornell who wish to use SUNY libraries.

If our slightly modified response to the open access program is acceptable, I would suggest that the appropriate SUNY officer contact Mr. G.F. Shepherd, Jr., Associate Director of the University Libraries (201 Olin Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York; 607-256-3393). They can work out necessary details regarding the identification cards.

In closing let me say we look forward to developing a mutually beneficial open access program with State University.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Risley
Vice Provost
Faculty concern regarding the proposal seemed to focus on what the impact of such a program would be on the University, the Dean said, and whether or not it would have negative impact. Mr. Giles Shepherd, Acting Director of University Libraries, pointed out that the proposed program would have to include the endowed as well as the statutory college libraries at Cornell, and that although the Libraries have a well established program of such affiliations, he feared that their facilities might not be able to cope with the number of loan requests coming from SUNY campuses. Professor Elias said the proposal seemed to contain some ambiguity regarding "use" of Library facilities, and that Faculty concern might be removed if the program did not require the University to extend borrowing privileges to off-campus users. Mr. Shepherd said that Chancellor Boyer had indicated a desire for all users to be able to exercise the same privileges in all libraries as they enjoy on their own campuses. The Dean asked Mr. Shepherd if the University could sequester certain portions of library resources from the open access program. Mr. Shepherd said this could be done, and that he intended to propose additional "caveats" before the program was implemented.

Professor L. Pearce Williams, Member-at-Large, voiced two concerns; first, that he objected strongly to the Faculty not being consulted about the proposal until it had become a reality, and second, that the proximity to the University of SUNY institutions in Cortland and Morrisville posed the realistic possibility that such a program would unduly strain the University's library facilities and in fact result in books being "lost." He advocated setting rules governing the program which would insure that the Faculty could observe the program in operation and exercise control over it.

The Dean pointed out that the Library Board was presently being reorganized and therefore it could not deal with this problem. He said it was possible to refer the matter to Research Policies, and asked Mr. Shepherd if the program had been finalized. Mr. Shepherd said the University could still withdraw from the program, however he wished to remind the body that "strict restrictions" were built into the program. Responding to the first objection of Professor Williams, he said that he had informed Mr. Thomas Tobin, Director of State Relations, of the proposal when it first came to his attention in an attempt to respond quickly to it, and that Mr. Tobin had taken the matter to Vice Provost Risley who responded to Chancellor Boyer on his own initiative. The Dean observed that Mr. Shepherd had now been reminded of the Faculty's interest in the matter by Professor Williams. Mr. Shepherd replied that the interests of
Faculty and students come first as far as the Libraries are concerned. The proposal by Chancellor Boyer did not seem to recognize this fact, and in his opinion the program would not work in its present form.

Professor Isadore Blumen, Member-at-Large, reminded the body that the interests of the statutory colleges also needed protection, and that the ILR School, of which he was a member, had also heard about the proposal after the fact. He said he had heard of an open access program adopted by another institution where a Faculty member had ordered substantial numbers of books from cooperating institutions and then placed them on reserve for his course. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if the proposal included "safeguards" which would insure that the University did not end up paying for large numbers of missing books. Mr. Shepherd said the proposal included such safeguards. Assistant Professor Morris R. Brownell, English, suggested postponing making a response to Chancellor Boyer's proposal until the Faculty and Senate could assess the probable impact of such a program, adding that payment of tuition was presumed by students to guarantee access to Library facilities. Professor John H. Whitlock, Member-at-Large, said it would be costly to safeguard Veterinary Library resources which were among the finest in the country. Professor Elias asked if the Faculty could be assured of "absolute cessation" of further negotiations with SUNY on the matter until the Faculty, Senate and other interested parties could evaluate the proposal. The Dean replied that since Vice Provost Risley's response to Chancellor Boyer had already been sent, the Faculty's position seemed to have been compromised, and asked Mr. Shepherd if he agreed. Mr. Shepherd said he was not sure about that, and that he would certainly consult the Faculty when a response was received from SUNY. Professor Robin M. Williams, Jr., Social Sciences, said he wished to be assured that negotiations would not continue without the Faculty being consulted. He had been at Cornell since 1946, he said, and was still hearing people say, "next time, we'll consult the Faculty."

2.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE CIUE

The Speaker called on Professor Walter Lynn, Chairman of the Executive Committee, who on behalf of the Executive Committee moved approval of the report of the Special Committee to Evaluate the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE). Professor Lynn disclaimed Executive Committee approval of the report, saying that he had been asked to make the motion to place it before the body. Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, Human Ecology, repeated an observation,
which he said he had made to the director of CIUE and to the Special Committee, that in his view the Center had given undue attention to technological aspects of undergraduate education and had not stressed sufficiently its human context. Professor Williams strongly opposed approving the report, saying he could not accept it as a report but rather as an apology for CIUE. He asked for an accounting of the $90,000 CIUE annual budget, to whom it had been paid and for what. He asked for an accounting as to how undergraduate education had been improved, who said it was improved and how the money was spent. On the ground that the report did not present such information, he moved to recommit with a request for the above information so that the Faculty might decide whether or not CIUE funds were being properly spent. Professor Elias suggested that moving to recommit would only waste more valuable Faculty time and result in no substantial change. He said that he understood that Professor Williams and other Faculty members who had served on the Center's Advisory Board had complained about not being consulted regarding the funding of CIUE projects. He also questioned the $90,000 budget, saying he wondered if it would not improve undergraduate education more to spend the money on three distinguished professorships or, perhaps, eight promising assistant professorships. Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, also opposed recommitting, saying the issue was comparatively minor, that CIUE was largely supported by non-University funds and that the University's financial commitment was a small one. The Speaker invited Professor William Keeton, non-FCR, a member of the Special Committee, to comment on the report if he so wished. Professor Keeton said he did not think the sort of Committee that had been appointed could have examined CIUE in the manner it did and also give a "blow-by-blow" accounting of CIUE finances. The Committee had contacted most Faculty members who had received CIUE help, he said, or who had collaborated in research with the Center, and their reactions had ranged from strong approval of CIUE to reservations similar to the one expressed by Professor Bronfenbrenner. On balance their over-all reactions were positive, he said. The Committee had also examined CIUE's sources of funding, which had been largely external, and had concluded that future possibilities for such funding were uncertain, but had based its report largely on the responses of Faculty who had worked closely with the Center.

Professor Williams said that one of his concerns about the report was that it did not specify how many Faculty members the Special Committee had consulted.

Professor Paul Olum, Member-at-Large, said that the motion to approve the report, which he would vote against, was neither necessary nor helpful to the
body, and that a motion to accept would not be helpful either since the report was already on the agenda. He asked if the Executive Committee had made the decision to ask the FCR for approval, saying that if this were not the case then it might not be necessary to consider recommitting the report. Professor Lynn replied that the Executive Committee had asked for approval because there was an action phase associated with the report. Professor Olum asked what the effective consequence of approval by the FCR would be. The Dean replied that the answer to the question lay in the report, and asked Professor Olum if he, the Dean, might read the report's recommendation. Professor Olum requested that he do so, saying one could move the recommendation without approving the report. The Dean read the following two excerpts:

"In sum, it is our view that CIUE, under its present leadership, has during this initial period moved successfully toward meeting its charge, and that reconsideration for the future should be given in the direction of confirming Cornell's commitment, so as to give CIUE the assurance of continuity and reduce its dependency on outside agencies."

"However, we believe that the minimum administrative action should be such as to underwrite the existence of CIUE as a defined and continuing institution at Cornell."

Professor Blumen reminded the body that it was debating a motion to recommit. The Faculty can defeat the motion to approve, he said, in effect saying "no" to the Executive Committee, or it can pass the motion to recommit, in effect giving a "soft no" to the Executive Committee. He preferred a "soft no," he said, but in either case did not want the Administration to have any impression that the Faculty supported "this kind of nonsense." The report tells the Faculty, he said, that for $90,000 per year the University has received "something wonderful" which is approved by "the kind of people who like Centers like this one." The Chair asked Professor Blumen if he was debating the motion to recommit, and was assured that he was. Professor Blumen said that if the motion to recommit failed, he would vote against a motion to approve the report since it was "a bad resolution."

The motion to recommit passed.

3. AMENDMENT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY LEGISLATION

The Speaker called on Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, who moved the following resolution:
RESOLVED, That the legislation for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility be amended as follows:

(Deleted material is in brackets, new material is underlined. Paragraph 1 remains the same, amendments starting with paragraph 2 are indicated below.)

2. The Committee, or a subcommittee it may designate, shall receive and review written complaints brought by a Faculty member with respect to matters involving academic freedom and other matters that might adversely affect his professional reputation, impair the execution of his professional and University responsibilities, adversely affect his economic status, lead to his dismissal, or otherwise alter terms of his employment. It, or a subcommittee, shall also review written complaints against a Faculty member [of actions against him] that might have the same effects. When appropriate, such subcommittees shall include members of the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty and of the Committee on University Research Policies.

It is expected that established appropriate procedures in colleges or other academic units shall be first utilized for such reviews; in such cases this committee or subcommittee may act as an appeal body. However, Faculty members or others may present their cases to the Committee through the Dean of the Faculty if they feel that the established procedure is not appropriate or adequate to their situation.

[After reviewing a complaint, the Committee or subcommittee shall recommend a course of action to the Executive Committee of the FCR and to the Dean of the Faculty.]

Nothing in the foregoing shall be taken to conflict with, or supersede any provisions for the protection of Faculty rights in dismissal or other procedures set forth in the University Bylaws or in Faculty or Trustee legislation.

[When dealing with any question of a personal nature the Committee or subcommittee shall at all times maintain strict confidence. The confidential nature of the discussions precludes dissemination or reports except as noted above without the written approval of the individuals involved and the concurrence of the Dean of the Faculty.]

The Committee, or subcommittee, shall at all times maintain strict confidence in the handling of individual cases. The confidential nature of testimony precludes dissemination of reports except as noted below.

After reviewing a written complaint, the Committee shall prepare a written report of its findings and recommendations for action, sending it to the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Dean of the Faculty. Copies of the report shall be sent by the Executive Committee to the individuals directly
involved in the complaint and, when relevant, to the President of Cornell University. A brief public announcement, prepared by the Committee and consisting of a summary of its concluding judgment with respect to academic freedom, improper discrimination, due process, and recommendation for future action, will ordinarily be made. The Committee report itself shall remain confidential in all cases except where, in the joint judgment of the Committee and the Executive Committee, its public release, in whole or in part, serves the public interest or clears an individual of charges seriously damaging to his reputation, when they have been widely circulated to his detriment. A complainant should be advised when initiating a complaint that ordinarily a brief public announcement will be made but in exceptional cases the report, either whole or in part, may be released.

Professor Ewing summarized the four reasons for amending the legislation given in the explanation accompanying the call to meeting. The first reason (a) was that in acting on a complaint brought before it the previous year the Committee had concluded that it was prevented by existing legislation from informing the complainant of its finding in the matter until it had obtained permission from all parties to the complaint to distribute such finding to all concerned. The Committee felt this legislation was an unintentional error in draftsmanship. The second reason (b) was that the Committee felt the need to be able to advise the President of its finding on a complaint, subject to Executive Committee approval. The third reason (c) was that the Committee felt that a summary of its findings, without details, must be released publicly in order to maintain community confidence in the complaint system. The fourth reason (d) was that the Committee felt it was only fair to inform a complainant that, under the amended legislation, a brief public announcement of the Committee's findings would ordinarily be made. Professor Ewing added that four words were deleted from paragraph 2 of the legislation because the Committee could not understand the necessity of retaining them. Professor Walter Galenson, Economics, moved to amend the amendment by adding the following phrase after the word "detriment" in the second paragraph of new language: "and except where the complainant deems public release essential to clearing him of charges seriously damaging to his reputation." Professor Galenson argued that a complainant should have as much right as other parties to a dispute to obtain public release if he feels it is essential to clearing his reputation. The Dean replied that this was precisely the question raised by Associate Professor Richard N. Boyd, Philosophy, during discussion of an earlier draft of the amendment presented to the body on May 16, 1973. Existing legislation recognized
that there are invariably at least two members to a dispute arising from a complaint, the Dean said, and hence required the consent of all parties to public release of findings. The present motion removes that judgment to an external arbiter.

Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, said that one party to the previous year's case had brought this exact question before the Committee, on which Professor Strout had served, and that after talking with the Committee the party had changed his position and agreed with the decision to let a neutral body rule on the question of public release of findings, the course of action embodied in the present legislation. Professor Galenson responded that neither comment addressed his concern, which was how an individual could answer slanders against him if he was prevented from causing the Committee's findings to be published. Professor Williams said that the original motion addressed itself precisely to Professor Galenson's question and that he would vote against Professor Galenson's amendment because his last comment "prejudges the question of what is slander." A third party is needed, he said, in order to avoid the continuation of slanderous accusations which brought about the complaint in the first place. Professor Ewing said that if Faculty members trusted the Committee sufficiently to feel free to bring a complaint before it, then he thought they must conclude that the Committee would agree to publish its findings if it found that serious damage had been made to an individual's reputation. Professor Galenson said he felt there was too much of a tendency at the University to keep facts secret. If the Committee had established the validity of charges brought before it, he said, then it should be willing to stand behind those charges at all times. The amendment was defeated. The original motion carried. Legislation as amended attached - Appendix A.

4. DISCUSSION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

The Speaker called on Associate Professor Richard H. Rand, Engineering, Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Physical Education Requirement, for a report. Professor Rand said that the Subcommitte's written report as well as comments from the Athletic Department, Senate and Vice President for Public Affairs, were available to the body. There had been much recent criticism of the Physical Education Requirement, he said, which had been epitomized by a recent Senate resolution recommending that the requirement be abolished and that academic credit be granted for physical education courses. Like the Senate and the University at large, he said, the Subcommittee represented
conflicting views on the subject, and finding resolution impossible it had decided to summarize the main issues and bring them before this body. Academically there are two arguments, he said. One, that physical education is a desirable activity and that every student should participate in such a program; the other, that physical education is not related to a student's typical major field and therefore he should not be required to participate. Moreover, it would cost the University about $200,000 annually in accessory instruction fees currently paid to the University by the State for physical education courses taken by students in statutory units. State budgetary representatives had told the Subcommittee, he said, that the State would continue to pay these fees if physical education remained a requirement or if the University granted credit for it, but not if it were abolished. If the requirement were made optional, and fewer students enrolled in physical education courses, the size and nature of such courses might be changed. He then listed the four courses of action developed by the Subcommittee: 1) to abolish the requirement and not grant credit, thereby costing the University $200,000 per year; 2) to abolish the requirement and grant academic credit; 3) to take compromise action such as not abolishing the requirement completely or reducing the number of academic terms required from four to two; 4) do nothing, thereby ignoring the Senate resolution and criticisms voiced by members of the community.

The Speaker asked if there was objection to granting Miss Zelon and Dean Kane speaking privileges for five minutes and asked each to limit their remarks to five minutes in view of the late hour. Professor Williams objected and moved to postpone debate on the matter indefinitely or until it was brought before the body in a legitimate fashion. This proposal came to the FCR from the Senate, Professor Williams said, a body with no constitutional rights over graduation requirements, a subject completely within the Faculty's purview. Moreover, the Senate membership includes students and nonacademic employees, he said, who are not and should not be involved in the matter. He suggested that if the Faculty took this "illegitimate" proposal seriously, it would be bombarded by similar resolutions from the Senate. Such a course would give over the Faculty's responsibility to determine academic requirements for graduation to the Senate, and result in debates "ad nauseam" on other University requirements. The point is not to keep or abolish the physical education requirement, he concluded, but for the Faculty to preserve its rights, including the right to teach its Senatorial colleagues proper procedures.
The Dean pointed out that the Subcommittee's report was made in response to a petition which he had received in the spring of 1973 signed by more than 1,000 students asking the Faculty to reconsider the propriety of continuing to assert the physical education requirement. After discussing the propriety of responding to the petition, the FCR Executive Committee and the Dean had asked Academic Records and Instruction and Academic Programs and Policies to examine the question and develop a proposal. The Senate passed its resolution at a later time, he said, and as a separate matter asked the FCR to respond to its position. Professor Williams moved that the FCR not grant speaking privileges to Miss Zelon as a Senate representative. The Speaker reminded the body that the matter under discussion was a report from and FCR subcommittee. Professor Olum said that Professor Williams was in error regarding the roles of the Senate and Faculty in academic matters. The Senate's original enabling legislation had provided the Senate a degree of control in academic matters, he said, which was later denied it. However, the Senate constitution does provide the right to propose academic matters to the Faculty for its consideration and to place such matters on the Faculty agenda.

Professor Blumen reminded the body that the point at issue was consideration of a report from an FCR subcommittee. Professor Lynn said he understood the matter was presented to the body for discussion only, and the Speaker agreed. The motion to postpone indefinitely failed, and the Speaker relinquished the floor to Miss Zelon. Dean Kane asked if the time limitation permitted proper consideration of his and Miss Zelon's arguments. The Dean asked if the FCR preferred to postpone continuation of discussion to a special meeting on March 27 or to continue discussion now. Professor John Whitlock, Member-at-Large, moved to postpone discussion until March 27. Professor Blumen said there was a possibility of another special meeting being called at the request of non-FCR persons who were unhappy with certain actions of the Executive Committee, and asked if it would not be better to continue the present discussion now.

Professor Whitlock's motion carried. (Subcommittee report attached - Appendix B)

Adjourned: 5:56 p.m.

J. Leeming, Assistant to the Secretary
The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility is hereby established.

It shall have the following functions:

1. The Committee shall concern itself with policies and procedures in the area of academic freedom and responsibility except as explicitly delegated by the FCR to other standing committees. It shall, when directed by the FCR, make studies and prepare reports and recommendations in its area of concern for action by the FCR. It shall provide an initial screening of formal proposals with respect to policies and procedures in this area from FCR committees or others, reporting its findings to the FCR if it feels that further study is desirable. It shall keep itself informed of developments with respect to academic freedom and responsibility which may affect the Cornell University Faculty, reporting significant developments through the Executive Committee to the FCR.

2. The Committee, or a subcommittee it may designate, shall receive and review written complaints brought by a Faculty member with respect to matters involving academic freedom and other matters that might adversely affect his professional reputation, impair the execution of his professional and University responsibilities, adversely affect his economic status, lead to his dismissal, or otherwise alter terms of his employment. It, or a subcommittee, shall also review written complaints against a Faculty member that might have the same effects. When appropriate, such subcommittees shall include members of the Committee on Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty and the Committee on University Research Policies.

It is expected that established appropriate procedures in colleges or other academic units shall be first utilized for such reviews; in such cases this committee or subcommittee may act as an appeal body. However, Faculty members or others may present their cases to the Committee through the Dean of the Faculty if they feel that the established procedure is not appropriate or adequate to their situation.

Nothing in the foregoing shall be taken to conflict with, or supersede any provisions for the protection of Faculty rights in dismissal or other procedures set forth in the University Bylaws or in Faculty or Trustee legislation.

The Committee, or subcommittee, shall at all times maintain strict confidence in the handling of individual cases. The confidential nature of testimony precludes dissemination of reports except as noted below.

