Minutes from the September 17, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to call the meeting of the University Faculty Senate to order, the first meeting of the 2008-2009 academic year. We are awaiting the arrival of a quorum and in the interim I will ask every one to please turn off or silence their cell phone and will remind everyone that there will be no photography or recording. Just a reminder at this point we have a rather full agenda but there are no speakers lined up for the five minute Good and Welfare session, so those five minutes will be allocated to other events of the day.”

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 14, 2008 SENATE MEETING
Speaker Beer: “Ok, I have been informed that we have a quorum. Thank you all for signing in. Since the first speaker on the agenda is not here yet, we will consider the minutes which were distributed to Senators with the call to the meeting, minutes of the meeting held May 14, 2008. Are there any revisions or corrections? Seeing none I will entertain the motion for acceptance of the minutes. So moved. The minutes are accepted unanimously and I am very pleased that President Skorton is here and I am very honored to introduce the President of Cornell University, Dr. David Skorton.

“Dr. Skorton has approximately forty minutes for remarks and possibly question and answer session.”

2. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT DAVID SKORTON  (Remarks as prepared for Faculty Senate presentation.)

Thank you, Professor Beer. It is a pleasure to be here for this first Faculty Senate meeting of the new academic year.

- I want to congratulate Professor Bill Fry on his election as Dean of the Faculty.
- I also want to thank Professor Charlie Walcott—who recently completed five years of distinguished service—for agreeing to serve as associate dean of faculty this fall while Professor Brad Anton is on sabbatical leave.
- I also thank Charlie for his extraordinary guidance in my first two years at Cornell.
- Finally, I’d like to recognize and thank Prof. David Harris for his extraordinary work as interim provost. David is not treading water—he is moving decisively on many issues and skillfully leading the academic mission.

I have focused in my first two years on becoming familiar and comfortable with the Cornell culture, focusing first on the environment for undergraduate and graduate students and on meeting alumni throughout the world as part of the initiation of the university-wide campaign.

- I am pleased to report that we have now raised some $2.3 billion toward our goal of $4 billion.
- I have had some 70 departmental and faculty visits during this time, and participated in another two dozen events involving faculty.
I now intend to redouble my efforts to engage with the faculty throughout the university.

Guided by Bill Fry, Biddy Martin’s and Charlie Walcott’s earlier advice, and now David Harris’s guidance, I look forward to knowing you better by visiting your departments, labs, and studios; by hosting small lunches with faculty in my office, and by calling together groups on specific issues.

For example, I met recently in my office with Professors Chris Barrett, Susan McCouch, Rebecca Nelson, Per Pinstrup-Andersen, David Sahn, and Vice Provost and Professor Alice Pell to obtain their good counsel in advance of a meeting at the U.S. State Department on the world food situation. The meeting was convened by Secretary of State Rice and attended by Secretaries Rice and Gates, USAID Administrator Fore, Dr. Nina Fedoroff (Science Advisor to Rice and Fore) and senior colleagues from Energy, Agriculture, State, the World Bank, the Gates Foundation, the International Food Policy Research Institute as well as Pepsico, Land O’Lakes, Monsanto, Nestle and others.

My theme was the role that university faculty can play in dealing with aspects of the world food crisis.

Also want to congratulate the faculty on another year of distinction. Just a few highlights, from many that could be noted: Building on the success we had in 2006-07, we had five faculty elected to the distinguished national academies last year:

- Jon Kleinberg, professor of computer science, elected to the National Academy of Engineering.
- Four new members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:
  - Barbara A. Baird, Horace White Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Biology;
  - John Guckenheimer, professor of mathematics;
  - Carol Krumhansl, professor of psychology;
  - G. Peter Lepage, professor of physics and Harold Tanner Dean of College of Arts and Sciences.

Cornell now has almost 190 current and emeritus faculty members in the national academies. E.g. Institute for the Social Sciences working on its fourth interdisciplinary theme: “Persistent Poverty and Upward Mobility.”

- Over next three years (2008-2011) will look broadly at why some people remain poor for long periods of time while others manage to advance economically—a global problem, considering that roughly half of the world’s 6+ billion people live on $2 or less a day.

- Core team of faculty from across the university, with Chris Barrett, the S.B. & J.G. Ashley Professor of Applied Economics and Management, serving as project leader.

- I already have the kickoff lecture, by Chris Barrett, on my calendar for April 22, 2009.
**E.g. The Cornell Population Program, formed last year, ushers in a new era in demographic studies at Cornell.**

- Outstanding population research and graduate training have been accomplished here for years.
- Now, with this new campus-wide program, research will be even more coordinated and interdisciplinary, with opportunities for faculty members and graduate students in related areas to interact, discuss ideas, and generate and analyze data in a cooperative, cross-disciplinary way.
- CPP recently received a hugely significant vote of confidence in the form of a $1.15 million grant from the U.S. National Institutes of Health. The NIH awards one such grant annually to a new program that shows the most promise of becoming a leading population research center.
- This is a real honor—a remarkable acknowledgement of the strength of our faculty, the great promise of our graduate students, and the effective organization of the program.

**E.g. Fourteen Cornell faculty members among those involved in new Institute for Computational Sustainability based at Cornell.**

- Directed by Carla Gomes professor of computing and information science, the institute has just received a $10-million grant from the National Science Foundation.
- Will work to advance computer science in order to study problems in ecology and conservation more effectively – and collaborate closely with the Cornell Center for a Sustainable Future.

**E.g. Robert Morgan, Kappa Alpha Professor of English, poet and novelist, awarded the 2008 Thomas Wolfe Prize from their shared alma mater, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.**

- Among his works – best seller Gap Creek and Boone: A Biography.
- Professor Morgan will be the first speaker at a series of literary lunches that Robin and I are hosting at our home beginning this fall—open to the first 25 people who sign up each time. A chance for groups of people from inside and outside Cornell to interact in a more intimate environment with writers.

**When Dean Bill Fry and I talked a few weeks ago, several themes emerged as being of particular interest/concern to members of the faculty. I want to speak to them today – and then leave quite a bit of time for your questions and comments.**

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE ECONOMY FOR CORNELL:** Tight economic times are a challenge for all Americans, and also for universities.

- Based on the complex and difficult situation in the financial sectors of the American economy, we are projecting lower than average endowment returns for the next 3 years, which will impact the availability of endowment resources to support academic programs, financial aid and other initiatives.
• We also face a very tight federal budget, which may further impact resources for NIH, NSF, and other federal sources of research funding.

• In addition, parents may be feeling additional economic pressure, which could impact our financial aid budget.

• While much of our concern relates to the national economic downturn, we believe that it is critical to maintain academic quality.

Of particular immediate concern are the state budget and its implications for colleges and universities. State budget cuts will lead to budget pressures within the university and this could affect academic programs, facility construction, and perhaps other activities.

• Governor Paterson and the State Legislature have completed action on a budget reduction.

• We are awaiting final figures from SUNY, but we anticipate that our share of the budgets that come from the state to our contract colleges and extension programs may face a reduction close to $10 million this year alone.

• In addition, contracts from state agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and Markets that affect the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Veterinary Medicine will also see reductions. These specific program reductions total approximately $1.6 million.

Please remember the great strength of the Cornell budget, which is based on multiple, diverse revenue streams including tuition, investments, grants and contracts, state funding and philanthropy.

• While we consider the best manner of handling any immediate state budget cuts, much of our concern does relate to the national economic downturn as well the direction of the federal research budget, which has been flat and resulted in some reductions.

• As stewards of this institution, we have an obligation to continually assess--as Biddy and Carolyn have in years past and as David Harris is doing now--our existing strategies and be prepared to adapt to the very real external factors, such as those that have dominated the news in recent days, which are nevertheless out of our control.

• Hence the importance of being open to considering moves that go beyond the immediate issue of state budget cuts and address other matters in a way that positions Cornell more effectively for the long run.

I’ve appointed an ad hoc committee to assess the situation and the appropriate response to it. I just received their report and am reviewing it.

• We will look at all the recommendations of this group as an opportunity for self-evaluation to strengthen the long-term health of the university.

• Strengthening the long-term financial health of the university and thus our ability to achieve our highest priorities will require consultation, planning, prioritization, cost containment and revenue enhancement.

• I will be guided in specific actions by the deans, senior staff and provost’s staff as we
adjust to state budget reductions and the general economic climate of the state and nation,

- And once our direction is set, the usual offices and leaders, the Provost and deans and VPs, will manage the budget as usual.

We likely have some tough times ahead.

- I will be honest with you. I will be as transparent as I can be.
- We are trying to figure out exactly how the state and national situation is affecting us.
- We know we have some challenges but we are strong.
- We cannot panic because we need to keep recruiting, and we need to keep bringing in research dollars.
- So we will need your help and counsel in cutting waste and collecting new revenues.
- Unfortunately, I have lots of experience with belt tightening.
- Substance and rhetoric both matter.
- You need to be a part of helping me communicate in the right way to your colleagues. I will trust you and ask you to trust me.

PLANNING: Planning is and should be largely decentralized at Cornell, as at all research universities. Nonetheless coordination, summarization, and communication of plans in and out of the university are critical and must be employed. This is particularly true during a period of relative budget constraints.

The new strategic plan aims to position Cornell as the “exemplary comprehensive research university of the 21st century.”

- Comprises five overarching goals I introduced last fall in my State of the University Address, along with a set of enabling strategies for each goal. Those goals are (in shortened form):

1. Sustain and renew the exceptional intellectual quality of the university by recruiting, retaining, and supporting a diverse and talented faculty, staff and student body.

2. Provide a distinctive education and extracurricular experience in an integrated living-learning environment for the most deserving and talented students; inspire them to be ethical and purposeful citizens.

3. Enable and encourage the preservation, discovery, transmission and application of knowledge, creativity and critical thought.

4. Extend our leadership in the use of research and education to serve the public good, in fulfillment of Cornell’s land grant mission, and its longstanding commitment to capacity building in communities in the U.S. and around the world.

5. Ensure the long-term stability and quality of the institution through careful planning, efficiencies, the appropriate integration of operations across the university, development of new income sources, and increases in private support.
• This last goal indicates the rationale for Cornell to operate in a more coordinated planning environment.

• The plan also contains a common-format summary of previously developed strategic goals by the provost and each college and vice-presidential division.

After two years of intense work, a new master plan for the Ithaca campus also has been completed.

• It provides the university with an integrated framework to guide its long-term physical development.

• Driven by academic planning priorities, the master plan provides a set of guidelines for decisions about where to locate the university’s research, teaching, residential and recreational priorities and programs.

• It also offers a campus-wide frame of reference for the university's current capital plan and links with precinct plan goals and with existing and emerging college facility plans.

• It is motivated by our plans for the future and closely linked to the City and Town of Ithaca, the county and the state, whose relationships have made an impact over time.

• This plan will also ensure that the development of the campus supports a culturally diverse community of faculty, staff and students who require a wide array of housing options, social and cultural programs and recreational opportunities in a healthy, safe and vital Greater Ithaca, while continuing the university’s long history of stewardship.

These plans, along with the 10-year financial plan, the capital development plan, and the provost’s academic plan, will all be reviewed each year to be sure they reflect the concerns of the faculty, staff, and students of Cornell.

TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID: Continues to be an important issue within higher education and at the national level. Maintaining access is one of our highest priorities, as it has been since the founding of the institution.

• In 2009 U.S. News & World Report, Cornell ranked 4th (tied with MIT) among top-ranked national universities in socioeconomic diversity – based on the percentage of our undergraduate students receiving Pell Grants. Within the Ivy League, we ranked 2nd—with only Columbia having a higher percentage of Pell Grant recipients.

• Percentage of Pell grant recipients—relatively stable for past several years; increased by .2 percent for 2007-08.

Last winter Cornell was one of 136 colleges and universities with endowments of $500 million or more asked by the U.S. Senate Finance Committee for detailed information on endowment growth and spending on student aid—responded with a detailed 25-page report.
• Senator Grassley (R-Iowa) and Senator Peter Welsh (D-Vermont) now appear to some extent to be backing away from original proposal to require universities to spend 5 percent of endowment each year, but they have indicated that Congressional interest in this issue will continue after the Presidential election.

• We are intensely involved in national discussion on these issues.

Cornell’s new financial aid policy—announced before the Senate inquiry—will improve greatly the accessibility of a Cornell education by a more strategic use of grants instead of need-based loans as part of our financial aid packages.

• Beginning this year, students from families with annual income less than $60,000, which is near U.S. median family income, will acquire no need-based student loans to attend Cornell.

• For next academic year, the income level below which no need-based student loans will be used will rise to $75,000, and we will index it as needed to be sure that debt is not a consideration for those who aspire to a Cornell education and who fall in the lower half of the socioeconomic spectrum.

• For incomes up to $120,000, we will cap need-based student loans at $3,000 per year, about half of the current average indebtedness of Cornell graduates.

We are funding this augmented financial aid policy by strategic reallocation of resources, by seeking continued and even enhanced philanthropic support of need-based student financial aid, and by carefully increasing the payout from our endowment.

• Of course, we need to walk a very fine line on the use of our precious endowment dollars.

• We need to maintain the growth and stability of the endowment for generations to come and to support faculty aspirations now and in the future.

• At the same time, we need to use the strength of the endowment to help keep our doors open wide for new generations of Cornellians, no matter their economic circumstances.

• Will continue to resist efforts by some in Congress to impose mandatory levels of endowment spending on colleges and universities.

CARBON NEUTRALITY: As you may remember, on February 23, 2007, I signed American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment.

• With strong support from faculty, staff and students—and joining with other U.S. colleges and universities—

• I committed Cornell to achieving climate neutrality, with respect to greenhouse gases, starting with our Ithaca campus, understanding fully the challenges involved and the reality that its achievement will require the development of technology not presently available.

Through efforts that include Cornell’s lake-source cooling system, aggressive transportation mitigation, energy conservation, laboratory energy efficiency programs, and electrical purchases the university has achieved a “net zero” increase in its carbon
footprint, (and in fact we have actually reduced our emissions) although the campus has grown more than 15 percent since 1990.

- We currently emit approximately 319,000 metric tons of CO2 per year – before offsets such as the oxygen produced by Cornell-owned forests.

- When the Combined Heat and Power Project goes online in 2010, the university’s greenhouse gas emissions will drop more than 30 percent below 1990 levels, well beyond Cornell’s own 7 percent goal, set in 2001.

In keeping with the goals of the Presidents Climate Commitment, on September 15th we submitted our first greenhouse gas (GHG) emission report for the Ithaca campus and estimated the commuter and business air travel GHG emissions.

- Faculty in Natural Resources have completed an estimate of the absorption of CO2 in the 14,000 acres of mostly forested land owned by Cornell within 20 miles of Ithaca. Using the existing management, those forests offset about 40% of the carbon emitted by faculty and staff commuting to work.

Vice President of Facility Services Kyu Whang and Professor Tim Fahey of Natural Resources co-chair the Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee (PCCIC), which includes faculty, staff and students, and I thank them for their efforts.

- With a $425,000 matching grant from NYSERDA, we are preparing a Climate Action Plan (CAP)—due to be complete in September 2009.

- A Faculty Climate Neutrality Committee is actively engaged in developing the CAP, and exploring teaching and project work in the classroom.

We have more than 300 faculty members who have identified their teaching and research as involved in some aspect of sustainability. Over the summer Cornell Center for a Sustainable Future solicited proposals for its new Academic Venture Fund program.

- The venture fund will support research that advances sustainability locally, regionally and internationally and that shows promise for securing external funding.

- It is designed to connect scholars across disciplines and with external partners, and to fill a gap in research that would not normally be funded by traditional grants because they are too interdisciplinary, undeveloped or high risk.

- Final proposals were due earlier this month – will provide funding for periods of 6 to 24 months, depending on amount of funding requested.

- I’ll keep the campus updated on our efforts to achieve carbon neutrality and maintain a sustainable campus through my column in the Cornell Daily Sun and in other forums.

Let me say once again how grateful I am for all you do for the university through your teaching, research, creative work, professional service and contributions as university citizens.
Thank you for your efforts on Cornell’s behalf. I look forward to our continuing work together. In the time we have left, I’d welcome your questions and comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much President Skorton. I would ask the senators and members of the faculty with questions, please stand, state your name and department or other administrative unit affiliation prior to asking the question. Are there any questions for President Skorton?”

John Weiss, Professor, History Department: “I noticed the plan to make financial aid to make students debt free and given that, does that policy apply across to international students?

President Skorton: “No, it does not apply right now. It’s a very important question, John. We have thought about that. They will correct me if I get this wrong, I think right now the need based financial aid available for all international students went up to $1.5M a year! So it’s very important point that we do not have the same capacity to help international students by any stretch of the imagination as we do domestic students. We looked in, David and Biddy and I and now David and I have been working very hard to increase new funding from outside the university as opposed to reallocation of very precious resources exactly toward that goal reducing a need based indebtedness and we hope to be able tell people about some success in that area within the next six to eight weeks of things we are working on right now. So that’s a very important question that you raise. We don’t do anything here like we hoped and hope to see that number go up very substantially.

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR and At-Large Faculty Senator: “President Skorton, I wonder if you could just describe a little bit more of the ad hoc committee that you talked about with regard to looking into some of the financial issues or about how it was put together and who is on it and then also with whatever reports are made will that be made public?”

President Skorton: “Well, let me start with the report. Once I digest that report, Risa, the senior staff the people who have to make decisions about the budget, especially the provosts - once we digest it, which should happen very, very quickly, of course the end result will be made public and here’s why I put the committee together. And again, I’m glad to take my lumps on this but this is how I decided to do it. I did it based on other experiences I had at higher education having to put together a committee to think about doing things. I wanted the committee to be a combination of people who normally deal with budget cuts from the state so I had Susan Henry on the committee and Ron Seeber. I wanted it to be people who do not normally deal with state budget cuts but are important representatives of decisions have to be made, so Peter Lepage is on the committee. I wanted to have the usual suspects are actually going to have to make decisions so the Vice President for Budget and Planning who works directly to the provosts is on the committee now that has been Carolyn Ainslie and as you know her last day was yesterday. She’s going to become CFO of Princeton and Paul Streeter – he can be described as her deputy was on the committee and then a bevy of the member of vice presidents on the senior staff. Bill Fry who, thanks to Charlie’s and UFC’s discussions
with me in the past, we now have the Dean of Faculty having more access to senior staff meetings. He goes to those meetings and he is there for discussion of the way things were set up. I was not going to put rank and file faculty, staff or students on that group, because the decisions are not ultimately going to be made by rank and file faculty. Consultation, of course, will be made by rank and file faculty, staff and students. I wanted the committee to feel empowered and free to put anything in to answer the questions that should be considered and my experience and once again I am glad to take my lumps and be criticized if you think this is the wrong way to do it, I did not want the committee to be constrained or concerned by people’s reactions to things that are purely conjectural. Let’s think about the different ways we can cut a budget. We can cut a budget by firing people. 62% of our university is personnel. The last university I worked at and led, 72% was personnel. So the first thing, in a human resource intensive organization people talk about when they do budget cuts is about firing people in a large way. In general that’s not an option for the university, not only because of tenure but because of the fact that it quickly makes the university go backwards in quality. But nonetheless I wanted them to talk about what possibilities we have for changing and hiring a structure in a university - you have to do things like that. Another way one can cut the budget is to change how services are delivered. And I wanted them to think broadly how we deliver services on campus and I want to be very open about this. I am constantly surprised at how decentralized Cornell is administratively. Now it’s hard to argue with success – Cornell is hugely successful – it’s the best school I’ve ever been at and so I am in awe of the way things have developed. That doesn’t mean it couldn’t operate more efficiently. It doesn’t mean that there has to be every administrator function, every communication function, every IT function does not necessarily have to be distributed equally throughout all administrative units. I wanted to think, suggest to me what we might look at - one of the things we might look at. If we don’t look at things like that openly and courageously what will happen is that we will slowly but surely stop being as good as we are. We have to maintain money for the core functions of the university. I wanted the group to be able to tell me exactly what they thought. Perhaps the most difficult question is that I wanted them to give me the basis of their wisdom of how much liquidity, how much extra financial capability do we need at the university to be able to prosper in difficult times. How many more faculty will not get their grants funded because the federal side funding is going backward or at best or staying flat. How much will provosts want to spend to make sure that those faculty efforts continue to go forward, money has to come from somewhere. How much can we expect the financial returns on investments to go down? People who do this for a living every day will advise me on that. And finally, how much will we expect, actual cash in our hands, from the enormous philanthropy. Last year again Cornell was in the top ten of all schools in the United States, sixth actually in the amount of philanthropy we receive. Last year in cash we were to report in the Ivy League, in the top half of the Ivy League is very, very, very substantial philanthropy but what can we expect now, the way things are in the sectors that represent some of the livelihoods of the people who helping us with generous gifts and I wanted to do those types of deliberations quickly. They took just seventeen days, something like that, two and half weeks to do it and to be fearless and give me your best thoughts on it and we will get the boiled down version to every body very, very
soon. There is no sense me sending out to the faculty and students or staff at large ideas that are rejected that were put in there because I wanted a broad view of what goes on. I will not keep that from you. Remember all the years before when I was at a public setting where you could edit any information you wanted just by the Freedom of Information Act but I wanted them, as I did in Iowa, I wanted them to be able to really “let their hair down” so to speak and talk about the broad range of things that might have to be done. So you will be hearing from us soon.”

Speaker Beer: We have an additional four minutes of questions and answers session with President Skorton.”

President Skorton: “And you have an unlimited number of minutes that you can write me notes and tell me that I do this wrong or try to come see me if you can get past my handlers other than the three more minutes now that I’ve eaten them up. Anything?”

Assistant Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Department of Communications and Senator-At Large: “We have talked about this a number of times and last year too this question about the funding shrinking and some struggles the faculty are facing about getting financing too. And the junior faculty live in the short term, the one year ‘til tenure, two years, three years, four years – is there going to be a way if you’re faculty are spending more time seeking funding and less expense getting funding that that … how is that going to be considered in the tenure process subsequently rather than if tenure committee happens to be privy to the fact that it is harder than it was ten years ago? Is there way to reorient our actions or will that be taken into account?”

President Skorton: “In a second the Provost is going to talk to you. I am going to do something else and leave you here all by your lonesome and I defer 100% on academic matters to the Provost but I will tell you what I am doing about it. I am doing two things. I am personally working very hard with the science coalition by direct meetings with heads of the agencies to push hard. Somebody else was at that World Food Crisis Meeting was the head of the World Food Prize which is why I got mixed up just now but also the head of the NSF was there. Also the head of The Fogarty Center at NIH was there. I’ve built up relationships over three decades of doing this kind of work. I work directly with them. Secondly we are using the Trustees and Overseers of the universities to go to their elected representatives and they have even more clout than I do. I am almost zero clout. They see me walk in and they say “let me guess you want more money, less regulation.” But I’m getting help; I’m getting sort of transduciveness of the trustees and overseers so I am doing everything I can on the revenue enhancement side which less of an issue. David has thought about this a lot but it’s crazy for me to tell his words to you. He can tell his words to you. One more quick question?”

Professor Phil Nicholson, Astronomy: “We are hosting a meeting next month with about 750 people coming to campus and one of our goals is to make the conference as Green as possible. Clearly one of the biggest generators of greenhouse gasses is the air travel involved. So there are two questions: (1) When you quote the number of institutions the vast majority associated with campus activity and (2) when you tabulate the University’s production of CO2, do you account for air travel by the staff and faculty?”
President Skorton: “I think that’s right for faculty, staff and employees at the university. I don’t know if it counts as student travel. It definitely counts as employee travel but not guests of the university that you bring to the campus.”

Professor Nicholson: “I have a proposal for the longer term. As there is so much CO2 associated with air travel it seems to me that we need to consider how to reduce the number of times that we are all flying in & out of Ithaca en route to Philadelphia or Europe. Initiatives such as the new inter-campus bus to NYC seem to be moving in the right direction here. Perhaps improved video conferencing facilities might even reduce some European travel. President Skorton: “Before my time sir, let me not take credit for this. Thank you very much.

3. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR INTERIM PROVOST DAVID HARRIS

Provost Harris: “Thanks. It’s a pleasure to be here. Thanks to Bill for inviting me. It’s good to see so many familiar faces out there, people I have known in various capacities. I told President Skorton when he said he was going to leave early, that was good, because I could tell you I didn’t agree with anything he said. The reality, of course, is that it is a really good working relationship. I think we should feel, as faculty members, as I do that it’s wonderful the President puts so much weight on the provosts, consults, well maybe not so much, but consults an awful lot with the Provosts about what needs to happen in the academic part of the university and so it’s extremely important for the university and from a faculty perspective.

“I wanted to hit on four different topics. President Skorton talked about several things that we are working very closely on, such as the state budget and related issues as well as external funding issues and I wanted to hit on four areas that I think you would be interested in and Bill also suggested some things on the list.

“One is the administrative transitions. The second is to talk you very briefly about external funding. Third, where we are with admissions and financial aid, and fourth something about diversity. I want to be sure I leave time for you to ask questions about these areas the areas that President Skorton touched on and anything else.

“First, just to let you know, you will hear later about the provost search and how that’s going. I saw Martha in here somewhere. I saw the agenda. I think that, as interim provost, it is an interesting opportunity. I think it’s important for you to know that I think this is going to be a period where there is a lot going on, there’s a lot of decisions to be made, but I have very strong working relationships with a range of folk who are involved in these processes, having been vice-provost for three years and deputy provost for one and really it’s a residual that can feel comfortable with what’s being created in terms of the team environment amongst the deans and vice provosts, so building on that. So there’s a lot of transition. It’s hard to keep the score card straight at Day Hall. Biddy has left for Wisconsin, Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development, Bob Harris, stepped down. After eight years in the position, Bob left June 30th and he has been replaced Betta Mannix; she is a professor in the Johnson School of Management. There was a search for a chief diversity officer for Cornell but we were not able to fill that position. We had an excellent candidate but for a range of reasons one of which was not small was
Biddy’s departure. It is very hard to imagine getting someone who is a top candidate who would work very closely with the provost on something like diversity to come when they have no idea who the provost even is going to be. So that was very difficult. We are relaunching the search. We are very excited that Betta agreed to do this. Hopefully you know her. She has tremendous credentials as a scholar and teacher in areas related to diversity.

“Second – International Relations. David Whitman has left; he is the current Dean of the University of Minnesota Law School. David was replaced in that position held originally held by Alice Pell, who many of you already know. She has been around Cornell a while, Professor in Animal Science, Director of CIIFAD and Alice has hit the ground running and we are working very closely on a range of things including campaign related issues. And the last one in terms of changes and a huge one as David mentioned is Carolyn Ainslie’s leaving Cornell. Yesterday was her last day. She’s on vacation the next two weeks and then she starts at Princeton October 1. Many if not all of you know who Carolyn is, know how important she has been to the function of the university. She has been here for the last 22 years, about a decade in the provost’s office. Paul Streeter, who has tons of experience, is stepping into this role in an interim capacity. As far as a search for Carolyn’s successor, we have made the decision that we will not launch that search until the new provost is identified which I think makes a lot of sense since this person reports to that provost and it would be difficult to hire someone and not know who the provost is. I think we owe it to the next provost to be able to define that position in anyway he or she wishes and so we are going to get the machinery going as much as we can over the next month or so and we are going to wait until the new provost is in to really get going. There are two new deans, Alan Mathios, Human Ecology and Kent Kleinman in Architecture, Art and Planning. There is a lot going on.

External Funding. The only thing I’m going to add to this is the Cornell Population Program (CPP) that President Skorton mentioned has received NIH funding. I just wanted to acknowledge that the Institute for Social Science, which hopefully all of you know about. This is the first project we funded in the Institute for Social Sciences and when we funded that project they delivered. The thing they said that we would have at the very end was a grant from NIH for the POP Center, so it’s really quite exciting having to see our first project bear fruit.

“I am going to use the remainder of my time talking about admissions and financial aid. It’s a really a very important area. If there were no students we wouldn’t have much of a university. I’m not in the classroom anymore but when I was in the classroom as a faculty member I learned it is extremely important to have great students in the classroom. It makes everything worthwhile. It’s a lot of fun to have great students and intellectually curious students and so we’re working very hard to get financial aid to make sure that continues to be the case. This year we met or exceeded our enrollment goals in every undergraduate college. We were a little on the high side which makes people like vice-president Susan Murphy a little nervous. She had eight beds this year, she told me, that if we had nine more kids she didn’t know where she would have had that last person sleep. But I would rather be on the high side than the low side, so that’s good news.
Financial aid and admission. We have a new financial aid plan that you've heard about. We're excited. I am more proud of that than almost anything else I have done at Cornell. It was an incredibly frustrating experience because when Carolyn, Biddy and I sat down and finalized it, we knew we weren't doing everything we should be doing. We knew we just couldn't afford to do all we should be doing, that, as important as access is to university it is just not possible. We'll continue to look at this and work on it.

“When it comes to African American students in the entering class, this is another disturbing story and very frustrating. It turns out, we'll have official counts after two weeks, but there is less than 140 black students in the entering class. It’s probably a twenty-year low. That is a 20% decline since last year in the number of black students in the entering class. That’s something that I’ve been paying an extremely large amount of attention to and have been, since I think March when I first realized that this was going to happen when we looked at the number of students being admitted. Then we started asking things like what can we do about yield? We’ve been working very hard. We realized we were not able to make it up in yield. I’ve been working very hard with Doris Davis, Associate Provost for undergraduate enrollment and admission. We are trying to figure out what happened and how can we make sure it doesn’t happen again. And, the story here is, and it may not be a surprise to you is there is no smoking gun. There is no single thing that explains it. It’s a range of things that explain it. We are working very hard to get a sense of what those things are and we can talk about it if you want. I am trying to get some sense of how to turn it around.

“Two quick other things. This past spring, Biddy asked me to lead an effort working with Carolyn Ainslie, Susan Murphy, Doris Davis and a couple of others, and we were looking at our own priorities. This was motivated by at least three things. One is this gap between what we need to do to assure access and what we were able to do. The second is the decline in black students and the extreme concern about what we are going to do to turn that around. And third is the increasing pressure from Athletics. As you may know, some of our peer schools in the Ivy League are offering students financial aid packages that are far beyond anything Cornell can do. We are all need-based schools but the definition of need – there is no consistency anymore. There used to be a sense as to what need was and so our peer schools have abandoned that and in fact have given away aids in ways we cannot possibly understand how they can do this in the need based aid. It looks like scholarships, quite frankly in some cases. Cornell is getting a lot of pressure from some folks. We have to match. We have to be top in Ivy League athletics. That means we have to do for these students what some of our other schools are doing and so, prompted by that, we decided that “you know what, let’s take a step back and ask the questions: what are our highest priorities when it comes to enrolling undergraduates? What can we do to attract them? To admit them? To enroll them? And lastly, what changes should we make in what we’re going to do for athletes. What lessons do we learn? What should we be doing for under-represented minorities if both groups are high priorities? Or for looking at what we do, for most groups, what can we learn about what we should be doing to attract the most academically advanced students to Cornell? Those are things we’re working through. It’s one of those funny things that I didn’t know I was going to be sitting in this seat and so I wrote the report for the provost
and now I have to deal with it. There’s a lot of things I wished I had known.

Admissions and financial aid. You all got a note from me about PeopleSoft and faculty advising. Actually, that is my biggest concern when it comes to PeopleSoft. It’s a big issue but the bigger issue is financial aid for students. This was in the Sun, but I don’t know how many of you people noticed it. Because of PeopleSoft related issues and our inability to prepare for it there are several hundred continuing students at Cornell who have no idea what their financial aid package is for the current year. And this is causing stress. Interestingly and you might realize it too as soon as I say it. The students aren’t all that stressed. Their parents, on the other hand… are watching very closely. The students are saying, “ah, it will all work out.” Parents have told me, “God what am I going to do?” and have actually gotten emails that are heart breaking about parents talking about they’re going to struggle and struggle and scrape and they move them back here sophomore year and say, “what am I going to do if the financial aid package comes back and we’re a thousand or more short. So I’m working hard as I possibly can to do everything I possibly can to get them their packages ASAP. Doesn’t mean I’m not paying close attention to PeopleSoft issues that some of you have raised. It’s really important, but my first priority has got to be to get those kids financial aid awards.

Lastly, I would like to mention the Institute for Diversity. I think it is a very positive story and I want to thank the folks on the faculty senate for being involved. This is the program we put in place this past summer. It was the first time we implemented it. Instead of having a university course diversity requirement as some recommended, we drew on the experience from Hamilton College and why not make every course or as many courses as possible, as smart as possible around issues of diversity. That means not only the content but it also means how courses are taught and so the idea was to have students and faculty go offsite for a retreat for three or four days and have a trained facilitator come and look at the syllabus or a portion of it and ask questions like, what can we do to improve this course from the diversity perspective, not preaching to anybody about content issues and changing content? But asking how can we have a course that is more consistent with the students you are teaching. My favorite example is in the social sciences – I’ve been through these courses. There are some economists here, economists who talk about issues in the labor market and says, “well, let’s talk about white men because women are too hard to deal with because they go out of the market because of child-bearing and minorities have such spotty records in the general labor market…” and I say, “whoa, wait a minute – what did you single out all those people when you taught your course around general labor, let’s talk about for a minute about those other folks. It’s too complicated. There’s a lot of long standing issues. There’s a good story here. We’ve had over forty faculty applying – we were able to have twenty faculty there with a range of departments and a range ranks from full professors to assistant professors. We will continue working on this.

“I’ll be glad to answer questions.”

Professor Stein, Physics: I was knocked back in my seat by one remark I must have misunderstood. Is it true that some of our Ivy League peers are giving what used to be called athletic scholarships namely where you give a scholarship to a person for their
athletic ability instead out of line with other financial aid?"

David Harris: “Well, what I can tell you is, that we are not and point two is that we cannot figure out the others are doing it. The coaches come to us and I feel for them. We are very focused on equity issues at Cornell. And they are focused on that but they’re also saying “I’ve got to think about these other schools and I have to go play hockey and football and basketball against those schools and be able to compete” and so they are coming to us with letters that these kids have from schools – you fill in the blanks – and they’re saying “why can’t you match it?” and I’m sitting down with Doris Davis and umpteen others and they’re saying there is no way we can justify this on the basis of need. Those are two facts.

Professor Stein: Ok, but it would seem to me that the appropriate thing to do is to bring this up with the other institutions that also swears as much as you do that they don’t give out athletic scholarships.

David Harris: That’s been done. And their comment is “well, you know, need is something that is difficult to define.” How much can one pay for college? And you know, they say we are actually not doing this just for athletes, we’re doing it for everybody. And so, we’ve got enough money and you don’t, and that’s your problem and that’s the sort of subtext. They don’t explicitly say that but I’m not that far off.”

Professor Stein: Need is what you need to get them to come, right?”

David Harris: “There you go! Need is what you need to get your goals.” Thank you!

Speaker Beer: Now I call on the acting associate dean of the faculty, Charlie Walcott for a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee.

4. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS Charles Walcott, Acting Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty: Well as a substitute Brad Anton allow me to present the report (Appendix 1) of the Nominations and Elections Committee. It’s reasonably straightforward. You’ve had it all sent to you in the mail so let’s just go through this. Next. Next. Next. Next. Next. Next. Next. Now, here’s one that I need to spend a moment talking about. University Faculty Committee is, as you well know, the Executive Committee of this body and normally those on the UFC are elected at large from this body. One of UFC members, Kathryn March has had the audacity to go on sabbatical leave this year and it was necessary to replace her. It turns out she was the only person from the humanities in Arts and Sciences and so the Nominations and Elections recommended Jonathan Culler as a one year substitute. Jonathan Culler is not a member of this body. On the other hand there was a recommendation from the Committee of Faculty Governance that recommended that a certain percentage of the UFC be elected at large from the faculty not being constrained by not being a member of this body so we’re aiming in that general direction and we will have that brought up to you for discussion at a future meeting but I am asking you to approve this exception to our general rule.

“That’s my report.”

Speaker Beer: Thank you very much, Dean Walcott. It is appropriate to accept and
approve the report of the Nominations and Elections Committee. (Approval moved.) Is there any objection to accepting the report?

“The report is accepted unanimously. Thank you. Now, I am very pleased to call the Dean of Faculty, Professor William Fry, a good friend and colleague.”

5. REMARKS BY DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean of Faculty, William Fry: “Thank you Steve. “It is a real pleasure to be here. I first want to start off by saying, as part of the austere budget measures for the university, we do not have refreshments. But that’s not quite right. There was just some mix-up and the food didn’t get delivered.

“What I would like to do today is to just describe to you the first ten weeks I’ve been on the job. It is a steep learning curve. I would like to share with you some of my impressions from those first ten weeks and identify some issues for the Senate. And I will be glad to answer any questions. But first I would like to make some introductory comments and I want to say publicly it’s an honor to serve as the Dean of Faculty. The previous deans have been exceptional and I have tremendous respect for them, especially since I’ve seen personally what they have done. I do take this responsibility very seriously and I’ll do the best job I can.

And second I want to say how much I appreciated the accomplishments of the former deans, Walter Lynn, Peter Stein, Bob Cooke and Charlie Walcott. I’ve had a chance to meet with each of them and learn quite a lot. I have learned the most from Charlie since I’ve had more contact with him. As David Skorton identified, there were a lot of things that Charlie did that were not visible to the rest of us. I know quite a bit about that and I think it’s fair to say that he’s improved the situation of the University Faculty quite considerably as a result. So Charlie, I can’t thank you enough. We all owe you a debt of gratitude.

“And I’ll just say a little about my experience at Cornell. I’ve been here longer than David Skorton - I started about thirty-seven years ago on the faculty. My first academic job was at Central Connecticut State College. My PhD is from Cornell so I get all those solicitations like many of you do.

I was Chair of my department for quite some time and I’ve been on a lot of university faculty committees and I was a faculty trustee from 1998 to 2002. I was on the president’s search committee that identified Jeff Lehman as the president and most recently I was senior associate Dean in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Last year I was sabbatical leave in South Africa where I made some discoveries in the lab. I understand the Dean of Faculty position is a part-time job so like you, I have graduate students, I teach an undergraduate course, Introduction to Plant Pathology on Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays and labs on Tuesday and Wednesday. I also attempt to do research. I have a very small research group now. If you count all the people in my lab, the full time people, the part time people, and the volunteers, they total eight bodies in the lab and like you just heard, I’ve been writing grant proposals and I am with the majority, I get rejected most of the time. I submitted five, but have only received funding for one
this year.

“So let me turn to my first seventy days, first ten weeks, as dean of faculty and let you know what I’ve been doing. I’ve met with a lot of people. I’ve met with each member of UFC individually and as a group a number of times. I don’t know if they are all here but I would like to identify the UFC members – Rod Dietert from Vet, Kathy Gleason from Ag and Life Sciences, Fred Gouldin from Engineering, Howard Howland from Arts & Sciences, Ellis Loew from Vet, Dennis Miller from Ag & Life Sciences, Vicki Meyers-Wallen from Vet, and Tim Mount AG and Life Sciences. I’ve met with members of the faculty, I’ve met with Pete Meinig, chair of the Board of Trustees. I met with David Skorton and David Harris and as President Skorton said I have attended a couple of the senior staff meetings. During these discussions I have a series of impressions and I’d like to share a few of them.

“The one impression is that everyone in the university, the faculty, administration, the trustees feel the need for a strong and effective faculty governance. I think we all have the same goals and the differences might be in how we get there or how we’ll arrive. I think we’re going to roughly the same place. I think the solutions will appear.