After reviewing a written complaint, the Committee shall prepare a written report of its findings and recommendations for action, sending it to the Executive Committee of the FCR and the Dean of the Faculty. Copies of the report shall be sent by the Executive Committee to the individuals directly involved in the complaint and, when relevant, to the President of Cornell University. A brief public announcement, prepared by the Committee and consisting of a summary of its concluding judgment with respect to academic freedom, improper discrimination, due process, and recommendation for future action, will ordinarily be made. The Committee report itself shall remain confidential in all cases except where, in the joint judgment of the Committee and the Executive Committee, its public release, in whole or in part, serves the public interest or clears an individual of charges seriously damaging to his reputation, when they have been widely circulated to his detriment. A complainant should be advised when initiating a complaint that ordinarily a brief public announcement will be made but in exceptional cases the report, either whole or in part, may be released.
REPORT OF THE FCR SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY

THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT, DECEMBER 13, 1973

There has been much recent criticism of the Physical Education (P.E.) requirement, epitomized by the Senate resolution of October 23, 1973:

The Cornell University Senate recommends to the University Faculty the following two resolutions:

1. That the two-year, compulsory physical education requirement be abolished; and
2. That academic credit towards the Cornell degree be granted for designated physical education courses. It is understood that the status of the physical education department, the quality and scope of the courses to be offered, and regulations and standards governing the granting of credit for such courses are matters in need of careful study.

This subcommittee is divided in its opinion on what should be done. Rather than presenting a particular plan, we shall outline the main issues and suggest several ways to proceed.

The chief argument against the P.E. requirement is that it forces all undergraduate students to participate in certain arbitrary activities in order to graduate, activities which may have little to do with their fields of interest. Those who support the P.E. requirement reply that P.E. is desirable for a well rounded education and that no student should graduate without taking it.

The academic issues are complicated by financial considerations. New York State currently pays Cornell University "accessory instruction funds" for courses taken in the Endowed schools by students enrolled in the Statutory schools. These funds will continue to be paid for courses taken in the P.E. department only if

a.) P.E. remains a requirement, or
b.) academic credit is given for P.E. courses.

It has recently been estimated that if these funds were lost by dropping the P.E. requirement and by not giving academic credit for P.E., then the cost to the Endowed part of the University would be about $200,000 per year (see "Financial Impact of Dropping the Physical Education Requirement", by A.C. Treadwell,
Nevertheless, it has been argued that the decision should be made on its educational merits alone, without regard to financial issues.

Moreover, if P.E. is made optional it is possible that fewer students would take P.E. and that the size and scope of the P.E. department might be reduced. This is unclear, however, for when Yale University dropped its P.E. requirement (without giving academic credit for P.E. courses) the use of the P.E. facilities remained about the same. On the other hand, the Yale program and local situation is somewhat different from our own and comparison may be misleading.

There appear to be four ways to proceed:

1. Abolish the P.E. requirement, without giving academic credit for P.E. courses. (Costs the University about $200,000 per year.)
2. Abolish the P.E. requirement, and give academic credit for P.E. courses. (The Senate resolution.)
3. Modify the P.E. requirement, say by reducing it from four terms to two terms. (A compromise.)
4. Keep the P.E. requirement as it is. (Ignores the Senate resolution.)

We recognize that this is a difficult and controversial problem and recommend that it be brought to the floor of the Faculty Council of Representatives for discussion.

The members of this subcommittee are: Herbert Everett, Eleanor Jorden, Richard Rand (Chairman), from the Academic Programs and Policies Committee; Charles Pearman, Martin Sampson, David Thomas, from the Academic Records and Instruction Committee; Norman Penney, Dean of Faculty.

We had our first meeting on October 16, 1973, and then met twice more in October and November, and had our final meeting on December 19. We are attaching as appendicies to this report brief summary statements from the Senate, the Dean of Physical Education and Athletics and the Vice President of Campus Affairs. These are intended to summarize more elaborate documents which set forth the position of the Senate, the Physical Education Department and the University Administration (in respect of the financial impact of abandonment of P.E., etc.) which are on deposit in the office of the Dean of the Faculty, 315 Day Hall, and may be examined by any interested Faculty member.

12/13/73
January 18, 1974

TO: The Faculty Council of Representatives

Dear Faculty Member:

The question of continuing the Physical Education requirement at Cornell comes before the Faculty with no clear-cut recommendation from the University Senate. On October 25, by the narrow margin of 44-42 (had one vote been turned around the motion would have lost), the Senate recommended to the Faculty that the requirement be dropped and that, in place of it, Physical Education be offered as an optional course with credit toward graduation.

The Faculty has to decide whether to accept the Senate proposal: to drop the requirement and to give academic credit for certain specified offerings; or to merely decide whether to continue the requirement or to drop it. In either case, there are a number of points we would very much hope the Faculty would keep in mind as it considers the future of the Physical Education requirement.

(1) Never in history has there been more awareness of the value of exercise to health and vitality, and one of the major concerns of the Cornell program in Physical Education has been to teach the students recreational activities they can continue to enjoy throughout their lives. The number of such activities we offer has grown over the years and there are now 45 for the students to choose from. It is astonishing to discover how many of our students learn for the first time in college how to swim or to play tennis and golf that provide them exercise and enjoyment for the rest of their lives. Our students are quite free to choose among these 35 programs. About half of them are coeducational: these include many of the most recently added ones -- bowling, skeet and trap shooting, archery, mountaineering, scuba diving, water safety instruction, senior life-saving, squash, golf, first aid, modern dance.
Courses of an originative character are also being introduced into the program. The most exciting of these is perhaps the course in Health and Physical Capacity being prepared for next September (if there is a program next September). The School of Nutrition, the Medical Department, and the Department of Physical Education and Athletics will work as partners in this course. It will include lectures on diet, nutrition, hygiene, and laboratory demonstrations of exercises suited to certain physical needs and disabilities or valuable as protection against certain common ailments, such as heart trouble, kidney malfunction, bad posture, and obesity. Dr. Ley of the Medical Department and Deans Roe and Barnes of the School of Nutrition have contributed a great deal to this course. To be complete it will need a diet table, and Mr. Arthur Jaeger, Director of Dining Services, plans to put into operation at Balch Hall a diet table that will be included in the University's co-op dining plan next year.

We are always open to suggestions for improving the program -- in fact we invite them.

(2) The social effect of the Physical Education program is far greater than most people who are not close to it sometimes realize. Nothing else brings together the entire student body in the way Physical Education does. This effect is particularly valuable for students during the freshman year when so many feel lonely and perhaps are unnerved by being thrust into a society that is new and strange and sometimes appears to them aloof and indifferent. The barriers that make for this loneliness and fear break down quickly when you are competing and exercising with hundreds of fellow students. A spirit of easy companionship, hardly otherwise achievable, grows quickly in such conditions.

There will, of course, always be a few people in every entering class who find any form of exercise obnoxious. The Arts College makes special provision for those students who will not learn a foreign language or elementary mathematics; perhaps Physical Education ought to do the same for the few who cannot endure any form of exercise. The vast majority of college undergraduates, however, plainly enjoy it and even for those who don't, 42 hours a year -- the equivalent of one week's work -- can hardly be thought of as an intolerable imposition.

We make no systematic attempt to measure the results of our work in Physical Education, but a few things are obvious. We teach over 300 freshman men and women how to swim every year. (The only requirement within the Physical Education program is, in fact, that the student learn
to swim before going on to select other activities.) We also know that those who cannot jog 220 yards when they come out for jogging can easily run three miles by the end of the year. We see large numbers of people to whom golf, tennis, squash, skating, skiing and a number of other sports are complete novelties becoming fairly competent in them. A poll taken among the men in the program last term showed that over half of them learned new sports in their underclass years, and over half of those continue voluntarily in the sport in their upperclass years; and of the 686 men we questioned last year, 577 said they planned to continue these sports after leaving college.

These results of our poll of the men in the program are impressive, but it is likely that a similar poll among the women would be even more impressive. Clearly, the biggest losers if we were to discontinue our program would be the women. We have a splendid Physical Education program for women and they enjoy it. It is predicted that many fewer women would use our beautiful facilities at Helen Newman and environs if there were no requirement, for women are much less likely than men to come around the gym and less likely, therefore, to take advantage of new recreational opportunities which can lend buoyancy to their lives.

Our athletic program for women has developed into one of the best in the country in recent years. Unlike the men, most of the girls on our teams learn their intercollegiate sport at Cornell in the Physical Education classes, for the very simple reason that sports programs for women are very sparse in high schools.

(3) We sincerely believe there is nothing wrong with the substance of the Physical Education program and much that is of positive value that is recognized by students as well as the rest of us. The difficulty here is not, we suggest, with the substance of the program; it is psychological. The program is required, and there is a strong a priori objection to all requirements these days. Unfortunately it is practically impossible -- or at least financially prohibitive -- to run such a program without the incentive of either a requirement or academic credit.

Some colleges have tried dropping their Physical Education requirement under pressure from those who disbelieve in requirements of any kind. Most of those who, like Yale, have done so, are now looking for ways to revive what disappeared with the requirement. A poll taken in 1971-72 by the Eastern College Athletic Conference shows 83% of the 212 members have kept the requirement as the best solution to the problem. This suggests that most institutions consider the ideological objections to a requirement, simply as a requirement, are outweighed by the advantages of a Physical Education program.
(4) The loss of financial support to the University that would occur if the Physical Education requirement were dropped would be substantial. About $326,000 in income would be lost, $250,000 in accessory instruction fee income from the State of New York. The State does not reimburse the University for courses outside the statutory colleges unless they are taken for academic credit or are required. If we drop the program of teaching in Physical Education we would have to fire a number of people and make some cut-backs in services. These savings would, it has been estimated, amount to $50,000 or $75,000 a year. The net loss to the University of dropping Physical Education would therefore be somewhere between $200,000 and $250,000 a year. This loss is essentially a loss for the endowed sector of the University, so that between $200,000 and $250,000 now being spent for other purposes by the endowed colleges would cease to be available to them.

The effect of dropping the requirement and the subsequent loss of accessory instruction fees on the Department of Physical Education and Athletics itself would, of course, be severe. The entire women's program is now supported almost wholly by accessory instruction fees, and the salaries of the coaches for their work as Physical Education instructors are now shared proportionately between the Physical Education division and the Athletics division. The loss, however, is the University's because it will have at least a quarter of a million fewer dollars to work with each year.

The Physical Education requirement has been in effect here at Cornell for 70 years for women and 30 years for men, and not until four years ago was there any noticeable complaint against it. Even now, in spite of the widespread, almost automatic bias against requirements as such, we meet no trouble in our Physical Education classes. In fact they take part enthusiastically.

Ironically, the movement to do away with the Physical Education requirement comes at a time when there is more national concern for physical well-being than ever before, and more concrete evidence to show that a balanced program of exercise is beneficial to both mind and body. It would, perhaps, be well to retain it just for the wholesome influence it has on campus. It comes, too, at a time when our facilities at Cornell are better and more complete and our course offerings broader and more sophisticated than they have ever been because we have responded as much as possible over the years to student desires and needs.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. KANE
Dean of Physical Education & Athletics
PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

45 Activities, a total of 66 offerings

17 Activities are now co-ed, a total of 29 offerings

14 Activities to become co-ed in 1974-75

In 1974-75 31 Activities will be co-ed
# PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Men's Program</th>
<th>Women's Program</th>
<th>Coeducational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - Beginning (required of non-swimmers)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Synchronized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Synchronized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Scuba Diving</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Diving &amp; Water Polo (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Life Saving</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Safety Instructors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis - Fundamentals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf - Fundamentals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo - Beginning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (Club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate - Beginning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (Club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Phys. Ed. (recommendation of Medical Dept.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampoline (available in Women's program in Gymnastics)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling - Beginning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be coeducational 1974-75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Men's Program</th>
<th>Women's Program</th>
<th>Coeducational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback Riding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Skating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching Band (Fall Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey &amp; Trap Shooting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Training (Mountaineering &amp; Survival Training)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey - Beginning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey - Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid - Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Dance - Elementary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ed. for Social Service (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery - Beginning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning (exercises, jogging, running)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Figure Control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be coeducational 1974-75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Men's Program</th>
<th>Women's Program</th>
<th>Coeducational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey - Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riflery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Conditioning (Fall Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country Skiing (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse (Spring Term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Spring Term)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fitness-Exercise (open to</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty, staff, students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be coeducational 1974-75

1/24/74
January 23, 1974

Professor Richard Rand
Department of Theoretical and
Applied Mathematics
College of Engineering
Thurston Hall
Campus

Dear Professor Rand:

The "Physical Education Act of 1973" contained two proposals: (I) that the compulsory physical education requirement be abolished, and (II) that academic credit towards a Cornell degree be granted for designated physical education courses. It is hoped that the following short summary of the arguments involved will be helpful to both you and your committee.

PART A - PROPOSAL I

The arguments that stand in opposition to the abolition of the degree requirement were primarily (a) that physical education is good for students and (b) that Cornell would lose the accessory instruction fees from the State if the requirement was abolished. The Senate did not find the first of these arguments compelling for the following reasons:

1. The physical education requirement is simply not a valid degree requirement. Although there are many courses which may be helpful for students to take, Cornell does not, and should not, insist that they be taken simply because it would be good for them. As Professor Olum pointed out, it would no doubt be of value for each student to take a driver's education course, but no one seriously considers making such a course a requirement for an academic degree. The Senate believes that physical education should stand on the same ground as other worthy but non-essential pursuits. It should be voluntarily chosen for its own merits, rather than forced on an unwilling, but presumably mature, degree candidate.
2. Requiring a student to enroll in P.E., especially when it is not justified by pedagogic concerns, is in reality an illogical and inconsistent holdover of the University's old "en loco parentis" doctrine. While it is undoubtedly beneficial for a student to get plenty of rest, eat properly, and study regularly; but once a student comes to Cornell, the University, quite rightly, assumes that the student is capable of looking after himself in these areas, which formerly were the concern of the student's parents. Similarly, good physical conditioning is something that a student should be concerned about, but it is an area which falls within the province of a personal, rather than an institutional, concern. Cornell is an educator of young people, not a parent to them.

The above being the case, we are left with one remaining objection to the elimination of the requirement, the possible monetary loss of the State accessory instruction fees. The Senate did not find this objection controlling for the following reasons:

1. The most important reason, which was mentioned over and over in the debate, was that the quality of the Cornell degree transcended any financial considerations which are unrelated to its pedagogic purpose. This point cannot be stressed enough, for the Senate believes that graduation requirements should be solely determined by their educational value to the student. Everything that is absolutely essential should be required, and those disciplines or experiences which are non-essential or merely broadening should be left to the discretion of the individual.

2. It is by no means certain, in any event, that Cornell will lose State money if the physical education requirement is abolished. As Dean Robert Kane of the Physical Education Department pointed out on the floor of the Senate, the University of Utah actually experienced a 35% increase in students taking physical education courses after their requirement was abolished. Furthermore, Yale University, after an initial decrease in enrollments, experienced an overall increase in students taking physical education courses after eliminating their physical education requirement. We in the Senate feel that this sort of phenomena may occur at Cornell, especially if the second proposal of Part A is adopted.

PART A - PROPOSAL II

The one argument which surfaced in opposition to the proposed granting of academic credit for physical education classes was that physical education was not as valid a discipline as the other disciplines offered at Cornell. The Senate, as a whole, felt that while that may be true, other factors nevertheless indicate that degree credit should be given to some physical education classes for the following reasons:
1. The granting of degree credit to selected physical education courses would have the tendency to encourage creativity in the department, and improve the quality of the department as a whole. Entering the marketplace, competing with other disciplines for students, would virtually force the Physical Education Department to improve the quality of the instruction that was offered. As the University of Utah's experience would indicate, when the quality, diversity, and attractiveness of course offerings improve, so does the number of students who wish to benefit from them.

2. Although physical education does not stand on the same footing as a discipline does, for example, chemistry and history, it is a valid discipline nonetheless, and as such, should not be denied credit merely because it is not as rigorous as other academic areas. Such institutions as the University of California at Berkeley have seen fit to grant 1/2 unit credit for physical education courses, and such a small amount of credit would not seem, to the Senate, to be unreasonable.

3. It should be further noted that such a scheme, should it be implemented, would be calculated to retain, or even increase, the amount of accessory instruction fees which Cornell receives from the State.

We hope that the above is helpful to you in divining the intent of the Senate in passing SA-217, "The Physical Education Act of 1973." If there is any other way in which we can be of service to your committee, do not hesitate to let us know. We will be glad to help.

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

Raymond J. Minella
Speaker

Laurie D. Zelon
Chairperson
Committee on Academics

RJM/Iha

cc: Robert McGinnis
Norman Penney
Charles MacKay
FINANCIAL IMPACT OF ELIMINATING THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT: A SUMMARY

This report focuses on the financial impact of eliminating the Physical Education requirement. Several key assumptions were employed in developing this report. These assumptions include:

1. no accessory instruction funds would be available unless academic credit was granted.

2. fixed operating costs could not be reduced substantially.

3. no physical education classes would be taught except those which could be self-supporting through a participant fee.

4. men's and women's intercollegiate athletics will continue at least at their current levels.

5. intramural programs would remain at least at the same level of participation or even expand.

6. modern dance would continue as an academic program.

7. affected employees would be given at least one year to find alternate employment.

Accessory instruction funds for physical education have been paid to Cornell since 1949. The amount of accessory instruction funds paid is determined by multiplying the number of physical education credit hours taught to statutory students times the accessory instruction rate (determined by the level of tuition in the Endowed Colleges). The School of Hotel Administration also pays accessory instruction funds for physical education. It is estimated that in 1973-74 3650 credit hours will be taught to statutory students at an instruction rate of almost $74. Therefore, Cornell University (these funds do not go directly to the Department of Physical Education) will receive approximately $270,000 from the State of New York for this instruction. In addition the Hotel School will pay the University approximately $28,000. In total Cornell University will
receive almost $300,000 for physical education instruction in 1973-74. If the requirement is eliminated the payment of this $300,000 from the State and Hotel Administration would cease unless the colleges were to accept classes in physical education as elective academic credit hours toward graduation. It is unprecedented and extremely unlikely that the State of New York would pay accessory instruction funds for physical education as a non-required, non-credit program. Other estimated income losses from eliminating the requirement would include $25,000 in athletic enterprise income and $3,000 in special physical education fees. The total estimated loss of income would be $326,000.

The extent to which this $326,000 possible loss in income can realistically be offset by expense reductions within the physical education and/or athletic budgets is extremely difficult to estimate since nearly all of the instructors in men's physical education program and some in women's program also function as coaches and their salaries are split between the physical education budget and the intercollegiate athletics budget. Since "coaching-hours" and "instructor hours" are not readily interchangeable it would not be feasible or possible to reduce the staff by the full-time equivalents functioning as instructors. Therefore, it should be emphasized that the exact amount of savings which could actually be achieved is a matter of judgement. However, the following estimations are provided as being realistic. Estimated savings include approximately $40,000 in Women's Physical Education, $53,000 in Men's Physical Education and $38,000 in Intercollegiate Athletics for a total of $131,000. This means that the total net cost of eliminating the physical education requirement would be about $195,000. All of these figures are detailed and further documented in the Treadwell report entitled "Financial Impact of Dropping the Physical Education Requirement", August 1973.

In summary, the elimination of the physical education requirement in 1973-74 dollars would reduce the income of Cornell University by $326,000. While some savings could be achieved, the net cost to the University is still estimated to be approximately $195,000.

William D. Gurowitz
FINANCIAL IMPACT OF DROPPING THE
PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

Anthony C. Treadwell
Business Manager
Division of Campus Life
August 27, 1973
I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the estimated financial impact, in 1973-74 dollars, of eliminating the physical education requirement. The report is not intended as a critique or update of the "Earle Report." Naturally, the estimated financial impact could vary greatly depending upon the assumptions used, but it is felt that the estimate arrived at in this report is reasonably accurate for the particular set of assumptions chosen. The Supplemental Report for Physical Education and Athletics for 1972-73, prepared by Jon T. Anderson, has been included as Appendix D for information purposes.

II. BACKGROUND

Since 1949-50 the State of New York has paid accessory instruction funds to the University for physical education (Appendix A). These funds are paid to the University along with the payment of accessory instruction funds for other courses taken in the Endowed schools by Statutory students and thus are not paid directly to the Department of Physical Education and Athletics. The amount of accessory instruction funds paid each year for physical education is determined by multiplying the number of physical education credit hours taught to statutory students times the accessory instruction rate (determined by the level of tuition in the Endowed colleges). Since 1965-66, the School of Hotel Administration has also

---

a. In 1970, a faculty committee, composed of Professors Wendell G. Earle, Thomas A. Sokol and Martin W. Sampson, was appointed by the Dean of the Faculty to investigate the potential consequences, both financial and non-financial, of eliminating the physical education requirement. The committee's report, which recommended continuation of the requirement, was published in the Cornell Chronicle of April 8, 1971.
paid accessory instruction funds for physical education.

Should the physical education requirement be eliminated, the payment of accessory instruction funds for physical education would stop unless the colleges were to accept elective physical education credit hours toward graduation (unlikely) or unless the State were to pay accessory instruction funds for physical education as a non-required, non-credit program (unprecedented and unlikely).

The extent to which such a loss of income can realistically be offset by expense reductions within the physical education and/or athletics budgets is the critical element in determining the net financial impact of eliminating the physical education requirement. The major difficulty in estimating possible expense reductions is caused by the fact that nearly all the instructors in the men's physical education program and some in the women's program also function as coaches and thus their salaries are split between the physical education budget and the intercollegiate athletics budget. Because of overlapping sports seasons and the different types of coaching knowledge and skills required by various sports, it is simply not realistic to expect that "instructor-hours" and "coaching-hours" are readily interchangeable. Therefore, it would not be possible to simply reduce the total staff by the number of "full-time equivalent" employees functioning as physical education instructors.

In addition, the heavy use of physical education facilities for intramural and informal recreational purposes almost certainly precludes the realization of significant savings in operating or maintenance expenditures.
It should be emphasized that it is a matter of judgement with regard to the amount of savings that could actually be achieved and that people representing various points of view may arrive at widely different numbers.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

The following set of assumptions are felt to be reasonably likely to occur if the physical education requirement is eliminated. No attempt has been made to cost out all the possible sets of assumptions.

A. No physical education classes will be taught except those which would be self-supporting through a participant fee. Presumably a very small number of courses could be taught "for free" on a sporadic basis by coaches whose sports were not in season and who were not involved in other coaching or managerial responsibilities.

B. No accessory instruction funds will be paid by the State for physical education (unless degree credit is granted for such instruction).

C. Building operating costs (utilities, etc.) currently associated with physical education facilities will not be reduced significantly because the facilities will remain open for general recreational use and intramurals.

D. Modern dance will continue as an academic program.

E. The intramural programs for both men and women will continue and probably expand.
F. Women's intercollegiate athletics will continue at least at the current level.

G. Men's intercollegiate athletics will continue at a comparable level.

H. A decision to eliminate the physical education requirement would not be implemented for at least one full academic year after the date of the decision in order to permit any employees affected to find alternate employment.

IV. SUMMARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

A. Potential Loss of Income

1. Accessory instruction funds (Appendix A) $298,000

2. Athletic enterprise income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Estimated Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Alley</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitation</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   25,000

3. Physical Education Charges $3,000

   Total estimated loss of income $326,000

---
a. Estimated income currently paid to athletics enterprises by students meeting the physical education requirement.

b. Charges to participants for special instructional classes taught by physical education (scuba diving, etc.)
B. Estimated potential expense savings resulting from elimination of the physical education requirement.

1. Women's Physical Education (Appendix B) $40,300
2. Men's Physical Education (Appendix C) 53,100
3. Intercollegiate Athletics
   (a) Salaries and fringes $26,000a
   (b) Enterprises b
      Equitation 2,000
      Golf 3,000
      Rink 4,000
      Bowling 3,000 38,000

Total estimated savings $131,400

C. Estimated net cost to University of eliminating the physical education requirement

Income reduction 326,000
Less: estimated savings 131,400

194,600 c.

__________________________
a. Associated with savings in Men's Physical Education
b. Estimated reduction in operating expenses of Athletic enterprises because of elimination of physical education obligations.
c. A preliminary report prepared in February, 1973 showed an estimated net cost of approximately $125,000 in 1972-73 dollars. The following changes are responsible for the difference between the two reports.

- Increase in accessory instruction funds $26,000
- Revision of estimated coaching requirements for women's intercollegiate Athletics (plus fringes) 17,000
- Personnel changes anticipated in the original report but already accomplished without elimination of the requirement (primarily hourly wages) 26,000 600
- Miscellaneous $69,600
V. CONCLUSIONS

The elimination of the physical education requirement would cost the Endowed portion of the University, other than the School of Hotel Administration, approximately $200,000 per year in 1973-74 budgetary dollars. Nearly all of this cost would be reflected in an increased subsidy to Athletics since shared costs would be transferred to the Athletics budget. Assuming that the requirement would not be eliminated until 1975-76, the cost at that time would be somewhat larger because of inflation. It should be noted that the constraints upon salary savings mentioned earlier in the report are reflected in the fact that, under the set of assumptions used in this report, only $71,500 (about 15%) of the total salaries of $467,450 paid to instructors or coaches was deemed to be realistic to eliminate.

Finally, it must once again be pointed out that the estimated cost of eliminating the physical education requirement will change depending upon the assumptions used. This report should be considered a starting point for deliberations, not an exhaustive and definitive treatment precluding the use of other sets of assumptions.
APPENDIX A.
ACCESSORY INSTRUCTION PAID BY
NEW YORK STATE TO CORNELL UNIVERSITY
FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION
1965-66 THROUGH 1973-74 (est.) a

(000's omitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>157.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>153.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>151.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>182.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>186.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>219.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>234.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>249.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74 (est.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a.
Accessory instruction funds for physical education have been received from the state since 1949-50. Only recent years are indicated here for purposes of brevity.

b.
In addition, approximately $26,000 was received from the School of Hotel Administration, which has paid accessory instruction funds for physical education since 1965-66.

c.
Estimated 3650 credit hours (3675 actually taught in 1972-73) times the accessory instruction rate of $73.90625 per credit hour. In addition, approximately $28,000 is anticipated from the School of Hotel Administration for a total of $298,000.
APPENDIX B
WOMEN'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Budget (1973-74)</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Transfers To Athletics</th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Coaching and Instructional salaries</td>
<td>143,350</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>105,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages b</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits c</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (towels, etc.)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate teams d</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services e</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office expenses</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education equipment</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (restricted expense, telephone, etc.)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$229,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>$172,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Includes provisions for modern dance and an intercollegiate staff in the final budget.
b. Hourly wages expended primarily for matrons, lifeguards, etc. and could not be substantially reduced without seriously curtailing the use of Helen Newman Hall.
c. Reduced in proportion to reduction in salaries. Actual fringe benefits are somewhat higher.
d. Actual 1972-73 expenses were somewhat higher.
e. Payments to golf course and rink for physical education classes.
### APPENDIX C.

**MEN'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Budget (1973-74)</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Transfers To Athletics</th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Office Salaries</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>41,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages - Instruction</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages - Teagle</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages - Intramurals</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages - Grounds</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Salaries</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wages**

| Instructional and Intramural Salaries | 172,325 | 24,150 a | 130,275 | 17,900 |
| Fringe benefits                  | 40,000  | 4,800 b  | 16,400  | 18,800 |
| Supplies                         | 3,500   | 500      |         | 3,000  |
| Laundry                          | 18,600  | 6,200    |         | 12,400 |
| Services c                       | 10,000  |          | 10,000  |        |
| Equipment                        | 2,000   | 500      |         | 1,500  |
| Uniforms                         | 6,500   | 2,200    |         | 4,300  |
| Other (Office, Travel, Tel. etc.) | 7,400   | 1,250    |         | 6,150  |

**Total** | 406,675 | 53,100 | 163,975 | 189,600 |

---

*a.* Would also result in $26,000 savings in Athletics because salaries are currently split between the two budgets.

*b.* Fringe benefits reduced in proportion to reduction in salaries and wages.

*c.* Payments to golf course and rink for physical education classes.
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PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
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   A. Women's Intercollegiate Teams
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   C. Intramurals
   D. Physical Education classes - Men
   E. Physical Education Classes - Women
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I. PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

A. Women's Intercollegiate Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronized Swimming</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation Statistics

### B. Men's Intercollegiate Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Football</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightweight Football</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Soccer</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Basketball</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Hockey</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Baseball</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavyweight Crew</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Heavyweight Crew</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Lightweight Crew</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Lacrosse</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>993</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

C. Intramurals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Leagues</th>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Contests</th>
<th>Participants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Touch Football</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomstick Polo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (University Championship)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>2,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing (University All Weapon Championship)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing (Novice)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing (Team and University Championship)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>16,898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including duplicates
## 1. Participation Statistics

### D. Physical Education Classes - Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Spring 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swim Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Swimming (frosh)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beginner Swimming</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Senior Life Saving</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Water Safety Instructors</td>
<td>(not offered)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scuba</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight Lifting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Squash</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Beginners</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outdoor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Beginners</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sophomore (Advanced)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outdoor (play 18 holes per week)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Games</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trampoline</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adventure Training</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Aid</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>(not offered)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Service</strong></td>
<td>(not offered)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctives</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Dance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

#### E. Physical Education Classes - Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st half</td>
<td>2nd half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance (Elementary, Intermediate,</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intermediate, Advanced*, 200, 201, Anatomy, Jazz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Figure Control</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Skating</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Dance</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey (Field)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey (Ice)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Gymnastics</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E. for Social Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riflery</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Conditioning</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, Sr. Life Saving, Water Safety Instr., Begin Synchronized, Advanced Syn., Diving)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I. PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

### E. Physical Education Classes - Women - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>2,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*16 for Academic Credit - Fall
6 for Academic Credit - Spring
II. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES

A. Special Programs

Special programs held in Helen Newman continued to expand. In 1972-73 they included:
- Swimming lessons for children
- Co-ed volleyball - Friday night
- Modern dance classes for faculty wives and grad wives
- Volleyball Club - undergraduate wives
- Badminton Club - students and faculty, men and women
- Use of facilities on occasion by Lansing School for Girls
- Grad wives and students - volleyball, badminton & basketball
- Cornell Dance Club - several performances during the year
- Synchronized Swimming Club - gave performances April 12, 13, 14
- Basketball and volleyball Intramural Tournaments
- Summer program in Modern Dance
- Use of facilities in summer by Model Cities, Advanced Placement, and Executive Developing.

Risley Recreation Room was used for ten classes in modern dance and ballet. The dance curriculum continues to expand and the Educational Policy Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences approved the proposal for a dance major. This proposal was, however, tabled by the Faculty until fall.

Teagle Hall dressing and shower areas were provided for all interested women between 12:00 noon and 1:30 PM Monday through Friday. Approximately seventy-five women used the area during the spring semester. Average daily attendance was twenty-four. The Barton Hall running track attracts the most noon hour participation. Some women play squash at this time but they are encouraged to use the courts during free play evening hours. There are also a few girls who workout in the weight room and Teagle gym at this time.

Grumman Squash Courts. In order to achieve maximum use from the squash facility, the courts remain open until midnight, seven nights per week. Reservation of courts is made on an honor system sign up sheet. The reservation lists show that all courts are used until midnight during the winter months. Co-ed use during the evenings is very popular, especially at the graduate school level.

Informal noon hour recreation period for faculty and staff. For the past several years physical education classes have not been scheduled in Teagle Hall from 12:00 noon to 1:30 PM. The period is devoted entirely to Faculty and Staff use of facilities. Faculty and Staff membership is now approximately 700 men. The pool
and squash courts are reserved for their use at this time. The Barton Hall and Teagle gym also receive heavy lunch hour use. It is a time when everyone has an opportunity to do "his thing", whether it is jogging, the weight room or a steam bath and shower.

Family Service Program. The weekly Thursday evening swim program has operated continuously in the Teagle pools since the building was completed in 1954. All faculty and staff personnel who hold membership in Teagle Hall may bring their families without charge. There is a 50¢ charge per person to all other University personnel. Average attendance is eighty-five per session. The shallow pool is very adaptable to the younger children.

Faculty and Staff General Conditioning Class. This group meets during the winter months - three times weekly - during the noon hour in the wrestling room of Teagle Hall. Mr. Tom McGory, Head Athletic Trainer, is in charge of the program. Thirty-five faculty and staff participated in the program this past year.

B. Physical Education Classes 1972-73 and 1973-74

Introduction to scuba diving, judo, karate, first aid, trampoline and mountaineering were offered for the first time in 1972-73 and were exceptionally popular. The registration for mountaineering and scuba was so great that a lottery system was established as the only fair way to determine class placement. In most all cases the above courses were offered on a co-ed basis. It should be reported that the girls enrolled in mountaineering did a remarkable job. In fact one of the girls will serve as an assistant instructor in the fall semester 1973.

The following activities are new or revised in 1973-74:

1. Skeet and Trap Shooting. The Ithaca Gun Company has been very helpful in making this course possible - five skeet and trap guns have been consigned to the department free of charge. Range participation will be held at the Tompkins County Rod & Gun Club on Route #34, only 4 miles from the campus. Several experts in this area will furnish the instruction. Ithaca Gun Company personnel will also assist in instruction. Early pre-registration indicated a heavy demand, both male and female.

2. Cross Country Skiing. This activity will be offered to the men for the first time in the spring semester 1974. Equipment will be stored at the Moakley House and the surrounding golf course will serve as excellent terrain for cross country work.

3. Squash. For the first time girls will receive formal instruction in squash. Based on male-female enrollment numbers, the twelve places in each class will be split 60% male - 40% female. How successful this activity will work out on a co-ed basis will be recorded in a later report.

4. Bowling. A competent instructor will be on duty for a major proportion of the bowling classes for 1973-74. Budget restrictions will permit hiring an
instructor on an hourly basis five hours per day. The cost to be shared between the men's and women's department.

5. The Games Program in Barton Hall will be offered on a structured basis in the fall of 1973. Instruction will be given in basketball, volleyball and badminton. An attempt will be made to break the groups into permanent teams and a competitive league type program developed. Each period to be divided between instruction and game participation.

6. Physical Education for Social Service. The class provides instruction and practice in those physical activities that can be utilized in various types of social service programs such as Vista, Peace Corps and local community programs during evenings and the summer months. The course consists of lecture, discussion and participation in the teaching of low and high organization games, group games for young children and team games such as basketball and volleyball. The students have been given the opportunity to participate in the roll of teacher and supervisor at the Greater Ithaca Youth Center and the South Side House. Term reports submitted indicate that the participation at the youth centers is the most rewarding part of the program. Fifteen students registered in the program in the spring semester 1973.

C. Selected Comments on Facilities Use and Policies

Helen Newman Hall is being used to capacity with virtually all of the 2,275 baskets having been issued this year. In April a small sauna was installed in the women's locker room and has proved to be a most popular addition.

Considerable improvements were made in the area surrounding Helen Newman Hall; i.e., planting of shrubs and trees, widening of road, extensive work on the bank and parking lots, plus a new regulation length playing field. The archery range remains insufficient in length and there is a dire need for more tennis courts and resurfacing of the present ones.

A new dressing and shower facility for women will be constructed under the south bleachers in Barton Hall during the summer. The target date for completion is September 1, 1973. The area will include one hundred and five storage baskets (Teagle type), twenty-four half lockers, showers, toilets, sinks and hair dryers. The facility will be available at any time that Barton Hall is open for general use. It will solve the dressing problem for co-ed physical education classes as well as the many hours of general recreational participation. A general expansion of female athletic programs is anticipated in the Barton Hall end of the campus.

Course Offerings - 1973-74 Policy. Physical Education course offerings are available to all students. It is necessary to restrict only in areas where facilities limit numbers within classes (such as 6 squash courts). All men in the physical education program will elect from 27 offerings. It will no longer be the policy to have separate classes for freshmen. The sophomores will have the opportunity of pre-registering; however, class places will be held open for the entering freshman class. Thus everyone having equal opportunity to enter any activity.
Certain variations pertaining to physical education course requirements have existed between the men's and women's departments. Changes have been made so that by the start of the fall semester 1973, all course offerings and requirements will be administered on a uniform basis.

Many courses are now operated on a co-ed basis. The rapport between the men's and women's departments is excellent and with additional co-ed offerings for 1973-74 we are making every effort to increase appeal and promote a healthy attitude.

Fees, 1973-74. To continue teaching certain courses, it will be necessary to charge fees for more of those activities that require special equipment or instruction. Some are among our more popular course offerings. For example, fees are now charged for mountaineering, equitation, scuba and skiing and next year will probably be charged for fencing and skating.
The Speaker, Professor Russell Martin, called the special meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. 60 FCR members and 7 visitors were present. The Speaker announced that this was to be a special meeting for discussion only. Visiting privileges were granted Ms. Laurie Zelon, Chairman, University Senate Committee on Academics, Dean Robert J. Kane, Physical Education and Athletics, Mrs. Martha B. Arnett, Director of Women's Athletics, Mr. Jon T. Anderson, Director of Physical Education and Athletics, Mr. George D. Patte, Director of Physical Education and Mr. Robert Harrison, Speaker of the Senate. Speaking privileges were granted Ms. Zelon, Dean Kane, Mrs. Arnett, and Professors Jay Orear, Physics, David H. White, Physics, and Assistant Professor David A. Singer, Mathematics.

At the suggestion of the Dean of the Faculty, the Speaker asked consent to grant speaking privileges to Mr. Harrison should he be called upon to comment on the matter to be discussed. Professor L. Pearce Williams, Member-at-Large, asked the reason for the request. The Dean replied that the Senate had placed its recommendation to abolish the physical education requirement on the FCR agenda with a request for early consideration, and that Senate legislation empowers the Speaker to follow up on legislative matters by speaking to them, answering questions, overseeing implementation etc. Professor Isadore Blumen, Member-at-Large, asked whether Ms. Zelon or Mr. Harrison was the Senate spokesman. The Dean said that Ms. Zelon, as Chairman of the committee which sponsored the Senate's Physical Education Requirement Bill, was the person most familiar with the Bill. Technically, he said, the spokesman for the Senate is the Speaker. Mr. Harrison was granted speaking privileges.