“And finally in discussions I’ve had with the faculty, it’s clear the faculty in this place want to make valuable contributions to the mission of the university. We do that to through teaching, research and outreach, but we also do that by playing a role in the decisions that the university comes to and again I think the faculty particularly want some sort of definition of what that role is. I think it’s a bit cumbersome. Some things clearly are in the purview of the faculty. And I think honoring those views is important. Other topics are not started by the faculty, but as David said he wants to be consultative. It is my philosophy that we should consult even if we don’t vote or we don’t approve or disapprove of a particular issue. I think there is tremendous education and benefit that can come from a give and take dialogue concerning those issues and it my hope that we will have some of those issues this year and we will have a respectful type dialogue with a lot of people.

There are several issues and I think David mentioned some of those. One is the university finances. My hope is that we will look at the university budget. Certainly the faculty doesn’t decide the university budget, but it might ask questions that might help. One is to look at the capital campaign. I think David also mentioned the master plan, capital construction. Another important issue will be graduate student tuition.

“We as senators all have a responsibility in this dialogue and I just want to remind everybody that this is a two way street. You need to consult with your constituencies and bring issues back to the senate. There are three ways to get items on the agenda. One is through the University Faculty Committee - any four members of the Faculty Senate can put an item on the agenda. Or any twenty-five members of the university can put items on the agenda.

“I wanted to identify three general topics that I think we need to address and one is to continue dialogue with the university administration on the general directions of the university and I think David gave suitable examples of that kind of dialogue. Also as
Charlie mentioned, the Senate received a report from the Governance Committee in March 2007 and one of their recommendations was to change the composition of UFC. We will be discussing this further.

“Another one of the recommendations is for the president and provost to be more consultative with the senate. I think the Senate can ask, we can’t force them. But my impression is that President Skorton wants to be consultative.

“A specific issue that is facing the faculty at the start of this year is that we are making a change in the academic calendar. The reason for that change is that the people involved with orientation say they need at least one fewer days and therefore suggesting that the fall semester start on a Wednesday rather than on Thursday. This is an issue that the Educational Policy Committee will look at and then it will come to the faculty. I will conclude and take your questions.”

Speaker Beer: “We’ll take two minutes for questions.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English and Director of the American Indian Program: “I was also on the Governance Committee that wrote that report and I wondered if there is a specific agenda since we made more than two recommendations and our consultative recommendations were more specific than just general rapport with the upper administration. Are other recommendations that were made in the report going to be addressed specifically?”

Dean Fry: “Yes, the recommendation was that the University Faculty Committee initiate consideration so that will happen and there were some very specific recommendations. For example, it was recommended that the membership of the UFC be broadened. That hasn’t happened yet. This is a process that will continue.

Professor Cheyfitz: “There were also recommendations that had ways the provostial and presidential searches would be conducted and they were very concrete.”

Dean Fry: “Yes, so that’s a great example. The recommendation was that faculty be added to the presidential and the provost searches and that happened and without forcing it. David Skorton met with the UFC and said, “I’d like to do an internal search, here’s the criteria we have. And the UFC – there was dialogue and consultation on that. And UFC suggested the mix of faculty representation wasn’t quite right and there were too few faculty on the search committee and he adopted both of those recommendations, increased the number of faculty and adjusted the membership.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks very much, Dean Fry and leads to the next item on the agenda, which is an update on a very important search for provost and for that we have the Chair of the Provost Search Committee, Professor Martha Haynes.”

6. UPDATE ON PROVOST SEARCH

Professor Martha Haynes, Astronomy and Chair of Provost Search Committee: “Thank you. I was just in search committee meeting and that’s why I was late. So, I had a very nice lead in and learned a bit about the search committee that I didn’t know. I’m sure you’re all aware of the search committee because we tried to make our activities
public. There are ten people on the committee - four of them are faculty members, representatives of the university administration, from the graduate student assembly, the undergraduate student assembly and the staff assembly and so it’s a very diverse committee. We, as was stipulated by Dean Skorton when he first called me, it’s an internal search it is a confidential search. So I will tell you a little about what we’ve done and where we are now and I will answer not answer questions that I do not feel I should answer. When we were called upon, David explained that it would be an internal search as is Cornell tradition and one of the things we were concerned about was how the process would reach out to find people who are obvious candidates as well people were not obvious candidates, especially when you have a search committee as diverse as ours. And so we spent the summer time trying to develop a process with which we could receive nominations and perhaps you are all familiar with that. At least I hope you are. We have developed a website where people can submit nominations and we had a period of two and half weeks where we went into the community, the entire community of Cornell, including the medical college and our friends in Qatar. What was actually gratifying with this is that we received a lot of nominations. Some of course were the same individuals but they came from all over campus and we even received nominations from alumni. Because we set clear boundary conditions that the person had to currently be a faculty member at the rank of professor, that’s the kind of nomination we got. We also developed with the help of the people in the President’s office and provost’s office a description of the job and the qualifications that seem to be important for the job and one of the things, that has been very important is that people took a lot of time on their nominations. They were very thoughtful. When people nominated someone they explained their nomination and some of that was extremely useful to the committee.

“When we first set up the process our understanding was we would have a target date of trying to get to the position where we would write our report, which is deliver a list of individuals to David Skorton whom we believe were qualified to be provost at Cornell University. It’s not a short list that we ranked. It’s a list we hoped that David Skorton would choose from, the decision being his in the end. Our target date to do that was short, such that he could potentially announce the individual at Trustee Weekend in October. I can say that we are working towards that schedule. I am glad my life isn’t at stake at that end result but we are trying to adhere to that schedule because we all realize the importance of keeping to that schedule. The committee has been working very hard to identify candidates and to come up with a criteria by which we can evaluate them and provide David Skorton the information that he needs to make the final decision. I think that’s all I have to say except to say that the committee is definitely heavily engaged and working very hard and was helped enormously by the time individuals on campus took to write nominations.”

Speaker Beer: Thank you very much. Are you willing to consider questions?”

Professor Haynes: “I am willing to consider questions, Just understand that this is confidential process.”

Assistant Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: If the calendar is met, when does the provost take office?”
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Professor Haynes: “My understanding from David is that he would like the provost to be in place by the end of the year.”
Professor Toorawa: “The calendar year?”
Professor Haynes: “Yes, but David Harris can probably answer the question better.”
David Harris: “I want the provost to be in place by the end of the calendar year.”
Speaker Beer: “If there is no further questions, thank you very much. The senate has accomplished its business with five minutes to spare and so it would appropriate to make a motion for adjournment.
Adjournment 5:55 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott
Acting Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty
Minutes from the
October 15, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to remind the members of the body that you should turn off or silence your cell phone and there will be no recording either audio or visual of the proceedings. We have one Good and Welfare speaker. I’m told that he will require only a couple of minutes. Therefore the balance will be available for Professor Peter Stein who may require more than the ten minutes that the agenda provides for him.

“At this point I doubt that we have a quorum, but in any case I think we can proceed with remarks from Interim Provost David Harris, who is also prepared to answer questions.

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR INTERIM PROVOST DAVID HARRIS

Interim Provost David Harris: “Welcome. What I want to do today is I want to deviate from the notion of a report from the provost and what I want to do is really have a discussion with the provost (you and me, not me and me) about an issue that I think is one of the critical issues facing Cornell University right now – an issue that I don’t know what the answer is. I’m not standing and saying this is what we’re doing for sure. I’m going to tell you, here is something really important and I’m going to tell you that we’re interested in your thoughts about how best to solve it. As Bill and I talked about, this is something where I think there is an opportunity to imagine some sustained conversations between some subcommittee of this body and the provost’s office and admissions. There are handouts on the table that you should have picked up. I’ll tell you what they are quickly. What you have in your hand is the 1998 policy passed by the Board on need-blind admission and need-based financial. You also have in front of you, a chart that compares financial aid policies at the Ivy League schools. That’s all public information and it’s on the website. We actually just went though and pulled it all off and you can see all the figures when you go to the websites.

“Overview. First, Cornell has a commitment to need-blind admission and need-based aid. We’ve had that commitment for decades. That’s the statement you have in front of you. Please take a moment to read it when you get a chance. It basically says, and this is really important, important to what Cornell is – it says that when we admit students to the university, we’re not thinking about whether they can afford it or not. We’re first going to see whose done the work, them, their parents, their community and so forth to be able to succeed at Cornell and then we’re going to take the second step with their financial aid incentive. How much need do they have and let’s figure out with these various pools out there and how we can meet their need.

“Point two: Cornell is committed to recruiting students from priority groups. Another way of saying this is that Cornell has a commitment to having a diverse class where diverse is broadly defined. We don’t just pick students and line them up purely on academic horsepower, if you will, and say let’s admit them. We say there are other things that matter. We want to have diversity by class, sometimes by economic status. Some of you say that race and ethnicity matter. Some say athletics matter. There are others who
think club activities. There is geographic diversity with New York State residency being important issue. There is a bunch of things that matter.

“Third point. We know that our peers have radically redefined financial aid, financial need and self help loans. That’s what you have in front of you. What you can see in these charts is something you would not have seen five years ago. You can see that schools have said, ‘Well the self help level, schools have done thing to rapidly reduce their self help, that’s the part that students pay through loans and work-study. You will also see that many schools have gone to no loan for students. You would further find that schools have done things with parent contribution not staying with the 568 agreement we used to have that said we would all use basically the same method for determining how much a family would pay, but now they have radically deviated from that. Harvard, for example said that 10% of $200,000 family income, $20,000. That’s all they’d say. The old model would have been different.”

Unidentified: “Is that the maximum self help per year?”

Provost Harris: “Yes it is. So it’s possible to graduate with loans in excess of $40K at Cornell.

“And last, and this is an issue we’re grappling with. We’re truly grappling and I don’t know how many conversations today and through this week and will be the rest of the week; but, how to reconcile these things. How to remain true to our historical, traditional position on need-blind admission, particularly need-based aid, and how to continue to think about shaping that class; to think about a level of diversity in the class on so many dimensions; and how to think about doing this in a context in which our peers have radically changed the rules of the game. You want to see part of why this is so difficult for Cornell - I’ll refer to this slide. It was just this week - I thought ok, this is the way you tell the story. What you have here is Pell Grants. To start with the Pell Grant, just in general is a deviation, but think about families under about $45-50K a year being eligible for those Pell Grants. The Pell Grants provides almost $5K a year. What you have here along the X-axis is Cornell’s peer group broadly defined, so you have your Ivy’s but you also have your Northwestern and Michigan. In parenthesis you have the number of Pell Grant recipients in each school and what this is telling you is that each of these schools said, we have got to do something about financial aid. They said, we ought to increase grant aid, our support, our dollars to kids who have Pell grants, on the order of $5K a kid and this is an easy way to start thinking about increasing it. This is how much it would cost the school. You see it would cost Michigan over $15M; Cornell is here around $9M and look at some of your other schools: Yale – under $2M, Harvard is about $4M. Because we’re so large and we have so many poor kids, our percentage is higher but then our base is so much larger. Doing anything at Cornell costs a lot more than other schools and that’s a big part of our count – just more expensive. We’re victims, if you will, by the fact that we’ve been economically diverse much more so than some of our peers and we’re larger. So that’s what we’re grappling with. Yes?”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “What is the number in the parentheses?”
Provost Harris: “I’m sorry, this number is the number of Pell Grant recipients. We have 1,834 at Cornell University. We take the number and multiply that by 5,000 and you get that. Other questions? So, hopefully it’s clear what challenges we’re having at Cornell.

“What have we done? Last January, we added some new financial aid measures. We said that we’re going to reduce student loan to zero if the family income is under $60K. We said that we were going to increase that threshold for need-based loans to $75K starting next fall. We said we were going to cap need-based student loans to $3K if your family comes between $60K and $120K. We’re excited about that. I’ve just literally a couple of hours ago seen the first numbers of how many students are benefiting from this and there is a huge increase, more than double the number of students at Cornell who have no student loan. This number of students far more than doubled actually. The number of students who have loans under $3K is also more than doubled so we feel pretty good about that. We feel good that we were able to do it. It’s a big stretch financially for Cornell. But at that time, in the end, Biddy, Carolyn and me said we feel great and we also feel concerned because we know we’re not doing enough. We know we need to do something about parent contribution, which we didn’t touch. We know that over $120K there is this cliff where you have that standard loan of $10,900. We knew we needed to do more, but we just couldn’t afford to at that time.

What Biddy did was say, OK since we’re feeling good but we know we need to do more, let’s look at this more in depth, let’s try to understand what our own priorities are at Cornell, what are the groups that matter to us, if you will. Among the potential students who come here - what do we actually do from the very first stage of getting those kids interested in Cornell, getting them to apply to Cornell, getting them to finish their application to Cornell, admitting them, reviewing their application, financial aid and getting them to actually come in the fall. The motivations, I’ve said some of them already, parent contributions and standard student loan levels, we thought they were too high and we knew they were much higher than our competitors – the Ivy plus competitors.

Second – we had a declining number of black students last year. This year the black student class is a little under 140. Last year it was closer to 190 and that was a one year drop. There was also a drop from the previous year. So this is our lowest number of black students, I’ve heard, in twenty years perhaps, a long time. And we think some of this could well be due to financial aid. The fact is that our peers only have to pick up a few kids, but if they all do that contributes to our drop.

“Third, we have seen the number of program recipients declining over time. It hasn’t been huge increases every year and some of it is definitional differences but there is a decline in the number of Pell grants students at Cornell.

“Last – Challenges in athletics recruiting. I mentioned this last time I was here. That athletics, since they are getting beat up by basically Harvard, Yale and Princeton in particular, but other schools as well. We just can’t compete with the financial packages the schools are offering these kids. It’s not like the old days when there was colluding. It used to be we were basically offering comparable packages to kids and decisions were made based on how they felt about the coach, how they felt about the school and a range
of other issues. Many kids today can’t choose that way today because the packages aren’t the same.

“As I’ll say later, but I’ll say it first now, there’s a concern about this being the canary in the coal mine. Things we are hearing from athletics now are likely the same kinds of things that other students will be facing as they go through the processes. We have defined the highest university priorities as four groups and this is actually based on the way things had been defined at Cornell, as well as our agreeing with it.

“We have identified high academic ability kids, underrepresented minorities, low socio-economic status students, and recruited athletes as being our four highest university priority groups. There are other groups too. I’m going to talk about these four today.

“The first thing we did was to say, if these are our four highest priority groups, what do we do for these students and are we doing the same things across the groups and the answer is no, we’re not. In fact, we’re doing a lot more for some of these groups than we’re doing for others – despite the fact that they are all supposed to be high priority groups. One example – early credential review is something we use for athletes. We are not the only ones, other Ivy school do it as well. Athletic recruits can get an early read from admissions and financial aid. They don’t get admitted but they get an early read to give them some sense of their probabilities. That’s something that’s very helpful for certain athletes who maybe thought I can’t afford Cornell and I don’t know if I can get in. It’s an indication that you’re encouraged. It’s something to think about. For some other groups that doesn’t happen.

“We looked internally. Then we looked externally. We saw that we are already falling behind many of our peers and the challenge has been trying to balance these two concerns. One of the things I talk about a lot is, if you have two roommates who are comparable in terms of financial resources, they should have comparable packages, at least comparable parent contributions. Athletics will push their students and will say that’s all fine and good but we’re not trying to recruit this roommate over that roommate. We’re trying to recruit this kid and Yale is also trying to recruit this kid to play football. We need to be able to compete.”

Professor Greg Poe, Applied Economics & Management: Your two roommates or three roommates situation – what happens if they attend different units at Cornell and they have different costs?

Provost Harris: “What we do to figure this out is - the way financial aid works- is we start with the cost of attendance. We say, how much can this parent pay and we use what’s called the 568 Agreement. It used to be all Ivy were in and they’ve been falling out. Harvard, Yale, Princeton and others, do things to deviate from the 568 formula for figuring out how much parents are supposed to pay for their kid to go to college. The formula is based on formulas for home equity, a whole bunch of things factored in, how many kids in college and so forth. After that, then you say, they can pay whatever it is, but it’s also the cost of attendance. If it’s lower, you say, well great, no need. If it’s higher then you say, how are we going to make up the difference? As so we start with work-study and you have student loans, you have student contributions from summer work
and the last dollar in is grant aid, Cornell money will come in. That’s how it works.

“We have proposed a number of changes and this is a funny story. Biddy asked me to write the plan and to chair the committee. When it was done, I thought this is pretty complicated. I’m glad I get to give it to Biddy to make the decisions and then she left! So here I am and the things I was proposing as really great idea I now think this is a challenge. The standard financial aid package and all of this would be easy of course if we had infinite resources. Obviously, with no budget constraint this would be easy.

“Standard financial aid packages. I mentioned before there is a cliff at $120,000 of family income. So you go from $3K annual loan cap, no more than $3K, to a loan potentially of $10,900, so there is a huge cliff there. The concern is that there is what is called need-based loans out there so things like Perkins and Stafford, you can only add those things up to $7,500 for freshmen. What actually happens is the loans in the freshman standard packages are about $3K higher than what they can get from need-based loans.

“Now what is special about need-based loans? They have favorable terms and rates and when the interest starts accruing. So what happens when you end up with private loans. Private loans mean you go out to a bank with someone else who can vouch for you with collateral and so forth and you have to get a loan from that bank so that’s what students are having to do in order to meet their financial aid in freshman year, in standard packages.

“We think that’s not right. It’s not consistent with this implicit agreement we made which is, you worked hard to get here; we’ll review you and if we accept you, we’ll make it possible for you to come. We’re not going to package with these loans where interest rates are higher and starting to accrue immediately – that’s not consistent with it, we don’t believe, so we recommending capping student loans $7,500 for kids under $120K.

“Second – cost of attendance. All this rests, in many cases, as I said to Greg on how much it costs to attend Cornell. We wrestle with how much it costs to go to Cornell. The cost of attendance assumption is not in the financial aid formula. The concern is that we don’t go back every year and consider what goes into that market basket and say, well, here are some of the things you have to buy, price them up. Instead what happens is we say, well, here’s what it was, let’s look at what happens with tuition and increase for inflation and so forth. But there are other concerns. I’ll give you two examples. One – there are things now you now consider a necessity for college that weren’t in there before and one example that many think is, is a laptop. You might say well, you go to college these days, having a laptop isn’t a pure option it’s something that’s quite critical – group projects, taking notes, doing various things, you need a computer or some kind of laptop. Maybe that should be in the cost of attendance. It’s debatable but that’s the kinds of need that happen.

“The other thing we think about is, what are those factors that are those middle class assumptions about financial aid. About paying for college, for example you come from Arizona you need a winter coat. Where does that come from? Well Mom and Dad, and the LLBean catalog. But what if you’re poor? Where does that money come from? It’s nowhere in our student aid formula. Uncle dies and you have to fly back to LA to the
funeral. Where is that? It’s not in here. So there are questions about the cost of attendance. We want that reviewed on a biannual basis by the Director of Admissions/Financial Aid.

“In terms of highest priorities. There are college priorities out there and I didn’t mean to skip over that. Each college can identify 2% of its enrollment as college priorities. Those kids, if there is financial need, will end up with less loan and more grant aid than they’d otherwise have. They would have more attractive packages. But colleges vary tremendously in how they identify need and so one of the things we’re doing is that we’re encouraging colleges to think about academic ability as important factors when they’re thinking about college priorities. We want to provide all college priority admits resources if needed for one campus visit. We hear that it seems to be a big factor whether kids come. I think there’s some positive activity there, but I still this it’s problematic.

“Underrepresented Minorities (URM) -- The overall approach here is that everything we do around underrepresented minorities we should think of them as students first, URM second. We’re very concerned about the number of URM. But I fear that we can turn off some kids off who may be thinking, “I want to come to Cornell because I love English; I want to be an English major” and if they feel that they’re not having those avenues open to them and they’re getting channeled more as a URM. We need worry about that kind of negative impact on our ability to recruit and so we want to think about a range of things that people see and feel.

“Advocates are the second one. Athletes actually have a huge advantage over just about every other kid who is coming to Cornell. Legacies are in that range perhaps. They have advocates. They have individuals who identify them, who meet with them often in their homes, who call them frequently, email them and so forth, tell them about Cornell to help them understand that it’s someplace that they can afford, some place that they can get in, someplace they’d be happy. That’s very different from other students. URM for instance, tend not to have that, since that’s a group that’s disproportionately first generation. There’s all sorts of things that Doris Davis, head of Admission and Financial Aid, tells me she’s hears in her conversations with parents and with kids some of it has been really bad advise. They think they can’t afford it. There’s one story that says if you don’t go after financial aid, they’ll give you some default financial aid and default financial aid is better than what you would have gotten otherwise. There’s a whole lot of things out there that if there was somebody, an advocate, they could dispel these myths and give folks good information. So we’re talking about ways to provide this information and to get closer to URM and other students who need help. Campus visits I mention again and we have already started to talk about this and how we can make that work better.

“Recruited athletes. Here the big challenge I mentioned already is, and this is a really important point, it’s not that Cornell does less for athletes than we did three years ago. That’s not what’s happening. It’s not why we’re less competitive. We’re less competitive because there has been a relative change in what we do for athletes – not an absolute change what we do for athletes. Harvard, Yale and Princeton and in particular Harvard, has gone way beyond in what it they can offer kids in terms of parent contributions and in terms of loans in terms of how much summer savings is expected – a
whole range of things. There are a number of our peer institutions who are matching Harvard, Yale and Princeton on these terms in ways that are hard to reconcile with Ivy League rules in many cases.”

Professor Abigail Cohn, Linguistics and At-Large Member: “Isn’t that in direct violation of, unlike financial aid agreements where they can opt out, isn’t this in direct violation of what it means to be part of the Ivy League?”

Provost Harris: “For Harvard, Yale and Princeton, clearly no. They can do it. The reason they get away with it is that they are not doing anything special for athletes. They have so much money and are doing it for everybody. They’re not doing anything special athletes. The question is how…”

Professor Cohn: “Is it just that the relative number of other students that they are doing it for is relatively smaller than the number of students than we would have to”

Provost Harris: “Well, it’s two things. One they have fewer kids they’re covering, for example. There aren’t as many enrollments, not as many raw dollars. They also have tons of more money that we do and they can afford to do things we only dream of. We can’t imagine actually pulling off. For some other schools it’s hard to understand how they are doing this and being able to provide the same budget relief, if you will, to other kids.”

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: “Could I ask you about the relative amounts that are going to the various groups. Are we paying about the same for the athletes as we are for other students?”

Provost Harris: “It’s important to realize that everything I am talking about that Cornell does is all about loans vs. grant aid. There is nothing that we’re doing that affects the parent contribution. I’ll use Greg Poe as an example. We start by saying Poe can pay this much and that’s it. From now on we say well if he is in one of the priority groups we might give him less loan and more grant aid. It’s on the order of magnitude of dropping that student loan from somewhere around $10,900 to somewhere around $5K.”

Professor Howland: “I mean are we spending most of our money on athletes or underrepresented minorities? What is going on?”

Provost Harris: “We are not spending most of our budget on underrepresented minorities. You’d be surprised; maybe you wouldn’t – this is a harder question to answer than you might expect. I was surprised this last June when I started working with Admissions and Financial Aid because they code the data such that a black, poor, athlete won’t show up in all those categories. The categories are mutually exclusive so they’ll code him maybe as an athlete and then he gets dropped out and from then on he’ll only show up as an athlete. URM if you were not an athlete so our financial aid data makes it very hard for me to answer the question you ask, which I have tried to get answers. Other questions?”

Associate Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “What are considered underrepresented minorities? What is the definition? When I read applications, I find it troubling when some of them apply… so if you were born in Nigeria to the Vice
President and his wife you can designate yourself as an African American and qualify for all kinds of designations that we do not intend?"

Provost Harris: “This is what I used to do prior to doing the provost thing - trying to address these things around race classifications, census and so forth. The answer is in this country, the way we do things is through self-identification, not observer identification. If I want to identify myself as Asian when I apply for a job, I can do that by law. There is nothing wrong with me doing self-identification. That’s what happens when you apply to Cornell. It’s self-identity. The groups that we think of as URMs are Black, Latino, American Indians, that’s your group.

Professor Toorawa: “Is this just for US Citizens?”

Provost Harris: Yes, everything I’ve talked about in aid is US citizens. We have very few dollars available for international financial aid and the international financial aid dollars that we do have are overwhelmingly for Canada and Mexico, with most of it for Canada.”

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg: “I think the categories are very different. Athletes are very different than the other categories. So, the quality of athletics is a concern. I presume that we’re losing all the time on the athletic side. That information is being published and I think it would be very interesting to have some historical figures, to have the staff go back and look at statistics.”

Provost Harris: “Exactly, I have done two things in the last couple of weeks trying to get data. One is to ask Athletics… tell them I don’t just want to know about the kids that they feel they’re losing compared to Harvard or Yale or whoever gets them. I actually want to see full population. I want to see the information on every kid who has been recruited. I want to know whom we’re competing with. I want to know when we did we win and when did we lose so that I can go back and look at that question for the current year and see how big of a deal this is. That data won’t be available for a week or two because the six week data is just coming in as of this past Friday, Doris Davis or someone from Day Hall is going out and trying to get the information. There was a guy who used to be here in Carolyn’s operation who was an expert – I can’t remember his name now. We can send him unique identifiers on every kid whom we’ve accepted at Cornell and didn’t come and then he can tell us if those kids ended up at one of the very many schools where he has data. I want to know – the kids that didn’t come last year which is the first year we saw this explosion of financial aid packages – I want to know where they went. Who did we lose them to? Those two things will partly address the concern. This is a big deal – if it were just Harvard, Princeton and Yale, I would have one level of concern. It’s that you’re seeing other schools which have better programs than we do (Columbia, Penn etc.) And you are seeing them match Harvard, Princeton and Yale in a lot of the cases. Is the sky falling? No, but it is something to be concerned about.”

Unidentified: “Concerning the international students – U.S. citizens and green card holders (permanent residents.)”

Provost Harris: “Yes, this is something we grabble with. There is this question, why is it that we should restrict that to US citizens? How much of our financial aid should go to international students and on what basis? How do you make those kinds of decisions?
Those are the kinds of things we continue to grapple with. Should we have a admission policy that says international are great as long as they are wealthy because those are the students who can afford to come? What should we be doing about the poorer students who are qualified but can’t afford it. Those are some of the many issues here.”

“Recruited athletes – as I’ve already said the issue here is parental contribution which makes it harder. In the past financial aid was more on loans instead of parental contribution and this is difficult. I don’t have an answer for what we’re going to do. We talk about it everyday and evenings and then some, it seems.”

Socio-economic status – here we are starting to target high performing high school students from low-income neighborhoods and use things like census data and college board data to identify these kids, and talking about how to effectively packaging those kids. You figure out using standard formulas – this family whose income is $50K a year, they can pay $5K or $7K a year and say actually we’re going to reduce that by $2K or so in part because I feel strong and some others do, there is nonlinearities in these formulas. At the very low end, there are things that aren’t in the cost of attendance that we talked about that actually have more need than you think they did. There are more things goings on that probably would not be quite as good at the very low end of the distribution.

“Last thing - health insurance. This is not a trivial matter here at Cornell. This should be in the financial need analysis. The last slide is marketing. The greatest policy in the world is of no use if no one knows about our policy. Has anybody been to our Admissions and Financial Aid websites lately? They’re not so good. They look like they’ve been around for quite a while and so we have to improve those at a minimum. We may not have policies that are as good as some places, but we have to at least sell ourselves as best we possibility can. We can create recruitment materials. Some of that can talk about financial aid. Instead of saying, tuition is $37K we should really say up front, X percent of kids get financial aid for many kids the cost is so important and so on. We can do a better job on that. We need to communicate better. I don’t think a lot of people even know the changes we made in January.

“Lastly, we have to have financial aid policies that are easy to understand. So, I’ll stop there and leave you with this challenge – need-based financial aid is critical. We’re trying to figure out what shape the class of priorities groups. We face incredible competition from peers – a range of sets, not a narrow set and lastly how to do this and stay within budget.”

Speaker Beer: “Let me remind members of the body during discussions if you would kindly identify yourself and your department or administrative unit and please speak loudly. I would ask Provost Harris if the questions seem to be voiced in a low voice please repeat it for us.”

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR and Senator-At-Large: “You had the working group up there and I wanted to ask you about the working group that has been involved with this. Have you been consulting with faculty senate committees on this? For example, the financial policies committee? And if you have, how? If you haven’t, then why not?
A  And  more importantly perhaps, is what can be done?”

Provost Harris: “When this was all done back in January when we first started, I think Carolyn did talk to Financial Aid Policies Committee.”

Acting Associate Dean Charles Walcott: “Yes, she did.”

Provost Harris: “I thought that happened. Thanks. So there was some involvement there. This working group really operated between say April/May and finished work the first two weeks of June. I had conversations with Charlie a little bit, here and there about some of these issues – and Bill. Bill and I talked and part of his vision for what’s going to happen with the senate is to have involvement before decisions are made. Things that are of some matter, some consequence. I think this is certainly in that category. I’m here today in part to find some people out there who say, “this is a really important issue and I’d love to know more and see how I can help. There used to be faculty senate committee on admissions and financial aid and it hasn’t been in operational for some period of time. Bill and I talked about putting that back together. I talked with Doris about putting the committee back together having them get together to address questions such as this.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I wanted to say that I really think that's important because it is great to have the information when you’re here but obviously very difficult as a whole body to have a full discussion.”

Provost Harris: “Yes, it’s taken me a year to figure out the rules of financial aid. It’s very complicated.”

Professor Cohn: “The thing that I’ve been hearing from students directly about is what happens to the group that was initially over $60Ks then over $120K family incomes and I’ve seen a lot of really excellent students in recent years who really are middle class who are not getting financial aid who are really struggling. I have an outstanding student who has decided to graduate in three years because her family literally cannot afford it. I understand that all these things need to be addressed but I think that’s also a pretty critical group, these are some of our bread and butter students. These are our top academic achievers who don’t fall into any of these special pots. The thing that’s really worrisome is not only are they being penalized financially, psychologically they feel penalized as well.”

Provost Harris: “You’re talking about kids who are over limit, no longer $60K and loan cap of $3K but over $120,000. This is the cliff issue and that’s a group we knew, we knew needed to be worked on – that was one of the things we talked about and I think this is a huge problem in part because as I said earlier I believe that there is this compact, this agreement, which is really, if you work really hard to get to a place like Cornell, we will give your application a fair review and if we admit you, we will make it possible for you to come here. I don’t think a $10,900 loan the first year is consistent with that and it goes up in future years. I think it’s too high. There are two things that are absolutely necessary. One is addressing this by bring it down at least to the level where you can get need based loan for $7,500 year, $3K a year per kid we have to drop that. The second one is to do something about the parent contribution at the low end. If you look at the families with an income under $60K a year at Cornell and there are some under some
$60K but they’re much richer than that, but family income under $60K, I just got this number today, 40% of those families have zero parent contribution. The median parent contribution for those who don’t have zero is $6K/year. That’s a lot when you only make $60K so I would like to find some way to reduce PC. This clearly is an issue. Trust me you’ll hear more about this cliff issue.”

Professor Stein: “Unfortunately I never got past the second slide. It was about the Pell Grants. I was just sitting here musing about the low income students because if you win that race, it’s a disaster because we can’t pay for it and it looked to me like we were winning that race in spades that our numbers are way up there. Why are winning that if in fact the others – what is it that we are doing that gives us that large number of Pell Grants?”

Provost Harris: “There is a slight increase in our number since 1988. Our percentage, I didn’t show you our percentage, is higher this year, but not that much higher. It’s because we have such a large base that’s why we have so many students. Someone asked at one point is the goal here to dramatically increase the number of poor students at Cornell. No, that’s not the goal. The goal is to try to keep roughly where we are, to not lose ground and this is one indicator but there is other data you can see as well. If you look at the family income, I’ve seen some histograms of family income over time, and you can see us slipping in terms of this and so that’s what we’re trying to do. Part of why you see this is because we have a pretty good deal state side for NY residents, so historically that’s been a much better deal than going to Penn, Columbia, etc.”

Professor Ehrenberg: “I just want to respond to Peter’s question: our share of Pell grant recipients is roughly the same in the endowed as the statutory colleges so there really isn’t a difference. Why do we do better than our Ivy League competitors? One, we sincerely try to recruit low income students and secondly our economic profiles are lower than our competitors our tests scores are correlated with are family income. It’s harder for low income students to make it to some of the other Ivy leagues.”

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “Harvard has a sliding scale. We have a sliding scale, why do we have a cliff? Second question: Are athletes our top priority – do we have a significantly different grant to loan ratio packages?”

Provost Harris: “First question – why do we have a cliff? Because, we don’t have the money. We didn’t like having the cliff. It’s often the case, you start saying, this is what you’d like to do and then you say the budget constraints intervenes – what can we do? We didn’t like having the cliff. We felt we were going to try first to do as much as we could and we still weren’t meeting our peers for the poorest kids, poor being under $120K. $120K is still pretty good income for this country and so we didn’t want to leave them behind but initially that’s what ended up happening. We talked about phasing in and so forth, the cost issue. The second part of the question was about how big a benefit do you get for being an athlete vs. high academic achievement?

Professor Delchamps:” Don’t you mean grant? And does that vary depending on the desirability on the scale?”
Provost Harris: “Yes, there is something called preferential packaging and the kids who get preferential packages have lower student loans than the kids who aren’t preferentially packaged. There’s URMs – it’s not mechanical but it’s URMs, athletes, low incomes, which means under $25K/year which is pitifully low income, college priority which is about 2% and add significantly to the diversity of the campus or some such thing.”

Speaker Beer: “We’ve reached the end of the question period, so I’d like to thank Provost Harris. I’d like to call on the Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry, for a few remarks.”

2. REMARKS BY DEAN OF FACULTY BILL FRY

Dean Fry: “I have talked with both David Harris and David Skorton about interacting with the faculty. They have both indicated they will be bringing discussion items to the Senate and working with the University Faculty Committee.

“I want to limit my comments today to two areas. The first is rather important and that is as Risa mentioned that a lot of the work is done through faculty committees and I wanted to give you a little update on the committees and second I want to talk a little about faculty involvement in some of the financial issues facing the university.

“The Office of the Dean of Faculty supports the various faculty committees. There is Diane and Sandie doing a wonderful job of supporting a wide range of these committees. The Dean of Faculty has been charged with the responsibility of making sure that each committee has a chair and I am pleased to report all the committees now have chairs. I would like to list some of those for you. Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty is Jerry Hass, the Committee on Academic Programs Policies - Bill Crepet, The Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education is Susan Ashdown, the University Benefits Committee, Will White. Educational Policy Committee, Georg Hoffstaetter, the Faculty Advisory Board on the Information and Technology is Evan Cooch. The Financial Policy Committee is Charlie Walcott, University Lectures Committee is Shelley Feldman and Library Board is John Hermanson, the Local Advisory Committee is David Caughey, the Music Committee Jerrold Meinwald, the Faculty Committee on Program Review is Brian Chabot and the University ROTC Relationship Committee is Mark Psiaki. We do appreciate what they’ve do. Charlie and I have met with several of the chairs and also with several committees. You will hear reports from three of them today.

“The second issue I wanted to address concerns faculty involvement in the financial issues. I think we’re all aware of what’s happening here and globally and there and of course there are implications for Cornell University. Certainly central administration is aware of these happenings and you’ve seen messages from the president who has been very helpful in that regard. Both David Skorton and David Harris are very consultative and because of that I feel privileged to have been in on some of the senior staff meetings with the president. They’ve dealt with some of the issues that are facing the university. I have not participated in all the nitty-gritty. What I have learned is that the senior staff will be meeting with the Financial Policies Committee. Some of those conversations are likely to be confidential and I think members of that committee will not be able to share
what those details are. But I did want the faculty to know that those conversations are taking place and there is faculty discussion as the university goes forward in looking at the financial issues.

“I also want to say that the university faculty committee is aware of several of the recommendations from the governance committee report and in response to one of those the UFC will report at each Senate meeting on its activities. The report today will be done by Vicki Meyers-Wallen.”

3. REMARKS FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Associate Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Baker Institute and UFC Member: “As Bill told you, I’m report on the activities of the University Faculty Committee. I want to mention that one of the things that the UFC is doing is we’re working with the Dean of Faculty and discussing further recommendations for the Governance Report. We suggest that you look at the University Faculty Website to see the final report and the recommendations. The UFC will be working through these recommendations during the year. We would like you to inform any member of UFC if you think there are issues that need to come before the university faculty as part of that recommendation. The other thing that I want to update you on is the president meeting with the UFC in the late summer and we talked about the provost search process. He asked for advice and several people gave advise and one of the things that came out of that was the UFC asked that the number of faculty proposed for the committee be increased and he did that. They also asked that the distribution on the committee be changed by adding more faculty and that was done. The UFC has also met with president and provost together and discussed several things. Primarily the president talked the budget situation and how it would be affecting Cornell. He also stated that there is an ad hoc committee that he has appointed that is providing him with advice. The senior staff is working through this recommendation of the ad hoc committee so that’s all I can say about that. You should have received an email letter from the president which points out these discussions about the financial situation that’s going on.

“The provost talked about financial aid issues as you heard about today and the low number of underrepresented minorities in the entering class. We have also met with Peter Stein about the recent survey concerning a university club, which he will report on later today. There will be a resolution coming forward. Tonight the UFC members will be meeting with members of the Board of Trustees. UFC has been doing this for the last two years. Obviously it is too late for tonight but we will meet again in the spring so please contact us if you have things you would like us to discuss with them.”

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2008 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: “We have reached the point of the agenda where we consider the minutes of the previous meeting. Any comments? I will entertain a motion to accept the minutes as prepared.”
Professor Stein: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “Any opposition? Accepted by unanimous consent. I now would like to call on Charles Walcott, officially acting Associate Dean and Secretary of Faculty and acting Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections”

5. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Associate Dean Walcott: “Here are the suggestions from Nominations and Elections and I would urge the body to approve these nominations. That’s my report.

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee
October 15, 2008

Educational Policies Committee
George Boyer, ILR

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies
Kevin Ernste, A&S

Financial Policies Committee
Donald Rutz, CALS

University Benefits Committee
Roger Battistella, CHE
David Lewis, AAP

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Is there a motion to approve the report of the Nominations Committee?”

Professor Stein: “So moved and what’s more, I’ve read it.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any discussion? All those in favor of approving the report say “aye.” Opposed? The report is approved. Now I would like to call on Professor Jerry Hass, Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty for a report regarding an email we all received some time ago.”

6. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF THE FACULTY REGARDING BRUCE/JOHNSON EXPRESSION OF PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL OPINION E-MAIL

Professor Jerome Hass, Johnson Graduate School of Management, Chair, AFPS: “Good afternoon. I’m here to report factually what’s happened with the Academic Freedom and Professional Status Committee regarding an email distributed by Thomas Bruce and Stephen Johnson entitled, “Expression of Personal and Institutional Opinion.” The email was distributed on September 19th. A number of faculty members expressed concerns to the authors and to the President and to the Dean of Faculty. At a meeting of the AFPS on
October 3rd, the AFPS discussed the issue and it was agreed to meet with Mistres Johnson and Bruce to discuss the email and a potential response. The AFPS met with Mistres Bruce and Johnson on October 10th, last Friday, and the meeting was also attended by Professor Steven Shiffrin from the Law School. The discussion began with Mr. Johnson describing the rationale behind the email and he stated that the administration had received several responses regarding academic freedom. At the meeting several facets were discussed including a policy statement adopted by the Board of Trustees in the fall of 1970 entitled, “University and Political Process” that prohibits the use of university funds and facilities for partisan political purposes and established guidelines for such political activity on campus. The Bruce/Johnson email cited that particular statement. That 1970 statement references a statement of guidelines for colleges and universities with respect to involvement in political activity in the forthcoming general election in 1970. So whether this statement applies beyond 1970 general election begs certain questions. The second thing we discussed is a statement adopted by the University Faculty on 11 May 1960 entitled, “Principles of Academic Freedom and Responsibility” which is found in Section 5.0 of the Faculty Handbook, the 2002 edition. Whether this statement constitutes university policy was questioned. Another part of Section 5.0 the Faculty Handbook discusses “policy relating to faculty consulting” and provides guidelines regarding use of university equipment for such purposes. Finally, more general consensus regarding the use of office telephones, computers, internet connections and when conducting activities deemed “political or personal in nature” and the implications associated with cornell.edu and academic titles and correspondence were all brought to the table as issues to be discussed. Mistres Bruce and Johnson circulated the draft of an email to be sent to the Cornell Community. Copies are being handed out. We looked at that draft at the meeting last Friday and decided that we need updates subject to qualifications was appropriate. We had agreed to provide copies to this body for you to take a look at before they distribute it the entire community which they intend to do. Mr. Bruce stated that he believed the 1970 statement policy regarding the use of university resources was outdated. There was general agreement on that issue. There was also a discussion regarding a need for the university to provide policy guidance regarding the broader issue of academic freedom. Mistres Bruce and Johnson indicated that the administration has undertaken the task of drafting a policy statement. The breadth of that statement of course will be revealed when we see that draft. At this time, the AFPS anticipates no further actions.”

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies: Could you shed a little more light? Has this been reissued each year since then and if not, why not?”

Professor Hass: “We did not particularly discuss that. We did talk about things such as that in 1970 there was not the use of the internet, not the use of personal computers.”

Professor Edmondson: “There has been other elections and no one has raised any fuss about it. I am surprised. I speak to this as a scientist because I take extra precaution always to preface my remarks – students you understand I am not speaking on behalf of Cornell University, it is my judgment, my personal opinion. I find it very intriguing and wonder why this comes into center stage at this time. I would really like to know. Has
there been other inquiries?”

Professor Hass: “I think you’d have to ask Misters Bruce and Johnson who wrote the memo.”

Professor Stein: “Yes. The same question, if my memory is correct, that same question was raised. We were given the following answer. This policy had been distributed every election year since 1970 by campus mail and this was the first year it had ever been distributed by email.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department and Director of the American Indian Program: “I’m wondering about partisan or political and catchall phrases. I do a lot of expert testimony. I’ve also been working on national academic freedom cases as well, so is this just directed at elections and that sort of thing which, if it is, you ought to specify that or because virtually, I can’t… everything I do in some ways is political and so this is potentially pretty dangerous in its current state.”

Professor Hass: “I accept your statement and believe that it would be appropriate to contact the authors of that memo and bring that to their attention. Whether or not they wish to specify it for particular purpose or for general use?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Let me ask you this then: why are they drafting this memo which impinges on everybody’s academic freedom and why aren’t we drafting this memo? Since when has this become an administrative policing operation rather than that of the faculty?”

Professor Hass: The faculty has addressed matters of academic freedom. There is a May 1960 statement adopted by the faculty, ‘principles of academic freedom.’

Professor Cheyfitz: “This seems to me to be really dangerous. They just passed a rule, an administrative rule for The University of Chicago, Champaign-Urbana that doesn’t allow faculty or staff to attend political rallies on campus. The AAUP has sent out a broad memo about that and of course we’re existing in a time that a lot of people are losing their jobs over issues of academic freedom and that sort of thing so this strikes me as potentially, if not actually……”

Professor Bill Arms, Computer Science: “Since I was one of the people that initially raised questions, I think we should ask that the first sentence of this draft message actually reflects what we wrote in the memo. If I can read the sentence that several of my colleagues disliked, “Administrative facilities, equipment and services of the university (e.g. campus mail, e-mail, telephones, computers, duplicating and addressograph machines) may not be used for political or other non-university purposes,” Not use discretion or take care but don’t use them for any purposes. It’s that phrase that I think has to be reversed.

Professor Hass: “I think you have to bring that to their attention.”

Professor Arms: “We have. Several times.”

Professor Hass: “At this stage, I can’t draft their memo.”

Professor Cohn: “It seems to me that the issue here is whether, as being individual faculty
members, we by definition are agents of Cornell or not. It seems to me that the standard interpretation and practice for many years has been that we’re not. That’s the whole notion of academic freedom and having the right to function as individuals within an academic community. What I find worrisome is this notion that they’re playing on that particular thing and I think it’s something that we as a senate either through the Academic Freedom Committee or otherwise should take up. I think it’s a serious shift in the understanding of what our jobs are.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I thought one of the reasons we had an academic freedom committee was to address the substance of academic freedom issues. It goes back to one of the things that Eric was saying, it doesn’t seem to me that it’s up to Misters Johnson and Bruce to tell faculty what academic freedom is and that if we think that the way they’re defining academic freedom and freedom of speech is overly restrictive then it’s up to our committee on academic freedom or some other committee that’s willing to look at it, to actually look the breadth of these definitions. So perhaps you could just tell us a little bit to begin with about whether your committee to discuss, the actual..... I brought the email from Bruce and Johnson, I have the language in front me, and when I got it, I think a lot of people got it, I think it was quite shocking to me to see this kind of meat axe approach was used to tell us that we couldn’t express our personal opinions using any university facilities and whether there was some statement before all this all sort was ignored because it came in a pile of papers is neither here nor there. The fact that we’re looking at it now and what they said now is shocking in its over-breadth in relation, to compare it to our understanding I would say to a person of what our freedom of speeches is within academic freedom. So perhaps you could tell us what the content of the discussion was on these issues.”

Professor Stein: “I was a member of that committee and I take second place to no one in my paranoid responses. Let me just calibrate myself. I had the impression at that meeting that this language which Bill Arms read, which is outrageous if you take it at face value – nobody really thought very much about it. One thing that occurred to me is that in 1970 the word computer meant something entirely different then it means today. It was a huge big machine where you went over with a huge bunch of cards and ran them through and paid money for the use of it and obviously if you were doing some partisan political activity and were running it through the Cornell computer you ought to think twice about that, that’s reasonable. But I felt that no one had thought very seriously about this and sent this out in a routine way. When we pointed out all of those things about a computer is now just a part of communication, a telephone. You really can make local calls. Of course you can, you can’t make long distance calls and charge them to Cornell to do party politics. There was general agreement about all of those things and no body argued with any of these statements and I left believing that they were going rethink this and draft it in terms of a 2008 perspective and that there wouldn’t be any disagreement with even this paranoid person what the answer was going to be, but we’ll wait and see. There wasn’t a whole lot of disagreement in the room and the expressions that I’ve said and others have said also at the same meeting – Tommy Bruce and Steve Johnson didn’t argue with it. That’s my impression.”
Professor Hass: “Just to reiterate – there wasn’t a lot of discussion about it because there was general agreement that there needed to be a change and they had said they were in the process of drafting something and we said ok, fine we’ll wait to see what you draft.”

Unidentified: “I want to know the status of the policy mentioned in the original email. Is it meant to represent Cornell policy which is the way it certainly was expressed or is it mainly the opinion of the Sir Johnson in which case there seems to be, it sounds like every time we ask you a question you tell us to direct it to them.”

Professor Hass: “My response about directing it to them with respect your having an argument about words they used, My point is that this is their memo, not ours. So if you have questions about words they’ve used and it seems to me the first place is to go to them and not to us. You’re seeing this memo in draft form. They agreed to have distributed here. We agreed that this was a good idea. We don’t necessarily agree with the memo or disagree with the memo, we have not taken a position on that. Regarding the memo, I believe, it’s their belief its university policy. I don’t think they’re speaking as just two individuals that happened to decide to send an email out. I think they are articulating what they believe is the university policy. They also believe that they did not do a particularly good job of articulating the first time and hence the second memo.”

Assistant Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications: Maybe this has put you in a bad situation because it seems like the draft has come to us, but there is no idea about how communications about the draft is to be returned to them. So it’s left that each one of us is going to email these guys. Who do I send it to? Could we agree that the notes from this section of the discussion could go back to them with some sort of advisory format that there had been discussion with four or five concerns raised. Circulating a draft is a means by which they asked for feedback. I think for our committee to discuss it. I would say the one I’d pinpoint was the question on email because I think email is the most familiar and casual mechanism by which we can make contact on campus but it is the one that has Cornell attached to it. I can see why we have problem with it. I think it then raises questions of where would professional use of our email addresses and our political/personal use of our email. I think that raises a very particular problem more so then any other technologies that might be at issue.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you Professor Hass for bring this issue to the Senate. I would like to go ahead with the agenda and call Professor Peter Stein for a report.”

7. REPORT ON SURVEY OF THE DEMAND FOR A UNIVERSITY CLUB

Professor Stein: This is not the first time I’ve talked to you about the university club. I’ve brought this issue up over the past six years, but there have been some changes and I would like to discuss them with you. Approximately six years ago, the provost appointed a task force to look at the re-establishment of a faculty club at Cornell. That quickly changed to the establishment of the University Club and the difference between the two words is University Club encompasses faculty and staff. That task force wrote a report and gave it to the provost and president and urged the university to re-establish a club. That hasn’t taken place over the past six years. Discussions have taken place on a
fairly regular basis about this. The last time I had such a discussion is when Charlie Walcott and I went to talk to the president about it and the president said that he believed that there was three problems: there was no money, no site, no need. Well, that pretty much killed it. It was the first time I’d heard there was no need for it and he said that he came to the conclusion in talking to people that there really was no demand for it. And out of that came a discussion with Charlie and the Provost. We asked the provost to fund a survey to see if there was a demand for it or not and that was done and I’m here to report to you about the results of that survey. (Appendix 1 – power point slides.)

The survey on the demand for a university club - this was a survey that was done by the Survey Research Institute. They designed it. It was a real survey, not an amateur job and the provost paid a big bill to have this survey take place and the projections and analyses that I’m going to talk about were derived from the results of that survey but they were carried out only by me.

“This are the details of the survey. I hope you picked up a copy of this, because I’m going to have to hurry through a couple of these slides, but I’d like you to be able to look at it. This gives the details and the point of this slide is to show you that this is a good survey. A lot of people, a wonderful rate of response, 97% response is unheard of in the survey business and roughly 20% of the population and 800 people interviewed. So what does that mean? It means simply this: that if you look at the results, they represent the views of the entire population that was surveyed. If you ask every single person in the groups who answered they would give you the same answers, more or less, we received on the survey.

“They were five questions. What services do you want to see in a club? How far would you walk? Do you think you would join it? What would you be willing to pay? How often do you think you’d use it? These are the crucial questions on whether or not there is a demand and I would like to take you through all these, one at a time. Now, in this slide, it’s really important in surveys to know exactly how you phrase the question because you get lots of different answers if you phrase it in a biased way. I’m not going to read that. By the way, the phrasing was worked out between me, the head of the survey research institute and Deputy Provost David Harris and we all agreed that these were reasonable ways to pose the questions.

“These are the results. It’s a little hard to read but I hope you can see them good enough. There were 22 services. The services were more or less common at university clubs at our peer institutions. The question here is how important are these services to the people that responded. They were asked to rate it on a scale of one to ten, where ten was as important as it could be and one was of no importance whatsoever. You look at that and you realize that the x-axis there is a ten, the only way you could get a ten here if everyone of the 800 people surveyed wrote down ten for that. So that’s the absolute maximum demand and if you think of it that way the importance response of 7.5 or 7.25 is a very high response. Curiously enough, I don’t want to go through the 22 but I would like to point out the following: I have divided them into three groups. If you’re interested in statistical error, the distance between two vertical lines is a two standard deviation affect. I divided into three parts. The top third where there was the most
interest. The bottom third is where there was the least interest and the middle third. I think it’s instructive to compare the items in top third to the items in the bottom third.

“Charge options. What that means is the most important thing to people was the ability to charge something to departmental accounts. I think it really explains why people answered that way is that they find it’s important to do business at this place; that’s what they were thinking of as being what they wanted in a club.

“So, if you look at the top third and I’m going to read them - charge options, having lunch, meeting other Cornell university faculty and staff, being open weekends and evenings, have coffee house, meeting rooms and have privileges of other clubs. The bottom third, a fitness center, weekend hours, childcare, interest groups, breakfasts is the only anomaly, family focused activities and single focused activities. The message I get from looking at that, is that the things most important combine a social infrastructure with doing business and the things that are least important have nothing to do with being a professor at Cornell or someone whose on the staff at Cornell just wanting something for your own personal enjoyment and so it does seem to me that it’s not just a perk for the members it’s something that the university might think seriously about supporting because it’s doing business in that setting.

“How far would you walk to this club? The answer is clear: people will walk ten minutes; people will not walk twenty minutes. About 85% of the people are willing to walk ten minutes and only 10% of the people are willing to walk 20 minutes. This is a pedestrian campus. People are not going to drive to this. As you all know, that means to serve potential members, that it must be located not much farther than ten minutes from their office.

“Will you join the club? If we look at the next slide, I’ll show you something that’s a little hard to understand but that’s what the actual raw data looks like where the bars represent what percent answered, etc. If you’re looking at that and you’re looking at what you expect it to look like when there is a high interest, you’re expecting to see the big bars on the right hand side of the scale. If there is no interest you expect to see a lot of the bars on the left hand side of the scale. If you just glance at this you see there’s a lot of interest in it. There’s not much difference between the professors, the postdocs, and the senior staff but one that there is difference from is oddly enough, the emeriti. The emeriti, when you get old you make your mind up about things, so the emeriti are divided into three groups – one is no, yes, and don’t care. How do you turn that data into an estimate of what in fact the membership will be. There are a lot of different ways of running that data, of turning that data that I showed you into a projection of membership. We did it three different ways. One way is to assume a probability of 100% for everyone that said ten, 0% for everyone that said one and a linear scale for the other folks. Another one that someone suggested to me was to take the top three as absolute yes, the bottom three as absolute no and then take the rest of the people to be 50%, so that’s what’s numbered “B”. “C” was sort of the same thing, something similar. When you look at you see it doesn’t matter what you do. Those are A, B and C and essentially what you get is that roughly 60% of the professors, the researchers and the staff say that the probability is that 60% of the people would join the club and once again a little surprising is the emeriti are
lower. People think of the emeriti as being the dominant group. So that gives you projected membership if you look at it that way: 2,600, 2,700, 3,000 – that’s a huge demand. There are roughly 4,000 people in the population.

What club dues would you be willing to pay? I heard it said that Cornell faculty and staff are cheapskates – they’re not going to pay for this. I’ve heard this time and time again – if it’s free, they’ll come, but they’re not going to pay anything for it. So we asked them. There are a lot of words here, but it’s to define what dues are. Next slide. These are the results.

“Willingness to pay dues. It was quoted in monthly dues, note that $25/month is $300/year and 50% of the people are willing to pay $300/year. As you can see, everyone is willing to pay $60/year and 90% of the people are willing to pay $140/year. It is not true that people are not willing to pay. Next slide.

“How often would you use the club? If the club is going to be financially viable it has to have two things. 1) It is going to need members and 2) the members have to come. The question was, assuming that you would join it, this was only asked of the people who said they would be willing to join it, how often would you use the club? Next slide.

“This is a plot of the answers to that and done the usual way by folding only the number of people into the number of people that would use the club.

“There is a chance that one out of four on any given day is going to be there taking part in some activity at this particular place. Again, it is a very large usage of it and that again is more or less constant between the professors, the postdocs, the research associates and the senior staff. A little bit less for the emeriti.

“There is a term of art in the restaurant business called “covers.” Covers are the number of times you would make a charge at a place. This translates into more than a thousand covers and if you have no sense of what that is – look at Banfi’s. That is real data on Banfi’s, the number of covers, and the other thing is real data on that little residual faculty club we have in the basement at the Statler. Banfi’s will not answer this demand. This demand is eight times the demand of Banfi’s. Skip next two slides.

“Financial viability. By the way, those two things I skipped are that you have to deflate the numbers because of the fact that not everyone is willing to walk ten minutes. The assumption was we put it at the intersection of Garden Road and Tower Road, which places everyone, except the faculty at the Vet School within a ten-minute walk. The financial independence and viability is possible with a thousand members and two hundred daily covers. What we’re predicting when we make those adjustments for the fact that some people won’t walk and some people won’t pay dues is something like 2,000 members and 800 covers and so it’s four times more eating than you need to support it and twice as many members. Next slide.

“There are several objections that you could raise to this. The most important of these is number 3 – will respondents do what they say they will do? Projections are an art not a science. You can get very good statistics on how people answer a survey but not such good reliability on whether they’ll do what they say they’ll do. I know a little about this
now. I’ve talked to a couple of professors of management. I have talked to a couple of people who are managers of clubs of peer institutions. I talked to a restaurant owner, trying to answer that question “will people do what they say” and the answer is – it depends. It depends on the situation and you can find examples where one professor of marketing says you are 2,000 members too high in that estimate. How high? The right answer is 80 and that’s a very particular set of assumptions. It’s like I’m trying to sell a new detergent. I went through a big campaign and I’ll end up with 4% of the market. This is a different situation. I’ve got results that you could argue that the correct demand is between 1,400 and 2,700 making various assumptions. That concludes my presentation. I want to say just one more thing. I would hope that we could have some discussion about this on the campus and the thought just occurred to me and I just want to say it: It’s important to hear not only a survey. A survey is very constrained. People can only answer a certain number of things. It would be nice, if you went back to your departments, you could talk a little about this and perhaps you would like someone to come talk about and listen to people saying what it is they want in such an organization. I volunteer to do that. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Stein. Dean Fry reminds us that there are copies of Peter’s report and the draft memo on the table. We now have reached the Good and Welfare section and Professor Georg Hoffstaetter, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee will use that time.

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

George Hoffstaetter, Associate Professor, Physics and Chair, Educational Policy Committee: “Probably the most important subject that we will be concerned with this year will be revising the academic calendar. About two years ago, the people in charge of orientation made a proposal to shorten the orientations time by one day and start classes one day earlier. About one year ago it was supported by the Associate Dean, by the Deans of the College, by the Vice Provost and by Biddy Martin. Now the next stage is review by the Education Policy Committee. We are going to discuss the idea, formulate a proposal and bring it before this body. This is going to be a very open process. We will consult many people and update you periodically on the process. I hope that towards the end of next spring we are ready to bring you proposal. People and groups we want to consult with are the Student Assembly, the Assembly of Professional and Graduate Students, Instructors of large classes. There may be others suggested as the process continues. The issue at hand is that if you add a day of instruction, you might be free to take one other day off and the question is which day?”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I declare the Faculty Senate adjourned.”

Adjournment at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott
Acting Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty
A Survey of the Demand for a University Club

Peter Stein¹
October 15, 2008

¹The Cornell Survey Research Institute designed, carried out and compiled the results of this survey. The Survey was funded by the Office of the Provost. The projections and analyses contained in this paper are directly derived from that compilation, and were carried out solely by the author of this paper.
• Groups Surveyed
  Professors (300)
  Non-Professorial Academics (130)
  Senior Staff (300)
  Local Emeritus Faculty (50)

• Subjects Were Randomly Selected

• 97% Response Rate

• Subjects Interviewed in April/May of 2008

• Roughly 20% of the Population was Interviewed
Overview of Survey Questions

- What services do you want in a Club?
- How far would you walk to a Club?
- Will you join the Club?
- What Club dues would you pay?
- How often would you use the Club?
What Services Do You Want in a Club?

“We’re interested in knowing how a range of features, services, and amenities will affect people’s decisions to join a university club. Using a scale of one to ten, where ten means very important and one means not important at all, please tell me how important or unimportant it would be that this club offers :-:”
How Far Would You Walk to a Club?

“Given that it is unlikely that the club will be able to provide daytime parking for its members, how many minutes would you be willing to walk to this club from your campus office? (We’re looking to get the maximum number of minutes you’d be willing to walk.)”
Will You Join the Club?

“Assuming this club would offer those features you find important, on a scale of one to 10, where one is will not join at all and 10 is will most definitely join, please indicate whether or not you would join this club:”
Percentages of Groups Members Likely to Join a University Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Projected Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Club Dues Would You Pay?

“All of the University Clubs at Cornell's peer universities find it necessary to charge membership dues to defray the costs of operating these facilities. Membership dues typically allow members, their families and guests to have access to the club. Members must pay their restaurant and bar checks and any extra fees for special services. How much would you be willing to pay per month for a membership for the Cornell University Club assuming it offered those features that were important to you?”
How Often Would You Use the Club?

“The major goal of the University Club is to offer its members a facility and services that are comparable to similar clubs at peer institutions. It would have a pleasant and comfortable ambiance, be easily accessible to its members, and offer food and beverage service whose quality and price was competitive with local establishments. If a Cornell University Club achieved that goal to your satisfaction and offered other amenities that are important to you, how often do you think that you would likely make use of it either for business or pleasure?”
Projections of Demand

Assumption 1

- Complimentary membership for all
- Club’s location is at everyone’s office door

2750 Members       1100 Daily Covers

Assumption 2

- $11.50 monthly Club dues
- Each member’s office is a 10 minute walk from the Club

2000 Members       800 Daily Covers
Financial Viability

2003 Report of the University Club Task Force

- Financial independence and viability will be achieved with

  1000 Members  200 Daily Covers
Complications

1. Correlations

   • Definition of correlation

     Zero: Those unlikely to join are willing to pay the same dues as those likely to join

     Positive: Those unlikely to join are not willing to pay the same dues as those likely to join

   • This analysis assumes zero correlation

   • If the correlation is positive, this analysis underestimates the demand
2. Non-Linear Effects

   - Success breeds success

3. Will Respondents Do What They Say?

   - Projections are an art, not a science
   - Memberships between 1400 and 2700 are possible
Minutes from the November 12, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

Acting Speaker Howard Howland: “Please turn off your cell phones and remember to identify yourself when you stand to speak. At this time we have one Good and Welfare speaker who will present for five minutes at the end of the session. I’d like to begin by calling on the Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry for remarks.”

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Bill Fry, Dean of the University Faculty: “This has been a remarkably busy semester what with the political and economic activity. The economy has everyone’s attention and David Harris will be talking about how the university is responding to the situation. I know the senior staff has been working very hard to prepare for this uncertain situation.

“I want to report on a transition that’s happening in the Dean of Faculty office and that is that Diane LaLonde whom many of us have known for a very long time has announced that she is retiring in early January. I think everyone here will miss her and I have to say that I might miss her the most. Diane has been spectacularly important to all of us, to faculty all over the university, to department chairs, to deans, to people in probationary tenure status, to people going through promotion processes. I think there are several of us who understand what a crucial role that Diane has played in the University, making life better for all of the faculty. She has done a tremendous amount and I want to pay tribute to Diane at this time. She is the glue that holds us together and she also is the person that keeps us interacting very smoothly. She knows the faculty legislation, policies, and the procedures. She has wonderful judgment and has done a great job of correcting the Dean as needed in a most gentle and helpful way. She helps all of us by answering questions, providing great advice and we are going to miss her absolutely tremendously. There are two people who came to speak about Diane. They are former deans of faculty Bob Cooke and Charlie Walcott.”

Charles Walcott, Acting Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty: “I just would like to tell the body how important Diane has been, not only to the Dean of Faculty’s but to the functioning of the whole faculty office. All of the letters purported to come from me, actually, of course, were drafted by Diane. All the important decisions were made in consultation with Diane and I think the summary of the situation is I cannot imagine how it is going to be possible to replace her ability, her good humor, her judgment and insight. We are going to miss her enormously. Thank you, Diane.”

J. Robert Cooke, Professor Emeritus and former Dean of Faculty: “Diane and I have worked together for quite a number of years here at Cornell. First we worked together when I was in my academic department back when I was a young associate professor. I later moved to the Office of the Director of Instruction to the Ag College and she joined me there. Then, after a number of intervening years I came to Day Hall to be in the Dean of Faculty Office and had her join me there. That is to say, that I have had ample opportunity to judge that she is a very talented person and her work is exemplary in nature. I am pleased to have a chance to join you in thanking her for many years of truly dedicated service to this
university.”

Dean Fry: “This is only a token of our appreciation. Thanks and best wishes from all of us.”

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Acting Speaker Howland: “Thanks Dean Fry and now we’ll call for approval of the minutes of the October 15, 2008 Senate Faculty Meeting. Are there any comments, corrections? If not, I ask for unanimous consent? Hearing no objections, the minutes are approved. I now call on the Acting Associate Dean, Charlie Walcott to give a very brief report on behalf of the University Faculty Committee.”

3. REMARKS FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Associate Dean Walcott: “I have two meetings to report to you on. One was the meeting with the Trustees and the subject of the discussion with the Trustees, was finances. You will learn in the course of the next hour or so, considerably more on that topic than I could report to you now. The other meeting, it was just the other day to set the agenda for this meeting, once again the topic was finances and that was followed with discussion of FABIT and some of the items from that committee which will be brought to your attention today and finally there was a brief discussion of the University Club and the decision that we weren’t going to talk about that at this meeting but we were going to talk about it at a later time. That’s my report.”

Acting Speaker Howland: “I would like to now open discussion with the Financial Policies Committee and the Senior Administrators David Harris, Steve Golding, Mary Opperman, Paul Streeter regarding the financial situation of the university. I will call on Professor Kevin Hallock, ILR and member of the Financial Policies Committee.”

4. REPORT/DISCUSSION, FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE AND SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS:

Professor Kevin Hallock, ILR: “My name is Professor Kevin Hallock and I’m a professor at the ILR School. I’m an economist and have served on the Financial Policies Committee for three years. I co-chaired with Ron Ehrenberg for a year. I chaired it myself last year and am still a member. I study compensation and executive compensation and job loss in financial labor markets and so this is timely. You may not all know the details of the Financial Policies Committee. It’s made up of faculty across campus. Currently we have faculty from Arts & Sciences, ILR, Human Ecology, AAP, CALS, Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine. It’s a diverse set of faculty from across the university. There are about a dozen members. During my time on the committee, over the last 2.5 years, met roughly every two weeks with university administration providing input. Typically we met with the Vice President of Planning and Budget, Carolyn Ainslie every time, sometimes with other administrators including the Provost and the Executive Vice
President of the University. We discussed budget and finances in the short and long term, distribution of administrative and essential costs, graduate student support, undergraduate financial aid, the capital campaign, space allocations, staff compensation, faculty salaries and other issues. The committee is only advisory to the university administration but I always felt that the university administration took our concerns seriously and objectively. I felt the committee members didn’t always agree with one another on every thing but in large part I think that they did. One could imagine that a committee who advocates for the desires of the faculty only; I suppose that might be a possible way that committee can be run but on my time it wasn’t run that way and I think it would be a mistake for that committee to run that way. In large part, the members of the committee considered each issue before them with an objective eye and thought about the long-term interest of the university, not just one particular constituent group. I’ve been here for four years and expect to be here about another forty as a faculty so I’m also thinking in the long term.”

Interim Provost David Harris: “ Good afternoon everyone. I’m here with my colleagues Steve Golding, Executive Vice President and also Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources. Paul Streeter is not with us this afternoon. There is a very big budget meeting happening tomorrow and given that we have been through this several times I thought it was better having Paul back at Day Hall doing some things for that big budget meeting tomorrow with the Trustees.”

“What we’re going to talk about today – we have an hour – and that hour is split up roughly equally between presentation and conversation. What we’re going to talk about today is the Cornell’s budget challenge. It is the story that’s being told all around the country. You saw it in the New York Times this past weekend, there are many schools that are facing challenges for mostly the same reasons that we’re facing challenges. Those schools are doing a number of things. We’re thinking of about what we should be doing and we’re actually acting on some of those things already. President Skorton sent a statement to the campus last week. He will hold two forums with faculty. He’s had other conversations and he’s engaged with other groups, but, we thought it’d be great for us to talk to the faculty senate.” “There are three things we want to accomplish today. Three questions if you will - the first question: why are we facing budget challenges? The second: what’s the long term plan for addressing the challenges and third: what are the immediate responses to the challenges? “Let me start out with why we’re facing budget challenges. Let me first tell you, a disclaimer, I’m not going to give you a number. I’m not going to tell you it is X dollars. I will say X; I won’t say what X is. Now, why is that? We’re not ready to state the size because, as you will see as I talk about the components, several of these components are still in flux and so I am not giving a number. But I want you to trust that there is a confidence interval and there’s a number bumping around the confidence interval, that confidence interval is significantly above zero – substantially above zero. It’s one of those things that I don’t want you to think that we don’t know the exact number. We’re doing a bunch of things and it might turn out those values overlap to zero and maybe it wasn’t a problem at all. So I want to make that crystal clear that there’s clearly a challenge that’s non-zero and that’s substantially above zero. Up here on the screen are the key elements that lead to that part of the challenge. We have State
Funds, Contract College Indirect Cost Recovery, Endowment Payout, General Purpose Operating Budget Deficit and Capital Debt Service. "Let me go through and explain what each of these elements are, starting with state funds. This is perhaps the easiest. Basically, we get about $160M/year from the state in appropriations and that’s been cut in-year as well as almost certainly cut next year. The base cut in the state appropriations; we don’t know exactly how big the cut is at this moment. We have a real good idea, but don’t know with certainty. The decision was made to tell us back in August that this was going to happen. It was the last meeting I had with Biddy and Carolyn when this thing broke. We didn’t know and they said they’d tell us after the election. The election is now over and now we’re getting close to knowing what the exact number is. It’s important to stress that state appropriation dollars, and I didn’t know this before a few months ago, they don’t only support activities in the contract colleges. Some of these dollars support activities at the center and some of these dollars actually flow to the endowed college as well for accessory instruction – the teaching of contract college students in the endowed colleges. Therefore, this number, this cut, affects contract colleges the most but doesn’t only affect contract colleges. “Second element: Contract College Indirect Cost Recovery. Here what we’re saying is there is an indirect cost recovery rate that comes on grant dollars. That number was reduced a few years ago from about 57 to about 53 and that is working it’s way through the system. The reduction in F&A comes as a result of that.” “Third: Endowment Payout. This is what all the action is about nationally. This is what people talk about - the market is down 30% or so in the last several months. We have endowments sitting in market, so endowments are going down all over the country. The first thing I should say is that we are extremely fortunate that we are one of the few schools that has a multi-billion dollar endowment, so we’re able to weather this in a way that some of the other schools can’t. We’re hearing horror stories of what they’re having to do, what they’re facing. It’s obviously difficult on us, but much worse in some other schools. What I have here is the formula that explains what the payout rate is. It’s a Board policy and it’s a moving average and that’s important because that means there’s a 12-quarter rolling average. What this basically says is, the hit you’re seeing in the market, even if the market rebounds next year, this hit is going to work it’s way through the system over a three-year period. This is yet another one of those factors that we don’t know with great precision what it is. It changes day to day – how big this issue is. “Four: General Purpose Operating Budget Deficit – the GP Operating Budget Deficit – this is a story that you see around the country - times were fat for a while and so we were able to do some things off of the surplus from our investments and those times are gone and so we have to look at our investments and expenditures and we have to adjust our expenditures or find other ways to get these initiatives on to more permanent funding. That’s basically what we’re talking about here. “Capital Debt Services – what this is basically saying is we have a lot of construction and other capital projects that are going on, on-campus and these also have to be on a more permanent source of funding. When you take all those things and add them together you end up with this budget challenge. All of this budget challenge does not all have to be met next year. Most of it hits next year but then sort of feathers in over the course of the next several years. “What do we do? The first thing we do is to acknowledge that we’re going to have to do business differently and we’re going to have to operate under these budget constraints. The first thing to be said,
as you can see up on the slides, and President Skorton has said this repeatedly – we have to operate under budget constraints in a way that will make us proud to be members and stewards of this university during the period of getting the budget back in line. This will be the institution that we would like to be members of for the next five years and beyond. That means we’re going to have to think about the expenditures necessary to recruit and retain faculty, staff and students. We’re going to have to think about what’s going to be required for research. We’re going to have to think about the land grant mission. We’re going to have to think about critical infrastructure. What that means is that we’re going to have to address current shortfalls but we’re also going to have to think about addressing some of the additional expenditures that will have to be made at Cornell University in the coming years. Let me be a little more precise. “We’re actually going to add some things to this budget challenge before we resolve it. What are those things? The first thing is SIP. One way you can deal with this is by saying, we’re not going to give any raises to any staff over the next five years. That’s one way you could address this budget challenge and I don’t think there’s anyone here who would argue that that’s viable. That’s something that obviously gets factored in. Also, there is financial aid. I was in front of this body about a month ago talking about financial aid and talking about some of the problems we have with financial aid. We believe that it’s critical at this time, not only to say we’re not backing off what we have committed to financial aid. President Skorton makes a passionate case. It’s also critical we move forward with some of the things we need to do with respect to financial aid and addressing some of those gaps in what we ought to be doing and what we have been doing. There was a quite heartfelt question by an undergrad at the second forum that stood up and said I’m really concerned. Am I going to lose my financial aid? If I do, I’m going to have to leave Cornell. It was great to be able to say, ‘No, you’ll be able to continue at Cornell.’ We’re not backing off in the way some other schools are forced to back off. “Inflation – obviously we have to factor in inflation. Prices will go up. There will be new critical institutional priorities. That’s something else that’s obviously happening. There will be new initiatives and it’s something we have to factor in before we think about how much we have to address. “And last, planned maintenance and infrastructure investments – It’s absolutely critical that as we move forward we continue to do maintenance on our buildings. We cannot let them just sit without maintenance over the next five or ten years. It’s not feasible. So, what do we do to address this? What I’m going to talk about is levers. There are various ones that you could pull to address this challenge. One is tuition and I’m not telling you that we are doing these things but I’m telling you the lever. So these are some of the things we’re considering and you’d expect us to be considering. “One is tuition, so tuition both means what is the rate of tuition that you consider tuition increases to get extra revenue into the general purpose budget or budgets around the university but it also is an issue of how many students do you have. Do you increase the freshmen class size beyond the 3050? Do you increase the number of transfers? Do you increase the number professional masters students? There are a number of things you could do that would affect the amount of tuition revenue. “Second: State Allocations – The belief that – experts tell us – that state money will come back at some level and we should factor some of that in the coming years. “Third: Fundraising – It’s a difficult time for fundraising right now but there are actually some people who are doing incredibly well in this environment and there are some who, even
though they are taking a hit on their wealth, are still a lot wealthier than all of us combined and some of those folks are still able to make gifts in the period and moving forward. “Campus Life Fees – Some portion of this – West Campus for example – will be addressed through some increases in campus life fees but it’s not possible, it’s not viable or feasible to put all of this on campus life fees. “Institutional Cost-Savings – You’ll hear more about this shortly, but there are ways in which we can be more efficient in the way that we do things, effectively saying that there are ways to reduce the budget that are not telling any individual unit that it needs to make a change but instead looking across units at Cornell and asking the question, “can we do this in a way that simply costs less and perhaps at the same service or maybe even better service and I’m going to talk at little bit more at the end about what those things are. “Unit Budget Reductions: After we have exhausted everything else all that’s left to is to say, here are the budget cuts, the allocation cuts that have to be administered to the units. These are academic units and administrative units that are around the campus. Are there any questions at this point? I’m going to move on to things that are actually going to happen in the short term.

Associate Professor Michael Van Amburgh, Animal Science: “What do you mean by campus life fee? How much does that mean? “

Interim Provost Harris: My friend Susan Murphy is back there --- What is the current campus life fee?”

Susan Murphy, Vice President, Student & Academic Services: “Campus Life fees are what we charge for housing and dining. What the general cost that are promulgated is about $9K for a half double room and full meal plan. The West Campus was thought to be initially covered by fund raising and it’s now it is going to be a debt. So the question is how is that debt structure going to come into the campus life budget as opposed to sitting in the general purpose budget without putting that level beyond what we can deal with.”

Interim Provost Harris: Any other questions at this point? So let me now transition.

I want to talk about immediate actions. Some of the things we’re doing in the longer term and I want to talk about some of the things that are happening in the short term, happening now. Capital Pause: These are things we are seeing that President Skorton mentioned in his email – the Capital Pause, the Hiring Pause, the Planning Period: this is where we are looking at efficiency savings and then also Unit Budget Decisions. This is where I turn this over to Steve Golding and he’ll talk about the Capital Pause and then we’ll have Mary Opperman talking about the Hiring Pause and then I’ll come back.

Steve Golding, Executive Vice President: Thank you David. I am just going to take a couple of minutes to talk about the Capital Budget Pause. The current economic climate as David alluded to has had an impact on university cash. University cash is a significant source of support for the university’s capital budget and so therefore a slow down in cash has an impact on the number of projects that we can do. Additionally, over the course of the summer, there was an reassessment based upon the current capital campaign to the amount of fund raising that was achievable for facilities as compared to financial aid, endowed professorships and so forth and there was a re-adjustment on the assumptions of how much capital fund raising we could do for buildings and we have had to absorb
the cost of buildings we have already constructed into the university debt and this has had an impact on the Operating Budget. It is clear that, from the initial assessments that we did, that the Capital Budget was out of line with the availability of resources and therefore, we needed to really step back and to think about how we might realign the Capital Budget to available resources and that’s why the President announced the Capital Pause. That does not mean that we are going to stop making mission critical investments but we are going to need time to make sure we are using the resources that we have in the most efficient and effective way possible. So, therefore, on that November 3rd we announced the pause. We announced it for ninety days; it will be somewhere between 90 and 120 days by the time it is completed. What that means is that only those projects for which construction contracts have already been let will be continued to perform construction on this campus for major capital projects. The example would be the Physical Sciences Building or the wing tower on the hotel. Other projects where we have not let constructions contracts – we will hold them during this pause. For projects that were already in design where we had a contract and we had incurred liability, we will allow that project complete that phase of the work so we do not waste university money but that, at the completion of that phase, we will again put that project on hold until we have completed our assessment. The same holds true for projects where we have not started any work. We will hold those projects until such time as we completed the assessment to determine whether or not they are still priorities at this point in time and would stay on the university’s capital budget or whether they would be moved to the B List and be held until a later time. All physical infrastructure projects have been put on hold expect for those that are mission critical. All IT projects have been put on hold except those for which we have already set up an obligation and the president has announced a $20M program for affordable housing and transportation where we have not made commitments has been put on hold for this 90 day period. There are, as you may suspect, exceptions to this policy. Those exceptions will revolve around projects where the funding has been identified and available to support the needs of the institutions, life health safety projects where we can identify as specific compliant to critical maintenance issue that would have a future cost to the university or projects where there is actually a chance where we can identify efficiency and thereby cost savings in the future. This is an ongoing review that will be managed through the Vice Presidents of Facilities and it will also be reviewed by the President, Provost and others as we move our way through this 90 day period. Questions?

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR and Faculty Senate at Large: You mentioned about affordable housing projects and the sense that ….?

Vice President Golding: Right, the president has been very clear, that he is committed to following through on his $20M commitment to the community both in the area of affordable housing and in the area of transportation. What he has asked is that during this period of pause, that if we have not incurred a liability that we just hold until we can make sure exactly how those projects are going to be paid for and those projects will not have a negative impact on other operating budget issues that the university will be dealing with over this period as identified by the provost so we will fulfill those commitments – it may take us a little bit longer and we just want a hold on them until we understand the
full picture of the operating budget issues that we are dealing with.”

Associate Professor Martin Hatch, Music: “Would you give us an example of number 1 project for funding or identified that are available?”