1. REPORT FROM THE DEAN

The Dean announced that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Research Policies had been created to consider the matters of Library expansion and the "open access" program discussed at the previous meeting. Subcommittee members are Professors Norman Kretzmann, Philosophy, Chairman, Walter F. LaFeber, History, and Herbert J. Carlin, the J. Preston Levis Professor of Electrical Engineering. The Dean invited FCR members to communicate their concerns on these matters to subcommittee members.

The Dean referred to recent articles and commentary in the Cornell Daily Sun about University regulations regarding responding to subpoenas issued to students, in which he said he was accurately quoted as having said that there was no currently pending "move" for Faculty legislation on the subpoena matter.
The Dean said that as the matter emerged he had been consulted, had taken some action, had caused some steps to be taken and was satisfied with the outcome. He said he saw no need for Faculty legislation in this area and that he was not in the habit of making statements about details to the Sun. He invited any FCR members who wished to talk personally about the matter to speak to him.

The Dean reported that discussions had been ongoing among various FCR committees, his office and the Deans' Council regarding legislating guidelines for grievance procedures to be adopted by the various colleges and schools. He said Cornell Chronicle would publish a current grievance procedure proposal draft, and hopefully action on the proposal could be taken in May.

The Dean reminded the body that the meeting was intended to discuss the physical education requirement only, with formal action expected to be taken at the April meeting. The Subcommittee on the Physical Education Requirement had submitted a report which gave no firm recommendation, he said, and therefore in an attempt to crystallize the issues he had prepared a tentative draft of three possible courses of action for use at this meeting. They are as follows:

I. RESOLVED, That the Senate proposal for removing the Physical Education requirement by offering academic credit for Physical Education courses be approved.

II. RESOLVED, That the Physical Education requirement be reduced from four to two terms.

III. RESOLVED, That the Physical Education requirement be abolished and no credit be given for Physical Education courses.

The Dean suggested that the FCR attempt to consider the matter in the order listed by the resolutions, and plan to deal with it at the April meeting in the same way.

The Speaker asked if any Faculty members were present other than those already named, and granted visiting privileges to Mr. Byron McCalmon, the Registrar.

2. PRESENTATIONS ON THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

The Speaker called on Ms. Zelon, who said the Senate considered the matter under discussion one of academic principle, and therefore wished to "treat it carefully." The Senate had no intent of harming the physical education program, she said, but instead considered it helpful to students academically in improving their physical well being. The Senate expressed the feeling of a majority of students, she said, that the requirement, being the only University-
Wide one for graduation, is not valid as an academic requirement. It is a manifestation of the doctrine of "in loco parentis," she said, adding that the Faculty should guide students but no longer require certain actions of them. She said she was appalled when she learned that students had been refused their degrees because they had not satisfied the requirement. Those who wish to take part in athletics or physical education will continue to do so if the requirement is abolished, she said, adding that many students now audit physical education courses and use the intramural program; while those who do not desire physical education do not benefit from the program. If the Faculty feels the principle is important, she asserted, ways can be found to make up the money lost by abolishing the requirement. The Senate recommended granting academic credit for physical education courses for two reasons, she said. First, it felt that physical education departments would become more competitive and would improve the quality of their courses in order to receive Faculty approval for credit. Second, the University would continue to receive State monies if credit were granted for such courses, even half credit according to information received by her committee. Funds may even increase after an initial dropoff in usage during the first four or five years, she said, if experience at other institutions prevails at Cornell.

The Speaker called on Mrs. Arnett. The point at issue presents a quandary that other universities have faced, she said. Most have kept the physical education requirement and offered academic credit for courses in the program. Very few have eliminated credit, or the requirement, and in her opinion to do so would seriously hurt the program. To maintain quality such a program requires either an academic major, a requirement or the granting of credit. The women's physical education staff is particularly concerned about the question because it feels it has more to lose than the men's program, she said. The women's program has traditionally been concerned with so-called unskilled girls, and secondary school training for girls is very poor compared to men's training. At Cornell, for example, 15 percent of entering women students cannot swim or perform basic exercises such as skipping rope. A recent study at Wells College indicated that students there were better prepared mentally than physically, she said. Moreover, she expressed reluctance to see women's physical education specialize in athletics or "team" sports. The Senate, she said, had noted the growth of the women's physical education program and called it the "largest single issue" in the physical education requirement matter. The athletic program grows out of the physical education program, she said, the most noticeable activities being fencing, ice hockey
and polo. Moreover, in her opinion physical education is an academic program, i.e., a discipline with an identifiable body of knowledge. As proof she cited recent approval by the Arts College Faculty of a major in dance, noting however that the "years of effort" involved in bringing this about gave proof that the University does not recognize physical education as an academic subject.

Her primary concern about abolishing the requirement, Mrs. Arnett said, was for the loss of staff and diversity that would result. Her 17-woman staff teaches 2,400 students, she said, fielding 18 athletic teams of high quality. The staff considers itself physical education professionals first and athletic coaches second, she said, and its members would be reluctant to stay at the University if the requirement were abolished. This problem is not shared by the men's physical education staff, she added, noting that there had been 75 applicants for the job of basketball coach. She concluded with the recommendation that the University retain the physical education requirement, "with thoughts, perhaps, of a change in the future."

The Speaker called on Dean Kane, who pointed out that the physical education requirement was not, and never had been, an academic requirement. It is needed, he said, in order to provide orderly use of athletic facilities. Yale and Rutgers universities, which abolished the requirement, had experienced fluctuations between non-use of facilities and overcrowding, he said. Instructional fees pay for the program, amounting to $250,000 during the current year, and, with tuition increases, promising to reach $276,000 next year. This income could not be exceeded, he said, if physical education were an academic requirement because students in statutory units would not take physical education courses as part of their academic programs. Moreover, if the program were voluntary, it would appear that the same staff, equipment, services, and expenses would be required to serve the community, but with less income. As a result Teagle Hall would be crowded in the noon-to-2 p.m. period, the Physical Education Department would not receive fees from its courses in equitation, bowling, etc. and would lose approximately $273,000 in income per year.

The swimming requirement, Dean Kane said, poses a particular problem. It is intended to "lure" nonswimmers to learn to swim, he said, and 95 percent of nonswimmers have been taught how to swim in one academic term (a total of 6,000 students since 1946). Although perhaps six students had had their academic degrees "held up" until they satisfied the physical education
requirement, he said, he knew of no one who had lost his degree for failing to pass it. He also pointed out that the economically deprived student benefits most from the program, learning such games as golf, tennis and baseball which stay with him beyond his sophomore year at college.

Dean Kane said his department hoped shortly to try out a new program in diet and exercise designed to avoid obesity, heart disease etc. and prepared in cooperation with the Medical College, the nutrition department and staff members in the Ithaca College master's program. The Dean also pointed out that the physical education requirement is not an anachronism. A 1971-72 survey revealed, for example, that 82 percent of colleges on the Eastern seaboard still retained the requirement, he said. He concluded by saying there was a correlation between academics and the physical education program, i.e., between intellect and good health. You can't have one without the other, he said, and expressed the hope that the FCR would consider a fourth course of action, namely reaffirming the requirement.

Professor Williams spoke opposing the Senate resolution in which he pointed out that it had passed the Senate by one vote (this in a body elected by only 27.7 percent of the student body, he added), that he considered the second paragraph of former Senate Speaker Raymond Minella's letter requesting Faculty consideration of the recommendation illiterate, that Ms. Zelon erred in saying the Faculty had abandoned the "in loco parentis" doctrine; it was, in fact, the Central Administration which had done so while the language and most other academic requirements were still in force, and that he did not consider the Cornell Faculty to consist of instructors, as it is at the University of Toronto, but of educators. He said he saw many Faculty members regularly working out in Barton Hall. Those who advised students, he said, knew that many of them seek "role models," and that he himself knew one sophomore who has been "regenerated" by a casual encounter with a Faculty member in Teagle Hall, a member who took the trouble to expose the student to physical education and also to help him academically. Physical education is not an academic question, he concluded, nor should it be. The point at issue is that if the requirement is abolished and credit not granted for physical education courses, the University will lose money, and will have to fire physical education staff members, thus causing a "further dilution" of its academic program. Typically, he said, the Senate passed a resolution boycotting purchase of union lettuce by the University, but did not care about the status of physical education staff members.
Associate Professor John F. Booker, Engineering, asked if there were any financial constraints on the amount of credit given for physical education courses, i.e., could the Faculty grant one-half a credit and receive the same accessory instruction fee as at present. He also asked if fees would be paid for credit granted by the FCR but not by individual colleges and schools of the University. Dean Kane said that the State would only pay an accessory instruction fee for one hour per term of credit, and that the statutory colleges would have to approve the credit to make it "fee bearing." Professor Singer said that Mr. Arthur H. Peterson, University Treasurer, had told him that, if credit were offered, accessory instruction fees would flow from the State regardless of the amount of credit; even as low as one-half credit, unless the State felt the University was not offering credit in good faith. The University would be paid for every student taking a physical education course for which credit was guaranteed to him. Professor Blumen said that he understood that if a half credit were granted for a course, half the fee would be received.

Professor John H. Whitlock, Member-at-Large, asked if the consequences of defeating the first resolution proposed by the Dean would be to eliminate all consideration of granting credit for physical education courses. The Dean replied no. Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B&PA, observed that the Senate seemed to have presented two arguments in favor of its resolution, one, that the "in loco parentis" doctrine had been abandoned, and two, that the Faculty should confine itself exclusively to academic matters. These arguments did not seem valid, he said, because in his view the University must produce people well equipped to deal with life, i.e., having physical competence and an ability to handle oneself well. In the world of the future, he said, this ability would become a way of life. Professor Walter R. Lynn, Member-at-Large, requested the Speaker to seek to clarify confusion over the accessory instruction fee question raised by Professor Booker by the next meeting.

Assistant Professor Norman T. Uphoff, Government, said that the body should consider whether or not physical education is part of required education at Cornell. He said he considered physical education important, and suggested that the Faculty might even consider requiring its own members to take part in such a program. If agreement is reached on its importance, he said, then the question is whether it should be required for students and would students required to take it gain physical competence. Students had told him, he said, that the physical education program at Cornell was of poor quality, and he asked Professor Williams if he did not think that the program might improve if it had
to compete on its merits with other University programs. The Dean suggested
that the physical education requirement could stand on its own, without
formal connection with academics. He reminded the body that other University
requirements had existed in the past, and cited the work requirement at
Bennington College as an example of a nonacademic requirement presently in
existence and presumably beneficial to students. The question is, he said,
should physical education be part of the Cornell experience. Profess Robert H.
Elias, Member-at-Large, said he also had heard complaints that the physical
education program consisted of exercise rather than a program with emphasis
on learning skills. He asked Dean Kane if he had any proposals for improving
the quality of education by downgrading the value given to sports in
relationship to physical education. Professor Williams rose to answer
Professors Elias' question on grounds that Dean Kane was an interested party.
He disagreed with condemnation of the program, pointing out that Mr. Robert
Martin, for example, gymnastics coach and weightlifting director, was a
"superb teacher," and that a mountain climbing course in which he (Professor
Williams) was involved as an assistant teacher provided skills of great
future benefit to students. Professor Elias referred to an article in the
current issue of Backpacker Magazine listing Cornell as among institutions
giving one hour of credit for a course taught by a Mr. Pack and asked
Professor Williams if he could help the body determine "who is giving credit
for what." Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, asked Professor Uphoff if
he would favor making use of physical education facilities voluntary in light
of the difficulty of reserving a squash court for play. The question of
Faculty interest in using such facilities and their availability to those
"passionately" interested in using them is a serious one, he said. Dean Kane
replied that the squash courts were open daily from noon until 2 p.m. and
from 4 to 6 p.m. He reminded the body that although the University desired
more squash courts, it would have none if the donor of the present ones had
not given them to the University for use by students.

Professor William F. Mai, Plant Pathology, observed that the need for
exercise, and for knowledge of how to exercise, increased with advancing years,
and that therefore he felt it important to expose students to many different
types of physical activity. The physical education program, being perhaps one
of the best in the country, he said, offers this exposure. Professor Peter
Stein, Physics, said that he had polled a number of his colleagues on their
feelings about the matter under discussion, and that they opposed granting credit for physical education courses, which they did not consider an academic pursuit. The Faculty should not grant credit for such courses in order to obtain accessory instruction fees for the University, he said, if only because there is a difference between recommending courses in physics and recommending physical education courses. He asked if a financial analysis had been made of the fee question and if there was a simple answer to the questions raised at this meeting. The Dean replied that Mr. William Gurowitz, Vice President for Campus Affairs, had prepared a financial analysis which was distributed with the call to the last meeting, and that a more detailed analysis, prepared by Mr. Anthony Treadwell, former Assistant for Business Affairs to Mr. Gurowitz, was available to interested persons in the Dean's office. The simple answer sought by Professor Stein, he said, was that the University would lose approximately $200,000 in accessory instruction fees per year if it abolished the requirement and did not grant credit for physical education courses.

Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, said that, having recently attended a cardiologists' meeting, he felt knowledge of diet and exercise were important and should be considered part of one's education, and recommended adding instruction in good diet to the physical education program. Professor Wesley W. Gunkel, Agricultural Engineering, agreed with Dean Kane's observation that if physical education were not required students would not take part in the program. He cited as example a graduate seminar, formerly required by his own department, which was made optional in the late 1960s in response to student objections to the requirement. At present only about 10 percent of graduate students in the department attend the seminar, he said.

Associate Professor Richard H. Rand, Engineering, non-FCR, who chaired the Subcommittee on the Physical Education Requirement, offered some personal observations drawn from his experience on the Subcommittee. Many physical education instructors are paid not only to teach but also to coach athletics, he said, which might be considered unfair since students taking physical education do not necessarily wish to support athletic teams financially. He too had heard complaints from students about the quality of physical education at the University, he said, and observed that without the requirement physical education would have to compete with other activities for students and thereby might upgrade its courses. Lastly he observed that in discussing the requirement Faculty tend to treat it in categories such as principles, finances, etc., but what invariably emerged was a "gut feeling" about each individual's experience and how he felt about physical education as a result.

Adjourned: 6:00 p.m.

J. Leeming, Assistant to the Secretary
The Speaker, Professor Russell Martin, called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m. 81 FCR members and 4 visitors were present. Speaking privileges were granted Assistant Professor David A. Singer, Mathematics. Visiting privileges and, if need be, speaking privileges were granted Mr. William A. Jenkins, Business Manager, Office of the Vice President for Campus Affairs. Minutes of the meeting of March 13 were approved with a correction made by Professor Paul Olum, Member-at-Large. On page 9, he said, the following sentence was inaccurate: "The Senate's original enabling legislation had provided the Senate a degree of control in academic matters, he said, which was later denied it." The sentence should read, he said: "Many students in the Constituent Assembly wanted the Senate's enabling legislation to provide control in academic matters, he said, but this was overruled by the constitutional drafting committee."

1. REPORT FROM THE DEAN

The Dean announced that he would be forced to leave the meeting shortly after 5 p.m. to fulfill another commitment. He reported that the Executive Committee had discussed procedures for having the Faculty work with the Administration on long-range budgeting, and had decided first to determine proper mechanics, kinds of information and kinds of decisions on which the Faculty ought to pass judgment. As a result the Committee had recommended that the Dean appoint a select budget committee of the Faculty to work on this matter, and he said he would do so if there was no objection.

Associate Professor K. Bingham Cady, Engineering, asked if the Review and Procedures subcommittee on legislation for a budgeting committee had not already handled this matter. The Dean replied that although there might be overlap between the two committees, his plan was not designed to produce redundancy. If the forthcoming Review and Procedures legislative proposal covered the matter at hand, he said, then it would become the vehicle for action. He said he also planned to appoint one member of the select committee to work with budget officials, primarily Mr. Samuel Lawrence, Vice President for Administration, on the coming year's budget in order to educate the committee on issues under consideration.

Among items which might be presented for Faculty consideration at the May 8 meeting, the Dean said, was the report on the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (C.I.U.E.), which the FCR had recommitted. Professor Raphael Littauer, chairman of the study committee, had gathered the requested information and sent the Dean a letter which he had referred to Academic Programs
and Policies for assessment. The evaluation report on the Center for International Studies (C.I.S.) might also be presented by Academic Programs and Policies for reconsideration, and a proposal on a half-time tenure policy, discussed by Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty and in the Deans' Council, might emerge.

Responding to the charge given him at the previous meeting to clarify the questions raised regarding receipt of accessory instruction fees for the Physical Education program, the Dean referred to a letter sent him by Mr. Arthur H. Peterson, University Treasurer, and distributed with the call to meeting. That letter, he said, established that the amount of money received by the University was related proportionately to the number of hours of credit recorded on student transcripts, there being four terms of physical education required by the University. The total number of hours of such credit recorded for students in Agriculture and Life Sciences, Industrial and Labor Relations and Human Ecology produces slightly less than $300,000 in accessory instruction fees each year. If the Faculty chose to reduce the requirement by one-half, the Dean said, the program would generate one-half the present income.

Professor Singer said that at the previous meeting he had not intended to create the impression that he favored granting half-credit for the program, and asked if by doubling the amount of credit the University could generate twice the present income. The Dean replied that such might be the case in principle, but that the present system had existed for many years and there was no possibility of negotiating such an increase.

The Dean then said that the four resolutions distributed with the call to meeting regarding the Physical Education requirement were an attempt to phrase in technical language the alternatives posed by the Senate resolution recommending that the Faculty abolish the requirement. The four resolutions are:

1) RESOLVED, That effective with the class entering in 1975, the P.E. legislation enacted in June, 1945, and amended October, 1949, January, 1950, and December, 1962, is repealed and the Physical Education and Athletics Department is requested to develop a set of appropriate Physical Education courses to be considered by college E.P.C.s for academic credit.

2) RESOLVED, That effective with the class entering in 1975, the P.E. legislation enacted in June, 1945, and amended October, 1949, January, 1950, and December, 1962, is repealed.

3) RESOLVED, That effective with the class entering in 1975, the P.E. legislation enacted in June, 1945, and amended October, 1949, January, 1950, and December, 1962, is amended to substitute the
words "two terms" for "four terms" where they appear in paragraphs 1 and 2 of said legislation.

4) RESOLVED, That the Dean of Faculty appoint a special committee to study and assess the quality of the P.E. program and the appropriateness of awarding academic credit for some P.E. courses and that the committee report to the FCR before December, 1974.

The Senate resolution consists of two parts, the Dean said. These are, first, to abolish the requirement, second, to award credit for physical education courses. The Faculty cannot award credit for such courses, he said, this being a function of the schools and colleges. The FCR can set up the machinery to enable units to award credit. He then described the phasing problems associated with passage of resolutions one through three. In the Executive Committee's opinion it would be technically impossible to abolish the requirement in the coming year since budgets and personnel were already firmed up. Thus the program would have to be phased out over a period of years. The fourth resolution had been added in response to questions raised about the adequacy of the present Physical Education program and whether or not it was worthy of academic credit if such were offered, he said. Obviously there were other alternatives to the four resolutions such as reaffirming the existing program or working out some other combination of a two-term requirement without an elective program. Professor Paul D. Ankrum, Engineering, asked for clarification on the question of granting credit for Physical Education courses. The Dean said that Physical Education and Athletics is a department of the University and, like ROTC, can seek approval from the school and college Educational Policy Committees for its course offerings. He and Professor Ankrum discussed the distinction between satisfaction of credit required for completion of the physical education requirement, as for instance in the Arts College, and acceptance of such hours of credit toward the 120 hours required for a degree as is the practice in the statutory units, with respect to certain ROTC courses. Professor Olum suggested that this distinction could be resolved by wording the end of the first resolution to read: "for credit towards the degree."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics, received affirmation from the Dean that he had told the body in effect that, without any action from the FCR, any EPC could decide to give credit for physical education courses, and that no action by the FCR could result in granting credit for such courses. Associate Professor John F. Booker, Engineering, received the Dean's affirmation that he believed Mr. Peterson's letter stated in effect that the State would pay accessory
had requested members are membership at-large Committee, who REPORT FROM excused himself requirement the Dean. The Dean said he believed this was the case, just as the ILR School could require its students to perform a term of labor as a nonacademic exercise which perhaps each ILR graduate should experience. Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B&PA, asked the Dean when and why the physical education requirement was established. The Dean said it was established in 1946 and speculated that it had been a carryover from World War II. Professor Ankrum pointed out that the third motion differed from the third resolution offered at the April 8 meeting in not offering elective physical education courses. The Dean agreed and said that to comport with the notice to the meeting the third resolution should include the language from the first resolution beginning "and the Physical Education and Athletics Department is requested..." Professor Daniel G. Sisler, Agricultural Economics, asked the Dean if all colleges would have to award the same amount of credit for Physical Education courses, should such courses receive credit. The Dean said this was not the case, adding that at present the Arts College gives four hours of credit for certain courses which receive two hours in the Law School. The Dean also pointed out that the merits of the Physical Education program had been studied in earlier reports and that no question about this aspect of the program had been raised in either the previous Faculty committee report or the Senate report. Professor Hutchins remarked that if the Faculty served a unifying function, it should establish uniform guidelines for the whole University rather than leaving it to the various colleges and schools to go their own ways. The Dean commented that S.U.N.Y. had repealed its Statewide physical education requirement the previous year in order to encourage its campuses to exercise local options, and that he had been advised that morning by Vice Provost Robert S. Risley that no S.U.N.Y. units had yet repealed the requirement. He then excused himself from the meeting.

2. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The Speaker called on Professor Walter Lynn, Chairman, FCR Executive Committee, who submitted the attached slates of candidates for Faculty Trustee, at-large membership in the FCR, committees for which non-FCR and FCR Faculty members are needed. (Appendices A and B)

Professor Lynn said that Associate Professor Ralph L. Obendorf, Agronomy, had requested that his name be withdrawn from the slate for one tenured Faculty
member to be elected for a three-year term to Admissions and Financial Aids, leaving only Professor Ankrum as a candidate, and said Nominations and Elections would like a volunteer or nominee to replace Professor Obendorf. Professor Ankrum said that if no other nominee were found he would withdraw his name also. The Speaker read the list of vacancies and asked if there were additional nominations from the floor. Professor Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if Nominations and Elections would select nominees for Admissions and Financial Aids and was told that would be the normal procedure. There being no nominations from the floor, a motion to close the nominations was carried.

(Subsequently, Associate Professor Gerald E. Rehkugler, Agricultural Engineering, agreed to be a candidate.)

3. PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

The Speaker said that he interpreted, subject to appeal, the four draft resolutions as distributed as constituting a portion of the agenda and asked if the body wished to change the order in which they would be considered. Professor Booker moved to suspend the rules and consider the fourth resolution first. Carried. Professor Vernon H. Jensen, I&LR, asked if passage of the fourth resolution would fulfill the FCR's obligation to respond to the Senate recommendation, and the Speaker said he believed passage of the first resolution would fulfill this obligation. Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large, said he thought the body could deal with the fourth resolution and then consider the first three resolutions as distributed. The Speaker agreed.

Professor Olum said the FCR's only obligation is that the Senate placed the matter on the agenda. The body can settle the matter any way it wished, he said, including consideration only of the fourth resolution or even ignoring the matter. Associate Professor Donald Hayes, Sociology, said that to complete the action the fourth resolution should be amended by the addition of language stating that there would be no change in the Physical Education requirement at this time. The Speaker called on the Parliamentarian, Professor Chester H. Freeman, Communication Arts, to rule on the Speaker's interpretation of the matter. Professor Freeman said he thought the body should decide how it wished to consider the matter. The Speaker called on Professor Lynn, who introduced resolution No. 4.

Professor L. Pearce Williams, Member-at-Large, moved to amend the resolution as follows:

RESOLVED, That the [Dean of Faculty appoint a special] FCR authorize the election of a standing committee to study and assess the quality of the Physical Education
program [and the appropriateness of awarding academic credit for some physical education courses] and that the committee shall report to the FCR before December, 1974[, and at least every two years thereafter.]

(Deletions in brackets, additions underlined.)

Professor Elias asked Professor Williams if he was making an amendment or a complete substitution. The Chair ruled that it was an amendment. Professor Ankrum asked Professor Williams why he wished to delete reference to awarding academic credit from the resolution. Professor Williams replied that he had written the amendment before the body decided to change the order in which it would consider the resolutions, and that he had assumed that the body would have considered the first three resolutions and not passed them by the time it reached resolution No. 4. Therefore the question of granting credit would have been dealt with. Moreover, he said, the FCR cannot grant credit for physical education courses. Any University-wide requirement ought to have Faculty oversight, he said, and therefore he favored an elected standing committee over an appointed special committee as the proper means for implementing the Faculty's obligation in this matter.

The Speaker pointed out that if the body considered Professor Williams' amendment to be a substitute motion, it must first deal with the original motion as offered, then move if it wished, to substitute Professor Williams' motion for the original and refine it as it had the original motion.

Professor Vinay Ambegaokar, Physics, asked if the Council on Physical Education and Athletics did not already constitute a standing committee and was told by the Speaker that this was a Committee of the University Faculty, not the FCR. The Speaker received a question from the floor as to whether any other courses existed as a University-wide requirement for graduation, and the Secretary said there were none. The Speaker concluded that the body considered Professor Williams' motion to be an amendment. A motion to close debate on the amendment was carried. The Secretary asked Robert J. Kane, Dean of Physical Education and Athletics, if members of the Council on Physical Education and Athletics were charged to assess the quality of the Physical Education program, and the Dean said they were not. Professor Elias asked if there were any non-Faculty members on the Council, and the Secretary replied affirmatively. Professor Hutchins objected to closing debate on the ground that he opposed the idea of having two committees fulfilling similar purposes, and was overruled by the Speaker. The motion to amend carried 39 to 32, and the floor was opened to debate on the amended motion. Professor Philip J.
McCarthy, I&LR, commented that he recalled the FCR devoting much time to settling the composition and size of its standing committees, and pointed out that here, "by a single sentence," it was creating another standing committee. Professor Elias said that the process of electing a standing committee would cause a delay of several weeks in making the committee operational, whereas if the Dean were to appoint a committee the December deadline for a report would become more realistic. Professor Williams said that he thought the committee would have an "easy job" of carrying out its charge. Professor John H. Whitlock, Member-at-Large, said that the motion only empowers creation of a committee and that the FCR Executive Committee would have to offer a resolution regarding its size, election procedures, duties, timetable, etc. Therefore it was not germane to debate what the Committee would do, he said, or when it would do it. Professor Lynn observed that Professor Williams' amendment had effectively altered the original resolution by removing from it consideration of the question of awarding credit for physical education courses and by substituting a committee whose function would be merely to "police" such courses. The question of awarding credit needs study, he said, and suggested deferring action on the first three resolutions until a committee had been established to report back to the body on the appropriateness of awarding credit.

Professor Hutchins asked if it would be inappropriate to ask the University Faculty standing committee on Physical Education and Athletics to assess the quality of the program and report back to the FCR. The Secretary asked Dean Kane to describe the membership of the committee. Dean Kane said it consisted of alumni, undergraduate students, trustees and three Faculty members.* Professor Hutchins withdrew his suggestion. The amended motion carried.

RESOLVED, That the FCR authorize the election of a standing committee to study and assess the quality of the Physical Education program and that the committee shall report to the FCR before December, 1974, and at least every two years thereafter.

Professor Lynn introduced the original resolution No. 1. Professor Singer recommended passing this resolution instead of original resolution No. 2 on grounds that it would preserve the physical education program, saying he had been particularly moved by the remarks of Mrs. Martha Arnett, Director of Women's Athletics, at the March 27 meeting, concerning the difficulty of trying to maintain her staff if the program were abolished. Professor Ankrum opposed

*Note: The correct name is Council on Physical Education and Athletics and was established by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. There are three faculty members elected by the University Faculty on the Council.
the resolution on the grounds of conversations he had had with 16 freshmen advisees in the Engineering College and a poll he had conducted of 33 Engineering College Faculty members indicating support for the present Physical Education Program.* Resolution No. 1 failed.

Professor Lynn introduced original resolution No. 2. Professor Olum supported the resolution on the grounds that, however beneficial the program might be, requiring physical education in order to receive a degree from the University is incompatible with general concepts of the University's academic program. The Faculty should not require physical education simply because it has control over the academic degree, he added. Resolution No. 2 failed.

Professor Lynn introduced original resolution No. 3. At Professor Ankrum's suggestion, the Speaker appended the following language from original resolution No. 1 to resolution No. 3: "and the Physical Education and Athletics Department is requested to develop a set of appropriate Physical Education courses to be considered by college E.P.C.s for academic credit."

Professor Stein asked Dean Kane how seriously passage of the resolution would affect the Physical Education program. The Dean replied that passage of the resolution would cost the University at least $150,000 in income annually, and that it would "hurt quality" because the program could not accomplish as much in a shorter time as it presently does. Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, supported the resolution on the grounds that it would help determine the amount of student interest in the program by putting it on a voluntary basis. Professor Williams said he did not consider the question of determining student interest important. More germane to this resolution, he asserted, is the fact that endowed college students do not contribute financial support to the program, therefore, if the resolution passed the University would have to depend entirely on the voluntary participation of students in the statutory units for support of the program at present levels. He reminded the body of the small support received by the Senate for its recommendation, stated that the FCR had already decided to support the physical education requirement in principle, and argued in favor of maintaining the two-year requirement both to avoid endangering present facilities and to assure continued use of facilities at present levels.

Professor Ankrum expressed disappointment in Dean Kane's reply to Professor Stein's question, saying he believed physical education would attract students on a voluntary basis, and that it would improve in quality if it had to compete with other courses at the University for credit. Dean Kane said
he had not understood, at the time he answered the question, the implications of the additional language appended to the resolution. If he had understood, he said, he would have given an entirely different response. Professor Ankrum said that the Engineering College gives 126 hours of credit, five of which are "completely free" and that the Faculty does not discriminate as to course matter in this area.** Original resolution No. 3, after a call for division, was defeated 37 to 33.

Adjourned: 6 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary

NOTE: Corrections received from Professor Ankrum

* "...and a poll he had conducted of 33 Engineering College Faculty members indicating support for the present Physical Education Program."
should read:
"...and a poll he had conducted of 33 Engineering College Faculty members indicating support for a required Physical Education Program."

** "...the Engineering College gives 126 hours of credit, five of which are 'completely free' and that the Faculty does not discriminate as to course matter in this area."
should read:
"...the Engineering College requires a minimum of 126 credit hours for graduation, six of which are 'completely free' and that the Faculty does not discriminate as to course matter in this area."
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Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections
Slate of Nominations

FACULTY TRUSTEE - 1 to be elected for a 5-year term

Sara E. Blackwell, Professor, Community Service Education
* Norman Penney, Professor, Law
Albert Silverman, Professor, Physics/LNS
Ari Van Tienhoven, Professor, Poultry Science

AT-LARGE MEMBER, FCR - 3 to be elected for 3-year term
2 to be elected for 2-year term

3 yr.  * Karen Arms, Assistant Professor, Neurobiology and Behavior
2 yr.  * Gwen J. Bymers, Professor and Chairman, Consumer Economics and Public Policy
       G. Conrad Dalman, Professor, Electrical Engineering
       Ronald B. Furry, Professor, Agricultural Engineering
       D. Bob Gowin, Professor, Education
       Alan K. McAdams, Associate Professor, Business and Public Administration
3 yr.  * Jerrold Meinwald, Professor, Chemistry
       Susan J. Morgan, Assistant Professor, English
2 yr.  * Willard J. Visek, Professor, Animal Science and Biological Sciences
3 yr.  * Robert J. Young, Professor and Chairman, Poultry Science

REVIEW AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE - 3 to be elected for 3-year term

* Robert F. Kahrs, Associate Professor, Epidemiology, Veterinary
* Herbert F. Newhall, Professor, Physics
* Richard F. Porter, Professor, Chemistry
* Edward H. Smith, Professor and Chairman, Entomology
* James S. Thorp, Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING BOARD - 3 to be elected for 3-year term

* J. Congress Mbata, Associate Professor, Africana Studies and Research Center
  Donald B. McCormick, Professor, Nutrition
  William McGuire, Professor, Structural Engineering
  Marion E. Minot, Associate Professor, Community Service Education
* Roger A. Morse, Professor, Apiculture, Entomology
* Stanley A. Zahler, Associate Professor, Genetics, Development and Physiology

MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE - 1 to be elected for 3-year term

Charles D. Gates, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
* James R. McConkey, Professor, English

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE - 3 to be elected for 3-year term

* James L. Gaylor, Professor of Biochemistry & Nutrition and Chairman, Section of Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology
* John T. Hsu, Professor, Music
2 yr.  * Barclay G. Jones, Professor and Chairman, City and Regional Planning
* Frank B. Miller, Professor and Chairman, Manpower Studies, I&LR
* Leonard Reissman, Professor and Chairman, Sociology
* Elected
UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS COMMITTEE - 2 to be elected for 3-year term
* Jay Orear, Professor, Physics/LNS
* William D. Pardee, Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry
  John D. Reppy, Professor, Physics/LASSP

COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS - 1 to be elected for 3-year term
* Wendell G. Earle, Professor, Agricultural Economics
  Christine Shoemaker, Assistant Professor, Structural Engineering

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Julius Fabricant, Professor, Avian Diseases, Veterinary
* Norman Kretzmann, Professor and Chairman, Philosophy

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Steven V. Beer, Assistant Professor, Plant Pathology
  Arnim H. Meyburg, Assistant Professor, Structural Engineering

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* W. Lambert Brittain, Professor, Human Development and Family Studies
* Henry N. Ricciuti, Professor, Human Development and Family Studies

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AIDS COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Robert L. Bruce, Professor, Education
  Robert H. Wasserman, Professor, Physical Biology, Veterinary

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AIDS COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Jeffrey Frey, Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering
* Eddy L. LaDue, Assistant Professor, Agricultural Economics

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Walter T. Federer, Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry
  Robert McGinnis, Professor, Sociology

PROFESSIONAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE - 2 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Seymour Smidt, Professor, Business and Public Administration
  Donald F. Solé, Associate Professor, Division of Modern Languages and Linguistics
* Howard M. Taylor, III, Associate Professor, Structural Engineering

RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE - 2 tenured to be elected for 3-year term
* Geoffrey V. Chester, Professor and Director, Laboratory of Solid State Physics
* Royse P. Murphy, Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry
  Edwin L. Resler, Jr., Joseph N. Pew Professor and Director, Sibley School of
    Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

* Elected
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Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections
Slate of Nominees for FCR Seats on Committees

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term

*Douglas E. Hogue, Professor, Animal Science
Neil L. Norcross, Professor, L.A.M.O.S., Veterinary

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term

Eric A. Blackall, Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of German Literature
*Shayle R. Searle, Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-year term

*Shaler Stidham, Jr., Assistant Professor, Operations Research
Terry L. Weaver, Assistant Professor, Microbiology

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AIDS COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term

Paul D. Ankrum, Professor, Electrical Engineering
Ralph L. Obendorf, Associate Professor, Agronomy—declined at FCR meeting 4/17/74 re-
Rehkugler, Gerald E., Assoc. Professor, Agricultural Engineering

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 3-year term

Loy V. Crowder, Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry

2 yr *Donald P. Hayes, Associate Professor, Sociology
3 yr *Paul J. VanDemark, Professor, Microbiology

FREEDOM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-yr term

Richard N. Boyd, Associate Professor, Philosophy
*Constance Wood, Assistant Professor, Plant Breeding and Biometry

PROFESSIONAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-year term

*Cary S. Hershey, Assistant Professor, Policy Planning and Regional Analysis
Dan E. Moore, Assistant Professor, Rural Sociology

RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE - 1 tenured to be elected for 2-year term

Norman A. Malcolm, Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy
*Wolfgang O. Sack, Professor, Veterinary Anatomy

RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE - 1 non-tenured to be elected for 3-year term

*William E. Fry, Assistant Professor, Plant Pathology
Uri Possen, Assistant Professor, Economics

* Elected
The Speaker, Professor Russell Martin, called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. Fifty-five members and 2 visitors were present. The minutes of the meeting of March 27* were approved as distributed.

1. REPORT BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

The Dean announced two presentations by TIAA-CREF on supplemental retirement annuities to be made May 16 in Room G 1 Uris Hall, the first at 3:30 p.m. and the second at 7:30 p.m. He pointed out that new options are available for TIAA-CREF subscribers, and encouraged interested Faculty members to attend these presentations.

The Dean explained that a proposal on part-time tenure appointments had not been included in the agenda because needed revisions were noted by the Deans' Council in its review of the proposal. A report on the reevaluation of the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE) was also excluded from the agenda because Academic Programs and Policies, chaired by Professor Philip J. McCarthy, I&LR, wished to wait until the Director of CIUE, Associate Professor James Maas, returned from leave so that he might have an opportunity to provide his "input," and until the revised report might be reviewed by the CIUE Advisory Committee.

The Dean announced a meeting May 10 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 110 Ives Hall sponsored by the Cornell Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) at which the President, Dale R. Corson, would discuss the state of the University with Faculty members. All interested Faculty are welcome to attend, he said. The Dean apologized to the body for his oversight in not preventing the membership solicitation from being included in the AAUP "Dean's Office approved" mailing of the invitation to their recent meeting. Such inclusion apparently may raise labor law problems.

2. COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION, ENABLING LEGISLATION

The Speaker asked if there was objection to considering item #3 on the agenda distributed with the call to meeting next. Professor H. Peter Kahn, History of Art, objected and asked the reason. The Dean replied that it was necessary to enact the enabling legislation at this meeting in order to ensure that the Committee on Physical Education could fulfill its charge and report to the body by next December. A vote to change the order of the agenda carried. Professor Robert H. Elias, Member-at-Large, moved the following resolution on behalf of Review and Procedures:

*Incorrectly dated as April 17 in Draft Minutes mailed to the Faculty
RESOLVED, That the following enabling legislation to create a Committee on Physical Education pursuant to the resolution adopted at the April 17 meeting of the Faculty Council of Representatives is approved.

COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Committee on Physical Education of the Faculty Council of Representatives is hereby established.

The Committee on Physical Education shall

1. Evaluate on a continuing basis the quality and function of physical education at Cornell;

2. Formulate such recommendations for improvements or changes in the nature, staffing, or status of the program as from time to time appear desirable;

3. Report its findings and whatever recommendations it may wish to make at least every two years to the FCR, beginning with a report to be made no later than December 1974.