Vice President Golding: “This would most likely be a state project where the state has indicated that they want us to continue following through with their capital projects for which the money had already been set aside by the state. Fernow/Rice would be an example in CALS. If on the other hand, one of the other contract colleges comes forth with a project which will have an increased cost in operating and maintenance, the president has asked that we hold that and make that does not have a negative impact on the operating budget of the contact colleges given all of the other issues that they are dealing with. It does not mean that the project will not go forward, but it does mean that we want to make sure that we are not exacerbating the problems that we’re dealing with in this short period.

Professor Stein: “I’m trying to get my head around this. A couple of observations. One: it seems to me that if you compare ourselves for instance General Motors, they’re in a lot worse shape, because people have stopped buying cars but students have not stopped coming here and I imagine we do not anticipate that, that we will not be able to fill our seats. I was thinking, just listening to this, that the places we’re hit, the value of the endowment has gone down and so to keep that same percentage point, that we’re going to draw less from it; that’s number one. We’ve got the state funds that have gone down and we’ve got some expectation that wealthy supporters at Cornell will reduce their support. Those seem to me to be the major issues that will hurt our income coming in. Has anyone ever added it all up and just try to figure out just exactly was fraction of our income, how much our income is going to go down due to these factors? I understand it can’t be precise but that’s one way of seeing how hard a hit it is.”

Vice President Golding: “I think we’re trying to work our way through that. The example of the endowment is a good one. When we started this conversation, the endowment was down about 12%. When we worked through it two weeks ago, we were looking at a 17-18% drop in our endowment. That’s after a 2.7% gain over the past fiscal year and since then the market has continued to decline a little bit more and so the endowment is down a little closer to 20% so it’s hard right now to say explicitly yes we have a sense of the direction but we don’t necessarily have, at the moment, an exact number that allows us to say with a high degree of confidence this is the problem that we’re solving too. We are getting there, but we are just not comfortable and we’re just not quite there yet.”

Professor Eugene Madsen, Microbiology: I’d like to know if you can give us what kind of scenario we’re looking at after 90 days? What’s magic about this 90 days?

Vice President Golding: “Under the capital pause it will allow us to understand exactly what the decisions will be with the operating budget and since university cash is not only important for the capital budget but the operating budget we need to have answers there. It will allow us to make the determination as to what the actual cost is of the increased debt that we are going to have to absorb for the projects for which we were not able to raise the funds through fundraising and it will give us additional time to review each
project to determine where does it sit in the overall priorities of the institution because quite frankly given the fact that the capital budget far exceeded the amount of available resources we need to go back in and work with senior leadership to re-prioritize certain projects. So that’s what the 90 day pause is going to be for.”

Professor Hatch: “Does 100% of funding have to be identified before the exceptions to go into effect.”

Vice President Golding: “Yes, we have to have knowledge of how a project is going to be paid for going forward if we’re to allow the project to proceed.”

Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources: “The hiring pause is a pause that came early in November and will proceed through the end of March. Let me start by thanking you in advance for your cooperation through the hiring pause. It is not a hiring freeze; it is a decentralized pause. Ultimately, the decisions about which jobs continue are being made at the Dean and Vice Presidential level. What that means is that you have a great deal of decision making and authority over which jobs can move forward. That’s important. So why should you proceed forward in this time. It’s because attrition is very important to us right now. 65% of the operating budget is in people. We know that the time has come and you heard David say that after we do what we can in cost there very well may have to be cuts in our budget. For many of you, you’re in tenure positions, for the staff that I think about every day and increasingly at night, they’re not, and so attrition becomes extremely important to me. What’s attrition? That’s the opportunity that we have to save money when people leave jobs and make them open. That’s the opportunity to save money because the job becomes vacant through voluntary leaving. Normally, we have a lot of that through retirement. Take a guess what’s happened to retirement and the staff ranks lately. Not a lot of that going on. Our staff regularly retire at very normal retirement ages. You tire them out. They like to go at 65. They love you but they are ready to leave at 65 and they send you post cards from warm places but they can’t go right now and so our attrition opportunities and our voluntary turnover is reduced. So when we have it, when there is voluntary leaving it is precious. What that means is when jobs open, we’re asking you to do two things. First, take a really hard look at each opening – do you need that job at all? That’s the first question we’re asking you. Can you hold that position open? If you can hold that position open it gives you in-year savings. If you need it, is there someone in another job that you could move into that job that you can’t do without. That creates permanent savings or can you look at our layoff ranks? Increasingly people are losing their jobs through no fault of their own, right now mostly on the contract college side. We have people in our internal placement pool, about 50 right now, who lost their jobs because their job ended on the contract side – really good people who lost their jobs. They’re in our pool and our HR people are helping them get jobs. We’re asking you to look there first. We have some great success stories there. So the hiring pause asks you to look inside first. So, between now and March, we’re asking Deans and Vice presidents to look inside first. For some jobs that’s not possible; their jobs are just very specialized and there is not likely to be any one – those jobs will go outside. But for other jobs, there’s plenty of good inside candidates so we’re asking you to look inside first. Positions on sponsored funds are not affected and faculty jobs are not affected.
Any questions? Thanks so very much! You have all already been so helpful – we have had some placements already. You’ll see a little promo in the Chronicle this coming week.”

Interim Provost Harris: “We’re now in the planning period ……….. the last, we’re saying 45 days, I don’t think it’s 45 days but it’s roughly 45 days. November 1st to early December. What’s happening in this period? One of the things that’s happening and by now you should have heard President Skorton’s email as well as other places about this electronic suggestion box and this is a place where we’re interested in having people share with us their thoughts about things we might achieve greater efficiencies and some cuts. We know we’re not going to create all the savings we need to create to improve things. We’re interested in hearing your ideas and acting on them. It was also set up so you can read what other people said so you have an idea of what others are thinking of. Second: we’re focusing on institutional cost savings strategies, these are the efficiency savings I talked about earlier, things like, for example, looking at publications, looking at the number of publications we have across campus but also looking at the format of these publications are they electronic or are they print? Do we print the right number or do we print way too many. It actually turns out VP Tommy Bruce has suggested that there may be substantial costs hidden here in terms of the number of publications we have that end up in the trash for people who receive multiple copies. Some publications can become electronic. We can’t get rid of print altogether but you might reduce print. It might be the fact that nobody actually notices or complains – so there may be substantial savings there. That’s one example. There are others. We noticed each of these areas we think there may be efficiency saving and asked the senior staff to work with their staff since it’s usually one of the VPs who has some sort of responsibility in this area to work with college officers and deans and faculty and others to try and develop the ideas and understand what exactly is the idea. What’s the potential savings? How long will it take to implement? What’s the probability of success? What are the hurdles to look out for as you try to move in this area? “The critical fact here is that every one of these efficiency savings that we do implement, and I always think back to the first lesson I learned in graduate school in policy classes we only study wicked little problems because the easy ones have all been solved, and I think this falls in that category. These efficiency savings will be difficult because for the most part it’s not because nobody ever thought about them but for one reason or another we said we’re not going to do that; we’re happier with a different system but for every one of these that we say we’re happy with the way things are that means that’s more of a cut that has to be allocated out across units because we’re not saving it through efficiency centrally. So that’s an incentive. “Budget Estimates: We’re also trying to refine budget estimates through this period. We’re getting pretty close on what that number is, narrower and narrower. We will continue to work very hard to refine that and also clarify the shortfalls to be addressed by unit budget cuts. I meet with the deans, faculty and VPs, and try to get a sense of what level of cuts and how cuts will be administered over what time period and so forth and lastly, this ends with a senior team retreat. Senior team is a term Pres. Skorton has coined in the last month or so. There is senior staff which the VPs who report to the President and Provost. There are also the deans and we’re putting those two groups together for a series of meetings and calling it the Senior Team of the university. “I want to close and open questions with just two
observations. One is, as Peter Stein was saying, I want people to keep in mind that this is a difficult time but we’re in this boat with a whole bunch of other places and in many cases they’re in much leakier boats than we are. We’re not alone in this and so when it comes to recruiting faculty, retaining faculty, same things with students, we can be at least a little comforted that while we have difficulties so will most other places. Second: we’re committed to being a stronger, more efficient university when this over and so throughout it’s not simply the case that everything will be no. As I said earlier there are areas where we will have increased investments and make sure university wide both in interim lean years and when this is over. I’m happy to address questions.”

Professor Gregory Poe, Applied Economics and Management: “Are we ever going to be bigger?” Are we ever going to adopt a transfer student program where 40% of our students are transfer or some number? Are we going to make a decision to make us bigger?”

Interim Provost Harris: “One of the things I’ve said earlier is that tuition is one of the levers we hope we could pull and so if you could look at transfer and say that’s one way to increase tuition revenue and so we may get bigger in some places, that it’s possible that the undergraduate student population may grow somewhat, even if the first years didn’t increase. One of things we’ve observed is that we’re increasingly having students who go abroad. Which means the number of students on campus freshmen year, in many cases, is smaller than off campus students in junior year, for any given cohort. So, one of the questions is, should we do something about this through enhanced transfers? Not just in one college, but across many colleges. We are working with Doris Davis and also representatives from the undergraduate schools to look at enrollment policies around the university. Of course, VP Susan Murphy has to consider this because these students one they get here they have to eat and sleep somewhere. That’s one of the things we’re working on. So we may get bigger there, while we’re getting smaller in other areas as we become more efficient. “

Dean of Faculty Bill Fry: “I have a question about Stanford. They are going through a very public assessment of their budget and are they working hard like we are or what is the situation there? Can you comment on that?”

Interim Provost Harris: “I can’t tell you precisely whether they are in worse shape or not. Let me give a quick antidote. The quick antidote is I had a chance to go to the Ivy League Provost meeting in early October and this is a really fascinating meeting. We’re meeting with all the provosts Ivy-plus and somewhere towards the end of that meeting someone said something about the budget and I thought there’s Harvard and Stanford and Princeton. They won’t care. I know we have all sorts of troubles and everyone’s faced dropped and everyone went around and talked about how this is an incredibly difficult time. Some of the schools, just because you have a large endowment and you get a lot of your annual operating revenues from that, it doesn’t mean that there’s lots of slack. You’re spending all that extra money you thought you had. Every school talked about this. They talked about some schools that have taken their capital campaign and put it all in annual funds. A quick bump instead of putting it in an endowment. A lot of schools are extremely worried about they are going to do now because they have no reserves. Coming
down they might have had otherwise, so I don’t think we’re in better or worse shape. I know a lot of schools are facing a lot of substantial challenges and we’re one of them and Stanford is one of them as well as other schools and then there’s state schools that are facing things beyond what we’re seeing. So I can’t give you the ranking precisely.”

Professor Susan Quirk, Animal Science: “I’m somewhat confused about why only positions on sponsored funds are not affected.”

David Harris: The question is why is it that the hiring pause has not affected positions on sponsored funds.

Vice President Opperman: “All that means is that positions on sponsored funds can go directly external if they want to. They can still post them internally if they choose to. Though if they think there’s someone internally that can fill the job, they can put it on the internal website as well, but they can go straight to the external website they can do that too. “

Professor Quirk: That’s what I assumed was the policy but I’m wondering why that impacts valuable employee who have been around for greater than ten years who have been consistently funded on sponsored funds and since NIH funding and other funding agencies are decreasing their funding, how does that affect very loyal employees who are not protected by the current policy.”

Vice President Opperman: “What this is for positions that are open on grant funds. What we find is that they are looking for very specific skill sets that people in our current layoff pool don’t tend to have so we can do it very quickly. We can look right into that layoff pool very fast and find out if we have anybody in that layoff pool really quickly and tell them if there’s anyone there and if not, they can go straight out to that external pool really quickly.”

Interim Provost Harris: “I’d like to make a very quick comment too. Something you may not know. I did not know until I talked to Mary about a week or so ago is that, what we’ve also done is created, in the jobs at the Cornell site, we’ve created a new piece that’s password protected with Cornell netids and passwords where the internal positions are listed there.”

Professor Lars Rudstam, Natural Resources: “I think I missed what the total time is the hiring policy suppose to continue?

Vice President Opperman: “Until the end of March and then we’ll look at it in March and see how big our layoff pool is at that time and we’ll decide then if it needs to continue.”

Professor Lieberwitz: ”I wanted to get back to that question Peter Stein raised and try to understand the situation. Susan Murphy mentioned that the west campus we thought we could have costs covered by debt and so I wondered if that is an indication that this is something that happened as a result of the recent financial process or are there other kinds of issues that were already existing?”

Interim Provost Harris: “The question is about West Campus. That’s not anything we can attribute to the current financial crisis. I know that because I had conversations about
adjusting campaign estimates or assumptions before the financial crisis occurred. What happens is you enter a campaign you have a bunch of expectations about what’s going to be funded at what level and what donors we can attract and at some point you look and say, well, this one didn’t pan out the way we thought it might have and so rather than think we’ll get all the money from gift funding we’re only going to get less than 100% of gift funding and the rest will have to be debt service and that’s what happened. in this project and there are other things that pop up during a campaign and you feel real positive like the substantial gift from Ratan Tata that was announced at the mid-October. We had not heard, we’d gone into the campaign assuming we’d end with $50M gift in research in Indian for scholarships for students from India. It goes both ways. The broader question – we are doing two things simultaneously. We’re both trying to make sure we understand what’s going on now, what’s the budget challenge. At the same time trying to understand are there things we should be doing differently and you’d want us to do both those things simultaneously and we are. So we’re spending more time than I want to with people like Steve Golding and so forth talking about all the operations and how they work and how we can report things differently internally. We’re going down to NY tomorrow to talk with the trustees and one of the big topics is how do we present data to the trustees. There are different ways we can present the data so people will see things more clearly so yes, we are working very hard to try to understand what happened, where we are and how we do what we can to prevent these things from happening again, keeping in mind there were exogenous shots. We couldn’t do anything about all of it.”

Professor Hatch: I’m trying to figure out in the suggestions that are being conveyed on the internet which I have been looking at and there are all in the area of savings that can be made, publications as you said, turning out the lights, and that sort of thing and I’m wondering how seriously they are figuring into a long term planning and it comes to mind when I’m looking at this exception to projects we’re funding and whether funds are available. Are you looking at the kinds of projects and seeing ways in which they can pan out over a longer term as savings for the university?”

Interim Provost Harris: “One of the things, in some early memos, when things started to occur is that we did not realize the challenge we were up against. What’s sustainability? How do we factor that in? I was quite pleased to see in meetings, we had a meeting with CFPC which stands for Capital Funding and Priorities Committee and we talked about sustainability and the question is, when’s the payback period, when will we expect this thing to return, to put us in the black and so we’re actively thinking about sustainability everywhere, in all these projects and also asking the critical and important question - will this pay for itself and over what period?

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR and Faculty Trustee: In my role as faculty trustee, and Rosemary may want to comment on this, I have had the privilege of watching these decisions being made and the thought processes of the trustees and the senior administrators over the last couple of months and I am very proud of serious issues being addressed by people who care very much. On the other hand, in my role as a faculty professor there is zero faculty input and there was a time when the faculty was much more involved in a whole range of issues at the university than it is today. And each of
these issues that you’re thinking about are in areas where some faculty members in different cases would have potentially important input to make and so I really strongly urge you, with my hat as professor, to rethink the role the faculty in very important decisions. I do appreciate this presentation; I am really grateful that you’ve taken the time that you could have used thinking more about the issues to fill us in on what’s going on. I hope you can find a way to involve faculty more.”

Interim Provost Harris: “We’re clearly moving in that direction. I don’t know if Bill wants to comment, but talking with the UFC has been quite open and other members have been quite open about the challenges we’re facing and we’re looking for suggestions. I think broadening that is an important move by the president to move beyond the senior staff and create the Senior Team and having a broader input from deans and deans working with the faculty and chairs and so forth so some of this is more indirect but I think we’re continue to and I’m sure Kent will after I’m gone in another month and half will continue to think about ways that we can involve the group even more and also the committed efforts of some is involved at some level but we can always do more.”

Professor Stein: “I have a couple of comments to make. One is this all seems fine, sounds like a good solid framework for an approach. I do agree with Ron. I think that involving the faculty at this level doesn’t make much sense at the level of the general presentation that you’ve made, but in the end this turns into real decisions about what, to use a common term “cutting the fat,” as to exactly what is fat and what is muscle because there are people who have big differences in opinion and I think at that point, when those kinds of decisions are made that involve individual positions or individual programs that we should really work quite hard to involve the faculty in getting their input into it.”

Interim Provost Harris: “I just want to be clear there will be no decisions made from Day Hall about specific unit cuts. What’s likely to happen when we get to the end of this is a conversation with the deans that says the general-purpose allocation is going to have to be reduced by this amount over this period of time. The deans will then work with the faculty in the colleges to figure out how to any cut in allocations will actually be implemented. It’s also important to acknowledge, and most people may not be aware of this, there are at least three colleges that come to mind, that have set up committees already that are faculty committees advising the dean. I know CALS and Johnson have them. I can’t remember which the other is. They’re setting up committees that are working very closely with deans to address the question and anticipating cuts that may be coming down the line. So there is some faculty involvement I’m sure.

Professor Stein: There was one thing in that rather lengthy list that concerned me a little bit. I’ve been at Cornell a long time and I’ve seen a lot of crises come and go and people lay out programs much like this one for dealing with them and one of the things I’ve noticed over those years which seems to me to not be a good idea is this notion that you can help yourself out of a temporary budget crisis by increasing the enrollment. The argument I’ve heard, more than once, over this period of time is that if you increase a small number of students then you get the whole tuition because you do it without causing any other expenditures to balance it so it’s sheer profit and I believe we have grown steadily over the years without any one decided that that’s what we wanted to do
by a series of such decisions and I personally believe those decisions are fundamentally wrong – that you have to think that every student you add costs you in some – it’s not all logical profit and you have to ask yourself whether you think Cornell is a healthier place with an enrollment of 2000 more than it has now or whether it’s a better university with the enrollment it does have.

Interim Provost Harris: Just a quick comment on this. There is no sense in which we think that you can increase enrollment and simply think about the $.27 or so cents on the dollar you tend to pay in financial aid and the rest is profit and then you have a bottom line. That’s why, when I mentioned that we had this enrollment priorities group that Doris Davis is leading and working with Susan Murphy’s group to understand, what’s the impact on student services and costs there – things like Gannett as well things like dining and housing. Also working with deans of the college offices to understand if you increase enrollment by this much what’s the impact on campus? Does it turn out you need more in instruction? More introduction to this that and the other thing? So thinking very much over this period of what is the impact and what is the real increase in revenue and we’re trying to think of a sophisticated way, working with a number of units around campus, to get a better sense of that."

Professor Lieberwitz: “I don’t think that you actually answered Ron’s question when referring to the UFC so I am hoping you’ll take it more seriously. “

Acting Speaker Howland: “I would like to call on Evan Cooch

5. INTERIM REPORT FROM THE FACULTY ADVISORY BOARD ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (FABIT) REGARDING WEB ACCESSIBILITY AND CHANGES TO CALENDARING AND E-MAIL PROGRAMS

Associate Professor Evan Cooch, Natural Resources and Chair, FABIT: It’s really a privilege to be here. I’m here to make a presentation on behalf on the group referred to as FABIT. It’s the Faculty Advisory Board for Information Technologies. It has an interesting history and is sort of circuitous in how it came to be, but the current role that it serves is as an interface between the folks at this university who are charged as their mission to build, maintain, and promote the use of technology in a whole variety of capacities and the interface between that group of people and selected faculty who are nominated by individual departments, individual colleges and such. We meet once a month to discuss a variety of issues. Some of the issues discussed are raised by faculty, and then put on the agenda, some are initiatives that CIT is the lead agency on and puts forward so that we can discuss them. We get some direct faculty feedback so that there is follow up and comments on the previous presentation, at least with respect to IT. There is a current formal structure in place for faculty to engage with management to make decisions at a very high level on IT and we think it’s been particularly useful. I’ve been asked by Bill Fry to talk about two issues that the university is pursuing at the moment which will have impact on faculty. I’ll leave the impact somewhat vague at the moment because whether it’s a big impact or a small impact, direct or indirect, will depend on your particular circumstances and your capacity as a faculty in this university. “I want to
talk about two things, one of them I’m going to refer to generally as what we call the ‘508 Policy.’ The Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1973. In 1998 there was an addendum added to the act that talked about accessibility issues for media that involved technology and I’m going to refer to it generically as the 508 Policy or the Web Accessibility Policy. The basic as we move more and more of our information to technology media, particularly with the advent of the World Wide Web is how are we going to accommodate the need for people to be able access it who may not have the capacities that we take for granted and graphics is one. “The basic problem that we’re faced with is how do we render electronic and information technology accessible to people with disabilities. By and large, the vast majority of the client pool that this act is directed at, have visual impairment problems. There are others but if you were somehow able to survey and enumerate the population of folks who have difficulty accessing technology most folks that I’ve talked to seem to think the vast majority of them are visual. So, some of the things we’ll talk about refer to that specifically but there are lots of general issues. The 508 Accessibility Act and addendum to the Rehabilitation Act that was passed in 1998 is mandated for federal agencies. Federal agencies have to do this now. They all have been doing it since 1998 although there have been some exclusionary clauses. The university, this is the information I gleaned last week I had in a conversation, currently is not subject to this but because we are an agency who receives federal funds in some fashion, we will sooner or later be subject to this. What CIT and Office of Communications and various other elements of the university are doing is trying to be proactive. We aren’t under obligation to make everything accessible so far but wouldn’t it be a good idea if we were ahead of the curve and started to work on this now and started figuring out the challenges, both in terms of the policies and technology before we are really given no alternative. The basic point is that agencies, and universities will fit in this category, ultimately must give disabled employees and members of the public access to this information that is comparable in content as currently available to any one else. “I don’t want to get too far down in the technical weeds so I tried to boil down a fairly long list of specific technical things you would need to do, most typically for things like websites. We’ll talk about other things in a moment, to have the text equivalents. So is a website is heavily graphics oriented and the assumption is that the graphic is going to relay some critical information, you have to have text alternative. Why text when you can’t see graphics it’s presumed you couldn’t see text – the reason is because there is technology out there that will take anything that’s text and read it aloud. There are technical tools that somebody who is sight-impaired can use to hear the text read to them from a website but that doesn’t work if the website is entirely graphical. There need to be text only page equivalents as needed. For pages that cannot be rendered accessible, you need to essentially create a duplicate set of pages. Pages that are generated by these things called scripting languages, java script, there’s a whole host of them that I won’t go into – they need to be rendered accessible. This is non-trivial, in many cases it’s not even possible under current state of technology but the basic policy, the 508 policy, has codified that this is something that needs to be addressed in order to be in compliance. On-going forums which would make a great deal use of 508 are students, staff, and faculty have to be accessible. They have to be, imagine the forum that you need to navigate just by what you hear as opposed to what you see, so cute little elements that are whizzy and
potentially useful for visual paradigm may not work very well if you’re not able to actually see things. So Section 508 support at Cornell – this is one that is presented to FABIT. The reaction is immediate, well how could you argue against this in principle? There is no argument that I think is rationale, at least from my perspective and, I don’t think anyone in FABIT found one either that the argument and the pushback is going to be well how do you actually do this? Let’s start with the positive: There is general support at least using FABIT’s representatives as a sample of 508 Policy. Cornell is taking the lead amongst most of the universities that I’m aware of in trying to be proactive in drafting a policy. It is being coordinated by CIT and University Communications. There is also some involvement with the Counsel’s office because there are some legal issues in play here and what we’re trying to do, is to come up with a policy that reflects the requirements of 508 but is consistent with the mission of the university. We’re not a federal agency even though we may receive federal funding, and to come up with a policy that clearly delineates the technical needs, what support services are going to be available, and what particular applications or bits of information that we disseminate through technology might be exempt. We want to acknowledge that there will, in many cases, be some situations which aren’t going to easily fit into the policy so we need to be very clear and specific about what potentially is exempted. The policy itself, is stated here, all web pages within the Cornell University web space and that does not simply mean Cornell.edu. So, you’ve outsourced or offshored a website off campus for whatever reason but it still conducts official university business, that falls within the purview of the university web space, subject to exceptions enumerated in this policy, must be made accessible to the widest range of users, including those with the more common sensory, motor and cognitive disabilities, by adopting at a minimum all the requirements of 508. It’s a very concise statement. Of course that the devil is in the details on how we actually do that. But this is the basic policy and I think the key point here for folks to be aware of is that all web pages within the Cornell university web space will be subject to this. Does this affect you directly as faculty? Not just individual faculty; faculty don’t exist in a vacuum. We have connections to units, research groups, and colleges. There are things that are beyond the immediate personal impact I will address. Here are some things I’m going to talk about specific impacts: administrative units will be subject to this, academic units, teaching, so blackboard websites where teaching. Research: websites devoted to research programs, the programmatic research areas (extensions, all sorts of things will fit into extension and outreach clauses) so basically almost everything from the top down (and you think university level, you think college level, you think research level, teaching units – they’re all going to fall within this so there is a direct and clear impact on these. “If it’s an unofficial site and I put unofficial parenthetically because there’s a certain amount of debate depending upon who you ask although I am sure folks who are drafting the policy there is no ambiguity as to what really does constitute official. I think in general these things are fairly obvious but I think there are going to some areas in the gray areas, in the middle. Inaccessible applications, I’ll come back to that in a minute. Inter-institution collections so if it’s a website that involves an inter-institutional collaboration simply because Cornell has a 508 policy we can’t enforce that on collaborators so inter-institutions won’t necessarily be impacted. Sites that are devoted to the development of the web as a pedagogy for information aren’t subject to this. Non-active archival sites – so
if you have a website that hasn’t changed in X number of years – not a problem. Sites that are targeted at very few users – the number 25 is actually in the document – they’re basically exempted from this and then the final item: Undue burden. I will talk about two particular items here. In accessible applications - if the site is crafted with technology that does not have and probably will never have a simple solution to make it accessible it’s exempted and the one that’s very commonly used in the acrobat file – pdf files. It’s so ubiquitous but of all the technology out there, it’s the most problematic. It was not designed for the purposes of being accessible to anyone who is visually impaired. So there are major challenges with working with acrobat files and sites are heavily using acrobat files are a problem. Undue burden – this is where it’s established that a particular website or I’m just using websites as a euphemism for a bunch of different things, but it is the most common one is that it would take so much work and so much money to retrofit it that it would cause an undue burden. There is a policy in place that you can apply for an exemption provided you can sufficiently document the burden. “Time to Promulgation: I asked a couple of folks what the actual start for this calendar is and I’m told probably as early as January. So if we use that as a reasonably accurate statement then in a year all new or redesigned sites published by the university, a college or program should be in compliance with 508 and I think the keywords here are “new” and “redesigned.” So if you’re in the process of developing or redesigning one this is something you need to be aware of. Within two years all official, administrative and academic instructional sites; within three years all academic research and outreach sites; within five years all official sites subject to exceptions as I mentioned before and a lot of faculty at the individual faculty level will fall in this category here at the bottom and so the time horizon that you need to consider for making changes for 508 compliance is far enough out that if you’re feeling at all concerned that this is going to be a major problem at least there’s time to find some solutions and the folks involved with the compliance policy have a lot of things in place to help. “The other topic I wanted to talk to you about today or briefly introduce you to is some recent initiatives you’ve seen some press about in the Chronicle and other places and that’s upcoming changes to the email and calendaring system. This is referred to collectively within the enterprise as the Ensemble Initiative and it is essentially a large, multi-faceted effort to figure ways to improve and modernize and enhance email and calendaring. It is a project that has been designed to deliver new email and calendaring and related services. I am going to focus primarily on email and calendaring since for most folks those are the primary services that you’re using and are going to be most influenced by in terms of this initiative but there is a whole host of other ones. These are services that are targeting both faculty/staff, and students. I am going to focus primarily on faculty and staff. Students are somewhat a different issues but I’ll at least mention them a little bit. Faculty and staff email and calendaring will be moved to what’s called an exchange environment. Exchange is a very sophisticated, very stable backend that’s been developed by Microsoft and it provides the basis, the underlying pipes if you will for the actual services that we’re going to use. Student email and some of the services – there’s an initiative in place to basically outsource those to both Google and Microsoft. This will not only have some significant infrastructural benefits because we’ll be making use of some external services but we will enhance and improve considerably the range of services we can actually provide to students far beyond what our current capability is. “Why do we
want to do this? You’re getting your email successfully, probably and some of you are actually scheduling using the calendar so why do this? The reason to do this is because the current system is ten years old and in technology terms, that’s archaic in some sense. Since the e-mail and the calendaring systems do not have the functionality that we need and increasingly desire. and the first item is one of the things that has changed in the last few years that’s what’s precipitated this. More and more people have the smart devices, whether it’s an iPhone, a Blackberry or some equivalent thing and to get those things to work successful with current email and calendaring specifically in combination is nontrivial and we really need to do something because these devices are becoming mission critical for a number of folks, especially at the Senior Administration level.

Scheduling meetings is way harder than it should be in the current system. The current system is actually obsolete and is no longer being supported by the company that created it so we’re basically at the point where we have to make a change anyway, but even if it were to continue I think there’s growing recognition that it’s simply not sufficient for our purposes. There is demand for change from some of our academic units. Some academic units are already running their own exchange services so what CIT is really trying to do is to say, look let’s consolidate our collective efforts and energy and experience and do this at an institutional level and we’re going to reap and collect the benefits from doing that.

“Moving the students offshore to Google and Microsoft is not as huge a shift as one might imagine since the vast majority of students are coming in using external accounts anyway so there’s a whole host of reasons to do this regardless but I think it’s really going to be a fairly benign transition for the students.”

I want to talk mostly about the faculty and staff side of things. Where did this come from? This isn’t something just popped up out of nowhere. The Ensemble Initiative and the decisions to go with exchange system and various other bits of infrastructure both from the hardware and software side of things came from a very broad task force that was built from across the university that represented different administrative units. We have representatives from faculty, there is some student input, and there has been very high level input from CIT. There’s been extensive discussion with consultants. There have been a number of executive steering committees that have talked about very specific elements. This has been in discussion, to my knowledge, at least a year, probably close to two years, at least in the broad sense. There have been a whole bunch of discussions about the specific requirements for campus units so individual campuses, hotel school, business school have had some chances to give some input and there has been and continues to be a high level of exchange in the process. Who is it governed by? Senior administration in charge is Polley McClure VP for IT, CIT has several sponsoring directors involved, Rick MacDonald, Steve Schuster, Jim Lombardi. Chris Lyons is the project manager. He gets to deal with all the nuts and bolts. There is also an Executive Steering Committee which I have served on and there are several advisory boards. “So, here are the really important things: If you’re using email, the changeover will not affect your email use at all. If you use Thunderbird, you can use Thunderbird. If you use Eudora, for a little while you can probably use Eudora although there are reasons you’ll want to switch off Eudora so your basic email client won’t change. It would only change if you wanted to take full advantage of emailing and calendaring simultaneously. At this point, the initiative is going to make use of Outlook on the Windows platform and on the Mac platform, Entourage. So if you never
use calendaring, it won’t make any difference but for a lot of folks it will. If you want the full email and calendaring you may make use of Entourage on the Mac platform or Outlook on the Windows platform. The calendaring is far more robust than what we currently have and can access a bunch of different things. It will be available, I’m told, September 2009. Migration will continue to March 2010 at which point Oracle calendar will be retired.”

Acting Speaker Howland: “The chair calls on Charlie Walcott.”

6. GOOD AND WELFARE

Acting Associate Dean Charles Walcott: “I just want to make a brief pitch for the United Way, to point out that even small gifts make a difference. A dollar a pay does great things – it turns out to be $20/year or so. The need is great and it’s obviously going to increase as state funds decrease. This year for the first time, corporate cornerstones, that is corporate givers have paid all the expenses for the United Way, all the administrative expenses which means any money you give, 100%, goes to the agencies and you have the ability to designate or alternatively agencies you don’t like on your pledge card and I would urge you to join me in contributing.”

Adjournment 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott
Acting Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty
Minutes from the February 11, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to remind the body that no photos may be taken, no recorders may be used. I ask all members and visitors please turn off or silence all cell phones. I ask all persons who wish to be heard to please stand and identify yourself with your name and your department. At the moment we have no Good and Welfare speakers. I call on the Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry for remarks.”

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Bill Fry, Dean of the University Faculty: “I would first introduce Karen Lucas who is the contact for the Dean of Faculty office, Karen will be the person you will interact with. I would also like to indicate that the President has involved the Dean of Faculty in a majority of senior staff meetings concerning budget issues. As recommended by the faculty governance committee, the Dean of Faculty has participated in some of the senior staff meetings and I assure you that the senior staff is occupied fully with the budget situation, which Provost Fuchs will describe to us. Also I want to convey that the Provost has asked for suggestions concerning the role of the University Faculty Senate in addressing budget-related issues. I will be meeting with the UFC and FPC as quickly as possible so that I can get a report back to Kent by next week. If any of you have any suggestions please send them to me as soon as possible. I should also say that today is the last day that we’re going to have refreshments. We are taking a hit like everyone else and the budget is going down so eat hearty today. I would like to make some comments concerning the calendar. The Educational Policy Committee is considering a change in the University Calendar. The situation is that fall orientation will be shortened by one day. The EPC recommends that classes start on Wednesday instead of Thursday in the fall. This would add one day to the fall semester, which is shorter than the spring semester. Additional options are that we start classes on Wednesday and we get Labor Day off or we get Labor Day off and treat Friday as Monday (if that makes sense) or we get the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off or we get a longer fall break or some other alternative. There is a letter from Georg Hoffstaetter to the community describing the situation. He is chair of the Educational Policy Committee. Please email Georg at gh77@cornell.edu with your comments. My personal view is that this is a very small issue concerning a single day. I also believe that Cornell’s academic calendar is troublesome and I would be really interested in a much broader review of the calendar, but that’s going to take more time, so the focus of the UPC this year is on a single day and if we can resolve that I would like to initiate a discussion about a broader less difficult calendar. Those are my comments to you today.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you Dean Fry. I now call on Associate Dean Brad Anton for a report from the Committee of Nominations and Elections.”

2. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Brad Anton, Associate Dean and Secretary, University Faculty: “Thank you. We recently
appointed some people to fill vacancies on Faculty committees and I have a list of them here. Also we are putting together a slate of candidates for the upcoming Faculty election. We have candidates now. We are working on the ones I sent you in the mail. We will have another mail coming to you soon asking for nominations only to faculty senators as we seek nominations for people to fill vacancies on University Faculty Committee and once that is known we will have the Faculty election in April. I thank these people for being willing to serve and I thank you also for giving us the nominations. I ask we approve this report.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “The report is up for approval by the Senate. Any objections? Report is approved unanimously.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “I now call on Provost Kent Fuchs for remarks.”

3. REMARKS AND DISCUSSION WITH PROVOST KENT FUCHS

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Can we turn off the projector? I know it’s hard to hear this, but I’ll speak loudly so you all will hear. Can the students in the back hear? I have been to many Senate Meetings, but I’ve never seen standing room only. My comments are going to be directed to the Faculty. I know there are members of press, there are a lot of students here and others but the comments are specifically targeted to the Faculty. Bill and I had a conversation about if we should exclude other members, and I’m just not comfortable doing that so; Faculty, welcome to the Provost’s discussion.

I am going to be very, very frank with you all about the state of the budget and most of my comments will be about the budget and the state of Cornell’s financial situation and what actions we’re taking. We are going to set a tone for conversation that will endure, hope will endure; the entire time I am Provost. In the end I am going to call on your help as Faculty to work together with us in getting ourselves out of this situation that the world’s economy has put us in. What I would like to do is accomplish several things. One, I want to briefly mention the past, where we are and how we got here. Interim Provost David Harris came to you all back in the fall and gave a wonderful set of slides that many of you may remember, talking about the curves and data and tables. I am not going to show PowerPoint. I am a PowerPoint guy, I love PowerPoint, but that is not the purpose here. The purpose here is to have a conversation that is frank and engaging and yet informative so I thought that I would do it without a lot of PowerPoint. Bring me back and I will show you my PowerPoint. What I want to do is inform you. I secondly want to engage you. There will be two messages around the state of our finances, and they are conflicting. One is that the situation is grave. We are in a crisis. If we do nothing, mind you the state of the institution is at risk. The other message, which conflicts completely, is that we have amazing assets. We are in good stead in all respects and we are going to do really well, so you have got to sort of keep those conflicting messages together. You have heard through the emails and open forum that President Skorton has had with Faculty, staff and others that we are facing a budget deficit, not a debt but a deficit that represents about 10% of our budget. I don’t think many of you heard what the real number is. The overall budget including the Medical School is $3B, including the Medical School’s and I
am going to use round numbers so these are not precise but they will give you an order of magnitude within 10 or so percent precision. The annual budget is roughly $2B; a bunch of that is research and other things that the Provost doesn’t have the ability to cut or correct. The unrestricted budget is roughly $1.2B, a little bit more than that. That includes my salary, includes you as Faculty. I think of that as restricted but on a budget perspective is unrestricted. You take $200M which is our budget deficit, $200M per year and on a $1.2B unrestricted budget that gives you an approximate percentage of the challenge that we’re facing – 16-17% of the budget correction is needed for the future. The fact is, due to a number of factors. Interim Provost David Harris shared this with you and I want to share it again with you briefly from a different perspective. The endowment has dropped significantly, and we have a rule as you all know (that) governs the endowment payout. That payout rule will come into place and we will have an endowment reduction of roughly 30%; that’s coming. That represents for us in terms of our budget here in Ithaca about $70M+ per year contributing to that $200M; so that’s about one third of the need that we need to address. Many of these problems that I have mentioned to you are ones where time is on our side if we don’t destroy the endowment. In order words, at some point, we hope, we expect, the market will come back, the endowment will come back and the balance that we have to employ as financial stewards of the University is not to make or take Draconian actions that are going to erode the academic excellence of the institution but yet take actions that will correct the problem and preserve the excellence as well, so we’re balancing both of those. So an endowment drop of about 30% in terms of payouts which will result in about $70M of less funds in either of our colleges and other central facilities as well. The second is the loss of income to the institution, and you can think of this in many ways. The way I think of it from the Provost’s perspective, and you probably have not heard this before is there have been, for 25 years, philanthropic gifts in particular from one special friend of the university. These gifts have represented $25-50M per year. Much of that has been at the discretion of the Provost, and so for about 25 years we have had a process where we have had a mechanism to fund initiatives that we have created, and we have all benefited. The beneficiaries ranged from students, to faculty, to departments, to colleges. But those gifts are no longer here. They ended a few years ago and we no longer have $25-50M discretionary funds in the Provost’s Office that we used to have. I had lunch with Mel Nesheim, and he said that when he was Provost many years ago he always dreaded the time in the Provost Office when those funds would go away. Well, they’re gone, and we have to adjust our expectations in our budgeting around the loss of those funds. Coupled with that, as those funds went away, the market was at an all time high and so we were using the return on the market at an all time high to fund those initiatives and that all stopped in October. So that is a real loss of income and it will change the way we make decisions and the way we adjust our institution for the future. We have had a lot of academic initiatives and priorities in the past few years that we rely on those funds and we rely not just on those funds but expectations for the success of the campaign so we have spent $650M of the Life Sciences Initiative and the expectations of success in fundraising in the endowment and we have had the tendency, I did it as a Dean, of creating initiatives that rely on success in fundraising, which no longer can we make decisions in that manner, and these are all wonderful initiatives that we have created, but they are ones that were the
President’s mid-term future; as long as I am Provost, we just can’t count on those funds coming in as we make those decisions. We don’t have the funds as part of our budget.