Professor Elias received confirmation from the Dean that existing legislation determines procedures for electing members to FCR standing committees, the number of FCR members to be elected, the number of tenured and nontenured members etc., and that therefore such procedures need not be contained in the body of the resolution. Professor L. Pearce Williams, Member-at-Large, moved the following amendment to the resolution, intended to be inserted before the charge to the Committee:

1. The Committee on Physical Education shall be composed of three (3) members of the FCR. One of these members shall, at all times, be a non-tenured member of the faculty. At least one member of the Committee shall be female; at least one member of the Committee shall be male.

2. Members of the Committee shall be elected for three years, except that in the first election the person receiving the most votes shall serve three years; the person receiving the second-highest number of votes shall serve two years; the person receiving the third-highest number of votes shall serve one year. There shall be an annual election to replace the outgoing member.

Professor Williams stated that he did not think it worth the Faculty's time to have nine members on this Committee, which was charged with the "relatively simple" task of evaluating physical education. He strongly urged that one member be nontenured and that one member be a woman, since part of the Committee's responsibility would be to evaluate Women's Athletics.

Professor Elias asked if the present motion called for the Committee to consist of nine members, and was told by the Dean that it did. There would be
four FCR members, the Dean said, three of whom would be tenured and one non-tenured, four members from the rest of the Faculty in the same ratio, and one member appointed by the FCR Executive Committee. Professor Elias asked if there was any provision to guarantee distribution of the Committee membership among State and endowed units, and was told by the Dean that there was none, nor was there provision in reference to women, but that he thought it fair to say that in practice both considerations would be taken into account by the Nominations and Elections Committee. Professor Elias suggested that statutory colleges be represented on the Committee, in view of the difference between their relationship with physical education and that of the endowed colleges, and their relationship with the State, and asked if this would require an additional amendment to the original motion. The Dean replied affirmatively. Professor Paul D. Ankrum, Engineering, said he favored a nine-member Committee on grounds that it should include the three non-FCR Faculty members elected to Physical Education and Athletics. The Dean said that there are two Faculty bodies which arguably have cognizance of the area to be dealt with by the Committee on Physical Education. One is the Faculty subcommittee of the Council on Physical Education and Athletics, which deals with such problems as absences from the University of students when athletic teams compete away from the campus. The other is Academic Records and Instruction, which deals with requirements for graduation, among them the Physical Education Requirement, and some other policy questions. It is, for example, currently studying the swimming requirement, he said. Professor Williams said that the function of the Committee on Physical Education would differ from those of the two groups named by the Dean, and that he felt it could fulfill its charge with three members. Professor Elmer E. Ewing, Vegetable Crops, with Professor Williams' concurrence, moved to amend the amendment by changing "FCR" to "Faculty." Professor Elias asked if there were any rules governing the proportion of FCR to non-FCR members on standing committees of the FCR. The Dean replied that the rules provide for four FCR and four non-FCR members, with the ninth member being a member of the FCR Executive Committee. Associate Professor Harlan B. Brumsted, Natural Resources, asked if the Committee would consist of three members only, or if as a matter of course FCR committees could "co-opt" non-FCR Faculty members in order to enlarge their resources. The Dean replied that standing legislation permits committees to form subcommittees which may consist of non-FCR Faculty members. The amendment to the amendment passed by a vote of 31 to 17.
Professor Williams asked if the amendment permitted the Committee to be composed entirely of non-FCR Faculty members, and was told it did. The Dean explained that while FCR rules and procedures stipulate the composition of standing committees of the FCR, they also state that if any committee sets up its own membership formula in its own legislation, this becomes operative. Professor Williams moved to amend his amendment by changing the first sentence of paragraph 1. to read: "The Committee on Physical Education shall be composed of three (3) members of the Faculty, at least one of whom shall be a member of the FCR." (addition underlined) Carried. Professor Elias opposed the resolution on grounds that there was grave doubt that the FCR and the divergent interests of the Faculty would be represented. Professor Clifford J. Earle, Jr., Mathematics, asked if the second sentence in the amendment's paragraph 1. was intended to limit non-tenured representation on the Committee to one, "and only one," member of the Faculty, and was told by Professor Williams that it was. The amendment was defeated. The original motion passed.

3. REPORT ON COLLEGE-LEVEL ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES
(Appendix A, attached)

Associate Professor Edward S. Flash, Jr., B&PA, Chairman, Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, submitted a report on college-level grievance procedures for academic personnel, on behalf of his Committee, noting that it had been distributed earlier to the FCR and published in the April 4 issue of the Chronicle. The report sets standards and guidelines that colleges may apply in grievance proceedings, Professor Flash said, and differs from earlier versions in that the Committee now proposes that it be regarded as Faculty, rather than University, legislation with the consequences that if this body approves it, it will be established and will not require approval by the Trustees. The Committee made this change, he said, in order to make grievance procedures comparable to appeals provisions in enabling legislation of Academic Freedom and Responsibility, as amended, to give the Faculty more control over its conduct in grievance proceedings, and to enhance Faculty members' discretion in developing procedures within their colleges. The Committee felt Faculty legislation would have the same practical impact as the alternative, he said, in providing moral suasion or academic pressure on a dean to develop procedures in his department if none exist, to follow, or acknowledge, recommendations of a grievance committee in a particular action or to account for his reasoning if he does not agree with recommendations of a grievance committee.
The legislation was modeled after existing procedures in the College of Human Ecology and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Professor Flash said. It is distinct from administrative grievance procedures in not providing for binding arbitration. It is essentially peer review with recommendations to a dean which he may accept or reject. Moreover the Committee felt that one set of procedures should cover all possible actions and not be limited to such issues as academic freedom and responsibility, discrimination or working assignments since these issues overlap and are inseparable. As a result the Committee included consideration of both substantive and procedural aspects, he said. It also attempted to include all academic personnel in the procedures, including research associates, lecturers, senior lecturers and extension personnel.

The Committee tried to develop procedures which would allow informal resolutions before reaching a formal stage, he said, and which would oblige resolution at the lowest possible level. Likewise, the Committee foresaw that formal proceedings would be resolved at the college level rather than the University level.

Experience with identical procedures in Human Ecology and Agriculture and Life Sciences has been so successful that there has been no need to resort to formal procedures, he said. Where it was thought that the existence of such procedures might invite grievance proceedings, it was found instead that they had served to improve communications and to cause avoidance of the use of formal procedures.

The Committee tried to develop maximum flexibility within colleges. Part IV particularly is phrased to provide guidelines, not procedures, leaving their application up to individual colleges.

Professor Flash concluded by reading the following excerpt from his Committee's report of April 29, 1974:

"The need for grievance procedures lies, we believe, in the interaction of three underlying forces: 1) the ever-growing complexity and specialization of advances in knowledge that increase both the need for and difficulty of, intra-interdisciplinary teaching and research, 2) the increasing teaching, research and service demands placed on an already heavily committed Faculty of constant size, and 3) the certainty of severe financial stringency for years to come. Competence in achievement, creativity and dedication, commitment and interdependence, all operating with the constraints of such imperatives, are bound to create friction. With good will and understanding, direct negotiations can resolve the great majority of inevitable conflict, but
not all. Grievance procedures adapted to the particular circumstances of the various departments can help resolve the otherwise unresolvable. They can constitute insurance for a Faculty that seeks to govern itself, and thus avoid complex resolution procedures and codes by outside representation."

Associate Professor Antonie W. Blackler, Biological Sciences, moved the first of two resolutions:

RESOLVED, That the FCR approves the standards and guidelines proposed by the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty for college level grievance procedures applicable to academic personnel, and recommends that the colleges and schools adopt grievance legislation in accordance with such standards and guidelines by January, 1975, and so advise the Faculty.

Professor Ewing, Chairman, Academic Freedom and Responsibility, said that his Committee had held considerable discussion of the standards and guidelines and in general supported them. He said he thought it would be helpful, however, to add to the motion language urging the President to urge the deans to implement the procedures. He therefore moved to amend the motion by adding, following the phrase "academic personnel," the phrase: "recommends them to the President for such administration support as is called for,". Carried.

On advice from the Chair, Professor Paul Olum, Member-at-Large, moved to amend the motion by adding the following paragraph:

That the question of an academic grievance procedure for students be referred by the Executive Committee for consideration to the appropriate committee of the FCR, and that this committee be requested to report the results of its deliberations during the fall semester of 1974.

Professor Olum spoke to the motion, saying that if the original motion carried there would be a grievance procedure for Faculty as well as a grievance procedure for students based on the campus codes of conduct, but that the system would have one deficiency in that it lacked an opportunity for students with academic grievances to be heard. Acknowledging that this was a sensitive subject, he said that nevertheless there were serious questions involved. He had heard from a great many students, he said, who felt they had no place to turn when they felt aggrieved by professors scheduling examinations illegally during independent study week, by the handling of grades, by treatment in courses or exclusion from courses, and in the case of graduate students claims of mistreatment in regard to papers they had written and theses submitted. He felt it was wrong, he said, at such a university for students not to be able to
bring true grievances before a committee of some kind. The question is not
within the Senate's purview but can only be resolved by the Faculty, he said.
Professor Olum asked if the Chair would be willing to consider his amendment
as a separate question. The Speaker asked if there were any objections to
treating Professor Olum's amendment as a third resolution. Professor Kahn
objected to including a separate matter in the present discussion. The
Speaker pointed out that since this was Professor Olum's last FCR meeting,
he would rule that the amendment would be considered as a third resolution.
Professor Kahn's appeal of the ruling failed by vote, and discussion returned
to the original motion as amended by Professor Ewing.

Professor Walter Galenson, Economics, asked if the Committee's standards
and guidelines replaced existing grievance procedures or constituted an
alternative to them. Grievance proceedings can involve such delicate
questions and matters of content, he said, that it seemed preferable in some
cases to resort to formal grievance procedures, where the complainant can
have "input" into the composition of the committee deciding the case. The
Dean replied that the standards and guidelines under discussion were not
intended to supplant established procedures or extra-University legal
proceedings. Professor Flash added that the language of the standards and
guidelines tried to make clear that they were not only an alternative but a
"last resort." Professor John G.B. Hutchins, B&PA, pointed out that grievance
proceedings often involve dissatisfaction with past administrative or peer
group decisions, and questioned the wisdom of allowing arrangements to be
made to overthrow such decisions. He also questioned the effect such procedures
might have on Faculty standards and discipline, saying that a grievance
committee faced with the need to explain its decision to change established
procedure might find it easier to succumb to the inclination to abide by past
decisions. He also commented that such grievance procedures had been known
to be used politically to create trouble, and that the committee work involved
in processing grievances could conceivably occupy a great deal of time. Professor
Flash responded that the better the original decision, the less likelihood of
there being grievances lodged against it. Professor Peter Stein, Physics,
agreed with Professor Hutchins' view, saying that decisions regarding promotion
to tenure invariably "lead to trouble," and that he questioned the wisdom of
encouraging grievance procedures that might be considered "automatic" and thus
promote the opinion that if a Faculty member was turned down for tenure, he
might as well take his case to a grievance committee since it "can't hurt."
Professor Ewing pointed out that it was already possible to have this kind of grievance considered at the University-wide level through the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, and that as noted on page 5, item C. of the standards and guidelines, a grievance committee can decide whether or not to hear a given grievance case. The Dean commented that tenure is the most sensitive and difficult of areas with which grievances can be concerned, and that he had had personal experience with several cases concerning tenure. He said he thought the Committee in no way intended its proposed standards and guidelines to encourage "armchair quarterbacking" of previous decisions, but intended them to enable a grievance committee to decide on the fairness of current procedures. It has happened that a dean never submitted a Faculty member's name to his Faculty for a decision on awarding tenure, he said, or that, given a favorable recommendation from a Faculty member's colleagues, a dean has elected to constitute himself a committee of one representing all that Faculty member's opposition. The dean's decision cannot be overridden, he said, but hopefully a provost in possession of all the facts would tell a dean to "go back and do it right."

Professor John H. Whitlock, Member-at-Large, asked if under the standards and guidelines a person feeling aggrieved could appeal directly at the University-wide level, or must he lodge a grievance at the college level where the dean is often the cause of difficulty. The Dean replied that according to the legislation of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility one can appeal to that Committee when it is not appropriate to go to one's college.

Professor S. Cushing Strout, English, said he thought having a grievance committee concerned with substantive issues would create difficulties. History shows, he said, that it is much harder to resolve substantive questions than procedural ones. Professor Flash replied that the Committee felt that although a grievance committee need not make its ruling on substantive grounds, it did need to consider substantive issues. The Committee preferred to permit the option of a substantive ruling rather than limit decisions to procedural issues, he said. Professor Stein moved to amend the standards and guidelines by adding the following sentence to paragraph 2. on page 2: "In the case of a tenure decision, a grievance committee should limit itself to procedural rather than substantive issues." The Dean agreed with Professors Strout and Stein that it was undesirable for a grievance committee, particularly at the University level, to "armchair quarterback the substantive academic position on the merits" of cases involving promotion to tenure. However, in law, he
said, an expert or professional decision is deemed arbitrary or capricious or has absolutely no substance behind it whatsoever. Therefore it is presumed that a grievance committee would need to examine the evidence in a given case and determine if it is sufficient in order to make its determination. It may be sent back for proper consideration.

Professor Hutchins asked if, when a dispute arises, a grievance committee would have to disclose confidential information publicly. Professor Flash replied that this was not the case.

Professor Strout restated his belief that the word "substantive" tended to cloud the issue. There is a tendency even in the courts, he said, to make procedural judgments on substantive issues. He suggested removing the word from the legislation in order to avoid confusion. The Dean asked Professor Flash if there were any other areas, besides academic or professional questions, where an evaluation of substantive issues would be required. Professor Flash replied that he thought any area described in the standards and guidelines could conceivably require such evaluation. Professor Francis M. Isenberg, Vegetable Crops, said that in the recent grievance proceeding involving Professor John D. Hartman, Vegetable Crops, confidential letters had been turned over to the plaintiff's attorney on request, and that therefore it seemed impossible to preserve confidentiality in such proceedings. Professor Whitlock commented that there had been cases of discrimination against Faculty members supported by false documentation, and that therefore it was necessary to deal with substantive factors in order to proceed with such cases. Professor Galenson spoke against the amendment, saying that the I&LR Faculty had debated a nearly identical recommendation in the School and had voted it down on grounds that many complaints involved matters too small to justify creating a grievance procedure to handle them. The Faculty felt, he said, that important issues should be handled by existing grievance procedures which are binding, not advisory, and urged its representatives in the FCR to vote against any such procedure. At the Speaker's request, Professor Stein restated his amendment, saying he wished to insert the following statement on page 2, paragraph 2, before the last sentence:

"In the case of a tenure decision, the grievance committee shall limit itself to procedural matters and not to professional academic judgments."

Professor Stein said that this limitation should apply to tenure decisions only since they are the greatest cause for dispute. The grievance committee must be permitted to consider substantive issues in all other matters, he said, since one cannot separate substantive from procedural matters in those
cases, but the legislation should make it clear that the grievance committee cannot review the academic and professional decision of a tenure committee. Professor Strout agreed with Professor Stein and urged that the word "substantive" be dropped from the legislation entirely. Professor Elias asked to what extent the Colleges of Human Ecology and Agriculture and Life Sciences had experienced complaints regarding the handling of grievances involving promotions, and was told by Professor Flash that there had been no complaints. In response to a question from the floor, Professor Flash said there had been no complaints about this matter in these colleges over a period of two years. Professor Robert E. Habel, Veterinary Science, said that to his knowledge there had not been any complaint of this nature for 15 years at the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences because the matter had never been considered appropriate for a grievance.* (See page 4294C)

Professor Stein's amendment was defeated. The original motion with amendments, below, carried.

RESOLVED, That the FCR approves the standards and guidelines proposed by the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty for college level grievance procedures applicable to academic personnel, recommends them to the President for such administration support as is called for, and recommends that the colleges and schools adopt grievance legislation in accordance with such standards and guidelines by January, 1975, and so advise the Faculty.

Professor Blackler moved the second resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility be instructed to develop procedures for handling University level appeals that are consistent with the legislation governing college level grievance procedures for academic personnel.

Carried.

Professor Neal F. Jensen, Plant Breeding and Biometry, appealed the Chair's decision to consider Professor Olum's amendment as a third resolution to be added to the agenda. Professor Walter T. Federer, Plant Breeding and Biometry, asked if the amendment would be returned to the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty for consideration if the body took no action on it, and if not, could the body move to refer it to the Committee for action. Professor Olum said he believed the matter was in order, its aim being to establish an academic grievance procedure for students, and that his resolution answered Professor Jensen's question in that it requested referral of the matter to an appropriate committee of the FCR. He also pointed out that as a result of this meeting the community would observe that an academic
grievance procedure had been established for the Faculty and would make public note of the fact that none existed for students. Therefore this seemed the appropriate moment to inform the student body that such a grievance procedure was under consideration by the FCR.

Professor Jensen said he had no objection to the resolution but felt it was new business and therefore should not be considered at this time. Professor Whitlock moved to table the third resolution. Carried.

The Speaker relinquished the chair to Professor Ewing who, as Chairman of Academic Freedom and Responsibility, moved acceptance of his Committee's report and approval of its recommendations with respect to issues raised by the Faculty Hearing Board for the Hartman Case. Professor Leopold Gruenfeld, I&LR, said that the report raised substantive issues which might have wide repercussions, and in view of the lateness of the hour, moved adjournment.

Adjourned: 6 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary

*This sentence appeared in Draft Minutes sent to Faculty, but as corrected by Professor Habel, should read:

"Professor Robert E. Habel, Veterinary Science, said that grievance committees had been in existence for 15 years in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the Veterinary College and to the best of his knowledge, the grievance mechanism had never been used in the Veterinary College."
COMMITTEE ON THE PROFESSIONAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY
Cornell University

MEMORANDUM

TO:      Norman Penney, Dean of the Faculty
FROM:    Edward S. Flash, Jr., Chairman, Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty
DATE:    April 29, 1974

Attached is a draft of legislation covering college-level academic grievance procedures. It was developed by the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty. We request that, along with this memorandum, it be distributed to the members of the FCR prior to consideration at the May 8 meeting.

In addition to a number of minor editorial changes, it incorporates the following substantive modifications over the proposal distributed earlier to the FCR and published in the April 4 issue of the Chronicle.

1. The standards and guidelines are now being proposed as Faculty rather than University legislation. Accordingly, action by the FCR on the proposal will be final with (if approved) no recommendation being forwarded to the Board of Trustees as originally contemplated. This change recognizes the faculty's freedom and responsibility on matters concerning its professional conduct. As a faculty matter, the proposal complements the appeal procedures covered in Paragraph 2 of the enabling legislation of the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility as amended.

2. The title has been changed from "Regulations and Guidelines for College-Level Faculty Grievance Procedures" to "Regulations and Guidelines for College-Level Academic Grievance Procedures." This change reflects the proposal that coverage include those persons, in addition to faculty members, who hold essentially academic appointments (See Part 4, Section 1).

3. Part 2, Section 5 concerning limitations on administrative authority is deleted as not being a component part of the proposed procedures.