[SB1] What we are doing is addressing those challenges. In the past six weeks, I have been in the Provost’s Office now for 42 days, and in the past six weeks, what I want to do is to tell you what we are doing and tell you what we have not done and tell you what we have to do for the future. So the past six weeks there has been enormous engagement with the trustees. President Skorton is talking many times per day with the trustees to the chairman of the trustees as well as the normal duties in fund raising and being our president of the university. There is enormous engagement by the Trustees. I think appropriately so, many of those are investing hundreds of hours per month, many hours per week, some of them for days, helping us make decisions about the endowment, helping us make decisions about financing and cash flow so we can right the ship from the financial perspective and it’s just been phenomenal for me to observe, the past six weeks how those that are friends and the alumni of the university are investing their time in helping us and how everyone, including colleagues in this room are working together to help solve the problem. In the past six weeks there has also been an unusual speed in the decision processing as you might imagine. We have had to make decisions to create a budget using a process that we will not use in the future and we could not use in the past and the reason for that is the markets have changed dramatically since the beginning of October and the size and scale of the problem became revealed to us in October. So we had about two months to understand the problem and from my perspective, six weeks to try to address the budget for this coming year. So what have we done for this year? We released yesterday the budget cuts for all of the deans, all of the vice presidents and we are addressing slightly less than a third of the problem this year: $200M problem and this year we cut the budgets across the board uniformly for all deans, all vice presidents. $60M we extracted out of the budget and it isn’t a matter whether you are a college, a contract college, or you are general purpose, whether you’re President or the Dean of the Faculty, everybody’s getting a budget cut that (is) roughly 5%. The President, his budget is down 10% including his personal salary. The Provost’s office is down 10% as well. The Provost’s office, just to give you an idea, represents about $2M of budget cutting. Some of that is funds that the Provost has to give back to the colleges, so these cuts don’t just influence the office, but they influence the initiative the Provost can deploy this coming year. What else have we done? We have frozen salaries of all the Faculty and staff, except for the lowest paid staff and Vice President Mary Opperman has created an initiative for a one-time bonus for the lowest paid staff, which you may have read on the web, and you know from President Skorton. Our expectation is that next year there will be salary increases for Faculty and staff and that is our goal as we do budgeting process but we will resume what we call our SIP program at Cornell for both Faculty and staff, but at this point there is none for this coming year except for the one-time bonus for the lowest paid staff. Graduate students – your stipend is going up. You are the only group across the whole university that is getting an increase in stipend. We are also doing the most controversial point of our correction this year and that we are doing what some deans refer to lovingly as a reserve sweep. We have a $600 and some odd million dollars of reserves across the university. Most of that, about a half billion dollars of reserves are in the colleges. These are committed reserves. College of Engineering has $50-60M of reserves, and those are
reserves that I know each year help make tough decisions that help the Dean of Engineering set the money aside for purposes for specific projects. But what we are doing is we are going out and taking pieces of those reserves, not specific accounts, but we’re giving bills to each one of the colleges, each of the vice presidents, and the correction this year for the reallocation this year reserves represents $75M. We are taking 30% of the central reserves, which are controlled, by the Provost and the President, so 30% of our reserves are gone. They are allocated so that represents $50M. Then the other $25M we are taking from the $500M that are out in the colleges. We are not looking at any individual new faculty accounts, start up accounts, none of that, but we are sizing up the size of the amount of the bill agreed to the college and the vice presidents based on the reserves in the departments and colleges overall. Next year, so will all be shared with the deans and vice presidents, the budgets for all the colleges, for all the reserve accounts and when they look at that as they did yesterday, they will see there is quite a differential amount of reserves we’re taking from different colleges and is based on ability to pay. We have to do it again next year, and then we will be done with this taking of reserves. We are doing $75M this year; we have promised the Trustees. They have basically demanded that we allocate another $75M next year. It is not clear what we would use next year for sizing the amount of reserves that we have to reallocate in the departments. It is unlikely it’s going to be on ability to pay. It is most likely that it will be a bill based on some other metric – the number of Faculty, the number of staff, I don’t know. We won’t use the same allocation as we did this year for the reserves. I would love to discuss that, as it’s the most controversial of what we’ve done in the Q&A if you want but it’s a necessary part of what we’re doing. We are taking of that $60M in budget cuts which represents about 5% cuts for all units. We are re-allocating $10M of that so we are reinvesting $10M and these don’t necessarily represent at this point the academic priorities of the institutions. They represent the needs of some critical units that have budget challenges that we would not, would be aggravated if we did not reinvest. So examples, in fact ones that we’re reinvesting at this point are in continuing education and the College of Veterinary Medicine. We taxed their hospital so we need to reinvest there. We are reinvesting in Art and Architecture Planning. We’re asking them to balance their budget, which has been underfunded for many years. We will reinvest in research. We will probably need to reinvest in fund raising, Alumni Affairs and Development if we are going to grow out of this and then there is another roughly four or so million dollars that has yet to be determined in the reinvestment. We also raised tuition. We raised room and board. Room and board went up about 4%. Tuition on the endowed side went up 4%. Turns out that’s the lowest increase in tuition, percentage wise, since 1966, but means a real sacrifice by students and staff who have children and its 7.2% increase on the contract college at the undergraduate level. We are in the process of doing, probably for me, something that is the most painful. We are looking at commitments that we made from the Provost’s office, ones that we think put the institution at risk and we’re re-negotiating and in some cases negating some of those commitments, so we’re reducing many of those long term commitments like 5% or 10% and these are commitments that are made by us to departments or sometimes to individual Faculty for retention purposes that this institution could not bear for the future. So we are going to, in individual cases, and we are looking at commitments that we have made over the past 10-20 years that I think just
have to be renegotiated. So that’s what we’ve done in the past six weeks, a lot of fun. What we’re doing now, as Bill just mentioned, as of this week since we’ve just issued the budget cuts is the long term planning process. We have solved about a third of the problem, a little less than that, $50M have gone to the budget deficit problem. We are going to take about $35M out of the endowment to help with financial aid so that’s a part of this $200M problem. We’re looking at the methods for doing that so that will be on a reoccurring permanent basis. Eventually we need to reinvest in the endowment and financial aid because that take out of the endowment, I don’t think is sustainable but for now that helps us to address the problem. So there is a remaining roughly two-thirds of the problem that we need to address as Faculty and now is the time for us to work together. We have got about nine months to come up with a plan of what we’re going to do for the next two years. Not about the finance problem, we know how much we have to correct, but now the question is how are we going to correct it. We have the finance part of the institution and the alumni and others that are helping us with cash flow and helping us to borrow, to manage the cash flow and use of the endowment but really rely on us as Faculty and academics to decide now how to address the problem. Remember it’s 17% of your budgets in your departments that are the piece of this that contribute in some sense to the challenge that we all face. Seventeen percent of the entire $1.2B unrestricted budget. I am going to come back to that, the part about the planning because I have asked Dean Fry to help us and the time is short. I have to report to the Board of Trustees at the end of the first week in March. March 6th and March 7th about the process that we are going to use to plan. Part of the planning is budget planning. Part of it is academic planning and part of it is institutional planning so the President will be involved, the vice presidents, the deans, the department chairs and virtually every academic department, but the time is short but the hope here is that you all have been thinking and planning already. The circumstances are different in the next five years. For the next five years, my term as Provost, we are living in a different world than we lived in October of last year. What we need to do is to decide how we are going to adjust as departments, institutionally, in all areas across the university to correct the budget and then to begin to re-grow ourselves out of this in roughly 2½ - 3 years. So we’re going to go through a process in three years. We have finished year one in terms of budget cuts. We just did it yesterday. Now we have two more years of budget correction and we need some significant planning. The kinds of planning that has to take place have to do with the size of the student body. It has to do with the size of Faculty. It has to do with how we invest our resources and facilities – it’s just all aspects of this university. The most strategic part of this I think is how we restructure as a university. If we do nothing, there will be another memo from the Provost in 11½ months, having another cut of this magnitude centrally distributed out to all of the colleges but frankly, I don’t have much interest in that. I think we have to think very, very carefully about what we want to look like as a university from central all the way to individual areas within each department. If the risk we have is the largest, let me say it in a different way, is that we as faculty will absorb our cuts by just people retiring or leaving and what that will mean in some departments they will lose half their faculty in this process because there will be hiring in certain departments. Other departments will lose no one – that is not the strategic way of managing what we’re doing. We have to think what it is, how we want to restructure it as an institution and that’s up to you all
and that’s up to the entire Faculty and the deans and department chairs and then we have to manage the budget to achieve those goals. There are many parts of the institution that are not going to change in this process. We are going to focus on excellence in teaching and scholarship. That will drive every decision and I recommend that that drive your decisions as you may plan your own departments and schools and colleges. We have to have aspirations that will endure beyond the current challenges. As I said, I think in three years we’re going to be reinvesting in significant ways and major areas and we’re going to preserve Cornell’s unique character. This is the place that you love and I love and it is a place that our alumni love and our current students do and this is a place that is unique in all aspects of its breadth and the areas that we work and its excellence, and we will maintain that and we will support it and invest in it. There will be investments as we move through this process of cutting. I talked about this $10M that we are investing from the cut. Remember that this is being balanced by faculty searches being stopped across the university, projects being halted, us resizing, renegotiating commitments in the midst of all that there are going to be reinvestments. There have to be. There have to be investments in faculty hiring. There have to be investment in financial aid as we just have and there will indeed the facilities that we will reinvest in as well. There will be a change in behavior, I believe, as we make decisions. We rarely make decisions that centrally where we ask about the opportunity costs. It is typically based on whether something is a good idea. But we can no longer fund all great, wonderful ideas. We will have to talk about the opportunity costs. We have to have a sustainable budget model for any new initiatives that come forward and those sustainable budget models cannot rely on the campaign as it has in the past. That has typically been the way that we have said we’re going to fund things. Any proposals that come forward and talk about raising an endowment to sustain the initiative, it’s unlikely to be funded for the future. We have to no longer think about funds as being restricted in certain areas. We often think about funding in one area as being no cost while funding in another areas is shared by all of us, all of the initiatives across the university are part of Cornell. Whether it’s a building or whether it’s the New Life Sciences initiative or whether it’s Gannett or anything this is all part of our future and we should all share in the debate and decide what is the highest priority. We are going to change the budget process. I mention that we have now shared with all the deans and vice presidents, with Dean Fry, with the Vice Provosts, the spreadsheet that shows three pages of all the income for every college. The infamous CAM charges, the overhead returns, F&A, all the income, all the expenditure for all the colleges and we’re improving the budgeting process that takes into account our unique structure of contract colleges and endowed colleges, and somehow we get a system to manage it in a way that provides incentives but also allows us to realistically invest in the areas that are important and do it in a way that’s transparent and also a way that also reflects our priorities as Faculty. I am almost done, how much time do I have left?”

Speaker Steve Beer: “At this point you have approximately eight minutes for finishing up and discussion.”

Provost Fuchs: “Give me one more minute.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “We can devote two more minutes to your remarks and discussion.”
Provost Fuchs: “Thank you Speaker Beer. I have just one last page. Meaningful remarks again to the Faculty. First I want to express my thanks to the colleges. We are going to have three years of challenges. We really are, but I know from being a colleague here that this is an institution where we as a Faculty will not only lead we will also work together. We won’t think of our own areas, research education and scholarship. We won’t think of our departments or our colleges; we’ll think of what’s good, best – the very best – for the whole institution so I sincerely mean this, I really thank you for the sacrifices you are making and for the time and energy and collegiality of the future. I already mentioned a couple of times that we have to start a planning process, and what I need very simply from Dean Fry is what is it that we should plan? How should we plan it? What’s the process that we could engage, and thirdly who should be involved? What representation from the Faculty Senate? What representation from the colleges as well as the rest of the University? We are all going to participate in this process. When you have a 17% budget correction on a $1.2M unrestricted budget, not 17% across the budget but 17% unrestricted, there is no way to hide. Don’t think that your department or your unit will be protected – there is just no way. In some sense it’s liberating – the challenge is so daunting that I know as David Skorton has told me, I will have no friends left because we are all going to be touched here. We are all going to have to reduce expenditures as we grow ourselves out of this challenge as President Skorton says. All of us will sacrifice. We are starting with salaries. We are starting with each unit – taking a 5% budget cut across this whole university and then reinvest in the reserves, but there’s no where to hide and it frees us up. It allows us to think in ways that there is no other situation that I can think of that would enable us to think in a more creative way or force us to as we think about the future. I want to conclude by thanking a couple of people. I thank you all as Faculty, but there are others across the institution – the ones that I have been working with most closely with in Day Hall and some of them were there before I was, obviously. But we have had a couple of interim people working that sort of dropped into this situation. One of them is our Interim Vice President for Budget and Planning, Paul Streeter. The other is David Harris who was the Interim Provost. He dropped into this. Paul works about 90 hours per week literally on behalf of us as academics and David Harris did a spectacular job last semester. So, thank you Paul.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Thank you Provost Fuchs. Will you welcome questions? Before questions, I would like to remind the body that only members of the University Faculty may speak at the University Senate Meetings.”

Muawia Barazangi, Department of Earth & Atmospheric Sciences: “To increase the income, what are the main problems in increasing the percentage such as students?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “One way to implement our budget correction is through increasing revenues. It is not just cutting fortunately. There are many creative ways of having new revenues. Much of that has to do with the educational program. There is a piece of it that is research and there is a piece of it that has to do with the New York State as well. Much of it has to do with students. I have been calling our provosts colleagues around the country and introducing myself, and they are all facing similar challenges on a very similar scale. They all have their own nuances and try to protect their private information.
Some of them believe that increasing particularly the undergrads enrollment doesn’t really help you financially. So this is a part of our challenge in the next few months is deciding what size should the undergraduate population be. It is not just revenue; it’s workload on faculty. It is the student life. Learning experience. North Campus. West Campus. But there are other areas. There are the masters programs. There are the Ph.D. programs. There are ways that we as Faculty – these are the areas the Faculty will decide what we want to do in this area. “

Speaker Steve Beer: “The gentlemen in the light blue shirt.”

"Hotel School -- I want to know what the basis is of your belief that this economy and therefore the problem will solve itself in three years?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “It is just a simple naïve optimism. That is all it is. I just cannot endure more than three years of budget cutting. People are going to start spending and there are economists in the room so yes.”

Bill Arms, Computer Science: “You said something about building. Some building projects have been postponed; some of them cancelled. Some have been given the green light and what is the criteria used and how is this being decided?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “The question is about the facilities. We have literally, I think, billions of dollars of needs in facilities across this campus. Funds come in from a variety of resources. Some come in from NYS. Some come from alumni donors and then we debt finance. Almost every building has some component of debt financing, which I think many Faculty didn’t understand. If we didn’t do debt financing you wouldn’t see hardly any buildings going up. The criteria that was most accurately described in an editorial in the Sun yesterday by Vice President Steve Golding and I think, I don’t want to repeat that; but there is a whole set of criteria about the priority. You look at our needs that we have, you go through the list for example, Olin Library. We need to invest $50M in Olin Library – most of it will have to be debt financed, but if we don’t we have to shut down the stacks. Which am I going to do? I am going to invest in Olin Library if I’m asked about what the option is. There are safety issues; there are academic priority issues. There is the ability to pay when it comes to a college and it’s the Trustees right now not the Faculty are the ones that are saying be careful of any investments and they are the ones that we’ll have to work with the most closely to convince them to allow us to do anything. The Trustees wanted us to capture all of the tuition revenues centrally this year. We didn’t do that. We allowed some of the tuition increases to reside in some, not all, of the colleges and the schools. The Trustees are being very aggressive.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Gentleman in the Bow Tie.”

Michael Reich, Mechanical Engineering: “Is the joining of reserve funds based on the ability of department units to pay, isn’t there a risk that or a tendency.

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Yes and that’s why we are not going to do that next year. The colleges this year that had the largest reserve contribution was Veterinary Medicine – wasn’t any of the big colleges. The second was my colleagues, College of Engineering that had the second largest. It was all based on ability, from our perspective, on ability to pay.
Understand there are no uncommitted reserves in a college, speaking as a Dean. There all there for a purpose and put aside based on good management for some specific purpose and what we're saying is the institution is at risk and we're going to reach in and take from that half billion in reserves in the colleges and vice presidents and re-allocate it to the problem we have and we're taking a third this year, 30%, of the Provost's reserves which frankly you want us to keep those reserves for critical things like paychecks so next year we won't do it based on the ability to pay but there will be a bill that we will send to Engineering College, I apologize, for your contribution. Then we will be done taking reserves.”

Speaker Steven Beer: "Peter Stein."

Professor Peter Stein: “There is a part of this that I don’t quite get that was brought up by the gentleman from the hotel school’s question. Your model is that in three years the Dow will be back.”

Provost Fuchs: “No.”

Professor Peter Stein: “Well when you say it is over what do you mean exactly.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “It means that we have a $200M+ budget problem and that has some assumptions that my colleague Executive Vice President Steve Golding could explain to you better than I about return in the endowment. We are modeling specific returns in the endowment. We are not saying it’s going to be back to where it is now, but we are saying, we’re taking actions now that will allow the budget to be stable. It is going to take more than three years but my actions, in terms of cutting and reallocation of reserves and endowment payout for us, that I am looking at from a three-year time limit. Will it actually take longer than that? And we are not expecting the endowment to come back in three years.”

Professor Peter Stein: “The reason I ask the question is it seems to me that one way to look at this is to make various assumptions. What are we going to do if in fact now the Dow is going to be at 8K for as long as we are all alive, then what? Does Cornell go down the sinkhole? Probably not, ok. What if it comes back in three years? What if it comes back in five years? And then make some kind of an estimate as to whether we are eating ourselves faster than we need to if indeed one believes that 8 years from now it will be back. I don’t know how to phrase the question but somehow I think that should be part of the plan.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “It is, It is, Peter. What we are not doing – believe me we are not going to take Draconian actions. We are assuming, this is an optimistic model and if things are more optimistic they turn around faster than expected, we will stop cutting in year three. Our colleagues are doing the same thing. I just spoke to the MIT provost two weeks ago. They are doing $50M a year in budget cuts and they are not going to do year three if the Dow comes back. You are right – a lot of this has to do – each year we’re going to have to re-adjust the plan. I agree with that, depending on the stock market and depending on the philanthropy that year but I have to trust my colleagues and all of our alumni that are on the finance committees. The Trustees would give us good guidance. But I don’t think we are cutting more than we should.”
Speaker Steve Beer: Brad Anton.

Professor Brad Anton: “Seventy-million of this budget deficit comes from the payout from the endowment. That is the part that is directly related to the market, influenced by the external economy. The other $130M that is in this deficit must be some ongoing problem.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Those are commitments.”

Professor Brad Anton: “Commitments? We have over-committed and reading in between the lines it is like I perceive that you have discovered that we have been operating by over-committing.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “It not between the lines, it is very clear.”

Professor Brad Anton: “Even if the economy does not crash around us we would still have $130M deficit problem to solve now because you discovered it, right?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “No, I didn’t discover it. It was discovered before me.”

Professor Brad Anton: “It was discovered? So, if that’s true, can you explain that?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Sure, Sure. It is not that it’s simply two pieces. One is a drop in the endowment and the other is a drop in revenues, and that is why I mention this, this reliance we have had on philanthropy. One donor gave us a half billion dollars over 25 years, much of it at the discretion of the Provost, and so that is what has disappeared so yes, we had overcommitted but its over commitment based on expectations of the future, you understand that? It wasn’t just that we were spending money, we had expected that the development, the campaign would be a billion dollars more now in the campaign so it wasn’t just over-commitment it was over-expectation about what we would achieve in the future for new revenue and it was the loss of gifts from an anonymous donor.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “With that, Provost Fuchs, thank you very much for your comments.”

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Speaker Steven Beer: “Approval of the Minutes of the November 12, 2008 Senate Meeting. Minutes were distributed to Senators by e-mail. Any objections or can the minutes stand as distributed? Here and now the minutes are approved as distributed.

I now call on Professor Howie Howland to give a report of the University Faculty Committee.”

5. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Howie Howland: “Brief report concerning the reporting and distribution of Senate minutes. Until a meeting of November 12, last year, it has been the policy of the Senate to post minutes of its meeting on the Senate website, however earlier in the fall, some remarks of the Acting Provost that were recorded in the minutes were accessed by persons outside the campus community and appeared out of context in the public press.”
Thus in order to prevent such incidents in the future, the minutes of the last Faculty Senate meeting were distributed by e-mail to Senate members. The UFC would now like to solicit your opinions on rather this or other policies that would ensure increased privacy should be adopted. We have three possible types of records of the minutes:

1) Tape recording of the meeting, which are going on now 2) Complete transcriptions of such recordings, which we have done up to now 3) Minutes in a summary form, which we have not done but could do.

There are at least three ways of disseminating the minutes:

1) E-mailing the senators and other meetings participants, as we did this last time 2) Posting the minutes on the web with password restriction to Faculty and administrators 3) Posting summary minutes on the web open to the group that had access before November of last year, a much wider group.

The major factors of importance here would appear to be:

i) Keeping an accurate and accessible historical record of deliberations of the Senate ii) Giving timely access to the Faculty and administration of current Senate deliberations; iii) Preventing the limitation of discussion due to fears that one’s words may be taken out of context or that they will reach an unintended audience. So we have a little bit of time for discussion. If you don’t want to express your thoughts now you are welcome to e-mail me or Dean Fry.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Would you like to take questions from the body?”

Professor Howie Howland: “Yes.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: “I think that this is a problem that does not exist, that you are describing something that I can’t see as a problem. I think the last thing that we need is to impose restriction on information that (the) University is a place where we can open discussion we are having now and once the minutes are approved I don’t see any reason for restricting them, it seems to me that we should invite more debate and there is always the risk of one statements being taken out of context, someone else’s point of view, I think this is a very bad idea to restrict access.”

Professor Howie Howland: “Thank you for these comments, I think the feeling of the UFC is that what we did not want was to restrict the communication between the administration and the Faculty and if administration becomes so cautious that they don’t really want to tell us what is going on that would be a bad thing. Now whether or not that is a realistic fear or not, it certainly was back last fall, but that was the feeling of the UFC.”

Professor Richard Helm, Physics: “I would like to agree with the previous speaker, the more people that hear what we say, the better off we are.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: “It seems to me that the logic of what you are saying would then say that well whoever was here should not be able to tell anyone what was said, I just don’t see the logic of basically what you are saying is that information should be confidential based on this very large definition of people who have access so what is the difference of what you are saying and telling us whatever the administration tells us or
Professor Howie Howland: “Speaking for myself, I do see a difference between somebody finding something in print and taking it out and giving it to a newspaper and somebody repeating something they heard in a meeting, but that is my own particular opinion on this. I think some of my colleagues from the UFC share these same feelings.”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: “Can you give us an example or some type of information that we would discuss in this forum that shouldn’t be made public.”

Professor Howie Howland: “I could imagine some but wouldn’t want to say it in a public place.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “As with every decision, leave it open here, there are students here there are staff here. About a month ago, I probably would not have been free to share with you the extent of the financial challenges. If this audience was not just Faculty, it sends a different message to staff when they hear about budget problems we are facing, there would be financial details. As you see I did not make that call, I did not ask that this be limited to Faculty, I think there can be times when you do want the meetings to be confidential to Faculty. Not this one, but there could be.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Thank you, and thank you to Professor Howland.”

6. RESOLUTION OF PAUSING MILSTEIN HALL

Speaker Steven Beer: “I now call on Professor Abby Cohn for introduction of the resolution.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “The resolution before us today grows out of a concern shared by many faculty members regarding the impact of continued debt financing of new construction at Cornell. We applaud President Skorton for his considered action of creating and then extending a construction pause to address this issue and other dimensions of the financial impact of planned new construction. I would like to take the next couple minutes first to speak briefly to the original resolution before you, (which is) endorsed by five members of this body, I would also like to explain why the endorsers of this resolution and Senator Tim Mount propose to put forward the new resolution which was circulated yesterday. I will then ask the Speaker and our Parliamentarian to advise us on whether we can or cannot pursue the adoption or the discussion of the new resolution and if not how we might proceed. I was told one thing yesterday and another about three minutes before the meeting, as our bylaws have been interpreted differently, so I don’t quite know where we stand; but why don’t we cross that bridge when we come to it. First, I would like to say very clearly that this resolution is neither for nor against Milstein Hall. The resolution is about process and making the best decisions that can be made in these extraordinarily difficult financial times. It focuses on Milstein, but the issues apply to all capital projects, current and future. What it calls for is that Milstein Hall, projected to cost an estimated $54M at least, still in the design phase, and with an anticipated funding gap of an estimated $25M or more be included in the construction pause. And that the time thus afforded be used as an opportunity for careful review of the current design to
address both financial concerns as well as issues of the sustainability. With Vice President Golding’s statement in yesterday’s Sun and I quote, “The pause affects all capital projects, except those already under construction at the time of the announcement or for which state funding has been provided. The list of projects affected by the pause include Milstein Hall as well as the Humanities Building, Gates Hall and Olin Library and many more projects.”

Professor Howie Howland: " Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but we don’t even have a motion on the floor, we don’t have it on the screen, and secondly we are getting a speech without a motion on the floor. I really don’t like this. Would the speaker Mr. Speaker, will you kindly move the motion so that we can address it.”

Professor Abby Cohn: “I am happy to do that although I have never been asked to do that before. I would like to move the present motion so that I can address it.”

Mr. Speaker: “Move it. Motion is seconded. Would you kindly address the motion.”?

Professor Abby Cohn: “The pause has been extended. We understand the first part of the resolution--as is stated here-to have been addressed and we welcome this news. The process of review afforded by the pauses addresses or offers the opportunity to address our second clause. We call upon President Skorton, the Capital Funding and the Priorities Committee, and the University Trustees to use the time thus made available to re-evaluate the current plans to ensure that this building addresses the current and future programmatic needs of AAP, while balancing the financial constraints and sustainability objectives of the university as a whole. Which thus leads to conditions under which a project might proceed, again as stated by Vice President Golding in yesterday’s Sun. Once the review of these projects is thoroughly completed, President Skorton will consider a recommendation to proceed on a given capital project provided that the following conditions are met. A capital project must be deemed critical to either the mission of the University or life and safety of the campus community and it must have an approved funding plan with the appropriate resources identified and available”. With regard to the first condition, we do not believe that an assessment of the programmatic needs of AAP falls within our purview and we in no way question the needs of AAP to maintain their accreditation, to bring their facilities in compliance with ADA codes to have appropriate studio space and to meet their programmatic needs more generally. The question we think should be addressed as now afforded by the pause is whether these important goals can be achieved in a way that does not necessitate debt financing from the general operating budget of the University and which addresses Cornell’s current sustainability guidelines, not yet in effect when the building was originally designed. We do dispute the assertion made by some, that Milstein and any other project for which debt financing is required is “fully funded” and therefore exempt from the construction pause. Since Cornell’s financial problems have been exacerbated by the wide-spread practice of debt financing, continued debt financing is of serious concern as our Provost has discussed with us earlier today. It impacts all aspects of university operations and directly contributes to the need for the 5% or more budget cut all units are absorbing for next year and will influence how big the remaining cuts will need to be in subsequent years. We believe that the issue of what constitutes “full funding” and on what basis debt financing
is used to fund new projects warrants a broader discussion than the framing in our original resolution and that is why we have brought forward a new resolution. At this point I will turn the floor over to the Speaker to address what it is that we should be discussing.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “At this point the motion on the screen is before us, Senator Cohn has spoken in favor, and it is now appropriate to have debate and will hear first from a Senator or member of the faculty who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution and then we will go back and forth hearing from speakers pro and con. If you would kindly wait for Emeritus Dean Walcott to deliver the microphone to you, then we will all be able to hear you much better. Is there someone who wishes to speak in opposition to what I should call the Milstein Hall Resolution?”

Dean Kent Kleinman, Dean of the College of Art, Architecture and Planning: “I am new to Cornell, so I don’t know you and you don’t know me. I appreciate this opportunity to address this motion, although this is not the preferred way I wanted to introduce myself to this community but that was not my choice. I also want to preface my comments by saying that I was not sure if this motion would actually be discussed or if the subsequent motion would be discussed. Since it seems to be the case that we are talking about this one, I would like to offer a little perspective.”

Speaker Beer: “Perhaps I can clarify at this point we are discussing the merits of the resolution that is on the screen, it seem highly unlikely that the alternative resolution will be fully discussed at the meeting today.”

Dean Kent Kleinman: “Okay, thank you. My interpretation of comments to the Cornell Sun was that there are three areas of concern that the Faculty body has. I have to say parenthetically that I didn’t see the motion coming because I didn’t understand the degree to which the project was not communicated to the Faculty in the past; I think there is a great degree of lack of communication that I hope will be corrected. I inherited this project, so I want to make clear that it was not a design or program that I invented or knew. I do know that for the last decade the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning has suffered with inadequate facilities and has been anticipating rectifying them with a new building. This building has a long history. It has had many designs, as many of you know. I now know about them as well, and I wanted to simply say that the design that we have and the urgency of building it is very real for us. I fully recognize the conflict that the Provost has laid before you today, so I don’t mention these things lightly at all. I have spent a good deal of time over the last two weeks speaking to the Accreditation Board. We are in extreme danger of losing our accreditation for our Architecture program if we do not satisfy our facilities needs. I know there is some question of what that means: we have committed to the accrediting body that we will rectify our facilities with a new structure. They are expecting to see a new structure as a way to remedy our needs, so anything less than that is a very dangerous course to engage in. I wanted to make sure this is as clearly understood as possible. In terms of the programmatic needs, I think it should be clear that when you have students commuting from Esty Street back and forth to campus, and graduate students paying high fees for their tuition, we have a serious problem. Even in
the absence of NAAB, that problem is extremely urgent and extremely real. I know we are in a fiscal crisis, but the problem is nonetheless very real. Let me talk about sustainability and finances, because I think those are the two issues that are very much the meat of this resolution. The way this building will be financed involves some debt financing—the there is no question about it. It is not that we have $52M, we do not. We are a small college with a fund-raising target of $30M. We are very close, about $2M dollars away from that target, and it is my responsibility to hit $30M and I am confident that we will do that. Where is the rest of the money going to come from? The college is making up only $12M of that through debt financing, but that debt financing is planned. We have an endowment that gives us money and that money is enough to fund the $12M we borrowed. That is not an unplanned, unanticipated burden—it is a planned burden that we are committed to. Whatever the balance ends up being once the final price is known does fall to the University, and I think it would be disingenuous of me to say anything other than that. When and if this project is approved, some amount of debt funding will have to be borne by the University. I appeal to you as a Faculty body not to let the fiscal situation get so much in the way that a significant academic mission is not considered vital. I think that is the commenation that really has to be had. Yes, it will cost the University some money in debt financing to build Milstein Hall. My back-of-the-envelope numbers suggest that the burden to the University, to borrow the balance, will be on the order of 25/1000th of 1% of the University budget. So this is the order of magnitude we are talking about to give the architecture program what it needs to stay alive. That is the computation that we have. Let me talk about sustainability if I may please. There is a lot of conversation about whether the building is LEED certified. I am quite familiar with LEED; I am not sure how familiar you are with it. We will do our best to make this the highest certified building that it really can be under the circumstances in which it exists. LEED is not for every building. LEED measures certain things that we simply don’t control—if you are on a brown field you get points, if you are not on a brown field you do not get points. Thank goodness we are not on a brown field. So please be aware that LEED is not the only measure that pertains to the building. I think, I hope, that it is sufficient to say that as Dean of the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning, there is no way that not being sustainable is something we find acceptable. We and our Faculty are committed to building a sustainable educational facility, and nothing could be higher to us as an educational value. Whether we make silver, I don’t know. We are very close, and we will know in a few weeks. I doubt we will make gold. I think we will be in the silver category, which is pretty good for a building of this program and that site. We are doing the best we can with that. Lastly, I just want to mention and some of you may know, the Architecture Faculty in particular are a very feisty bunch. They generally have different opinions on many things; they never agree on another architect’s design. That is almost unheard of. Yet you have a letter — I believe it is open to the Senate — which 18 of our 23 Architecture Faculty have written on behalf of this project, not because they love the design, not because they love the debt financing that we will have to absorb, but because they love our students. This building is 100% for student programming. I might add that as of today, 13 of the Art Faculty have also written to encourage this body to let the President make his best judgment on whether or not this project should go ahead. With respect to the pause, it is my understanding that this facility is subject to the pause. It is not exempt from the pause,
and if the President and the trustees determine that it is mission critical and fiscally responsible to go ahead, they will make that judgment and we will go ahead. I encourage this body not to preempt that with this motion. Thank you.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Is there a person who wishes to speak in favor of this resolution?”

Professor Carol Rosen, Linguistics: “I think I can rise as a speaker in favor of the motion, since I am one of its five original sponsors. However, what I would like to point out is that the resolution which is in front of you right now, which has provoked such an eloquent defense of Milstein Hall on part of the Dean, is rendered in large part moot by Vice President Golding’s recent public statement to the effect that the construction pause is in fact fully general and that all projects will be examined and considered under uniform criteria and indeed we have heard that the Architecture College will respect such a decision and go from there. Given the very recent and welcome statement by Vice President Golding, a new resolution has been drafted, and my concern is this: what can we do in order to get the better-targeted resolution to come under the consideration of this body? Would we have to suspend the rules so the new resolution could be presented today? The new resolution calls for a sensible general procedure in harmony with the measures that our administration is putting in place to cope with the financial crises plus also responsible measures that would put our institution in the right with respect to environmental considerations. I am not sure whether I am considered to be speaking in opposition or in favor of the motion on the screen. My concern is to see if we can redirect our attention to the new motion which is now more appropriate.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Thank you, you raise the question as to whether or not the alternative resolution can be considered, and there have been many discussions between the Senate Parliamentarian, Peter Stein, myself and the Dean of the Faculty, and I would like for the Parliamentarian, Peter Stein, to address the question of whether or not we can consider the alternative resolution which was distributed to members of the Faculty yesterday afternoon at this time. Professor Stein has investigated the matter, and I have some back up data in hand if you need.”

Senator and Parliamentarian Peter Stein: “I was first consulted on this weighty matter yesterday when Steve (Beer) sent me an e-mail, and we spoke on the telephone, and I answered him quickly by saying, well in my experience, I am not a professional Parliamentarian, but in my experience in a number of organizations that a motion to suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote, and with that two-thirds vote, then you can do whatever you want, irrespective of the rules; I have seen that in more than one organization. Then I was approached this morning again by Steve and when I say that, I said I better read Roberts, and so I did not call him back immediately, I spent maybe 15-20 minutes leafing through Roberts, and I was quite surprised to realize that the common practice is quite contrary to the rules of Roberts. There are two things that are talked about: one is the suspension of the Bylaws and the other is the suspension of the Rules. Rules according to Roberts can be suspended by two-thirds motion, but what are Rules? Rules are not the Bylaws, Rules are a lesser set of conventions that are usually followed by a body and those Rules can be suspended. I cannot give you an example of one but I think one might be such as in many bodies exactly in what order does one thing come on the
agenda in general might be a Rule it is not a Bylaw, but a Bylaw, which Roberts describes as a fundamental way of operating, if the body uses continuously and always uses cannot be suspended by suspension of the Rule; it requires suspension of the Bylaw and a Bylaw can only be suspended if the Bylaw includes a provision for how you suspend the Bylaws and what Bylaws you can suspend. I am sorry for this lengthy thing but it does seem to me that the Senate Procedures has, as long as I have known them, and I have known them for their whole life, has this process by which it decided that in order to get a sensible and deliberate consideration of a motion so that senators can consult with their constituents about what position they should take on it that a motion to be considered at a meeting must be given to the senators a week in advance. Therefore, I come to a conclusion that Roberts Rules says that it is not possible to suspend these rules and that the substitute motion cannot be considered.”

Speaker Steve Beer: Thank you very much. "The gist of it is that our understanding of it is that since the requirement that motions be distributed to the Senators one week in advance is Bylaw, which cannot be overturned by any sort of vote of the body."

Professor Abby Cohn: “Is it the case that we can ask for consideration of the new motion at a Special Meeting next Wednesday, since there is always a Special (Meeting) already scheduled, that would therefore constitute the requirement of a week in advance notice since it was circulated yesterday.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Yes that is correct, the Senate Procedures provide for a follow-up meeting one week following the regularly scheduled meeting, that would be next Wednesday, February 18 at 4:30pm. Since the “policy change resolution” was distributed to senators yesterday afternoon, the group would have met the time requirement for distributing a motion at least one week in advance of the meeting so we could have a meeting one week from now to consider the resolution distributed to senators yesterday afternoon, which calls for a change in policy by the administration. The motion is on the floor and is still subject to debate, and we will hear from someone in opposition.”

Motion by unidentified speaker: "I move to table the resolution.”

Motion by unidentified speaker: “I second the motion.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Motion has been made to table the resolution, and this motion is not debatable; all those in favor say Aye, all opposed to tabling say No. The motion is tabled. At this point we have reached the end of the scheduled agenda, but Provost Fuchs has additional points to make.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “I just wanted to make sure the pause situation is clear. The pause does not mean that projects are not moving forward, you understand the conditions that were clearly outlined Vice President Golding’s Sun article, and let me be very specific of one example, the Trustees meet frequently and when we get to the point where the President asked me my opinion on Olin Library, rather that $50M renovation should move forward, I am going to say yes it should go forward because I think we have evaluated that situation, it is life-saving critical, there will be others like that, I hope are not assuming that every project, that nothing is going to happen until after July, this is an important point for the credibility of the Faculty.”
Professor Tim Mount: “I want to ask a question, are we going to have a Special Meeting next week or do we need to make a motion?”

Speaker Steven Beer: “There are various provisions under which a Special Meeting can be held; one, it can be called by the Dean, another can be called by a number of members of the Senate, and then one other, I think we can move that the Special follow-up Meeting be held next week at 4:30 pm, and that can be discussed and voted on in the time remaining.”

Mount: “I so move.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “The motion has been made that we have a follow-up meeting in one week’s time; perhaps the mover would clarify what the business of a follow-up meeting should be?”

Mount: “To discuss the new resolution that we have before us.”

Motion by unidentified speaker: “Second motion.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “The motion is seconded that we have a follow-up meeting to discuss in one week’s time to discuss the resolution that was distributed yesterday afternoon so we will have debate on that motion.”

Professor from Applied Economics & Management: “If you are going to discuss this, I would really prefer the committee broke out planning and sustainability and to treat them separately.”

Professor from the Hotel School: “Why can’t we do this at the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting?”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Perhaps that is a question that one of the people in favor of this motion can address.”

Professor Abby Cohn: “Since we just had clarification from the Provost that anytime if a building is deemed critical programmatically to the University, and the funding is available that project can move forward, and I appreciate that clarification, but I also felt VP Golding’s statement was also quite clear to that effect. It seems that it would be very timely to us as a body to discuss the issue of how full funding is defined and give any thought to the resolution and or guidance that we might see fit to (offer) the administration as soon as possible.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “It would be appropriate to hear from someone in opposition to have the special follow-up meeting next week.”

Professor Peter Stein: “I must say the Provost telling us what he did in 6 weeks, in the 6 weeks he could close the university. I am a little nervous saying what I am about to, but it would be my guess that nothing is going to move on or off, that no shovels are going to go into the ground in the next month, and if, in fact if that is the case, if the timetable for proceeding on new buildings is to be measured in say half-years, than perhaps we don’t need a special meeting, my concern is that people won’t come to the Special Meeting even if we call it, so that if we could be assured by the Provost that nothing will happen that we are asking not to happen, then I would vote against having the Special Meeting, not because I disagree with the resolution, but because I think the emergency might not be
there.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Peter, I don’t think I can say nothing is going to happen.”

Professor Peter Stein: “Do you think another building might be taken off the pause list or construction might start on some other building?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Number one, I don’t control it so I can’t make a commitment; number two, there are projects with urgency and I think we have to treat all projects uniformly; we (have) got contract colleges, we (have) got hazards, I would feel really uncomfortable saying, I don’t even know when the next meeting is, but I would feel uncomfortable saying, this motion does not say that something is going to happen either. The way I read, it just says we are going to carefully evaluate it.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders: “I am a new senator in the Government Department. I think it is important to have the discussion next week because the ground is thawing and shovels can go into the ground and a point has been raised and I think we desperately need to discuss the critical issue of whether a building is important to the University mission. The Dean has raised this issue again; it is the strongest argument for building a particular building to meet the needs of Architecture, Art and Planning. No one disagrees that we would really like for AAP to get better space and to get more space, and the question is how you meet that and whether if it has to be a building designed by the world’s most expensive architect and ignoring sustainability standards. It has some very bad sustainability features: environmental, physical and even fire code problems, so there are many reasons to be critical of the design. You say that Milstein is absolutely necessary to give accreditation to a program that is ranked first in the country. This is really a question: why would an accreditation team, having said that the problems they see with AAP have to do mainly with disability access and the interiors being sort of rundown? Why not refurbish the existing space and to make it accessible to the disabled? I teach in Sibley, and I saw that this problem has been addressed by the installation of two new elevators in that building. Rand certainly needs an elevator, I just went over there today, and I know they need an elevator to take their stuff up and down. But, that is not a really big expense, why would an accreditation board say, you have to build a new building designed by the most expensive architect in the world in order to keep accreditation?”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Kindly address the question as to rather or not there needs to be meeting next week or not.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders: “I simply don’t have time to get into this, this is really an urgent question because I think it’s the issue that most people will use to make up their minds as to rather to vote for the resolution or not, you really need to really have that worked out.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Are we ready for the question? Question has been called on a motion to have a follow-up meeting next week to discuss the resolution that is on the screen at present.”

All in favor: 26

Opposed: 31
Motion for meeting next week failed; therefore the next scheduled meeting of the faculty senate will be Wednesday, March 11, 2009.

Adjournment 6:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Fry
Dean of the Faculty
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RESOLUTION

WHEREAS Milstein Hall was originally designed as “LEED Compliant”,

WHEREAS Cornell’s recently established sustainability guidelines state that all future buildings should meet at least the “LEED Silver” standards,

WHEREAS we believe that AAP should set the highest possible standards in this regard (“LEED Gold” or higher),

WHEREAS Milstein is projected to be unusually expensive and the cost will impinge on the overall financial situation of the University,

WHEREAS the estimated $54M cost of Milstein is far from fully funded and will require debt financing of an estimated $25M or more putting additional pressure on the general university operating budget,

[NB: Evidently the debt financing will be split between the general university operating budget and AAP, funded by the Thomas bequest, a $20M endowment intended to support the programmatic needs of the architecture program.]

WHEREAS we believe that the financing of Milstein relying in significant part on debt financing should place it under the pause,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

WE call upon President Skorton to include Milstein Hall in the construction pause and,

WE call upon President Skorton, the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee, and the University Trustees to use the time thus made available to reevaluate the current plans to ensure that this building addresses the current and future programmatic needs of AAP, while balancing the financial constraints and sustainability objectives of the university as a whole.

In order to implement a genuine culture of sustainability at Cornell, we call upon President Skorton to support and act on the recent resolution by the UA (passed unanimously January 28, 2009) to establish a university-wide sustainability committee.

Valerie Bunce, Government, senator-at-large
Abby Cohn, Linguistics, senator-at-large
Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, senator-at-large
Satya Mohanty, English, senator
Carol Rosen, Linguistics, senator
Minutes from the March 11, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

1. Call to Order by Speaker Steven Beer: “I sense that the quorum is not yet present but we will conduct some business before that happens. First, I would like to remind everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phones. In addition I ask that the speakers please rise and identify yourself with your name and affiliation or department. At this point we have no good and welfare speakers. At this point I would like to call on the Dean of Faculty William Fry for remarks.”

2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN, BILL FRY: “My comments concern three topics, the first two of which are related. First, I want to discuss the budget situation and provide some personal insight to the deliberations. Second, I’d like to discuss the strategic planning initiative that will begin later this semester. Third, I’d like to make just a brief comment relating to the report from the Committee on Faculty Governance. First, here are some comments on the budget. The President spoke on Monday to the faculty and the Provost spoke last month to the Senate on the fiscal situation facing the university. These numbers are important and I’ll repeat them here just in case someone does not have the full picture. We have a structural deficit (spending more than we have) of $100M. This deficit will be eliminated by a $50M reduction in budget in FY10, and another $50M in FY11. The reduction for FY10 has already been identified. There is also a $35M deficit because of increased undergraduate financial aid. This deficit is being funded by withdrawing $35M (annually) from the endowment. There also an annual shortfall of $80M because of decreased value of the endowment. This deficit will be eliminated in three years by reducing the endowment payout over each of the next three years. Finally, there is a line of credit debt estimated to approach $150M. The first payment of that debt ($75M) is being paid by using “reserves” -- $50M from the Provost and $25M from the colleges. The mechanism to repay the rest of the debt has not yet been specified.

The first set of budget corrections have been across the board, and the Provost has stipulated that the next set of budget corrections will be strategic. He has asked for ideas from a variety of sources including the faculty. Provost Fuchs has met with members of the UFC, the FPC, and the Faculty Trustees several times to discuss an approach. In response, the UFC, the FPC and the Faculty Trustees have made suggestions as to how to structure the strategic planning process. A paper copy of our suggestion is on the front table.

We suggested two levels of task forces. First, there needs to be an overarching task force that receives all suggestions from other task forces. This overarching task force will make recommendations to the Provost. We suggested that this task force be comprised of some faculty, some vice presidents, some vice provosts, and some deans. Second, we suggested that there be a series of specific task forces. Some of these task forces will be college-based, but there should also be some university wide task forces. These various more specific task forces will make recommendations to the overarching task force. The composition of these task forces should reflect the topic. Some topics to be addressed by the more specific university wide task forces should consider academic structure of the university, size of the university, revenue enhancement, cross-college allocation structures (i.e. accessory
instruction etc) and shared/duplicated services.

Finally, I want to report that the UFC has made some slow progress in considering the recommendations from the Committee to Review Faculty Governance (submitted in spring 2007). The UFC and members of the Faculty Governance Committee will meet this semester to evaluate the recommendations on which the UFC has not yet come to some decision.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my report and if there’s time I’d be happy to respond to questions.”

Risa Lieberwitz, ILR and faculty senator at large: “With regard to those that are recommending specific task forces, I was particularly concerned about a comment President Skorton made with regard to something like 50 lecturers that might be cut over three years and he didn’t say just by attrition. There was also the issue of non-renewed contracts so it seems to me that there is a serious issue of potential layoffs of non-tenure-track faculty. I like the recommendation of having these task forces but there is a very particular concern about the non-tenure-track faculty and their vulnerability. I think we really should pay attention to that and also in terms of the composition of the committees that we should include non-tenure-track faculty as well. You may have already thought of that.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “We have to move on with the agenda, so thank you very much Dean Fry. I now call on Professor Rod Dietert for a report from the University Faculty Committee. Before Professor Dietert reports I would like to remind all Senators that you need to sign in, on the attendance sheet in the front. At this point we lack a quorum so if anyone, any Senators are present and haven’t signed in, please do so now.”

3. REMARKS FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE: Professor Rod Dietert, Senator at large and also UFC member: “This is also the formal UFC report. It really just elaborates on several points that Dean Fry made. There are three topics to cover: First, is really old business. As you may recall, at the February Faculty Senate meeting we asked the senators for their discussions and ideas concerning the reporting and distribution of Senate minutes. Based on those discussions, you can see those minutes of that meeting the UFC has decided not to pursue that further at this time. The status quo seems to be very much embraced among senators and we’re very content to put that aside with no plans to bring forward any resolutions unless were asked to do that by you.

Second: the second topic is one that has engaged many of us aggressively recently. That is budgetary planning. The UFC has been involved, as Dean Fry has indicated, there has been a lot of activity in the last four weeks. We started on February 17 with our meeting with the Provost where he again asked us for input into the structure that you now see in terms of the task force. We then met with the Financial Policy Committee on February 23 and that has been followed on Tuesday, March 3, last week, which the financial policy committee, the faculty trustees, the provost, and the president all involved across the meeting. Subsequently, Wednesday, March 3 we met with the trustees, including our faculty trustees as well for that evening meeting, so we really have a lot of activity in terms of meetings that we need, to try to ensure that we could help the provost and president
with structure that provides from the faculty input in a timely fashion with the right expertise for some of the decisions to be made, particularly for FY11.

So this is in the process and I think you see some of these results now that the Provost sent to us on the task force, our committee and faculty of the Financial Planning Committee and the faculty treasury were involved in this issue along with the administration.

The third topic that Dean Fry mentioned is our desire to pursue the recommendations of the Faculty Governance Committee for consideration so we could develop and bring to you, topics for consideration and to that end, we are requesting a joint meeting with the faculty governance committee. I think we've done the easy, obvious tasks. Now we're down to some things that either may be in place or maybe more challenging and we're going to meet with them to gather more information in terms of learning how to proceed with you. That is the extent of my report. I don't know if there's time for questions.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “I think we have time for one question. None? Thank you very much Professor Dietert. Are there any Senators who failed to sign and when they arrived? If so please sign in now. Before we consider the adoption of the approval of the minutes I think we will move to the next item on the agenda, a report from Professor John Hermanson, Chair of the University Faculty Library Board concerning open source publishing.”

4. REPORT FROM THE LIBRARY BOARD CONCERNING OPEN SOURCE PUBLISHING: Professor John Hermanson: “Thank you for inviting us. I represent the Library Board. We have been meeting about a number of issues this year and budgetary issues are facing the library in a big way. Anne Kenney, the university librarian, in regards to open access publications, has approached us. The only way to strongly put this is the current model of faculty publishing is not sustainable. University libraries are facing above inflationary levels of cost increases per year, especially for science journals, subscriptions, and they are trying to find ways to deal with this. And hopefully now the Ivy leagues plus (the Ivy Leagues plus a number of other distinguished universities) are in consultation to try to set aside money and mechanisms whereby we can experiment with the idea of open access publishing in a way that it might have a chance of success. This is not a done deal. I think it's important to say that. Discussion is going on in Anne Kenney’s office in the Provost’s office in terms of whether or not some money can be set aside to do this.

This goes back to the resolution concerning scholarly publishing by this body in 2005, which essentially endorses the idea of faculty participating in publishing and open access rather than restricted access. The library, like all of us, will be facing at least a 5% budget cut this year. I believe they are impacted in some of the materials they are purchasing and so this is something that Anne Kenney is extremely interested in addressing so she approached us with the idea of possibly approving the expenditure this year of $25,000 perhaps to be matched by the provost, perhaps putting together a pool which could be available to the faculty of the University if they were to submit their work to the open access publication. In this sense if you haven't done this before, essentially you are invited
to submit your material and essentially there's an application fee or processing fee that goes along with this. However when you are done with the process and you see a publication resulting the copyright is essentially held by you. You have access to the material. The students have access to the material and it is more freely available through electronic means.

Basically we are looking at right now at about a $50,000 pool. We don’t know if that is enough. From the previous experiences we have been discussing initially, it’s probably more than is necessary because there are a number of open access journals already available to faculty to publish in and they are relatively low in terms of volume submission they have seen.

The library board, on the advice from the 2005 Senate resolution, following on some discussion about members of the board, but also any of the people who had been involved in a task force that studied this and this goes back to 2004. This is something that may be worth experimenting. Questions, of course, come up - how do you judge who gets to publish? So what if there is a run of this money? Do we take the front row for example and say your work is better than people in the back row? How would that $50K be allocated? Will it be sufficient? And so is it too early to say we have a committee that will address this issue, the question is certainly where this is going. This may be very important in terms of the assistant professors coming up for tenure if they're being encouraged to publish in open access -- will that affect their impact factor. Something like that may be relevant to this committee for that reason. Would our funds be sufficient? Will there be more money in the coffers? We don't know. So anyway, at this point, this is presented to you early to begin a discussion, to remind you of the activity that's going on here back in 2004 to 2005. It has really been brought to the forefront.

Right now the library board is going to keep pursuing this. We are in discussions with the librarians to bring in some speakers; to bring in some people who might actually speak with this body in the next month or two and tell you what's on the table. Again this is the Ivy plus and Kenny’s comment was a think we are the only Ivies who doesn’t participate in this and yet given the current climate, economically we need to be very careful about what’s going on. So again monies not spent have been allocated and this is under discussion and this is something that Dean of faculty thought was important to bring to your attention. So, here are a few bullets to think about and if you have questions, we will be happy to answer them.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “We might be able to take one question?”

Professor David Levitsky, Nutrition: “Any idea of the percent of publications currently from faculty using the open access forum?”

Professor John Hermanson: “I can’t give you a number but it’s relatively low. In many of the journals that I know I read that I recall I published in, you can now elect to submit your material and it’s accepted. You can elect to fork over several thousand dollars -- -- it varies from person to person by what we’re seeing is how many people are taking that step. They might take that $2000 and spend it on a graduate student. I think one of the issues that the provost at various universities are looking at, is there a way that we can
make this more appealing to a larger group of universities in the way that will get the attention of the publishing houses so they may be more willing to join this initiative. I think I’ve heard a number that I’ll say here, it’s something like a 19% increase in profits this year.”

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Speaker Steven Beer: “We are now going to consider the minutes of the meeting held on February 11, 2009. All those in favor of approving those minutes signify by saying aye. Opposed? The minutes are approved and now I would like to call on the Associate Dean of the faculty, Brad Anton, for a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee.”

6. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE: Professor Brad Anton: “I don’t have much to report. We had hoped to have our slate of candidates ready for faculty elections for this meeting but I was inexcusably unable to get that work done. I have contacted everyone by telephone so we should have the slate ready to send to everyone by e-mail. I’m hoping within the next few days or by next week. I am going to ask for your help in filling some positions in the University assembly. We have historically had trouble filling the faculty slots of the University assembly and right now we have them nearly filled but we are going to be losing several people at the end of this semester. We will have four vacancies there. The University assembly is the one governing body on campus that brings together students, faculty, and staff to address issues of common interest, most recently they were engaged together rewriting the campus code of conduct. The University assembly intends to rewrite its own charter. There is also a university sustainability committee that they will be participating in and so there are some items of interest here. Also President Skorton has shown new willingness in engaging the University assembly in campus affairs and to respect the opinions of the University assembly, so there is more reason than ever to be involved. Any of you are interested in participating in the University assembly or have colleagues that would be appropriate, please send those recommendations to me.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you very much Associate Dean Anton. I would like to now call on Medha Devare to report on VIVO.”

7. VIVO REPORT: Deputy Provost David Harris: “I am just going to introduce this segment briefly by way of saying that I am really excited that we have moved to the point where we are. We were here about a year ago, some of you may recall talking about this project. It is an effort to bring information about faculty across the entire University, to make it accessible to folks looking for research collaborators, looking for courts of interest to people now looking at projects that could support, to make it easier for media to find experts for stories and other things and we said we would come back and present this group with an update. That is where we are now. I just want to say briefly, that is especially important in the current financial climate to have something that allows us to be more efficient for the use of the University and just one example is student.

Unfortunately we have had to end many services this year. That means students will not have as many professors available in their own department and the system makes it easier
for them to find exciting classes across the University. Medha will tell you a lot more about it. She and John Corson-Rickert from Mann library have taken the leads.”

Professor Medha Devare: “David mentioned a little bit of what we were trying to do. I should go ahead and say that it is a simple point of access right now, to provide perspective of Cornell University. That includes Weill Cornell. Our data on Weill Cornell is a little out of date. We are working with them on where we can get more information in a more timely way, to keep things current so you will be able to search across not just across the Geneva and Ithaca campuses but also Weill Cornell. Currently, VIVO includes all of the faculty and academic appointment books. Basically VIVO includes everybody at Cornell except nonexempt people, undergraduate students and graduate students. We are working on getting nonexempt’s in; there is some question about grads and other students but that is down the road. I just wanted to do a quick walk-through. I don’t know how many of you are familiar with VIVO and I don’t know how many of you have seen it in its previous incarnation, which was more of a life sciences tool. It has now broadened beyond that. Just a real quick introduction to it. This is the homepage. The URL is vivo.cornell.edu or vivo.library.cornell.edu. You can get to it various ways. If you Google VIVO Cornell, you will get there.

At the top level, you will see people, academic units and events, seminars and research. You can browse those on your own; I don’t want to spend too much time right now, as I don’t have that much time. On the right-hand side here you will see upcoming seminars. We try to get seminars across campus in here. We are working right now on that manually but we will soon be working with the University calendar so we will be getting stuff pulled from there.

The research I wanted to quickly show you and then do just a couple of searches. Research areas have research facilities organized by core laboratories, a list of facilities to help you find what you’re looking for. But this is of special interest I think because all along we had heard that there wasn’t any easy way for people to know who is working in a certain area in the world for instance. So we tried to take a stab at then and, while this is not by any means accurate, well it’s mostly accurate. If I click on a continent here and if I look at Africa for instance, a preliminary list of people who have identified themselves somehow, somewhere within their research description or their faculty reporting mechanism as having expertise in Africa or having a project, and that’s how the information gets there. As I said it is by no means complete because it depends on our getting that stuff, on having it on your profiles or knowing it in some fashion or another. That is an interesting thing in what we hope to move to very soon, I want to show this to you really quickly, it’s not available right now, it is a test right now, let me show you what we are hoping in the future to have.

For instance if I wanted to know who was working in Brazil, we would want to implement this side of the map and if I click on this, I get a list of faculty who have identified themselves as working in Brazil. We want to move to a less clunky view overall. We have been approaching that gradually with the profiles of people we have and the homepage really but we haven’t addressed a lot of our other information that we will be using. I just wanted to show you that as a way of showing where you might want to go with this.
So if I go back to the homepage, I will let you go in and browse and if you do find anything that strikes you as odd or something about your profile that doesn't strike you as correct you can send e-mail and we will correct it. I wanted to do a quick search and - is there anything anyone particularly would like me to search for or should I bet that I have a couple of search options I can just look for? Okay, "epidemiology" or "epidemio*" which will get you more. It is a truncated ending but it's a broad search approach. So when I do a search like this in VIVO, it allows me to show you what I have been trying to make. It does allow you to look across the entire campus. The first thing you see is the faculty organizations. If you're looking for people, you see people from across the board here. So there's somebody at Weill, somebody in Geneva. There is somebody in EE and so on and so you see that spectrum of people to deal with this at one glance. So quickly you can find collaborators. You can find people who you might be interested in. I can go in here now and look at a profile and I already talked to Bill Fry in advance so I am picking on him and we will look at his profile.

So that's what VIVO looks like. You might look at this and Bill might look at this and say well where is all this coming from. It is coming from a variety of different sources. The basic idea of VIVO is to be an integrator of data. A typical university, and ours is a typical university, has sources of data all over the place, and all of this information exists as public information but it's very hard to find. You very rarely can actually get it all together in one place and that's what we're trying to do. We are trying to be that integrator. We are trying to get this information into a database all over campus, HR being one of them, so that's how we keep our information current. It is like getting regular updates from HR. We get information from faculty reporting systems. For instance this information on Bill Fry comes from the CALS faculty-reporting forum. A lot of the colleges have recently decided to go with that in the faculty reporting system and we already mapped their data elements to that. We will very quickly be getting that information in here. The idea is that you don't necessarily have to do updates to multiple places. It is going to be done in one place. We will get it by whatever mechanism, various mechanisms, and we'll make it available for people, others who want to use this stuff. That is the basic idea behind it.

If you look at Bill's profile there are affiliations, which will tell you which faculty appointment, is in it and so on so forth. You go further down there's research XXX reported to CALS and that's been brought in here. Their research areas reported to CALS are in here. This spans communities because again people will look at these things and say that's management. Who else is doing this at Cornell? So you can click on that and you will see a list of those who can do that. It is a quick way of creating those mini communities in finding out again record focus, on domestic focus, impact statements, courses he teaches – and again that comes from a database, of course database. Service backgrounds and all this other stuff, publications.

Grants and publications are a little bit behind so if you look at your profile and you see that my latest grants and publications aren't in here that's because we are working on it. We are trying to get recent publications etc. If you are Cornell faculty member, Cornell community member, you should be able to just click the link to get to the article very
quickly it is our hope in the end. The thing that we have implemented to make it easier for people who want to go and self edit, for instance colleges who don’t have a faculty reporting system, we have implemented a self-editing system and what I’m going to do is really quickly, to login as myself and show you how it’s done, to show you how easily this can be done.

I will try to do this with an approximation is on the top right-hand corner. I just type in my net ID and password and this is just for administrators and editors essentially, people won’t be able to do this. I want to go back into my profile now.

You’ll see something that looks like this and all of a sudden you’ll seeing edit statements next to your stuff. So I can go in and say okay I want to edit and I want to add something more or correct something in my thing and it should be very easy to do. You could even use the HTML source if you know how to do that or this is an easier way to do it and I’m just going to say “blah blah”. I then say “save change” and it should show up like this. Then you can go back and take out. So I’m going to make myself ahead of something – I will make myself the Head of the something, all I do is select from a list, and pretty soon these functions are very large but we’re working on some awesome features, I can enter this and easy as that I am on the net. That is really dangerous.

You will notice when you go in here, there are some things that the edits do not show. That is because it is coming from a database of records that we don’t want people to go in there and start putting in whatever they please because HR has a record of what your primary affiliation is that’s where we’re getting it from. Similarly if you go down to research and you look at the primary investigator, there is no edit button there and that’s because that comes from OSP, the office of sponsored programs warehouse. Further down, if you go into teaching, there should be courses taught; if you have courses taught that would not be editable either because that’s also be coming from a database record. So if you go in and wonder why certain things are not editable, that’s why. We are getting them from somewhere else, from a more authoritative source. So to keep current, if we want to keep things accurate. This is why they are working like that.

This is sort of a quick update on VIVO is an integrator. You can now see how it’s an integrator of things. It’s bringing data and from a variety of different places. It is also a disseminator and that’s something working on right now. Let me show you a couple of examples of the disseminator capability.

One the elective programs in life science. This is a relatively new portal and driven entirely by data from Google and it does some really neat things. A task force has worked on this to identify, they’re something like 39 fields in the life sciences department. They sat down and grouped them by six broad areas. You go to apply to biology for instance, you will get a list of graduate fields that are considered to be in applied biology and these are not mutually exclusive. There is entomology for instance, could be here or could be in some other area. When you look at this, you see a list of faculty and then you see their research areas. We try to keep it very brief so that when I look at agricultural biotechnology, you can see this. I can click on this research area in the community shows me which faculty members have identified that as being their research area. So that’s kind
of a neat thing. The other thing people might like is this tab then again leverages VIVO. I click agricultural biotechnology and say which graduate field deals with this. For an incoming student this becomes really powerful is driven entirely off the data from VIVO. We are anticipating that this will be the case more and more. We are being approached more and more by folks, by potential consumers, all over campus who say hey you got it why should I need to rebuild it? To show me what you’ve got and we’re trying to put that in place.

I think some departments have also included, well not newer profiles the content is the CALS research program in many departments within CALS are now including links to their CALS research profiles. So that’s another way this is being interpreted. The idea behind it is to try to integrate data make it available to everyone and hopefully this will be done sufficiently system and cut costs for department and other units. I should mention we have departments and other academic units. We also have centers and institutes and other such things. We’re interested in trying to model Cornell’s webpage is not an easy job for all kinds of little issues but if you look at this and you do have strong feelings one way or another do let us know. We want to hear and want to correct whatever it is that you are having problems with.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “I think we have time for two minutes worth of questions. Are there any questions on VIVO?”

Dean of Faculty Bill Fry: “Where do you get the photographs?”

Professor Medha Devare: “The photographs are sort of a bug-a-boo. We get what we can off the web and sometimes people have old photographs and sometimes there are recent ones and we just click on them. We hope that people write to us and say hey, how about this picture instead. That is one of the functionalities that we have in common.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “One other question.”

Professor Tarelton Gillespie, Communications: “We are in the process of doing faculty activity reports is this another place where this information could be?”

Professor Medha Devare: “You are talking about the academic insight? That is what I mentioned the faculty recording system and actually CALS has adopted this and I think AP, Johnson, Hotel, ILR are going to adopt it very shortly. Engineering is probably going to adopt it. There are a number of colleges that have decided to go with this vendor, it’s an outside vendor, and we’ve made sure we could map to the public information. We are not interested in anything that is at all sensitive. That is not our job. So we’re getting information that’s publicly available. CALS is actually closest for editing for faculty, not anything that we have asked for but that was a decision that was made by the data folks.”

Professor Tarelton Gillespie: “So that means that in the CALS that none of that information will be editable?”

Professor Medha Devare: “No I am afraid not. You know if you really want to edit it, write to me and I’ll get stuff in. We expect to have the active updates increase pretty soon. We have already mapped it is working very well and should be in shortly.”
Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to call George Hoffstaeter for a report from Educational Policy Committee.”

8. REPORT FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR. Professor George Hoffstaeter: “I work in the physics department. I chair the Educational Policy Committee and, as you heard twice already, we are engaged in a slight change of the academic calendar. The reason is that the orientation week will be shortened by one day. That is a done deal and because of that, there are various options of change to consider. We have asked this Senate and various groups from the University for input. For example we sent e-mails or letters to the deans, directors, department chairs, the vice-president and provost and to you. We also sent a letter to the student assembly and we have received some responses but we didn't get enough responses so I encourage you once more to go back to your divisions and departments to discuss the matter and get back to us no later than March 23 because we want to have our next meeting on March 26 and in order to discuss the subject we need to define whether there is a consensus or at least one very strong opinion of how we should change this.

Let me go to the various options. First of all, because orientation is shorter by one day, it seems natural to start teaching one day earlier. That would mean that when we started on Wednesday rather than on a Thursday. That would be good because the fall semester is already shorter than the spring semester. The spring semester is 14 full weeks long. The fall semester is 14 for weeks minus Saturday but then minus Monday and Tuesday and now Wednesday. So we are two and half days shorter in the fall. We have identified the following options.

First add the extra Wednesday and take no additional day off. That would be good of course because the semester would have more length but the problem is that there are various other concerns for example take Labor Day. It is especially good for people who have children who would have a hard time trying to find childcare that day. It would be bad especially for large lab classes who would teach various subgroups of the class of different days. If you take Monday away a group that meets on Monday, we would be eliminating a whole week of classes for them. Another reason why Labor Day is that this creates a very long weekend just after instruction has started and allows for greater amounts of time for nefarious social activities such as drinking. We could eliminate that problem with Monday lab therefore teaching by making Labor Day free but teach the Monday classes on the previous Friday. We thought that that would not only be good for the lab but also an intelligent move for him the students.

Another issue is that some TA education sections are on Friday. One could take the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off. This way students student have more travel time to get home to their families. More students would be tempted to take Monday and Tuesday off and leave during the weekend before Thanksgiving. Another advantage may be that this frees up only half a day because break starts at 1:00pm Wednesday.

We could make fall break longer by one day. That would be really good because it aligns fall break more with the fall break of the school districts and again this is for families with
childcare. There are many other options as I said. You should take this to your units and discuss this and get back to me no later than March 23. I am going to tell you a little bit about the responses received so far. This is an extremely unscientific survey. First all, the numbers are really small. But also the responses that are behind the numbers are very varied and I just increase each number by one when I got any public indication of any option so these numbers don't really count.

The responses received are characterized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional day off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor day off</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor day with Monday classes on Friday</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday before Thanksgiving off</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make fall break one day longer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancel fall break and start after Labor Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger changes of the calendar needed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK day should be considered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start to eliminate evening prelims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No one wants to teach one more day. Some of you want to take Labor Day off but a few thought it wasn’t such a good idea. Some would like Labor Day with Monday off and hold classes on Friday before. Wednesday before Thanksgiving off seemed to be the most favored option or make fall break longer by one day there is a little bit of interest there. They are two people who want more changes. They want to cancel fall break and start after Labor Day. Two more people said that much larger changes need to be considered and one person wanted to start to eliminate evening prelims altogether. One person pointed out that Oxford teaches only teaching 24 weeks but the rest of us are teaching 30. So there are a few wanted to consider much larger changes.

From this you get a slight indication; you can generally see that we don’t have enough input to say what idea would be favored. No constituency has voiced a uniform strong opinion any opinions on the subject of changing one day of the academic calendar are very diverse. So given that background we look forward to hearing from you before the next Senate meeting which is April 8. We will meet just before the April meeting and try to determine from the added input which of these options is strongly favored by faculty. We intend to recommend a resolution.

Speaker Steven Beer: “We have seven minutes for questions and discussion. Lady in the front.”

Professor Judith Reppy: “I didn't realize you wanted numbers, the numbers of how many faculty said each thing? We have not had a faculty meeting so I'm just gathering individual responses. The thing I found interesting would be the arguments. I would like to suggest that they're a couple of arguments that seem very strong and one is the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and almost everybody said that students aren't there anyway so teaching is a farce. I happen to share that because of the phenomena of giving a lecture to two people. The people who were in favor of the Labor Day off are very strong on an issue of a family-friendly policy so it seems to me there are two kinds of arguments
that are arising at least in our department rising up to the top. Do we want to be family-friendly or do we want to look at how the students vote with their feet?”

Professor Georg Hoffstaeter: “I would like to respond to that because at least one person pointed out that the Thanksgiving break is probably more important for the students families so that has something to do with being family-friendly especially in times where psychological problems abound getting the students a break in time to go home for Thanksgiving. It is important to them.”

Professor Walter Lynn former Dean of Faculty: “In earlier days we always wrestled with two things. Number one there are statutory requirements in terms of the number of weeks we are required to have classes which seems to be ignored in this resolution. The fall has always been a problem. Spring is the one that we always manage to meet in our calendar responsibilities but I just wonder whether somebody is checked with New York State to see whether how many weeks we are required to give classes.”

Professor Georg Hoffstaeter: “In response to that, of course we are meeting the requirement also in the fall and we are doing it by counting the study period of instruction so it does not change that situation in any way because they are adding one day.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “The gentleman in the blue shirt.”

Professor David Delchamps: “Walter, I was chair of the Educational Policy Committee previously and we did check into that exact thing and we decided that it was legal. My comment on this resolution having been chair of the Education Policy Committee is that I just wanted to mention a little history here. The Labor Day issue predates the existence of this extra day to play with. For many, many years, the ILR School went on strike every Labor Day -- they didn't have classes that day -- as a kind of a protest. Labor Day is a family issue case. There is no day care in Ithaca on Labor Day. Zero. I hear that from my colleagues who have children. I have to drive somewhere the day before Thanksgiving and that would be an issue for me, but Labor Day is before this extra day of labor. The Educational Policy Committee had been talking with Kent Hubbell and people like that because of Labor Day to try to get a day off orientation. Finally they managed to say okay we could give up the day's orientation. The reason they did it was because we wanted that so we could take Labor Day. Well then all of a sudden all these other options were on the table. Now I won't deny that that these are all valid ideas, but where those new options came from, I'm not really sure. When I was chair of the Education Policy Committee, I just thought that once we got that day off orientation, Labor Day would be taken off and we could figure out how to fix the classes so they worked okay. That is my comment.”

Professor Georg Hoffstaeter: “Additional options were added in the discussions.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Abby Cohn.”

Abby Cohn: “I would like to raise two points. One is I think there are other very compelling reasons in favor of taking Labor Day off. It is a federal legal holiday. It is one of only two federal legal holidays that Cornell respects and does not count as a hidden holiday for its staff. It makes teaching that day very complicated. I have had days where I
was supposed to teach and the elevator in the building was locked and there were disabled students unable to get in and attend their classes. We teach, not because it’s a legal teaching day, but by convention. I find that highly anomolous. I think those arguments need to be weighed in, not just the family-friendly one which I also find very compelling. The other thing is, I am curious to know how the decision is going to be made. If you want a reasonable sample, then I suggest that all faculty be polled and given the opportunity to voice their individual opinion and then count those opinions. If you, as a committee, feel that you will make a policy decision that is purely advisory than that may not be necessary but I think by suggesting, for example, that eight is few and three against is many, we highlights the fact that we do need a more systematic way to affect this.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Gentlemen on the side.”

Ed Lawler, Former Dean of the ILR School: “This issue has come up quite often when I was dean and I would like to point out several issues involving the information, in a larger context and it is symbolic and important to having Labor Day off. I would just like to point out two major points and its symbolic importance. New York State is a state that celebrates Labor Day as a holiday. I think it is time that this institution took the opportunity to celebrate and acknowledge Labor Day in a way that is consistent with value and tradition in a larger context of the operation of the University.”

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: “Computer Science Department has some of the youngest faculty of any department and also the department is struggling to have more women on the faculty. I made two discoveries. One is that we are expecting three new children within the next nine months and the other is that for the faculty members who have young children, they really consider this to be a major problem.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Gentleman in red.”

Nicholas Calderone, Entomology: “I think that the argument for Labor Day is very powerful, historically, politically, etc., as is your argument the day before Thanksgiving. That is also a very strong argument. Maybe you could consider taking both days off. We are getting one day back on Wednesday but if you have another way to get another day back somewhere, half-day somewhere else, then we would have like issues.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Has the committee considered two days off?
Abby Cohn: One and one half days.
Professor Georg Hoffstater: “One more thing I’d like to talk about but we haven’t talked about very much is that yet but I think these two points make larger changes because of our families but for maybe we need more changes.
We consider ourselves making recommendations not making policy changes. We need to do something here more doable.

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you very much for bringing this controversial issue. Now I would like to call on Senator-at-large Abby Cohn for moving the resolution concerning construction and renovation of buildings.”
9. RESOLUTION CONCERNING CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS. Professor Abby Cohn: “I present to you a resolution regarding decision-making and funding of construction endorsed by 13 members of this body. Do I need to move the resolution? Yes. I move the resolution. Seconded. We all are acutely aware, Cornell is facing an immediate 5% permanent budget cut next year and discussion of further cuts to come, depending on the arithmetic, 5 to 12% and this is impacting all aspects of our operations, our faculty, our staffing and/or grad programs and so forth. So we are all facing these immediate consequences. Secondly, I would like to highlight the fact that, that was discussed by President Skorton in his remarks on Monday that actually, while a significant portion of this situation is due to the drop in our endowment -- to the order of 70 or $80 million and it gets worse by the day. I think it was $70 million Monday and its $80 million today, President Skorton also acknowledged that $100 million of the deficit is due to what he refers to as a structural deficit. We are to understand that the structural deficit as being discussed today by Dean Fry relates to over-commitment and over expenditures in a number of areas, critically including the very extensive construction that we have done on the campus in recent years. I would also like to acknowledge that, while we have this issue with funding or construction and have relied heavily on debt financing, we also have some other very compelling and strong goals and objectives, including the decision to increase financial aid at this critical moment and the goals to have new campus-wide initiatives relative to our carbon footprint. I would like to turn now to the resolution itself.

In fitting with the president and the provost commitments to transparency and accountability, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to adopt a new policy for governing the construction and renovation of all buildings, the Full Disclosure Policy, that requires a comprehensive plan for securing the funding of the construction and operation of each building before the construction begins, and that this plan for financing each building should be made available in advance to the campus community.

In addition, consistent with the announced construction pause, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to evaluate the financial status of ongoing construction projects, and if a comprehensive plan for the funding of the project has not yet been established to delay the construction timetable until an acceptable plan for financing is in place.

We believe that these two points complement the steps already taken by the president and central administration in terms of the construction pause now extended until June 30, 2009, as well as the proposed strategic planning initiative to be undertaken by the Provost’s office. We also feel that the step should be taken in the broader context of long-term campus goals, including sustainability, and so we further call upon President Skorton and the university trustees to enforce a strict standards for the energy efficiency in the design of new buildings and renovations of existing buildings to reduce future operating costs, and in addition, to reflect the increased public concern about the energy security and climate change and to facilitate the transition to a carbon-neutral campus.

So let me take a moment to spell out a little more explicitly what we have in mind when
we call for a full disclosure policy and to highlight why we feel that transparency in this particular arena is so critical. Let me share an example. I am concerned by the legal notice that appeared in the Ithaca Journal March 2, 2009, announcing tax-free bonds under the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York for up to $575 million. The notice refers to a host of capital projects, some completed; others underway and yet others still in the planning stage currently subjected to the construction pause. In communications that I had earlier this week with both Vice President Steve Golding and Provost Fuchs both have confirmed that this is completely separate from the $500 million in taxable bonds that was recently approved by the Board of Trustees and was discussed by President Skorton in a memo to us. As I understand from Provost Fuchs that this notice refers to “a September 2007 board approved resolution for projects that were underway or planned at that time.” These projects that are completed or underway are presumably part of the structural deficit referred to by President Skorton on Monday.

But I am both concerned and confused by the inclusion of a number of projects still at the planning stage such as the Milstein building, the Humanities building, Gates Hall, Central campus parking and so forth which as described by Vice President Golding in the Sun on February 10, 2009 are indeed subject to the construction pause. What I would like to know and what I believe as faculty we have the right to know, is what portion of these bonds are anticipated for projects in the planning stages?

I am concerned by the implication that these future projects may be funded through renewed debt financing, as suggested by this notice. It seems odd to me that – at this juncture, when we are making major cuts to our core programs, in terms of faculty and staff positions -- that we would be considering any significant debt financing for future construction on the order of magnitude suggested by this notice. I have written and shared these concerns with Provost Fuchs and Vice President Steve Golding and have not gotten a reply to those questions.

Again as stated by Vice President, Golding in the Sun, there are two criteria for both projects subject to the pause being released. “A capital project must be deemed critical either to the mission of the university or life and safety of the campus community, and it must have an approved funding plan with the appropriate resources identified and available.”

What our resolution calls for is that the basis for these decisions, that is the basis for defining that some future construction meets these two criteria, being made public. Furthermore as I suggested in a recent communication to Dean Fry, we also need direct faculty representation on the strategic planning bodies making these decisions, in particular, the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee as well as any strategic planning committees now being formed and in both cases, these individuals should be named through the Elections & Nominations Committee. We believe that the increased faculty representation and critical decision-making bodies will further the goals of transparency and accountability that both President Skorton and Provost Fuchs have embraced.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you very much Senator Cohn for moving the resolution and speaking to it. We will now debate the resolution. First we will hear from a member of the
faculty who may be opposed to the resolution is on the floor for discussion.”

Professor Bill Arms, Computer Science: “I would like to speak against the motion. I have been on the faculty Senate now for 10 years. The faculty Senate has typically not concerned itself with the university’s budgets and trade-offs and there’s a good reason for this. University budgets are very complex. I have spent 17 years on the budget committees at Dartmouth and Carnegie Mellon which are simpler universities than this and still complex to know that all decisions are very complicated trade-offs between academic programs, capital, short-term, various sources of funding, and so forth. It typically takes a new member of the committee about a year to get up to speed so that they understand the trade-offs and can make sensible contributions to University budgets. Now we are in a financial crisis and it’s absolutely appropriate that the Faculty Senate get involved but we should do it the right way. We should do it in the way that was described by Bill Fry in his introductory remarks. Some members of the faculty should make the time commitment to really get involved in the process and really understand the budgets. It means that some people would have less time for teaching, less time for research, but they will be in a position that they can really contribute in a sensible balanced manner. I think the worst thing we can do is the shotgun approach in which we grab on an issue, get carried away by rhetoric, and try to force opinions based on limited knowledge of the situation. This is after all, what drove California to bankruptcy and I hope that we can support the process described by the Dean of Faculty and keep away from the shotgun solutions.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you. Is there a speaker in favor of the resolution?”