Relevant motions will be introduced at the meeting.
REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR
COLLEGE-LEVEL ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Part I - OBJECTIVES

1. The objective of academic grievance procedures is to provide appropriate means of last resort whereby an individual holding an academic appointment at Cornell University who believes himself or herself to be aggrieved can obtain consideration and, possibly, redress of his or her grievance.

2. The objective of the Regulations and Guidelines set forth below is to establish standards for the development and maintenance of specific grievance procedures within the different colleges of the University. Although specific procedures may vary from college to college in accordance with the particular circumstances of each, they should be consistent in their recognition of the interests and responsibilities of the individual, the college, and the University.

3. A system of accepted and understood academic grievance procedures is intended to serve as one of the means by which a community of self-governing academicians exercises its freedom and responsibility.

Part II - DEFINITION AND ASSUMPTIONS

1. Definition: For the purpose of the following regulations and guidelines, a grievance is defined as an injustice or harm arising from a specific situation involving an act or acts of alleged unfairness which the individual regards as just cause for protest on his or her own behalf (or individuals on their own behalf).
2. **Nature of Grievable Action.** An academic grievance procedure can be applied to the substantive and/or procedural aspects of any grievance arising out of the academician's execution of his or her designated responsibilities. Grievable actions might grow out of a number of separate or related aspects of those responsibilities, of which the following are illustrative but by no means limiting: (a) appointment, tenure, and reward; (b) academic freedom; (c) work assignment; (d) working conditions; (e) discrimination by race, creed, sex, or age; and (f) existence of, adequacy of, and adherence to equitable grievance procedures. The frequent interrelationships among these different aspects necessitate one set of academic grievance procedure guidelines and standards adaptable to all aspects rather than separate guidelines and standards for each.

3. **Right to Invoke a Formal Grievance Action.** The individual academician has the right as a condition of his or her appointment to seek through formal grievance procedures involving the judgment of his or her peers a redress of those decisions made and/or those actions taken at the departmental, college, and/or University level that he or she considers intolerable to the effective execution of his or her responsibilities.

4. **Limitation on Right to Invoke a Formal Grievance Action.** The right to invoke a formal grievance action does not extend to abnormal participation in or obstruction of the normal decision making processes. The desire to prevent or to anticipate or to register mere unhappiness over a particular decision or action, does not, in and of itself, justify invoking a grievance procedure. Only when direct negotiations between parties to a dispute have been exhausted and not led to a resolution of a dispute may the individual (or individuals) resort to invoking the academic grievance procedure of his or her college.
Part III - COVERAGE

1. Academic grievance procedures are applicable to all employees of the University (except as noted below) who, because of the predominantly academic nature of their responsibilities, hold teaching, research and/or extension appointments; i.e., to those men and women holding appointments as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Visiting Professor (all ranks), Adjunct Professor (all ranks), Instructor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Research Associate, Research Associate, Senior Extension Associate, or Extension Associate.

2. Academic grievance procedures are not applicable to degree candidates having appointments such as Teaching Assistant, Research Assistant, or Graduate Research Assistant.

3. An individual who, by his or her appointment, is covered by more than one University grievance procedure, may choose the procedure under which he or she wishes to protest a particular grievance. An individual may not, however, invoke more than one grievance procedures for the same grievance.

Part IV - MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR COLLEGE-LEVEL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

1. Establishment of procedures:
   a. Establishment of grievance procedures applicable to the academicians of the college as defined in Part III.
   b. Publication and distribution of the provisions of the procedures to all individuals covered by them.

2. Committee Organization and Structure:
   a. Designation by appointment or election of responsibility
for handling grievances to either an existing committee
or committees or especially created committee or committees.

b. Adequate notice to all college academicians of such assignment
and provisions concerning the assignment.

c. Charge to the committee(s) regarding responsibilities, mandate,
discretion, limitations, etc., for the handling of grievances
under the established procedures.

d. Adequate representation on the committee(s) of the various
components of the those with academic appointments by e.g., rank
and/or discipline and/or department and/or nature of appointment.

e. Exclusion from participation as a committee member any indi-
vidual who is a directly affected party to the particular
grievance at issue.

3. **Committee Responsibility:** Understanding by the academicians of the
college that the purpose of the committee handling grievances is to
resolve them either by helping the parties reach a decision accept-
able to both or by rendering a recommendation.

4. **Operation of Procedures:**

   a. Arrangements which require attempts to settle individual grievances
      by direct negotiation between parties concerned before application
      of grievance procedures.

   b. Explicit procedures for (1) submitting a grievance in writing
to a designated party, (2) referring to the appropriate committee,
(3) establishing essential facts and unresolved issues, (4) arrang-
ing for adequate documentation, (5) establishing time schedule
for handling particular grievances, and (6) communicating both recommendations and ultimate decisions.

c. Right of the committee handling the grievance to decide (1) whether or not direct negotiation remedies have in fact been exhausted; and (2) whether or not facts warrant consideration on the substantive and/or procedural aspects of the issue, a detailed investigation, hearings, recommendations and decisions.

d. Provisions assuring equitable and expeditious handling of individual grievances.

e. Submission by the appropriate committee of written report to the dean of the college, setting forth findings and recommendations.

f. Requirement of written notice from the dean to the principals of the grievance, the University Provost, and the Dean of the Faculty of his acceptance or rejection of the Committee's recommendations with reasons therefore.

5. **Confidentiality:**

a. Provisions for maintaining strict confidence with regard to all matters relevant to individual grievances on a criterion of need-to-know.

b. Provision for summary notice within the college of the case, the issue, and the resolution at the request of a party to the issue and with the concurrence of the committee.

6. **Appeal:** Procedure for permitting one of the parties to a grievance of a decision made in accordance with college-level grievance procedure to appeal for a University-level review of that decision in accordance with the procedures of the Faculty Committee on Academic
Freedom and Responsibility. (Application of academic grievance procedures does not limit the individual academician's right to available legal remedies as an alternative and/or as a supplement to faculty grievance procedures.)

**Part V - CONFORMANCE WITH UNIVERSITY POLICY**

Decisions made under the academic grievance procedures must conform to existing University policies. Such decisions may lead to the establishment of new policies, but they may not, in and of themselves, constitute new policies.

**Part VI - GRIEVANCE EXPENSES**

Any necessary expense of the hearing shall be borne by the University with the exception that if the individual wishes to retain a representative or counsel, he shall bear the expense of such representation. If the employee is represented by another individual of the University, the representative will be allowed reasonable time to perform his function without loss of pay.
Part VII - IMPLEMENTATION

1. The Dean of the Faculty shall publish and distribute, in such manner as he deems appropriate, copies of this legislation to academic personnel of the colleges as well as to deans and department heads.

2. Consistent with the relevant procedures of the respective colleges, members of the faculty are urged to:
   a. initiate establishment of college-level procedures in conformity with the foregoing standards and guidelines, if none exist.
   b. initiate review of college level procedures if they exist; and, if necessary, institute such modification as may be necessary to bring them into conformity with the foregoing standards and guidelines.

3. The Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty shall, as may be requested:
   a. consult with and advise academic and administrative officers and members of the college faculties on the establishment and maintenance of college level grievance procedures consistent with the foregoing standards and guidelines.
   b. certify as to the adequacy of college-level grievance procedures in terms of the foregoing standards and guidelines.
The President, Dale R. Corson, called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. 62 Faculty members were present. The President announced the death of:

Leland C. Weaver, Emeritus Professor of Poultry Husbandry, March 7, 1974

Minutes of the February 20, 1974 meeting were approved as distributed. The President relinquished the Chair to the Acting Speaker, Professor Paul Olum, who announced that the minutes of this meeting would be distributed as soon as possible, and if no additions or corrections were received in the Office of the Dean of Faculty before July 1, the Executive Committee of the FCR would act for the University Faculty in approving them.

1. RECOGNITION OF RETIRING FACULTY

The Dean of the Faculty, Professor Norman Penney, noted that it had been the custom for the past two years to recognize retiring Faculty members at the last Faculty meeting of the year. Those retiring this year had given many years of their lives to higher education and to Cornell, he said, and this occasion served to express their colleagues' eternal gratitude and respect as well as the hope that the University would profit from their wisdom, advice and companionship in years to come. He then read the names of those retiring Faculty members present, who stood and received the applause of the group at the conclusion of the ceremony. The total list of retirees is:

George P. Adams, Jr., Economics
Frederick B. Agard, Division of Modern Languages and Linguistics
Robert J. Ames, Communication Arts
George W. Brooks, Industrial and Labor Relations
Wallace D. Brown, Cooperative Extension
Marlin G. Cline, Agronomy
J. Milton Cowan, Division of Modern Languages and Linguistics
Lawrence B. Darrah, Agricultural Economics
Herbert Dieckmann, Avalon Foundation Professor of Humanities
David Dropkin, John Edson Sweet Professor of Mechanical Engineering
W. Duane Evans, Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics
Reeshon Feuer, Agronomy
Harrop A. Freeman, Law
Frank F. Gilmore, Business and Public Administration
Henry P. Goode, Industrial Engineering and Operations Research
John D. Hartman, Vegetable Crops
Glenn W. Hedlund, Agricultural Economics
Robert F. Holland, Food Science
John K. Loosli, Animal Science
Thomas W. Mackesey, Regional Planning and Vice President for Planning
Howard W. Matott, Extension Administration
Arthur M. Mizener, Old Dominion Foundation Professor of Humanities
Walter L. Nelson, Biochemistry, Biological Sciences
Katherine J. Newman, Human Nutrition and Food
Michael Peech, Agronomy
Robert L. Raimon, Industrial and Labor Relations
Howard G. Smith, Electrical Engineering
Robert M. Smock, Pomology
John C. Swan, Extension Administration
Kenneth L. Turk, Animal Science
Ethel L. Vatter, Consumer Economics and Public Policy
Robert J. Walker, Mathematics
Ernest N. Warren, William G. McRoberts Research Professor in Administration of the Law
Carlton E. Wright, Consumer Education
Charlotte M. Young, Nutrition

2. REPORT BY THE DEAN

The Dean reported on the status of the censure of the University by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) a year earlier. He reminded the group that the censure arose from the Medical College's failure to give written notice of termination to one of its nontenured Faculty. Neither the time period nor the written notice required by the AAUP had been observed, he said. The University had made a settlement offer to the employee in question and had instituted a policy in the Medical College requiring written notice of termination within the proper time period. Nevertheless, at the most recent AAUP general meeting the AAUP Committee A had voted by a divided vote not to recommend removing the censure, and the AAUP had supported the Committee. This action caused deep concern to himself and the executive Leadership of AAUP on campus, the Dean said, particularly Professor Albert Silverman, Physics, President of the Cornell AAUP Chapter. Professor Silverman had argued at the AAUP meeting that the University had tendered compensation and changed its rules, but without success. The Dean said he had informed the President-elect of the AAUP and the Chairman of the Committee A that he felt it was unreasonable and unfair for the University to suffer under censure without having some bill of particulars as to matters still requiring action. They had referred him to an AAUP staff member who wrote the Dean expressing sympathy for his position but stating that he and his colleagues wished to see what policy changes were in work at the University before undertaking to act next year. The Dean said he and Professor Silverman planned to pursue the matter independently of the Administration, and that it appeared that the prospect for removal of censure next year seemed quite good, but that in effect the AAUP was exerting pressure on himself and Professor Silverman to influence the Administration to place the University more "in line" with AAUP policy than it currently is. He added that the policy changes sought would be applicable to the Medical College and School of Nursing Faculty, neither of which are under the jurisdiction of the Dean of the Faculty or any of its committees, which contributed to the awkwardness of the situation.
The Dean reminded the body that the Committee on Nominations and Elections was canvassing the Faculty seeking nominees to serve on the newly formed Physical Education Committee and announced that the Committee would also shortly be seeking nominees to serve on the Library Board which had been recently revised with a view to having more Faculty involvement than in the past. "Active users" of the library will be sought, he said. The Library is facing a crisis in physical facilities, he added, and a solution to the problem would be the most important matter for the Board.

The Dean announced a meeting on May 16 to be conducted by a representative of TIAA-CREF to describe a supplemental retirement annuities (SRA) plan. He noted the recent removal of the compulsory five percent annual contribution by employee-members of TIAA-CREF, and said that Faculty members now had a choice of leaving the amount in their retirement plans, removing it and adding it to their incomes, or putting it into the SRA retirement plan which is portable, tax sheltered and cashable at will.

The Dean announced that the May 16 issue of Chronicle would list the nominees for Dean of the Faculty and Secretary of the Faculty, to replace the incumbents whose terms were expiring.* They are:

For Dean of the Faculty:
Ralph Bolgiano, Jr., Professor of Electrical Engineering
Byron W. Saunders, Professor and Director, School of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research
Peter C. Stein, Professor of Physics

For Secretary of the Faculty:
Russell D. Martin, Professor of Communication Arts
Richard M. Phelan, Professor of Mechanical Engineering

The Speaker asked if there were comments or questions. Professor John H. Whitlock, Parasitology, informed the body of recent legislation passed by the State Legislature requiring 40 percent participation by constituencies in the election of University Trustees, and said it would help if 40 percent of the Faculty voted in such elections. The Secretary of the Faculty, Professor Robert Cotts, commented that the TIAA-CREF SRA plan was open to all employees of the University regardless of whether or not they subscribed to present TIAA-CREF plans.

3. INCLUSION OF TREASURER ON EX OFFICIO FACULTY LIST

The Speaker announced that the meeting lacked a quorum to conduct official business, and suggested that the body vote on the next agenda item in order to obtain a sense of the meeting and to inform the Treasurer of the Faculty’s

*See Appendix A for results of election.
intent. The matter would still have to be acted on officially at a Faculty meeting, he said. He called on the Secretary of the Faculty, who as Chairman of the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty, moved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Office of the Treasurer be included in the list of ex officio members of the University Faculty.

The Secretary explained that the previous year the Committee had revised the list of ex officio Faculty members and the criteria established for deciding on ex officio membership. Since that time, he said, the Board of Trustees had revised its description of the duties of the Treasurer, making it conform, in the Committee's opinion, to the revised criteria. He read the following excerpt from the criteria:

Article IX
1. "Except in unusual circumstances only the chief executive officer of any unit shall be an ex officio member.
2. "The office holder shall be directly involved with educational policy involving more than one college or school, or be in the position to make fiscal decisions which have a direct educational impact over more than one college or school, or which have a University-wide effect."

Professor Whitlock asked if the Treasurer, Mr. Arthur G. Peterson, was not already a Faculty member. The Speaker said the resolution treated the office of Treasurer, not the incumbent. Carried unanimously.

4. REPORT ON STATUS OF COMPUTER ACQUISITION

The Provost, W. Donald Cooke, reported developments regarding the acquisition of an IBM 370/168 computer that had occurred since the FCR acted on the matter the previous September. The outlook for external funding was not as good as once thought, he said, and income from research contracts had declined. The University Computer Board had examined the whole question of funding prospects and decided to "gamble" on the new computer since computer usage by students and Faculty at Cornell was less than at other institutions of higher education. The Deans' Council and the FCR Research Policies Committee had also discussed the matter. In sum, he said, the University was proceeding in more precarious circumstances than originally anticipated. Professor Geoffrey V. Chester, Physics, commented that the deans had given encouraging support of the decision, and that the capabilities of the IBM 370/168 appeared "much better" than they had seemed the previous fall.
Professor William T. Dean, Law, asked if there were any plans to share use of the computer with other institutions. The Provost replied that he fully expected such sharing to take place. He said he had discussed the matter with representatives of the State University of New York, and that he saw a possibility of developing a New York State area program of computer sharing.

5. RECOGNITION OF RETIRING DEAN AND SECRETARY OF FACULTY

The Speaker called on Professor Walter R. Lynn, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chairman of the FCR Executive Committee, who paid tribute to the Dean of the Faculty and to the Secretary of the Faculty, Professor Cotts, whose terms of office were expiring. He noted that Dean Penney had, as Dean, championed Faculty concerns, exercised discretion, and had been influential throughout the University, while he continued his teaching and other professional responsibilities in the Law School. Taking office in 1971 when the FCR charter had just been established, he had created the FCR committee structure which included ten standing committees, and had made a "paper organization" into a viable operating one, Professor Lynn said. In addition, the Dean had gathered the Faculty's response to the so-called Cranch Report, established a viable relationship between the Faculty and the Administration, kept a tight rein on University Faculty business, and been active in FCR committee meetings. He had been a good colleague as well as a good dean, Professor Lynn concluded. Professor Cotts, he said, had served as acting Dean in the Dean's absence and been responsible for notes appearing in the Faculty Bulletin of Chronicle. A dedicated servant of the Faculty, he had chaired the Committee on Membership of the University Faculty and had continued as Professor of Physics during his term. At the conclusion of Professor Lynn's remarks, both officers received a standing ovation from the body.

6. REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

The Speaker called on President Corson for remarks on "Some Questions to be Wrestled With in the Next Few Years." The President expressed appreciation to the retiring Dean and Secretary of the Faculty for service to the entire University community. He then addressed himself to Faculty tenure, a subject he said had recently received national attention. The institution of tenure was being challenged in state legislatures and by state boards of regents, he said, and he believed unwise action was being taken in some cases. He said he did not believe in tenure quotas, and that where they had been adopted he believed it was a mistake. With uniform age distribution in a Faculty and
constant annual attrition, a high tenure ratio would provide the greatest opportunity for young Faculty to advance. For example, he said, if 50 percent of a 100-member Faculty body were tenured, 12 nontenured Faculty members would have an opportunity to earn tenure over a six-year period, assuming a four percent attrition rate. If 75 percent of the body were tenured, 18 nontenured members might advance to tenure every six years, and if 81 percent were tenured, 20 members might advance in the same period. Low tenure ratios, he said, besides limiting the number who might advance, also gave a high turnover rate with the result that there was no continuity in teaching and research programs. It is important for each department of the University to examine the age distribution of its Faculty, he said, and to be ready with good young Faculty when openings occur. He also cited the problems created by inflation of rank in recent years. The category of instructor has almost disappeared, and today's Ph.Ds enter the Faculty as assistant professors. In practice, tenure decisions are being made on the basis of five years of work, which is an inadequate base for extrapolating a career stretching over 30 years. He expressed approval of the concept of establishing the position of associate professor without tenure as providing a longer base of performance for young Faculty members. He concluded by saying there is a need to bring young people into the Faculty, and that high tenure ratios produce a "bigger crop" of new people coming into the rank than do low tenure ratios.

Turning to the subject of affirmative action, the President said that the goals of affirmative action programs seem good. He cited a recent agreement between the University of California at Berkeley and the Office of Affirmative Action, which had been accepted by the Office of Civil Rights, as an example of success in this field. Institutions are being asked to cast their nets wider than ever before for Faculty and nonacademic positions, he said, but the procedures prescribed to bring this about are complicated and give Faculty members most trouble. He said the University of California agreement was 50 pages in length, and that approximately $5,000,000 in contracts had been held up pending final signatures. The precedent set by the University of California agreement will serve to maintain high standards in winning acceptance from the Office of Civil Rights. The only other institutions with approved plans are Harvard, M.I.T., and Florida State University. Cornell must develop procedures for adopting its own affirmative action program, he said, and reported that he would be meeting with the academic deans and department heads the next day to go over requirements. Documentation and record keeping is the second most
onerous aspect of such a program, he said. For example, the University of California was required to produce records of successful and unsuccessful prospects for employment so that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission could determine the qualifications of those rejected for employment. The University of California had estimated that it would require $250,000 annually just to implement its accepted affirmative action plan.