Professor Mark Hatch, Music: “I just want to say that this resolution is in fact helping to clarify certain issues of policy that Professor Arms has said are complex and; if we’re now worried about being driven to the brink of bankruptcy, I think the resolution is trying to say that the difficult situation we’re in may have been caused at least in part, by questionable processes that were put in place and that created imbalances. A more open system would have alleviated this.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Is there another speaker who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution?”

Professor Richard Talman, Physics: “As I read the motion, we are asked to give a vote of no-confidence in the administration. Now, in ordinary times it is really appropriate to have a measure of antagonism controversy between the administration and faculty. But in hard times, it is a time for solidarity. I think I am opposed very much the same reasons as the first speaker. A second motion for example, to get the detail, is why we call it locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. Now the administration is as aware as we are of these things but we are not more qualified and in fact they are more qualified than we are to plan these financial issues.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Is there another person other than Professor Cohn to speak in favor?”

Professor Timothy Mount, Economics and Management: This seems to me a statement that we ought to return to the way things used to be. This is just a question of a two-way interaction with faculty decisions that really affect the academic program and the
university for many years to come. Buildings last a long time and I think that this was much more open and discussed than it has been over the past 10 years, so I disagree that we have any qualms with the current administration but I think that we were concerned that the faculty were cut out of these decisions in previous administrations.”

Speaker Steven Beer: Is there another person who wishes to speak in opposition with the motion is on the floor?”

Professor David Grubb, Materials Science: “I would just like to remark on the previous resolution. This resolution is much more sensible than it was in previous iteration but is still not particularly clear. It says: "There will be a comprehensive plan. If there is not a comprehensive plan, there has to be an acceptable plan.” What does this mean? It is also a mixture of two paragraphs of extreme fiscal responsibility and a third one of fiscal irresponsibility and saying "we must enforce strict standards of energy efficiency with no regard to cost.” I just think it's a mishmash and it is just people venting against the administration.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Is there another person who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution question.”

Professor Abby Cohn: “I just want to respond directly to a couple of points. I myself, and I believe I speak for all of the endorsers of this resolution in no way see this as a vote of no-confidence of the administration. In fact we see it as highly consistent with the commitments that both the President and Provost have made to greater transparency. We are trying to frame how that might happen. We have intentionally rewritten it precisely because we felt that there were things in the earlier resolution that were not realistic. But that is not what is on the floor before us. What is on the floor before us are the three points we have raised here and I would like to suggest that we are talking about life long energy decisions here. What I mean when I say, by full disclosure, is the kind of numbers, for example the Dean of Architecture, Art, and Planning put before us last time when he said that roughly of debt financing, roughly $10 million will be borne by AAP and the remainder, $10 million plus, will be borne by the general operating expense of the University. Those are the kinds of numbers were talking about. We are not talking about second-guessing the administration. We are talking about how we can work together with the administration to move forward in a constructive way, in light of, I believe some poor decisions, and not sufficiently transparent decisions that have been made in the past.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “As a point of reference, the speaker observes that there are, in addition to Senator Cohn, 12 other members of the faculty in support of this resolution as it was presented to the faculty Senate. Is there another member of the faculty who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution of the floor?”

Speaker from AAP: “I just want to comment a little bit about the back-and-forth going on. Some of the aspects, some things were talking about is the aspect of transparency is very important, particularly in light of where we are with our economy and the situations about the funding, etc. we are facing. Some of the things that I have been thinking myself grappling with are information about the funding, the building, etc. I think the Dean has tried to give the college and faculty very, very good information. He has done that on
several occasions, presenting this to the entire college. The college itself is set up with committees. I am just a little puzzled in the sense that I feel like I need more information about the financial aspects and I think it would be good if somehow we could have more of that, actually even before we vote on this resolution, before we do this again. I say that because I think there are still financial aspects and today with what Senator Cohn brings to the floor. That is a new thing for me. Each month, each week things are happening and we’re finding out new and different information continually about the finances. With regard to what the resolution is talking about, again, the overall transparency aspect has been very good. I don’t think we need to be in the business of micromanaging what takes place with these construction situations. I would agree with the gentleman from computer science and these are very complicated financial aspects and that is partly where I stand on this and I’ve been speaking with different individuals who have gotten different information. One aspect, what I felt I knew about Milstein for instance, and what is it exactly we talking about these aspects have been transparent. They have been looked at and they were approved, the debt financing and so on and so on. I was not on any of those committees but I have tried to be a faculty senate, think it’s my responsibility to try to find out, to talk to other faculty to find as much as I could but those aspects. And we know from our last meeting, that there were a lot of issues and when the Dean was here he explained what that was so again I almost feel like if I had some of those other players to talk more about it, I think I would feel better one way or the other by the resolutions, and I’m still not quite sure how I feel.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “The speaker advises the body that the Senate rules require that the Senate adjourn at 6:00pm sharp. It seems that we have another 4 1/2 minutes to discuss this motion on the floor. The question has been called, is there a second? We will now vote on whether the question shall be called. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Nay. The question has been called so we will go directly to a consideration of the resolution, which is on the floor, which has three aspects. You see the first one now and now you see the other two. All those in favor of the resolution as presented, signify by saying aye. Those opposed, nay. The speaker is in doubt, so I will ask those who are in favor to please stand and remain standing until the Dean and Associate dean have counted. Those opposed, please stand. I call now for exemptions, Senators would have refrained from voting. Three.

The resolution passes by a vote of 27 in favor and 23 opposition and three exemptions. The resolution has been adopted by consensus. We have no good and welfare speaker on tap, therefore the Senate adjourns.”

Adjournment 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Anton
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
RESOLUTION CONCERNING CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Whereas Cornell is facing serious financial challenges that have resulted in a 5% cut in the base operating budgets across campus, with further cuts to come, and a freeze on filling all but a handful of new faculty positions, dramatically affecting the core operations of the university,

Whereas Cornell’s financial problems have been exacerbated by the practice adopted by past administrations of initiating the construction of new buildings before sufficient funding has been secured,

Whereas completing construction projects without sufficient funding has required Cornell to undertake a substantial amount of debt financing at a time when the yield from Cornell’s endowment and new gifts from alumni are much lower than in recent years,
Whereas Cornell has made important commitments to other worthy objectives such as increasing financial aid for students and making Cornell a carbon-neutral campus,

Be it resolved that, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to adopt a new policy for governing the construction and renovation of all buildings, the Full Disclosure Policy, that requires a comprehensive plan for securing the funding of the construction and operation of each building before the construction begins, and that this plan for financing each building should be made available in advance to the campus community.

In addition, consistent with the announced construction pause, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to evaluate the financial status of ongoing construction projects, and if a comprehensive plan for the funding of a project has not yet been established, to delay the construction timetable until an acceptable plan for financing is in place.

We also call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to enforce strict standards for energy efficiency in the design of new buildings and renovations of existing buildings to reduce future operating costs, and in addition, to reflect the increased public concern about energy security and climate change and to facilitate the transition to a carbon-neutral campus.

Valerie Bunce, Government, senator-at-large
Eric Cheyfitz, English, senator
Abby Cohn, Linguistics, senator-at-large
Shelley Feldman, Developmental Sociology, senator
Martin Hatch, Music, senator
David Levitsky, Nutritional Sciences, senator
Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, senator-at-large
Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Biomedical Sciences, senator
Marilyn Migiel, Romance Studies, senator
Satya Mohanty, English, senator
Timothy Mount, AEM, senator
Carol Rosen, Linguistics, senator
Elizabeth Sanders, Government, senator

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, March 11, 2009
Speaker Steve Beer: “I would like to call the May 13, 2009 meeting of the University Faculty Senate to order. I would like to remind people present to please turn off your cell phones or silence them. There will be no audio or video recording except by the authorities. I would like to ask all of the people who wish to speak to please rise and identify yourself as to name, department or other administrative affiliations.”

“We have three good and welfare speakers that will be heard towards the end of the meeting. The Associate Dean of the Faculty has just arrived so I will ask him to present his report on behalf of the Committee on Nominations and Elections.”

1. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT – ASSOCIATE DEAN BRAD ANTON.

“The Nominations and Elections Committee filled a few vacant seats recently and I have the list here, several appointments for assembly committees and the Advisory Board Information Based Technology. We have forty-four more vacancies to fill in the next couple of weeks and members of the Nominations and Elections Committee will be calling your colleagues seeking volunteers to fill these committees and I hope you encourage your colleagues to volunteer. I ask to defer voting on the reports; we don’t have a quorum.”

Speaker Beer: “That is correct. We don’t have a quorum, so we will delay approving these reports until we have a quorum.”

Associate Dean Brad Anton: “I am finishing my term as Association Dean of the Faculty. I want to thank those of you who have helped me get the job done and I also want to thank Sandie Sutfin who will be leaving the Dean’s Office, retiring. She has been there for over twenty years and has been a cheerful, always willing, able assistant during my time as Associate Dean and I am very, very thankful for her help and I wish her the very best in retirement.”

Dean of Faculty William Fry: “Sandie was in the Dean’s Office for twenty-five years and at Cornell for at least thirty years. She and Diane LaLonde have been wonderfully helpful and we do appreciate them. I would also like to take a minute to thank Brad Anton for his competence as Associate Dean. Brad has done a great job.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I would like to now call on Senior Vice Provost Bob Buhrman to speak to us on new developments concerning conflicts of interest.”

2. REPORT FROM SENIOR VICE PROVOST BOB BUHRMAN ON NEW DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

Vice Provost Robert Buhrman. “I appreciate the opportunity from Bill to come here today to give you a brief update on things. Unfortunately, what’s occupying my mind since I started this position about a year and a half ago and just to give you an update about what’s going on. We will be back in the fall to update you much more about this. I
first want to mention research compliance. I work in the physical sciences, the applied sciences. Basically, those of you who do work in certain research areas, we have a major burden on research compliance and it is getting bigger every year. We currently have forty sets of regulations that apply to research that we do on this campus that have to be implemented and carried out on our various operations, including sponsored programs. There are new regulations that were proposed in 2008. We have 700 subcontracts go out to other institutions that we now have to track electronically and update physically. Homeland Security now requires that we verify citizenship and we have to implement training oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research this past year.

“Some areas of concern and the greatest impact on researchers, faculty and their associates are effort reporting and certification. We are under law review from the NSF. We are not training the faculty well enough in those areas. In the area of research integrity and assurance, just to give you examples. Export control – in 2005 there were no cases. However in 2008 there were 144. In animal care and use, we have 776 active protocols, that’s a 150% increase from 2005. We have 114 facilities on this campus that we have to make sure are accredited and we’re undergoing a re-accreditation right now. Biosafety, we now have 288 active protocols which is a 50-60% increase since 2005. Human participants, we now have roughly 1500 active protocols at this point and that’s a 200% increase since 2005. This is a major burden on the faculty. Now I’ll talk about financial conflicts of interest which is the main subject.

We have to identify, manage and disclose appropriately any financial conflict of interest that is related to research, particularly sponsored research for federal agencies. We will talk about real conflicts and situations where someone who is not part of our institution would look at it and say there is likely a conflict. In many cases this can be quite innocent but someone else might not see it that way. We don’t have to remove conflicts, we have to identify, report, and manage it. That is a very important point. That is what we have to do and we’re not yet doing it well enough, according to the outside world. There is a lot of attention on this recently. Senator Grassley has made very public inquiries to NIH and NY Times and elsewhere and Cornell researchers predominantly researchers at the Medical School have been pointed out. There have been more flagrant issues at Emory and Harvard, fortunately for Cornell. All of the higher institutions of learning and research are involved. Last year there was a report from the Association of American Medical Colleges and Association and the Association on Universities (AAMC/AAU) on financial conflicts of interest and how we weren’t doing well in these areas, particular focus is on clinical research which we don’t do much of on this campus, but we associated with the medical school and the reports on this campus which involved drug discovery which is pre-clinical, which is drug discovery, which is pulled into clinical studies and that’s going to engage us in this concern.

Many of our counterpart universities are updating under pressure their financial conflict of interest policies. The most recent one is at Columbia and a colleague of mine down there just shared that with us. They just announced this on April 3rd is an update and still responding what the NIH is now requiring and we are not there yet. If you’re interested in that, the link to the Columbia policy is
http://evpr.columbia.edu/files_sponsoredprojectprocedures/imce_shared/COI Policy_4_3_09_new.pdf and you can google it quickly.

Finally NIH has done mail reviews of current conflict of interest policies at universities including Cornell. We responded and they responded to us and they found our current policy wanting. They have made pretty strong demands that we update it to be compliant with their current regulations. We said we would try to do that by the end of the calendar year. As of last week, NIH put on the federal register a request for comment on enhanced regulations of conflict of interest identification and management which we expect will resolve after the comment period and discussion ends. We currently get, on this campus, about $65M/year from NIH. NSF has similar regulations that are focusing on other issues but if NIH says we have to do it, NSF who gives us over $100M a year, we are going to have to do it for all federal agencies.

Currently we have a policy that we’ll adopt that was written by Provost Barker in 1986. It was amended shortly thereafter. In 1992 we established a faculty committee to go with it, the University Conflicts Committee which we are currently working with. In 2000 the current annual electronic disclosure process was established. Hopefully, you have read that document here. I won’t ask you to read it right now, we can incorporate them into the minutes. Currently we are in the process of annual disclosure. We have already done it or soon will be doing it. This has to do with reporting confidentially, internally to Cornell what external relationships you had, if you had any, or external business you have which relates to research and other conflicts.

Reporting is an employment requirement at Cornell and most people do this every year. There is Part I and Part II. Part II was completed by 600 people last year. Part I was completed by 3,000 to give you the scope. Of that, Part II is the one where you have potential conflict that has to be examined and looked at and of that we identify the ones that need to be matched. I cannot report to you that we are confident we are identifying all those that need to be identified and all those that need to be managed. We don’t have any major problems, but we don’t have the ability to report to the NSF and the NIH that we are in great shape. We are not in full compliance.

What we are currently doing internally is reviewing and getting ready to update our policies and procedures on research related conflicts of interest. That is being done through my office and working with the University Conflicts Committee with Bill Fry, the Counsel Office, the legal team, the Audits Office which comes in and assesses and has written several reports over the last years and essentially saying we are not fully up to where we need to be. President Skorton felt when he came here, he has a significant background in this issue from his experience at Iowa, he felt we had to look at this issue both at the faculty level and administration level and trustee level and he asked last summer that we put together a task force of administrators and trustees that can look at the issue on both campuses. This is a task force that is chaired by myself and my counterpart is the Dean of the Faculty down at the Medical School and what we’re doing is looking at what other institutions are doing, what the ranks require and what is Cornell to do to ensure that our research integrity is respected. No one questions our work. When we publish data it’s not because we can make a little money on the side, but because the
data is true. It is a very good objective. That task force, we’re nearly at the draft report stage, but that’s not the detail stage. The detail stage is likely updated research conflict will be done internally and it will be done by the Conflicts Committee. We will consult with this group and other faculty groups for discussion in the fall and we’ll take it from there with your input.

The hope, the result in the fall we will have a research related conflicts of interest policy procedures that will be in compliance with current regulations and any expected changes will come over the next year or two from the federal government. The title will be something like Policy and Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research. It will be a supplement to the existing policy that we will continue that applies to Cornell’s expectations about us as employees in respect to commitment and conflicts and things of that nature.

What is the impact on you? If you have no research related financial conflicts of interest, there will be no impact. There will be a different form next year but it will be simply somewhat differently phrased questions where we get the same answer. If however you have an interest that is related to your research, hopefully in a more helpful way to report that interest, confidentially to the university and give the details to the extent that a trained group of people can look at that and decide whether or not there is a conflict that needs to be managed and reported to the federal funding agencies if it is related to a federally funded contract, contract or award. That is a requirement which we’re not fulfilling at this point. We have to do that every time we submit a proposal. This is why people in medical school, if you do a clinical study you have to ensure you are not trying to prove that a drug works that you have intellectual property ownership of or that you are getting paid to be a consultant in the company that’s doing it without disclosing that information. Those facts are allowed as everyone knows those facts are out there rather than you not say anything.

There is a great poster child story about a researcher at Emory this year who took speaking fees from a drug company and accepted $800,000/year and he spoke about how great the drug was but he never disclosed in his speeches or his publications that he was getting this $800K. A neutral observer may assume that there might be a conflict there. It was assumed by NIH and Emory was put on the death watch, that is if you didn’t update your conflict of interest procedures within a few months they would be spotted in proposals in NIH. That got the attention and I don’t want to do that here and I don’t want us to have people questioning our research at all and I assume the faculty don’t either.

I go back to the beginning we are going toward administrative burden on the research. That is the nature of the world we are in and we have to deal with it and we’re going to try to minimize it. We are going to try to clarify it and so we are going to try to move forward to meet the needs.”

Speaker Beer: “Questions? [none] I am sure the Vice Provost will take questions by email.”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “I take them by email and I’ll be back.”

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call on Professor David Gries, member of the
Education Policy Committee for a resolution on behalf of the EPC to remove public availability of median course grades.

3. RESOLUTION FROM THE EPC TO REMOVE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MEAN COURSE GRADES - PROFESSOR DAVID GRIES.

Professor David Gries, Computer Science, Engineering: "The Senate voted in 1996 to put both median grades on the transcript and to make them perhaps available on the internet and that was done. Professor Lemley came here in 2006 and proposed that the public availability of the grades be removed and the Senate turned it down. Since then, we’ve received more information. There is an article by Talia Bar, Vrinda Kadiyali and Asaf Zussman on a study done on Cornell’s median grades. There had been a few other studies on median grades and so on and on of what they do. You can see them on the slides. I won’t read them to you. They were very small studies. They show that students tend to choose courses from instructors who grade leniently and so on."

“This wasn’t a big study. Cornell study actually looked at all A&S students taking A&S courses from 1990-2004 and they had the advantage of being able to study the effects, the change leading to the publication of the median grade in 1996. They also used the task force of some students who were attracted to leniently graded courses. Here you can see a graph that shows that during pre-enrollment and add/drop periods, students looked much more heavily at the median grade website, these are all of those periods where add/drop or pre-enrollment and that shows that incidence of students, during that period, of what the median grades of courses are. The findings that people came up with that, and you can read a long, very well done paper with graphs and statistics in it, that students who take median grades into consideration, tend to be drawn to the leniently graded courses and more importantly, the most talented students are less drawn the leniently graded courses.

Here you see the median grades starting back in 1990 here at Cornell and it’s fairly even, even going down a bit until median grades were published and that’s about the time the median grades were first published. They also tried to determine just what drives this? Is the quality of the students? The teachers? It showed that one third of grade increase could be due to increase in quality of students. They figured that out based upon a task force. The major influence was the publication of the median grades."

Question from Unidentified Speaker: "What you have just said is contradicted by this data. The biggest jump is before the median grade. I don’t want to take your time but I’m just telling you that this is basically adrift across the screen."

Professor Gries: “Well, I would say that this is going up and down, not straight across. This, to me, is a big jump. If you read their paper carefully, statistically they say that the grade increase is due to the median grade being published. You will have to read the paper carefully for that; that’s their finding of these grades. There are two things for me. One, there were students with lower grades who tend to take these higher graded courses, not the talented students, so they are choosing not based upon the kind of knowledge they want to get but on what kind of grade they might be able to get in the course. Secondly, they do say that this has contributed to grade inflation and the more grade
inflation we get, the more grades are compressed, the less meaning these grades have. It is very difficult for any employer if three-quarters of the students get A’s and what the translation means.”

Speaker Beer: “We have to move to the resolution.”

Professor Gries: “This is the resolution. I won’t read it unless you want me to read it. The EPC based upon the study felt that it would be best for Cornell not to publish the grades. I should also say only one other university that I know of that does publish median grades and that’s Dartmouth and they started about 1997.”

Speaker Beer: “The resolution by the Education Policy Committee is before the body for discussion. Any discussion?”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computing Engineering: “A little bit of history here that I think is relevant. In 1996 when the Senate voted to put the median grades on the web for everyone to see, part of that was an effort to shame the faculty into cutting down on grade leniency. They were worried students would see data exactly as they have and therefore they said well, we’ll put the grades on the transcripts as well and that would be a check against such student misbehavior. As it happens, it was easy to put them on the web, harder to put them on the transcripts until PeopleSoft came along. Therefore, they have not appeared on the transcripts for anybody until the class had entered last fall. The bottom line is that to check against this kind of student misbehavior has never been in effect and it’s obvious that these data that are following that. Now, Ann Lemley, when she came before this body three years ago, I was on the committee who drew that motion, when she was chair, the motion actually said “we would like to take the median grades off the web until we can put them on the transcripts because one without the other is not going to work.” I have not decided how I will vote on this motion. I am ambivalent about; I’m eager to hear what everyone else has to say, but in my opinion we should have it either both places or neither place.”

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: “ I am unimpressed with the analysis. I could think of a lot of ways of doing the analysis that was shown by those graphs. One could try three squares fit to two linear functions that have different slopes at the time when the median grades were started. One could compare that rise in median slope, median grades to other institutions that didn’t publish them and to see if there was any systematic effect but as the gentleman who spoke before I don’t know whether my impression is to what that graph says would be borne out by analysis, but we could certainly make the analysis.

The other is a little more industry that David Delchamps is right about the time when that was put into effect and I remember it vividly at that time, but no one at that time assumed it would take more than a year or two to get these things on the transcripts. The natural assumption was well, let’s get people used to it a little. Lets start publishing them and in a couple of years they’ll be on the transcripts. We thought it was not beyond the power of emerging computer technology to put another line on the transcript but it turns out it took fifteen years. I am always surprised by that. The argument for putting it on was neither to restrain nor to encourage grade inflation. It was much like what Bob Buhrman
talked about before, namely he talks in full disclosure. It was full disclosure. It was truth in grading was the name that was given to the motion. The idea was, you tell employers what the median grade is and you tell the students what the median grade is and with that good information, both them can make their decision. If you take the information out, students will still make the same decisions and they’ll make it on the basis of what they hear from other students. If they’re going to make decisions on whether courses are graded easily or not, it seemed fair to let them make their decisions on the basis of data that was good. My feeling is that, now that it is coming on, this is the wrong time to take it off. That everyone will now know what the median grades are and can make their decisions intelligently.

Professor Gries: “Let me respond to the first part. I just took two graphs out of that article to show you some of it. I could have presented many of the tables. These people are very sophisticated, educated, far better than I, and have done a very good job.”

Speaker Beer: “We will consider that a point of information and will take comments from members of the faculty who wish to speak in favor of the resolution.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “I am still trying to understand what the logic of it is. Is it to shame the faculty to give more information to potential employers? I am not sure what the logic was and therefore I’m not sure on what basis I should decide whether it was or wasn’t useful in the first place or whether it has or has not been working.

Speaker Beer: “Let’s have a debate and hear from someone who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution. Gentleman in the red tie.

Speaker Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE: “I first want to say a few things about this paper. I believe this paper was done credibly. It’s been published in the Journal of Economic Perspectives which is a peer reviewed journal of the American Economics Association. But I don’t believe it has anything to do with the current situation. What the paper shows is that it would be really foolish to put grades in front of students as we have done without also putting them in the hands of employers. By doing so rational students would realize that getting high grades in a course that gives high grades is not going to be very valuable when that information is given to their future employers. Failing to do so will encourage that same rational student to use the information we provide to find the easier graded classes and take them. Hence we should never have provided this information to students without also providing it to their future employers by putting this information on their transcripts. But since we are finally going to do this, the paper is irrelevant to what will now be the way to do things, and we should not worry about its conclusions. Finally we will provide this information to the other side of the job market by putting those median grades on each student’s transcript. So at last students will have to bear the cost of taking watered down classes. Hence, I oppose the motion.”

Unidentified Speaker: “I don’t think that’s quite accurate as I understand it, the median grades are only going out to freshmen this year, so we have three more years where the grades will be on the web unless we take them off and the median grades will not be posted against the course they are taking. Virtually, uniformly everyone wanted them off.
I think it’s a scandal. I think the initial intent was of course to put both together and hopefully when faculty looked at these grades they would be ashamed to have given 300 people in a course all A’s. That didn’t happen. That was wrong. I really think, for the next three years, we should certainly take them off so we don’t have this situation where the median grades are standing there and then three years later we can consider it again. I am certainly not going to vote for this motion and for taking those grades off the web.”

Speaker Beer: “Can we hear someone who wishes to speak in opposition?”

Professor Richard Talman, Physics, A&S: “I don’t believe that trend for one moment. But let’s say it is, in fact, the trend is as you describe caused by the availability of these median grades. How is a person to interpret the grades right today? Whatever the cause of this trend is they don’t know what the median is? The point as Peter Stein describes was truth in grading and grades become meaningless if people don’t have access to the scale on which the grading is performed.”

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Vet School/Biomedical Sciences: “I just have a question about information which seems obvious that’s not in here. It is just that if this passes, the grades will still be listed on the students’ transcripts and that did not specifically say that?”

Professor Gries: “We are not questioning that at all.”

Speaker Beer: “Any further comments?”

Professor John Weiss, History, A&S: “I guess my comment is really a form of a question since I teach both a number of seminar courses and small courses which in fact students do well and they get high grades and I teach larger courses, up to 200 students where there is a wide range and I wonder if in fact by publishing these median grades would put the burden on employers to figure out whether this is a small course in which students receive a lot of intensive teaching, a lot of attention and therefore everyone is expected to do pretty well. The employer has to look at this and figure out what’s going, whether this is a course of that type or whether it’s another course and there is of course that middle range where an employer would be able to figure out what’s going on and what that median grade really means.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the back.”

Professor Fred Gouldin, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Engr.: “I would like to speak in opposition to the motion as it stands now. As I understand the motion has since been removed the student access to strengthen the courses they are taking and yet the median grades will be on the transcripts. I wouldn’t think that’s fair because the Ag students wouldn’t know how to interpret their grades until they see their final transcripts. So if you leave it on the transcripts, we ought to put the results on the web. Professor Ellis Loew, Biomedical Sciences: Does that mean that a student looking at his/her grades on the web would be just as fair as someone who would not see median grades on the web? So in other words this resolution does not remove anything from the printed transcript only from the web?”

Speaker Beer: “Faculty member in the back.”
Professor Philip Nicholson, Astronomy, A&S: “I wonder if we can consider a friendly amendment that adds a brief clause at the end saying that until the median grades are available for graduating seniors transcripts which would effectively delay it for three years.”

Speaker Beer: “That would be an official amendment. The speaker is unclear if a friendly amendment can be offered to a motion that is made by the committee.”

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: “I am sure the rules forbid substantive amendments. There are substantive amendments and the question is whether you consider this a substantive or just a minor change in wording. If it’s substantive, then it’s forbidden. If it’s just a minor change in wording to clarify then it’s allowed.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other persons who wish to speak?”

Professor Gouldin: “I would like to add to my comment. The implication that putting median grades on transcripts is in my mind that As are not As anymore. There is no absolute grade and what we’re going to tell employers, and admissions departments, and graduate schools are meant by A’s in one course vs. A’s in another by giving the median grades. If we’re going to do that, then we should do it in a timely way.”

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson School: “I think one way to do this is to cease publishing the median grades on courses that have already been taken. That means that students need to make a judgment on the basis of getting a meaty course. The other is an interpretation of what they actually did at a given time.”

Speaker Beer: “Are we ready for a vote?”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications, CALS: “If people are concerned that they might have information as long as I can see my course, my grade, my median, it’s not the same as here are all medians for past courses which might have occurred in past decision making. I don’t know what people have access to, or is it just like the actual official applicant that has the grade or will have the grade. There are actually two online spaces where it could be, the collective and the individual render.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you qualify that question?”

Professor Gries: “I don’t know whether I can. Right now it’s on the web and it’s on the transcripts and you’re suggesting putting it in a third place?”

Speaker Beer: “We have to move to consider the resolution of the publication of median grades on the website will continue or will cease. Are we ready for the question?”

Unidentified faculty member: “I don’t have anywhere near enough information to decide whether I can decide. I am not if sure some of these statements are too controversial to correct. Is this contributing to grade inflation at Cornell? I am not sure I understand how the grades appear on the website. I don’t know how this question was resolved; the difference between a seminar which everyone would get an A and a large class with resources. It seems to me it would be irresponsible for me to vote on this now and I would like to do whatever one needs to do have this tabled. Make a motion that it’s tabled and we request the Dean or the Committee to bring much more information to the
faculty to make a decision which clearly impacts the lives not only the students but the faculty who have to make decisions about how to they are going to grade. I would just like to add that shame is not a good way to teach me how to grade.”

Speaker Beer: “The speaker feels that there is some confusion and further study of this matter may be in order. So we could entertain a motion to refer this matter back to the committee.”

Unidentified Senator: “I so make the motion.”

Unidentified Senator: “I second it.”

Speaker Beer: “I refer the matter to the Educational Policy Committee to lead the discussion of that vote.”

Professor Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE: “We don’t discuss a table motion. It can’t be voted on.”

Professor Emeritus Stein: “Point of order. There are two motions here. A Table motion has not been made. The motion on the floor cannot be debated and must be past by a 2/3 margin.”

Speaker Beer: “We will now vote whether the motion to publish mean grades is to be tabled. It requires a 2/3 vote. All those in favor of tabling the median grades motion, say “aye”.”

“Aye.”

Speaker Beer: “All those opposed?”

“Nay.”

Speaker Beer: “The motion has been tabled. We will now go back to a procedural question. The Report from the Nominations and Elections Committee; a quorum is now present so it would be in order to consider accepting this report. All in favor of accepting the report, signify by saying “aye”.”

“Aye”.

Speaker Beer: “Opposed, Nay? [no response]. The report has been accepted and now we will consider the matter of the minutes of the April meeting of the University Senate. Are there any objections to accepting the minutes of the April meeting as distributed this morning? The minutes of the April Meeting are accepted as presented. We move on to Professor Tim Fahey who will report on the President Climate Committee.”

4. REPORT FROM PRESIDENT’S CLIMATE COMMITMENT COMMITTEE – PROFESSOR TIM FAHEY.

Liberty Hyde Bailey Professor, Tim Fahey: “Bill Fry asked me to update you on the President’s Climate Commitment. I am sure some of you have already heard something about this. If you’ll permit me, there’s a little history I’d like to begin with. About ten years ago, there was a group of students who sat at Day Hall and demanded the president sign a pledge to abide by the Kyoto Protocol which was to reduce carbon emissions,
greenhouse gas emissions back at 1990 levels. There was a tent city in front of Day Hall for about three weeks before the president signed the pledge. I think the people in the facilities department said yes we can do this. There was some doubt about whether this was reasonable with Cornell campus growing at the rate it is growing could we really ever achieve the Kyoto Protocol. We were supposed to be a leader and so we said we would. It is amazing how these things changed in the last ten years. Two years ago, a group called the American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Committee, ACUPCC, came to us and said why don’t you propose going climate neutral? So they were asking for a pledge of neutrality at universities. We wrote a white paper on it and within about two weeks, the president signed it, so we are going climate neutral."

“That is a pretty radical thing to say. This is what it says. We have to go climate neutral in our time. At this point there are 700+ signees to this commitment. We were one of the first. In fact, President Skorton is one of the founding members of the ACUPCC, so we’re out front on this whole thing. What we have been doing for the last year and half or so is developing a plan by which we can actually come into compliance. This is a sequence of activities that will be in the development of the climate action plan.

The first thing that we did is create an emissions inventory so we knew where the greenhouse gases were coming from as well as a base case against which to compare our future progress. The best case then, we’re going to have a third more square footage on this campus in forty-fifty years, so we would, business as usual, have a lot more greenhouse gases.

This is where our greenhouse gas emissions come from. This is the result of the inventory. About 55% of our emissions is heating the buildings at the central heating plant and burning mostly coal and maybe a little electricity. We purchase a lot of electricity from the grid which makes up a little over a quarter of the greenhouse gas emissions to compare to grid emissions. About 17% is from travel. These are the categories that we have to account for and it comes to about 319,000 metric tons of CO2.

How can we go about this with zero returns emission per year? We are going on the assumption that it’s not impossible. This inventory for the climate commitment are now right in the plans. We got matching funds from NYS energy reserve to hire consultants to help us development this report and there is a dozen or more staff members who are putting in a lot of time figuring out how we’re going to meet this commitment.

The second step in the process was to gather all this from everyone on campus: staff, faculty, students. We received 706 ideas for reducing carbons emissions on campus and we have what I call four “wedges” in the climate change. Energy conservation would be reducing in buildings that already exist -- reducing their carbon footprints. We will be making new buildings smarter. Third, we’re going to be changing our fuel mix probably from coal to other renewables and other low emissions sources. And then there’s transportation. Most of our ideas fall in those four categories.

We are going to take those ideas and figure out how to whittle them down to ones that are reasonable. This is a big deal. There is a lot of reference going into this and I think that the Climate Action Plan is sort of putting campus sustainability in prime time. The
climate action plan is going to make us do triple bottom line accounting. It is going to convince everybody on campus that we have to take into account not just the economic bottom line but also the social bottom line, the environmental bottom line, etc. when we are making decisions about the future of the campus.

The consultants have developed a decision tool that’s going to form decisions in a different way, a fundamentally different way. Just to illustrate, on the life-cycle cost analysis of the changing of the heating plant and that cost will include the cost of the value of carbon dioxide. Today we don’t get any carbon dioxide tax but ten years from now carbon emissions won’t be free. There will be compliance. There will be rules. If we make a decision to put into place a change facility then I think we can figure out how much it’s going to save us in carbon emissions cost. The consultants took the 25 or so studies of future trajectory cost of value carbons and put them into this curve. In 2030 the anticipation is that it will be about $60 per C02 and that’s going to make a difference to decisions, so if you make a decision now you ought to be thinking about how much carbon is going to be worth in the future and that will be part of the economic equation, the economic bottom line.

We have all these options and we have to come up with a portfolio and sequence of activities. There will be short term activities; there will be activities that may be carried over fifteen years in an intermediate term and then some things that will happen when new technology comes available, hopefully from activities and research at Cornell. There will be a demand side and a supply side and there will be technological options and there will be changes in behavior on campus.

The portfolio that we finally come up with is being developed with the attitude that we should take into account certain principals. The bottom line is, trustees are going to be interested to know the options will save us money and might save us costs. If the trustees sign on to these recommendations, they are going to be taking the stand that Cornell could be a leader in this and we can advertise ourselves as helping to lead the nation in sustainability. Finally, these have to do more so with opportunities more so than with cost. Campus sustainability creates a lot of education and research and outreach opportunities on campus. It says right in the President’s Climate Commitment, that we will make neutrality and sustainability a big part of our educational experience. Whether we do that with campus life activities or education programs, promoting more course work, we’ll probably be changing. Availability of research opportunities; this is an example. In the development of the climate action plan we arrange for grants co-funded between the centers for sustainable futures and facilities department to support people doing research that attribute to the plan. It is a group from the Development, Sociology, Natural Resources, who are doing the survey of what we’re moving towards, the major possible alternates we have to changing transportation, wind power, biofuels, etc. and we’ll get primary data to know how the community will react and publish those stages.

I don’t want to dwell on this, but this is the draft portfolio and it has those same four “wedges”: fuel mix, renewables, transportation, green development, and energy conservation. There are two sides to the diagram. The supply side which we aren’t going to use often or to any significant extent but it does create research opportunities and it
does create changes in the way that facilities does their business. For example, it’s more than likely we won’t be burning coal in the near future and in the meantime all you’ve heard about is biofuels, upgrading the hydroplant, etc. Some of these are technologies that Cornell faculty are involved in doing research to develop these technologies. They are testing them in the engineering college. On the left side are things that are probably more likely to affect our day to day lives as faculty, students and staff.

Two final comments: If the final action plan is approved by the trustees, they will not be approving specific activities, it will be approving in principle that this sort of activity in general is a good idea. When a specific activity is considered, it will be considered as an individual item and all the information that pertains to that particular option will be considered in detail in a normal decision making analysis.

The second point that I wanted to make clear or promote is that the problem of top down vs. bottom up responses to climate change and sustainability in a more general sense. I have sought from day one that the climate action plan, the PCC, provides the real opportunity to really promote widespread change in people’s day to day attitudes toward sustainability not just in climate but in all aspects of sustainability. I ask folks to bring it back to your department and tell your department that this is going on. If they can get involved, if they have something in their courses that they can contribute toward better understanding of sustainability problems or climate change problems or the day to day activities of the building – these are the kinds of problems, sustainability problems, that can’t be solved by top down – it’s from top down and bottom up. Sustainability is all of our problems and we have to get involved to solve it.

Laney Joyce from the facilities department has been very much involved and the last thing I would say is that you folks would not believe the quality, talented, hard work that the facilities department at this university does. It is extraordinary.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics, A&S: “These are wonderful initiatives. One of my concerns is how do we make sure that, in the different spheres we’re operating we really hold ourselves to these goals and in particular I’m concerned with respect to green development. There are projects that are currently on the planning table that are now under the construction pause where it has been said that these buildings are grandfathered in, relative to our current and future initiatives. I find this deeply concerning. This is the rhetoric we heard around the Milstein project, which is still under the pause and then also around the discussion about other buildings. This body had a discussion about these matters and passed a resolution relative to the review in decision making of current and future funding projects and also the concern about being sure that all construction projects did meet the sustainability guidelines. I am just wondering how we start doing that right away and not say, “well, we already planned this before so we will do it in the future”.

Professor Tim Fahey: This plan is due for the trustees approval in September and part of the plan will be how will we do it? What is the structure that’s going to be created to implement this? One of the reasons they gave us a bunch of money to do this is then we can create tools that other universities and institutions can use to develop their own
climate action plan. These are written documents – not a pile of paper on a shelf, it is going to be a website with a suite of tools that allow you to make decisions on a daily basis. Hopefully that will make a difference."

Professor Gregory Poe, Applied Economics, CALS: “I’m worried that you don’t have a timeline set.”

Professor Fahey: “We do. There will be timelines in September. The trustees have to approve it and we are not going to go public with it until September 15th. There will be a timeline and it will be in the 2050 range.”

Professor Poe: “2050, and if we haven’t met that, are we going to buy offsets?”

Professor Fahey: “We will probably do some offsetting along the way to local offsets and local community offsets.”

Professor Michael Louge, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering: “This is a wonderful initiative, a wonderful thing to do. Unfortunately I am a little bit of a skeptic when it comes to this kind of issue and that has to do with what my colleagues in Economics have said. If we don’t have any incentives to do this, chances are it will not happen. We don’t have a history of putting in the appropriate maintenance costs of rebuilding and this, in some sense, has to do with rebuilding. We built Duffield Hall and Duffield Hall cost us $200,000/month in utilities to heat during the winter season. We can claim many things we want about sustainability but it is a fact is that that amount is rather large. If you would like to consult cornell.edu you will see a disclosure of all the amounts with respect to each building and Duffield requires about 7% of the entire utilities on campus. Unless we have incentive, having initiatives that come from top down as President Skorton just did, it’s totally meaningless. What will happen is people will go on as usual – we have lights burning 24/7, 365 days a year even when students are not around.”

Unidentified speaker: “Clearly we will have to spend money to save money. What we found in doing the analysis is that there are many opportunities that will have a positive rate of return and they will save more than they will cost on a life cycle cost basis when you include the cost of carbon and low cost of money that Cornell has typically has had. At most you do spend money to just reduce carbons and that point is really certain because of how much society has put on the cost priority. That will change the equation over time and so we did our best to estimate the future. The future needs to be dynamic and will be.”