7. REMARKS BY THE PROVOST

The Speaker called on the Provost who discussed the current status of Faculty salaries. His office had released detailed information about Faculty salaries the previous spring in the report, "Cornell in the Seventies," he said, and intended to update the material in cooperation with the Committee on the Professional and Economic Status of the Faculty, hopefully by the coming fall. At the moment, he said, the annual rate of inflation was 14 percent, and no institution could keep up with such a rate. Over the past three years at Cornell, Faculty salaries had gained over the Consumer Price Index, but the gains will have been erased by July 1 by inflation. At the same time, he said, keeping up with the CPI was not good enough in terms of buying power. Over the past 25 years an assistant professor's buying power had increased by a factor of three, and a professor's buying power by a factor of two. According to latest salary data issued by the AAUP, Cornell's position vis-a-vis the top 27 Ph.D-producing institutions had remained unchanged since the year before -- the statutory colleges fourth, the endowed colleges eleventh in rank. The one area of gain at Cornell was at the level of instructor. The more serious problem, however, affected all of education. While education gained over the rest of the population in the 1960s, teachers are now losing to doctors, lawyers, and professional people. Unlike the professions, educators cannot determine their annual income except in the area of tuition. All other income is determined by legislators, donors, or the stock market. He concluded that he could not truthfully feel optimistic about salaries for Faculty or other employees at the University. None of them would equal the inflation rate, he said.

Professor Dean commented that to his knowledge no legislation enacted by Congress contained the phrase "affirmative action." To lawyers, he said, affirmative action seemed a bureaucratic device intended to implement and further the doctrine of equality of opportunity as defined by Congress, and there is difference of opinion as to whether it is accomplishing this goal. The Supreme Court recently declined to rule in a case involving the achievement
of equality of opportunity by what might be called "beneficent discrimination," but in so doing invited further cases on the matter so that we may soon learn whether or not equality of opportunity also includes affirmative action. To some lawyers, he said, affirmative action "smells like quotas," and those who remember, for example, quotas on the number of Jewish students who were admitted to medical school don't like them.

There being no further questions or comments, the Provost gave a spontaneous tribute to Professor Olum who was taking part in his last Faculty meeting before leaving the University to join the Faculty of the University of Texas. Although he and Professor Olum may have entered many discussions from completely different points of view, the Provost said, and disagreed in the course of discussion, they always knew what it was they disagreed upon, and that is not a very common situation. Professor Olum received hearty applause from the floor.

Adjourned: 5:14 p.m.

J. Leeming
Assistant to the Secretary
Appendix A

THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Office of the Dean June 4, 1974

To: Members of the University Faculty

From: Robert M. Cotts, Secretary of the Faculty

Re: Election of Dean of the Faculty and Secretary of the Faculty

At its meetings of June 1 and June 2, 1974, the Board of Trustees changed the Bylaws regarding election of the Dean of the Faculty (Article XIII, section 4). The old Bylaw read: "Dean of the University Faculty: There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty who shall be elected by the Board upon the recommendation of the President and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board. In recommending a candidate for the deanship the President shall report to the Board the opinion of the University Faculty concerning such recommendation - such opinion shall be ascertained as that Faculty may determine." The new Bylaw reads: "Dean of the Faculty: There shall be a Dean of the University who shall be elected in such manner as the University Faculty may determine, for a term of not to exceed three years, subject to confirmation by the Board."

Consequently, the University Faculty election is now the determining factor in selection of Dean of the University Faculty.

The results of the recent election are:

for Dean of the Faculty (3-year term)

Byron W. Saunders 281 - elected
Ralph Bolgiano, Jr. 240
Peter Stein 219

for Secretary of the Faculty (2-year term)

Russell D. Martin 503 - elected
Richard M. Phelan 186

Terms of office for Dean Saunders and Secretary Martin will begin July 1, 1974.

Because the Bylaws had not been changed before our election, this announcement of election results was postponed until after the Board of Trustees had met.

The ballots of the earlier general University Faculty and FCR elections are being processed by the computer and results will be announced in the CHRONICLE as soon as they are available.
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4126-29C
4116F
4065F, 4116F, 4168F
4116F
4224C
4085-86C
4213C
4064-65F, 4168F
4131-35C, 4157C
4224C
4070-71C, Appen. A, 4116F
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   Sub-committee of Academic Programs and Policies
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Children's Tuition Fee (Cornell)
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Cline, Marlin G.
Cole, Randall K.

Committee Appointments
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Retiring as Secretary of the Faculty 4299F
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Master of Professional Studies (Int'l Development) 4121C
Departmental Compensation, Part-time, Extra, Inter 4065F
Desegregation Guidelines 4119-20C
Dieckmann, Herbert 4295F
Discrimination re Religious Holidays 4116F, 4147C, 4163-65C, Appen.C-1
Dropkin, David 4295F
Durfee, Arthur E. 4167F
Duthie, Mary Eva 4056F

Egalitarian Principle 4153-54C
Einaudi, Mario 4167F
Einset, John 4167F
Evans, W. Duane 4121-22C
Exam Scheduling, Veterinary College 4224C, 4228-29C
Excused Absences from Classes (see Absences) 4118-19C, 4147C, 4156C, 4168F
Executive Committee (FCR) Chairman as Acting Dean 4295F
4224C

Rules and Procedures - Amendment to Legislation 4046C
Employee (University) - Member Board of Trustees
Equal Educational Opportunity Proposal
Evans, W. Duane
Exam Scheduling, Veterinary College
Excused Absences from Classes (see Absences)
Executive Committee (FCR) Chairman as Acting Dean
Faculty Advisory Group
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Feuer, Reeshon
Financial Aid
Financial Condition of the University (see also Budget)
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Financial Planning, Long Range (see Cranch Report)
Financial Status of the University
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Finances, University
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  Equal Access to Courses
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SA 42 - Senate Resolution- Student Bill of Rights
Freeman, Chester, Parliamentarian
Freeman, Harrop A.
French, Orval C.
Fringe Benefits
Functions of University Faculty - Amended Legislation
Gift, Helen H.
Gilmore, Frank F.
Goode, Henry P.
Governance, University
Grading
  Grade Symbols
  S/U Grading - Arts and Sciences
  S/U Legislation
  Symbols WP,WF,W
  Symbols NA to F
Grants and Contracts - Publication of Information
Grievance Procedures
  Remarks from Dean of Faculty
  Report, Resolution
Hanks, Elton K.
Hartman, John D.
Hedlund, Glenn W.
HEW Letter, President's Response
Hodges, Wayne L.
Holidays, Religious (see also Discrimination)
Holland, Robert F.
Hutton, James
Independent Courses, Committee on
  Proposals and Discussion
  Legislation
Independent Study Period
Interdisciplinary Programs
International Development Degree
International Student Affairs, Committee on-Amending Leg. 4173-74C
International Studies Report, Referred to AP&P

4054-55C, 4069-70C
4185C
4295F
4065F
4213C
4096C, 4137C
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4147C
4085C
4116F, 4147C, 4163-65C, Appen. C-1
4118-19C, 4147C, 4168F
4065F
4137C, 4147C, 4160-63C, 4168F
4163-65C, Appen. C, 4168F, 4249F
4067C
4295F
4167F
4065F, 4117F, 4169F
4171-72C, 4174C
4167F
4295F
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4086-87C
4116F
4181C
4050-53C, 4147C, 4168F
4122-26C
4126-29C
4090-95C, Appen. A
4065F, 4117F, 4147C, 4156C, 4168-69F, 4250F, 4268C
4287-94C, Appen. A
4110F
4295F
4295F
4154-56C
4166F
4147C
4295F
4167F
4065F, 4116F, 4156C, 4168F, 4220-23C
4225-28C
4116F
4253F
4121C
4173-74C
4224C
Jensen, Vernon H. 4167F
Kearl, C. Delmar 4184F
Knapp, David - Acting Provost 4153-54C
Egalitarian Principle 4143C
Report 4167F
Konvitz, Milton R. 4167F
Krenzin, Ralph E. 4167F

Land Grant Mission, Committee on 4185F
Landscape Architecture - Master Degree 4192C
Law School Growth 4253F
Layer, John W. 4167F
Leaves, Replacements on FCR and Committees 4190F
Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Titles, Legislation for 4207-11C, 4213-19C
Lectures, University Committee on - Amending Legislation 4173-74C
Leeming, Joseph, Assistant Recorder 4053C

Legislation
Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Amendment 4147C, 4175-78C, Appen.A, 4168F
Academic Integrity Code and Actions - Revisions 4261-64C, Appen.A.
Academic Integrity Hearing Board, Amendment 4071-72C, Appen.B.C, 4116F, 4235-37C
Advisory Group, Faculty 4240-48C, Appen.A-1, A-2
Attendance of non-Faculty FCR Committee Members 4054-55C, 4065F, 4069-70C, 4116F
Calendar and Schedules, Committee Legislation 4174-75C, 4172-C, 4174C
Change Date of Committee Appointments 4117F
Class Schedule (see Class Schedule) 4181-83C
Children's Tuition Fee 4047-48C
Committee Vacancies 4121-22C
Elections of FCR Membership 4048-50C, Appen.B.
Excused Absences from Classes 4170-71C, 4174C
Faculty Trustee 4171-72C, 4174C
Functions of the University Faculty 4122-26C
Grading Symbol Proposal, WP, WF, W 4126-29C
Grading Symbol NA to F 4181C
Grading - S/U - Arts and Sciences 4050-53C, 4064-65F, 4147C
Grading - S/U Legislation 4287-94C, Appen.A.
Grievance Procedures 4220-23C, 4225-28C
Independent Courses Committee - Legislation 4173-74C
International Student Affairs, Amendment 4066F
Inexsion at Faculty Meetings 4173-74C
Lectures, University Committee on - Amendment 4207-11C, 4213-19C
Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Titles 4072-73C, Appen.D, D-1, 4116F, 4188-4189F
Membership in University Faculty, ex officio 4174C
Moses Coit Tyler Prize Committee - Amendment 4173-74C
Music Committee - Amendment 4213C, 4264-66C, Appen.B, 4268-74C
Physical Education Committee 4276-78C, 4279-83C, 4284-87C

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF UNIVERSITIY FACULTY (OPUF)
Deletion of Recorder Title 4189-90F
Replacements in FCR and FCR Committees 4190F
Research Policies Committee Amendment 4172-C, 4174C
Rules and Procedures Governing Committees 4171C, 4174C
Secretary of the University Faculty 4121-22C
Terms of Office - FCR Membership 4173-74C
University-ROTC Relationships Committee-Amendment
Levine, Pincus Phillip
Library
Capacity
Expansion, Referred to Res. Pol-Sub-committee Formed
"Open Access"
Long Range Financial Planning (see Cranch)
Loosli, John K.

MacDonald, J.W.
Mackesey, Thomas W.
Mahoney, James O.
Majors for Undergraduates
Martin, Russell D., Elected Speaker
Matott, Howard W.
Maynard, Leonard A.
McCurdy, John C.
McKelvey, Jean T.
McLeod, Robert Brodie
McManus, Howard N., Jr.

Meetings - Faculty
September 15, 1972
November 1, 1972 - joint with FCR
February 14, 1973
May 16, 1973
September 12, 1973
February 20, 1974
May 15, 1974

Meetings - FCR
September 6, 1972
October 11, 1972
November 1, 1972
December 13, 1972
February 7, 1973
March 14, 1973
April 11, 1973
April 18, 1973 (special)
May 9, 1973
May 16, 1973 (special)
September 12, 1973
September 19, 1973 (special)
October 10, 1973
November 14, 1973
December 12, 1973
February 13, 1974
March 13, 1974
March 27, 1974 (special)
April 17, 1974
May 8, 1974

Membership in the FCR - Elections and Terms
Membership-University Faculty-ex officio Listing

Memorial Statements
Mineka, Francis E.
Minutes of Meetings, Approval of
Mizener, Arthur M.
Montillon, Eugene D.
Moore, Clyde B.
Music, Committee on - Amended Legislation
Named Professorships
Necrology
Nelson, Walter L.
Newman, Katherine J.
Nominations and Elections Committee
Reports of Slates

Slates of Candidates for Dean and Secretary of Faculty
Canvass for Physical Education and Library Board

Norton, Mary Beth - Election as non-Tenured Faculty Trustee

Oldberg, Sidney
Olum, Paul - Tribute To
"Open Access" Program at Libraries

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (OPUF)
Amendment to Legislation
References to Recorder Deleted
Replacements for FCR Members

Palmiter, DeForest H.
Parliamentarian, Chester Freeman
Parratt, Lyman G.
Part-time Degree, Arts College
Part-time Faculty Appointments
Pasley Document Amendments
Payroll System, Computer Based

Penney, Norman
Acknowledgment of Retiring Faculty
Retiring as Dean of Faculty
Performance Evaluation
Perry, John E.
Philbrick, Shailer S.

Physical Education Requirement
Petition to Abolish
Referred to Committee AR&I

Physical Education Committee
Legislation
Discussion Meetings
Petition from Students
Resolution
Subcommittee Report
Senate Policy Study Group II-FCR Representation
Policy Notebook - Asterisked Material

Position Paper #15
Guidelines Reports
Committee on Admissions and Financial Aids
Committee on Freedom of Teaching and Learning
Comm. on Professional and Economic Status
Referral to Committees
Report by Acting Provost David Knapp - Discussion
Segregation and Desegregation on Campus

President Dale R. Corson - Reports
Affirmative Action
Availability of HEW Letter
Biological Sciences - Growth of
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4156C
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4212C
4066F
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4160-63C
4159-60C
4137C, 4147C
4143-46C
4069C
4300-01F
4154-55C
4252-53F
President Corson- Continued
Boyce Thompson Institute

Budget Priorities
Building Renovation
Campus Disturbances
Censorship by AAUP
Computing Program
"Cornell in the Seventies" Review of Major Goals
Cranch Report
Dean of Faculty - Member of Deans' Council
Experiments in Undergraduate Teaching
Finances, University
Financial Situation, Endowed and Statutory Colleges
Interdisciplinary Programs
Land Grant Mission Committee
Law School Growth
Library Capacity
Library Expansion
 Majors for Undergraduates
Named Professorships
Salaries, Faculty
Tenure, Faculty
Tuition Increases

Professional and Economic Status Committee

Associate Professor Without Tenure
Cornell Children's Tuition Fee
Early Retirement
Faculty Appointments and Promotions
Faculty Grievance
Fringe Benefits
Grievance Procedures - Legislation
Part-time - Extra/Inter Departmental Compensation
Part-time Faculty Appointments
Performance Evaluation Procedures
Position Paper #15
Race and Sex Identification
Salary Information

Provost, W.D. Cooke, Acting
Faculty Salaries
Tribute to Paul Olum

Provost, David C. Knapp, Acting
Report on Position Paper #15
Letter-Egalitarian Principle

Quorum, Lack of

Race and Sex Identification Referred to P&ES
Raimon, Robert L.
Ratner Report (Financial Status of University)
Recognition-Retiring Dean and Secretary of Faculty
Recognition - Retiring Faculty
Recoder

Assistant
Deletion of Title
Election of

Reed, Harold L.

Referendums
Elimination of Recorder Title
Replacement of FCR Members
| Replacement of FCR Members - Amendment to Legislation | 4190F |
| Research on Campus | 4065F |
| Research at C.A.L. | 4065F |
| Research Policies, Committee on Amended Legislation | 4173-74C |
| Boyce Thompson Institute - Discussion | 4230-31C |
| Computing Operation | 4213C |
| Current Status of C.A.L. | 4086C |
| Grants and Contracts - Publication of Information | 4090-95C, Appen.A. |
| Library Expansion - "Open Access" Program - sub comm. | 4252F, 4256C, 4267C |
| Proposal for new Library Board | 4213C |
| Research on Campus | 4065F |
| Research at C.A.L. | 4065F |
| Rights and Privileges of Professional Researchers | 4065F |
| Retirement, Early | 4065F |
| Review and Procedures, Committee on Amend Legislation | 4117F, 4147C, 4169F |
| Budget Committee - recommend Legislation for | 4275C |
| Committee Appointments | 4117F |
| Financial Condition of the University | 4213C |
| Memorial Statements | 4117F |
| Non-Tenured Faculty Trustees | 4066F, 4136C |
| Necrology | 4066F |
| Rights and Privileges of Professional Researchers | 4065F |
| Rinehart, George S. | 4110F |
| Robinson, Gustavus H. | 4056F |
| Ross, A. Frank | 4167F |
| Rules of Order, Special | 4096-97C |
| Rules and Procedures Governing Committees, Amending Leg. | 4172C, 4174C |
| Salaries, Faculty Information | 4065F |
| President's Report | 4254-55F |
| Provost's Report | 4301F |
| Saturday Class Period, Proposal to Eliminate | 4087-88C |
| Scholarships | 4065F |
| Scott, Ruth J. | 4056F |
| Secretary of the University Amended Legislation | 4171C, 4174C |
| Recognition of Retiring Secretary | 4299F |
| Slate of Candidates | 4297F |
| Segregation and Desegregation on Campus, Pos. Paper #15 | 4069C |
| Senate, University Conflicts With Faculty | 4250-51F |
| Resolution SA-42, Student Bill of Rights | 4163-65C, Appen.C. |
| Sharp, R. Lauriston | 4167F |
| Smith, E.Y. | 4056F |
| Smith, Howard G. | 4296F |
| Smock, Robert M. | 4296F |
| Special Rules of Order | 4096-97C |
| Speaker, Election of | 4045C, 4191C |
| Speaking Privileges to Committee Chairmen | 4153C |
| Stout, Evelyn E. | 4168F |
| Student Bill of Rights | 4117F, 4156C, 4163-65C, Appen.C, 4168F |
| Student Information System Subpoenas Issued to Students | 4168F |
| S/U Grading Legislation Arts College | 4267-68C |
| Other | 4050-53C, 4156C |
| | 4181C |
| | 4050-53C, 4064-65F, 4147C |
Supplemental Retirement Annuities
Swan, John C.
Synthesis Committee (Response to Cranch Report)
  Swan, John C.
  Synthesis Committee (Response to Cranch Report)
  (see Class Schedule)
  Tolles, N. Arnold
  Travis, Bernard V.
  Treasurer, ex officio Member University Faculty
  Trustees, Faculty
    Amended Legislation
    Election of Non-tenured Trustee
    Non-tenured (Ruling on Eligibility)
    Non-tenured Ruling
    Tuition Increases
    Turk, Kenneth L.
    Tyler, Moses Coit Prize - Amending Legislation

University Governance
University-ROTC Relationships Committee
  Amended Legislation
  Committee Report
  Cross Enrollment

Vacancies, Committee
Vatter, Ethel L.
Veterinary College, Final Exam Scheduling
Visitor's Rule Waiver

Walker, Robert J.
Wanderstock, Jeremiah J.
Waring, Ethel B.
Warren, Ernest N.
Weaver, Leland C.
Wells, John West
Wichels, Herbert A.
Wood, Doris T.
Wright, Carlton E.

Young, Charlotte M.
Zimmerman, Stanley W.