Professor Emeritus Stein: “In listening to you talk it seems to me that there are two kinds of initiatives that one can consider. One is where reducing the carbon footprint actually saves you money and the other is where reducing the carbon footprint actually costs you money. There are lots of things that go into this, like assuming a future carbon tract, and assuming a life cycle cost, etc. No one could argue against changing your incandescent bulbs putting in your little florescent bulbs because, not only does it reduce the carbon footprint, it saves you money. Who could argue against that but there is another class of things, like putting up solar panels in Ithaca which costs you money yet reduces the carbon footprint. Are you limiting yourself to only things in the first group where you actually pay dollars to reduce the carbon footprint or do you consider things where
reducing the carbon footprint actually costs you money?"

Professor Fahey: “There is no way we can get to zero climate neutrality without it costing us money.”

Unidentified Faculty: “I would like to know where we are in the process of planning such that the Board of Trustees will not only approve the list but also a notion of how to make decisions that will get us through the list, going back to Abby Cohn’s question, how do we solve the point that people are saying, this is grandfathered in so we’re stuck with this building. Is there a process for deciding that?”

Professor Fahey: “It is going to be in the climate action plan.”

Speaker Beer: “We will now take a report from Dean William Fry.”

5. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY – WILLIAM FRY

Dean Fry: “I would like to take just a few minutes to talk about issues that have come up in the last several months. First, we have a strategic planning process. It is going to take a fair amount of time and effort. It is going to be happening over the next two years and you will be hearing a lot more about it. There is a going to be considerable activity on the part of the faculty. Second, I would like to indicate that there is a search in place for the new Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education. Michele Moody-Adams is leaving. David Harris is chairing the search. The Nominations and Elections Committee has provided us with a list of suggested faculty members and you may recall that it is an internal search. Fourth, there is also a search for the Vice Provost for Budget and Planning. Paul Streeter has filled this position wonderfully during the interim, the last nine months. The candidates will interview with the Faculty Policy Committee. Fifth, we all learned last week that Steve Golding is leaving his position as Executive Vice President and we are determining whether or not it is necessary to refill that position. That decision has not yet been made.”

“I would like to talk about the Strategic Planning Process. We have this $215M budget problem and we have taken a third of that cut so far for FY10. It is up to 2/3 yet to go. Hopefully that will be informed through the strategic planning process. Provost Kent Fuchs has asked that each college create a task force and their goals are to assume a 15% reduction. They are to consider reconfiguration and they are to be consultative. I think the Arts College is further along on this topic than any other college. In addition to that there are cross-disciplinary task forces – a few of them are the Life Sciences, Social Sciences, Management/Business. You can see that they are chaired by one or two provosts. There are also two student-related task forces. The first is Enrollment and it is chaired by David Harris and Susan Murphy. The Nominations and Elections suggested a candidate for that task force. There is another task force, the Student and Academic Affairs and chairs have not yet been identified. The charge has not yet been identified.

The administration has a series of task forces and the administration is planning to take larger budget cuts than are the academic units. There is a budget task force that looks at the budget process, co-chaired by Paul Streeter and Cathy Dove and that task force will include representation from the FPC and will look all issues across the campus. There are
additional task forces in the facilities, information technology, general administration and risk management. They are not as far along as the previous task forces are.

I also want to indicate that the administration will be hiring a consulting firm to aid with the planning of the various planning steps that will happen. My concern is that there is a fantastic amount happening. It will happen during the summer and into the fall. We will have something in place, sometime in October or November of next fall. We will have the FY11 budget and my concern is that many people will be asked to serve on these task forces and I hope that when asked people will be willing to do it and commit for the next year.

Speaker Beer: “Thanks, Dean Fry. We will go on to Good and Welfare, starting with Professor Emeritus Charlie Walcott.”

Professor Emeritus Charlie Walcott. “There is a substantial budget problem coming. You have 5% cut this year and probably another 10% or so next year. A faculty member brought up a proposal with the Financial Policies Committee this year. Unfortunately we really didn’t have the time to discuss this thoroughly, in which he suggested it might be possible for tenured faculty to go half time for a brief period of time, if their circumstances made that seem like a desirable thing to do. The basic reason is that in some departments, these budget cuts are going to be borne on the backs of the lecturers and the non-tenure track faculty and dismissing a lot of those folks might have a really serious effect on our instructional program. His suggestion was that there some faculty in the university who would be in a position where they said, for one reason or another, that they would be able to go on a part time basis. This is already permitted if you will notice. It is in the faculty handbook on page 18 or 58, I guess. It is possible for a tenured faculty member to reduce to half time in consultation with the department chair and the dean. The basic proposal that came up is that this might be something that some folks might like to do and the savings that accrued to the department and might spare the cut of a non-tenure track faculty. The Financial Policies Committee tabled this until the fall until they have had a chance to think about it and discuss it. The basic principle is embodied in trustee legislation so that’s not an issue. What is an issue is whether it might be possible to sweeten the pot to some degree. For example, perhaps if you went half time, it might be possible to pay full time benefits or it might be possible to establish a discretionary research account with the equivalent of half of your benefits in it. It might be possible for example to not count that half time as half time, in terms of sabbatical leave. There are various proposals that might make it more desirable to do and I really wanted to warn you that this is under discussion. The basic principle is approved at faculty legislation. The details of this proposal are found on a single half sheet of paper in case you are interested.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much Professor Emeritus Walcott. Professor Terrence Fine.

Professor Terry Fine: Shortly after the formation of the Faculty Senate I was looking for mechanisms by which Senators who did not know other Senators could gain the Senatorial support needed to introduce motions. I mentioned that to my wife Dorian,
who told me about “Good and Welfare,” and that is where it came from. The uses to
which Good and Welfare has been put have almost always been other than that original
purpose, and I now turn to use it in yet another way. This is a good opportunity for me to
say goodbye. Over my forty years I have been a member of all of the variously-formed
faculty self-governing bodies that preceded the Senate. Looking back today, I conclude
that the current Faculty Senate is by far the most successful form of self-governance that I
have experienced. We owe the creation and initial leadership of the Faculty Senate to my
friend, former Dean of the Faculty, Peter Stein, sitting nearby. Folks I want to thank Peter
for that. I have watched him work – I’ve watched you closely Peter! – for something like
forty years, and he’s incredibly hard-working and persistent and innovative and devoted
to Cornell. I also want to thank J. Robert Cooke, Peter’s successor as Dean of the Faculty.
Bob Cooke led us through the most difficult times this Senate has faced, a time when
Faculty elements were deeply divided and some strongly opposed to decisions made by
then-President Hunter Rawlings, Bob always managed to ensure that the divisive forces
did not divide us. He kept us united by being endlessly patient, patently fair and wise
enough to always lead us through or around an impasse. I have not had a chance to work
with either of Deans Charlie Walcott or Bill Fry, but I do thank Charlie for his efforts, and
Bill, I wish you the best. Finally, you the Senate have my best wishes as you continue the
noble tradition of Cornell Faculty self-governance in what will be financially challenging
times."

Speaker Beer: “We have one more Good and Welfare speaker, Dean Bill Fry."

Dean Bill Fry: “Concerning the resolutions that Charlie identified, it sounds like a nice
idea to help out with some of the financial concerns of the university. The university has a
lot of challenges financially and whatever help we can give because there will be
considerable cuts. I also want to identify that the charge to the individual colleges in
terms of these half times, if you want to consider it, these half-sheets are available to you.
“Please take this discussion of Reduction in Effort that Charlie Walcott brought up to
your departments to discuss."

*Note: The speaker misspoke at the May 13, 2009 meeting and an explanation can be
found in the September 9, 2009 minutes.

Adjournment 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Fry
Dean of the Faculty
Financial Conflicts of Interest and Research

Bob Buhrman
Senior Vice Provost for Research
May 13, 2009
Research Compliance

• A substantial and **required** administrative burden on Cornell researchers and on the institution.

• Broad and growing spectrum of regulatory areas
  – 40+ sets of regulations and compliance areas of major concern to sponsored research (3 new in 2008: sub-award reporting (700), Homeland Security e-Verify, and “training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research”)

• Areas of current concern and greatest impact on researchers
  – Effort reporting and certification
  – Research Integrity and Assurance (ORIA)
    • Export Control (*144 cases in 2008, none in 2005*)
    • Animal Care and Use (*776 active protocols, 150% increase since 2005*)
      – 114 facilities, AAALAC re-accreditation process on track, 2009
    • Biosafety (*288 active protocols, 58% increase since 2005*)
    • Human Participants (*1497 active protocols, 200% increase since 2005*)
    • **Financial Conflicts of Interest** (FCOI) (*all lead investigators*)
Financial Conflicts of Interest

• Identification, management, and appropriate disclosure of FCOIs is essential for ensuring the public trust of research institutions and for continued access to federal funding.
  – Real conflicts, and situations where a neutral observer might reasonably conclude a conflict exists (apparent conflict)
  – *Must properly report and manage all real and apparent conflicts*

• Research-related FCOI the subject of significant, and growing, federal scrutiny and public attention.
  – Senator Grassley’s inquiries to NIH and NY Times articles on same
  – AAMC/AAU report on FCOI and research (clinical and non-clinical)
  – Many leading universities updating FCOI policies - e.g. Columbia
  – NIH mail reviews of universities’ FCOI policies
  – NIH soliciting comments regarding a planned revision of its FCOI regulations - May 8, 2009
Financial Conflicts of Interest - Cornell

- Research-related FCOI covered by overall Cornell Conflicts Policy
  [www.policy.cornell.edu/Conflicts_Policy.cfm](http://www.policy.cornell.edu/Conflicts_Policy.cfm)

  - October 29, 1992 (established University Conflicts Committee);
  - October 28, 2000 (annual electronic disclosure process established)

- The University encourages academic personnel, consistent with university policy, to engage in sponsored research, to participate in professional practice as appropriate and necessary to sustaining intellectual output, to consult widely, and to engage in entrepreneurial and other activities that may benefit not only the participants but also the university and the larger public. The academic community at Cornell strives toward these objectives in a context of freedom with responsibility. Cornell's conflicts policy recognizes and affirms the settled tradition and expectation that members will conduct their relationships with each other and the University with candor and integrity. ...Cornell does not require individuals to avoid all situations where there may be a seeming or potential conflict of interest. On the contrary, some types of conflicts are unavoidable and completely acceptable. ...The obligation to disclose external financial interests and time commitments stems from the public trust vested in a University, is required by the Cornell University Conflicts Policy, and fulfills legal reporting requirements to funding agencies. (preamble to Part I disclosure)

- Recent NSF and NIH audit findings indicate that Cornell is not in full compliance with federal FCOI regulations.
Financial Conflicts of Interest - Cornell

- Cornell is currently reviewing and updating Cornell policy and procedures for research-related FCOI.
  - Internal Ithaca process
    OVPR; **University Conflicts Committee**, Dean Bill Fry (co-Chair); Counsel’s Office; Audit Office
  - President’s Task Force on FCOI: Charge: “Recommend working principles and best practices”
    Bill Fry, Trustees, Ithaca and Weill administrators, David Hajjar (Weill co-chair) and Bob Buhrman (co-chair)

- Expected result: A research-related FCOI policy and procedures for Faculty and Administration review, and subsequent Board of Trustees review and approval in the coming year.
  - Cornell Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest and Research
    • Supplement to overall Conflicts Policy
Impact on Cornell Faculty

- If have no research-related financial interests or external relationships
  - *no impact*

- If have research-related financial interests and commitments
  - Improved reporting process
    - annually and at time of proposal submittal (modified Form 10)
    - objective is to assist and better guide faculty in proper FCOI reporting
  
  - Central, confidential, oversight of development and implementation of FCOI management plans
    - goal is not to eliminate relationships but to manage them appropriately
      - Meet requirements of federal regulations
      - Assure public trust in the integrity of Cornell research
To: The Faculty Senate
From: The Educational Policy Committee
Re: The resolution from the Educational Policy Committee concerning median grades, which is being offered to the Faculty Senate for consideration on 13 May 2009

The resolution being brought to the Faculty Senate concerns the removal of the median grades from the Cornell Website. We know that, in April 2006, Professor Ann Lemley, Textiles and Apparel, and Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, proposed removing the median grades from the web and that her proposal was voted down.

However, new information has emerged that indicates that the median grades are being used in ways that are not helpful to the students or Cornell. In September 2007, Talia Bar, Vrinda Kadilya, and Asaf Zussman published paper [1], which reports on a study done using the median grades on the Cornell website, along with some surveys of students. The study examined a large data set covering the period 1990–2004, and the abstract of the paper says that “our study provides evidence consistent with these predictions:

(1) students will tend to be drawn to leniently graded courses once exposed to grade information;
(2) the most talented students will be less drawn to leniently graded courses than their peers;
(3) the change in students’ behavior will contribute to grade inflation.”

For these reasons, the EPC believes that it would be better not to publish median grades, especially since they are now being placed on transcripts. More information on article [1] can be found on the next page, and the paper itself is available on the web at http://ssrn.com/abstract=1019580.

We present some of the information from article [1]. [1], which is based on all students attending Cornell A&S courses over a 15-year period, has a lot more detail and interesting analyses and interpretations. The two figures on this page are taken from [1].

Besides the median grade data found on Cornell’s website, the study used some surveys as well as individual SAT scores of students. The use of individual SAT scores allowed them to study which students will be more attracted to leniently graded courses.

The figure to the right shows the number of daily visits to the Cornell median-grade website over a 2.5 year period (Fall 2002 – Dec 2004). Students visited the website a lot more during pre-enrollment periods than at other times, indicating that the median grades were of interest to them while they were selecting their courses.

Fig. 4, to the right, shows the mean grade in Cornell A&S courses from 1990 to 2004. The first median-grade report for Cornell appeared in Spring 1997. Fig. 4 shows that the mean grade actually went down from 1995 to 1997, but there was a sharp increase in 1997 and a strong general upward trend from then on until 2004.

One question is: how much of the rise in mean grade was due to the existence of the median-grade website? [1] has an analysis that suggests that “grade-driven course selection is likely to have had a large influence.”

[1] discusses two other explanations for a grade inflation: a change in faculty composition and increase in the quality of students.

[1] argues that a change in faculty composition did not contribute to grade inflation.

[1] estimates, based on their analysis, that an improvement in the quality of students accounts for about one third of the increase in grades. SAT scores were used as a basis for measuring student quality.

[1] provides an interesting discussion of the effects of grade inflation. Basically, grade inflation leads to grade compression and a resultant loss in information.

[1] makes the point that a student can increase their GPA and thus their ranking relative to their peers by taking leniently graded courses. By studying the data for Cornell’s Department of Economics, they showed that such a “ranking bias” occurred.
Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

May 13, 2009

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies

Thomas Bruce, Law (reappointment)
Paul Ginsparg, A&S (reappointment)

Institutional Review Board for Human Participants

Gary Evans, CHE (reappointment)
Jeffrey Hancock, CALS
Elaine Wethington, CHE (reappointment)

Assemblies

Campus Planning Committee

Patricia Pollak, CHE (reappointment)

Dining Services Committee

David Levitsky, CALS (reappointment)

University Sustainability Committee

Martin Hatch, A&S
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Bill Fry

May 13, 2009
Reaccreditation process (preparation) has started
   6 teams

Search for vp for undergrad education (D. Harris, chair)
   N&E suggested faculty members
      (internal search)

Search for VP for Budget and Planning
      (candidates to interview with FPC)

Executive VP position (refill?? current evaluation)
Strategic planning process:
College Task Forces
  15% reduction
  consider reconfiguration
  consultative
Cross Disciplinary Task Forces
  Life Sciences (S. Kresovich)
  Social Sciences (D. Harris)
  Mgmt/Business (R. Sieber)
Student-related Task Forces
  Enrollment (D. Harris, S. Murphy)
  Student and Academic Affairs (in evolution)
Administration-
  Charges being finalized, to be on the web.

(admin budget cut > schools/colleges)

i. Budget Process: Co-chaired by Paul Streeter and Cathy Dove (membership will include representation from the FPC).
ii. Facilities
iii. IT
iv. General Adm (including Finance, HR, etc)
v. Risk Management

Consulting firm
(to aid with efficiencies in administration)

Much happening.
Minutes from the September 9, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

1. Call to Order by Speaker Steven Beer. “I would like to remind members of the Body that there are no photos to be taken and no audio recorders are allowed during the meeting except by the authorities. I ask everyone I would like to ask all of the people who wish to speak to please rise and identify yourself as to the name, department or other administrative affiliations. We will now move to the Nominations & Elections Committee Report from Associate Dean of the Faculty Fred Gouldin.”

2. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Speaker of the Senate
Steven Beer, CALS

Academic Freedom & Professional Status of the Faculty
Chekitan Dev, Hotel
Risa Lieberwitz, ILR
Nancy Chau, CALS

Academic Programs & Policies
Cornelia Farnum, Vet.
Ann Hajek, CALS
Elliot Shapiro, A&S

Educational Policy Committee
Lorraine Maxwell, CHE
Deborah Trumbull, CALS
Robert Turgeon, A&S

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics & Physical Education
Wayne Knoblauch, CALS
Frank Rossi, CALS
Jeffrey Scott, CALS

Faculty Committee on Program Review
Cliff Pollock, Engr.

Financial Policies Committee
Charles Walcott, CALS
William Lesser, CALS
Peter Wolczanski, A&S
Stephen Pope, ENGR.

Institutional Biosafety Committee
John Parker, Vet
Paul Jennette, VET
Christy Michaels, non-affiliated member
Keith Perry, CALS
David Soderlund, Chair, CALS
Institutional Review Board for Human Participants
Brian Wansink, CALS
Virginia Utermohlen, CHE

Local Advisory Council
Ronald Harris-Warrick, CALS
William Olbricht, Engr.

Professor-at-Large Selection Committee
Abby Cohn, A&S
Clare Fewtrell, Vet.
Kathryn March, A&S
Max Pfeffer, CALS

University Benefits Committee
Robert Connelly, A&S
David Lewis, AAP
William White, CHE

University Conflicts Committee
Ken Birman, Engr.
David Putnam, Engr.
Dotsevi Sogah, A&S

University Faculty Library Board
Mary Beth Norton, A&S

University Lectures Committee
David McCobb, A&S
Wolfgang Sachse, Engr.

University-ROTC Relationships Committee
Mark Psiaki, Engr.
Jeff Varner, Engr.

University Sustainability Committee
Warhaft Zellman, Engr. ASSEMBLIES University Assembly
Martin Hatch, A&S Ellis Loew, Vet. William Ghiorse, CALS Charles Walcott, CALS Randy Wayne, CALS

Codes and Judicial Committee
Kevin Clermont, Law Risa Lieberwitz, ILR Rachel Weil, A&S University Hearing Board

REPORT OF UNIV. FACULTY ELECTION

Associate Dean and Secretary of Faculty
Frederick C. Gouldin, Engr.

Faculty Senate-at-Large, Tenured
Michael King, Engr.
Helene Marquis, Vet.
"A vote was taken for Speaker of the Senate and Professor Steven Beer was elected Speaker of the Senate.

The Nominations and Elections Report is approved."

Speaker Steven Beer: “We will now move ahead quickly into the report accreditation of Cornell by Dean Mathios and Kent Hubbell. We have a microphone here for your use.”

3. RE-ACCREDITATION AT CORNELL

Dean Alan Mathios: “I am here to report on the progress about the accreditation process. We are accredited by Middle States and so we have formed a steering committee to guide the University successfully through the process. It is a two year process, actually getting through this is voluntary and Cornell participates voluntarily. This is distinct from other accreditations that go on throughout the university. For example the engineering college has separate accreditations and many, many other programs also have independent accrediting bodies. We are not involved in that process.”

“Every 10 years we are required to go through a re-accreditation and it basically involves the University putting together a self-study that looks critically at the way we do our business. We invite an external review team to read the self-study, visit the campus, and then they write recommendations to the Middle States group. Then the Middle States essentially gets back to us whether we remain accreditation. There are different levels of accreditation and we are very much hoping that we get to the point where we only have a five-year review. A typical successful accreditation is one where they will come and evaluate how we’ve done five years from the site visit. Anything more severe means more visits earlier on, so our goal is to get to the five-year review and not have to do it again for another five years after that.

We have organized a steering committee and I will show the membership of the steering committee in just a little bit. We are required to address essentially 14 standards of excellence that Middle States dictates to determine the basis for accreditation. We guess that our self study will be approximately a 200 page document that we will submit to Middle States and that would be the basis of how they would review us with appendices, and probably thousands of extra pages to support this. The theme of the Middle States self-study is at Cornell’s choosing and we chose to title it "Any person … Any Study within One University". Essentially this deals with the fact that we are a decentralized
University with many undergraduate and professional colleges yet we have one faculty Senate, we have one student assembly, one Board of Trustees and so the challenges and opportunities that that structure provides is sort of a unifying theme of our self-study. This self-study is due to Middle States by November 2011 and so we will summarize the work that is required through 2011 and examine what we done so far.

Who is on the steering committee? It is co-chaired by myself and Kent Hubbell and other members include Bill Fry, Barbara Knuth, Susan Murphy, Paul Streeter, Marin Clarkberg, Kristin Walker, Nikhil Kumar, undergraduate student in ILR; Gina Ryan, grad student, in microbiology: and David Hajjar, Weill Cornell Medical. Just to remind you, this is an accreditation of the entire Cornell University, not just the Ithaca campus so we are working collaboratively with Weill. Fortunately the medical college is going for their independent accreditation prior to this so all the work that they will do on that will provide input and documentation for what we’re going to need from them. So, it’s actually very good timing.

In addition to the original steering committee that put together this self-study, we also assigned 14 standards of excellence into six clusters and each of those clusters is chaired by a person who helps organize and provides input to the steering committee dealing with those standards. We have chosen to take the 14 standards and break them up into the themes: institutional stewardship and the standards that they will be dealing with integrity, governance and administration; the Faculty; Student Admissions and Support; Educational Offerings; and Assessment of Student Learning.

At the very end of my presentation I’ll talk a little about the assessment team because assessments of student learning is something new in Middle States accreditation. This has not been the focus of what they have done in the past and it's a major focus of what they are talking about now and so we'll talk about the strategy we are using to address this.

The first working group is Institutional Stewardship. We will deal with Standards one, two, three and seven as Middle States outline them. The standards are mission, goals, and objectives, planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal and institutional resources. This is related to many of the other issues going on at Cornell. We will be working very closely with reimagining Cornell and integrating that material into a lot of our work. Kathy Rasmussen is chairing the group.

The next working group will be dealing with Standards four, five and six, and these working groups deal with the standards Leadership and Governance and Administration and Integrity. Charlie Walcott is chairing that committee. The next Standards are eight and nine - Student Admissions and Supports. Kraig Adler is the chair of this. The Faculty, Standard 10 is chaired by Amy Villarejo. Standards 11, 12 and 13 Educational Offerings, chaired by Laura Brown and finally the Assessment of Student Learning, Standard 14, chaired by David Gries.

The time line -- we have successfully submitted the self-study in spring of 2009. Middle States found it acceptable and complimented the university on the design. We are well on our way. The working group reports are due to be delivered to the Steering Committee sometime in May in spring semester. The Steering Committee will gather all the these
documents and put together a first draft of the self-study, and we will be seeking input along the way and the final draft of the self-study will be submitted to MSCHE in March 2011. The External Evaluation Team visits campus May 2011. All of this is on the web at Cornell.edu/Middle States (middlestates@cornell.edu) and you can send any questions by email me or Kent.

Let’s talk about Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning. This is new to Cornell. Biddy Martin, when she was Provost, talked about the federal interest in assessment of student learning and this pertains to a 2 to 3 year long discussion about what the federal government was going to do, demanding that universities start measuring the value added that they provide students. What Middle States expects from us on paper, what they write, is that the institutions must possess the following:

- Clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels - including the University level, the college level, the major level and even at the course level (institution, program, course).
- A documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning.
- Evidence that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with constituents and is used to improve teaching and learning.

That’s quite a different approach than what we have been doing, where we have not documented how we actually assess outcomes. We have many, many measures that we use to talk about the success of our students.

We have Middle States holding a conference to talk about these exact issues, and what we really want to learn is exactly what the expectations are in reality and not necessarily what they put on paper and we are sending representatives from every college to Middle States with direct questions about what types of measures of learning they are interested in and whether these types of measures of learning satisfy Middle States. We want more information about what the expectation is from us. Every college is sending a representative to the conference with direct questions to be asked of Middle States. Then the representatives will come back and meet with each other and report to the steering committee so that we can better understand how the university should develop assessment measures in the next few years and start planning and describing how they are going to meet Middle States expectations. This is going to be a long drawn out process, but we hope to be very organized in writing out a plan on how the university approaches this so that Middle States will actually see that we have made progress on this. We will report back to the Senate and other constituents as this develops, as we get more information about what is expected of faculty even at the basic course level. We will keep the faculty Senate informed and that's how we are approaching this.”

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Speaker Beer: “Thanks very much. Before we get to the next item, we are going to consider the minutes of the May Senate Meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to the May minutes of the faculty senate?”
Professor John Weiss, History Department: “I was comparing my notes with the minutes as distributed and I noticed that the request of the Dean that we take our discussion of Reduction in Effort that Charlie Walcott had brought up at the end, to our department and it was not included here, and I think it should be included for a number of reasons. 1) I found my chair very enthusiastic. He thought that having this option was giving tremendous flexibility in responding to the financial crisis, so we were interested in what legislation is needed to enact these types of options. As a way of staying, as the UN puts it “seized of this matter”, I want to see that that’s included in the minutes.”

Speaker Beer: “We will kindly ask the staff to include that notice of your comments are made today pertain to the May meeting.” Are there any other additions/corrections?

In looking over the draft minutes, I found that the Speaker misspoke. A motion was made and duly seconded to report the matter of publishing mean grades back to the Educational Policy Committee. After some confusion concerning a motion to table, which had not been made, the Speaker calls for a vote on the table motion. Clearly the Senate had intended to refer the matter back to the EPC. I have been advised by the Dean that the committee will further consider the matter in its deliberations this semester. The Speaker hereby apologizes for mis-speaking. Furthermore, I would suggest placing a note in the minutes of the May meeting indicating that the foregoing explanation will be found in the minutes of today’s/September University Faculty Senate.

Any further additions/corrections? Are we ready to consider the minutes as corrected?

All those in favor say “aye”? Opposed? The minutes are accepted as corrected. We will now move on to the next item. We will hear from Vice Provost John Siliciano who will give us an update on H1N1.”

5. H1N1 UPDATE – VICE PROVOST JOHN SILICIANO

Vice Provost John Siliciano: “I wanted to update you on where we stand as things developed. I know you received separate emails – one from Jan Corson-Rikert, the Director of Health Services and Bill Fry, as faculty members you received one from Provost and recently you received one from Tommy Bruce, the vice president of Communications, so that is part of the background. I wanted to give you an update on where things stand. They are rapidly changing. As of the beginning of last week we had 50 cases of probable H1N1 flu. They all have flu symptoms. As of today we have 400 new cases so that’s tenfold in little more than a week. They are probably more cases, most likely these are under reported. These are people contacting Gannett with flu-like symptoms, so is growing rapidly. As you can imagine, colleges are perfect petri-dishes for the spread of flu the way students live together, eat together, partying together is very significant in fueling this. Most cases are mild to moderate, but there have been some severe cases. We have one student who is in very very critical condition in the hospital and there are several others under observation.”

“There are a lot of people working essentially round-the-clock to deal with this as we get into more serious situations. Gannett Health Care is inundated at this point; it looks like a war hospital with lots of students lining up. The staff is stretched really thin in terms of
resources so we are pulling in assistance from across the campus for other people who can help. Gannett is following up on a daily basis with all the students who reported there to make sure they haven’t taken a turn for the worst. They are supplying health kits to those students. They are tracking them. Campus Life is dealing with issues involving the housing, feeding and transportation of sick students. As things continue to evolve, we will track how things are progressing here, and all we can hope for here mostly is to slow the progression of the flu spreading across the campus. There is obviously no chance to stop it, but if we can just blunt or slow its drive we can help them with the health crisis, and perhaps we can delay things until a vaccine becomes available in mid-October.

We are planning for situations, if it dramatically worsens such that in case we have to close the university for some time. That is unlikely. What we’re facing instead is referred to in the email you received, that there is going to be a high level of absenteeism here. In terms of how the faculty can help - I think the way the faculty can help and it is referred to in the resolution before you which is to urge faculty peers to adopt a very flexible and accommodating attitude towards frequent absences during this term. It is very difficult to deal with this any other way. We just need this kind of flexibility. Most faculty have been very flexible. Many faculty have begun their classes as the Provost suggested, discussing the options that would occur. However we are getting scattered reports that some faculty are behaving quite differently over this by telling students that they need to attend class even if they are ill. Is it very difficult situation to put students in. They are already under extreme stress. The last thing we want is having them attend class when they are actively ill. I think the resolution you have before you is exactly what we would hope for, what we’ve heard from the Provost’s office. I think coming from the Faculty Senate as the leadership of the faculty would be very, very important. That’s a quick update.”

Steven Beer: “Thanks very much. Any questions?”

Unidentified Speaker from Hotel School: “Are students contagious before the symptoms show?” Provost Siliciano: “The question is whether students are contagious. People are generally contagious one-two days before they are symptomatic. That is why you cannot use quarantine on this. The best we can do is to get students out of circulation when they realize they are getting ill, so we are encouraging all students to self isolate. Faculty and staff can help isolate also, by staying home. For students it means staying in the dorm room. This presents an extreme level of complexity in their typically shared dorm rooms. At this point we are following the CDC and NYS health recommendations that suggest that you still co-house sick students with their well roommates as long as they observe a lot of protocol in terms of distance, etc. We are also contingency planning, if we reach a situation where we have to have large separations of sick and healthy students. We are creating situations where we can put a large ring around large spaces – essentially put up large dormitories.”

Unidentified speaker: “Is there any commonality in all the cases?”

Provost Siliciano: “No, other than they are students who like to share germs. There is nothing, there is no particular path. As you know though, the severe cases can by in large, can dramatically affect people with underlying health conditions, such immune
depression, etc. Most students get sick and recover very quickly.”

Unidentified speaker: “Is there a benchmark? I have no idea if 400 is five times the norm, two times the norm etc.”

Provost Siliciano: “We don’t have a benchmark for this flu. It is increasing very rapidly. At this time of year there are no students getting sick with flu. Virtually none, which is why I am safely referring to this as being H1N1, and it appears to be exploding on campuses across the country. The University of Washington has gone to 2K cases in a matter of days. It may taper off, but we don’t have a good sense of that.”

Professor John Weiss, History Department: “I would just like to know the level of lethality of H1N1 and I sent an email to the Provost last week about the countries that have been following this in the southern hemisphere in particular places like New Caledonia, which of course whom we have an association with and they have noticed a significant increase in the lethality of it. We have one case now where we have a student who must be on a respirator now, but that’s something to keep in mind that is more lethal than ordinary flu. I think about 20% more lethal. I know the French are monitoring it, and it is getting increasingly more lethal than what it was. As far as the target age group, and I wasn’t certain what the target age group was and it is something to keep in mind, for instance knowing the number of respirators we have in Tompkins County, things like that.”

Provost Siliciano: “We are monitoring the situation very carefully in terms of this and are in contact with the CDC. We do have plans in place that were put in place over the last few years in the events of this seriously, more virulent flu such as the bird flu in Asia. We do have plans in place to close the University and all the ramifications of that and were watching whether this progression forges the degree of severity that we would do that. Right now we are planning to maintain status quo operations.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much Vice Provost Siliciano. We will move on to a report on the Resolution Concerning Make-Up Exams by Professor Rod Dietert.”

Professor Rod Dietert, Microbiology & Immunology: “I am a University Faculty Committee member, and we present a Resolution from the University Faculty Committee for your consideration. The original resolution was distributed a week ago, and an amended version with additional UFC input and also some policy committee member input was distributed yesterday around noon, and the resolution is before you for consideration. I am happy to answer questions, but we are bringing this to you to address concerns in the way UFC saw faculty potentially participate.”

Speaker Beer: “The committee has asked for discussion. After discussion, we will vote on the resolution. The resolution is before you on the screen. Any discussion? Any support or opposition to the resolution? It appears the body is ready for vote. All in favor and I will read the amended resolution: “Be it resolved that, the Faculty Senate encourages instructors to offer make up exams following scheduled examinations, delayed due dates for other assignments, and excusable of classes missed due to illness, to facilitate the self-isolation component that is an essential part of the campus strategy to minimize the spread of this infection and the public health risk for the campus. All those in favor, signify by
saying “aye”. Opposed? The resolution has been adopted unanimously.”

Speaker Beer: "I would like to now call on Provost David Harris for an update on Administration Efficiencies."

6. **ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCIES - DEPUTY PROVOST DAVID HARRIS**

David Harris: “I am Deputy Provost David Harris, and I am going to talk about a narrow piece of this very large effort called reimagining Cornell and in particular the role of the consultants. The reason for this piece is because there have been a bunch of questions and misunderstandings about what the consultants are doing and what the consultants are not doing; so I'm going to talk about that very narrow piece of it. When this all broke last year, the president was very clear in saying that we had to find a way to deal with this budget in making the University stronger moving forward. What I have on the screen is a graphic illustration of that statement. What this is saying here is the core of the University, the core Teaching, Research, Outreach and then we moved out of the circle to the Student Experience, things are less hampered - for example, programs like Academic Support, things like Admissions. We then move on to things like Administration and Facilities, and back-office operations that are common to a larger organization; HR for example is one of these. Then we go into this outer ring and in the outer ring we have Procurement -- things we purchase. These rings are not independent of one another. I don't want to imply they are. This is a guide for thinking about reimagining Cornell properly, the guide for thinking about the budget cuts that are before us. The particular piece we want to talk about, is this piece up here.”

“As you know, back in the spring, Provost Fuchs established a number of academic task forces. There is one for each college. He also established some crosscutting task forces. But as we look at what we spend, we get the savings way out here in the outer rings which is where you want to get as much of the savings as possible. We do have some expertise on this. We have Provosts, Vice Presidents, who are responsible for these outer rings. But none of these folks and in fact I would argue no one at your institution, has dealt with a budget challenge of this magnitude in trying to understand how is it that we could radically change some of these things so that we could protect the inner circle as much as possible. So what we did was to say we could go out and talk to some people who are experts. So we talked to consultants. We interviewed a number of consulting firms. Their scope is not about the core of the mission. Their scope is about the things that you will find in the vast majority of large, complex organizations. We were also clear as to how they work, and we're not bringing them in to tell us "here's what we have to do". We are bringing them in to give us recommendations from their experience, and it is also not from a permanent file drawer that they have already but they are actually going on campus, talking to a bunch of people to learn about this environment and come back with recommendations. The way this actually works, the mechanics of this -- there are three pieces to keep in mind, and I've alluded to one of them already, the Cornell led academic task forces. These are the inner rings or two. These are led by Cornell. In this case here, Student Enrollment, there's existing expertise with VP Susan Murphy. We drew on the consultants to help us with the analysis of the data.
Then there are the areas that the consultants are leading. The areas that they are leading are the administrative part of the University, not just the administrative part of Day Hall, the administrative part that sits in colleges as well, and they are providing recommendations on that. The other part that is going on here is the Strategic Plan document that comes at the end of this academic year.

How are we interacting with consultants? The first thing we wanted was project leaders. David Skorton meets monthly with the project leaders, a little more often than that actually, with the leadership of Kent Fuchs and they are actually talking to the consultant folks. I am the project manager for this effort which means my responsibility is main liaison with Cornell and the consulting firm. I am talking to them on a daily basis (they’re just outside my office) and provide guidance for the Project Core Team. That Project Core Team as a membership listed on the right, and that’s the group that gets together every two or three weeks and the consultants talk to individuals more often and then come to this group and say "in the last few weeks we were talking to people, we think you may have this opportunity in IT and we’re getting a sense that there might be this opportunity with something else but does that resonate with you? Are we missing something? They all talk about things and then eventually close up with project leaders. In the end, the engagement with the consultants ends in the first week of November. Decisions will be made by the President and Provost. The recommendations are coming through a number of avenues. This is not just the consultant recommendations the recommendations are from the task forces in the strategic planning process as well. Those recommendations come formally through the academic task force, consultants, and strategic planning advisory committees.

There is a forum that was held last Friday, and it was staff based but anyone is invited to these forums. As you heard, there’s another one to be held next Wednesday, and the President and Provost will focus on faculty. There are also a number of engagements and interactions with peers. There is a website, read out the homepage for Cornell for strategic planning what they are. You can see information. There is video on the forum. You can also get to the suggestion box. So far they have met with over 350 people on campus since the engagement began in June. I just wanted to give you a quick overview and spend the rest of the time answering questions.”

Professor Tarelton Gillespie, Communications:”You mentioned November 1st. Can you just confirm timelines?”

Provost Harris: “The engagement ends the first week in November. That is when the piece ends. There is a whole timeline of activity coming so you can see them on the reimagining Cornell website, but the reports from the academic task forces are due October 1st. There’s a lot of things going on after that.

Also, these consultants just finished an engagement at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill that was incredibly similar. Not surprisingly, if you realize that most universities are facing what we’re facing. They did just finish up the engagement at Chapel Hill, and we talk to them they said this was a very unusual case. Usually they can’t take a team from one project to another project that is very similar. There are also
proprietary issues that would occur, like if you went from forward to General Motors. We don’t work that way in higher education. They can actually take what they learned at North Carolina, and they literally put that group here. One week they are at Chapel Hill; in the next week they started in Ithaca; and we benefited from the fact they were already running. They were already thinking about a bunch of things that apply to this contract, not all of them. They certainly gave them a context to hit the ground running, and there are other universities that have contacted them since they started working with us. It won’t be just these two schools doing this.”

Susan Quirk (Animal Science): “I wonder if some of these decisions have already been made. For example there is a new program where they are required to learn a different method of purchase.”

Provost Harris: “E-shop. There are no decisions that are coming out of this. No recommendations from the consultants through this process to the President and Provost that have been active yet. I just had a meeting yesterday. It was a critical point where the first-half of this engagement roughly was data gathering, trying to develop and pinpoint some options and have been meeting with the President and Provost and is now getting some feedback from the President and Provost. There is a new effort called E-shop. It came out of the meeting held last December. This is a paperless initiative. This is one of the advantages. We investigated options and what we found from other schools and how they rolled out procurement and other campuses and the savings they have seen from it. I think what we’ve learned from this insight will allow us to enhance the separation that’s already begun.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical Engineering: “Maybe I missed in previous answer but at North Carolina, do you know how much they benefited?”

Provost Harris: “Yes. We talked to the Chancellor of the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill and to several other people and what they said was they would not be at the place they are now if they had not worked with these consultants. That’s exactly what Kent Fuchs talked about after coming out of a meeting – it is clear that we are much further down the road in a very good direction on the outer rings than we would be if we were doing this alone.

I think I’m fairly good in statistics, but if I had a really hard stats problem in my research, I bring in a stats consultant. This is kind of like how this is.”

Elizabeth Sanders (Government): “The diagram seems to give the impression and they wonder how real is that inner core, the faculty the teaching, graduate students, the undergraduates. It’s going to be protected, but what people are already experiencing is different. I just went to a faculty meeting today in my department, and we had three positions unfilled, one of which, and we’re the smallest of all government departments that our peer institutions and our competitors for placement in recruiting and so and yet, as tiny as we are, we have three openings, one of which is Constitutional and Public Law - - a very fundamental subject for the study of government and especially for the number of students who go on to law school. They are really at a disadvantage because we have nobody to teach that. So it seems to me there is great damage there. And that red inner
circle is not being protected and that's the real worry -- the cause of this financial distress -- we have really damaged our inner core.”

Provost Harris: “If I, in any way, said explicitly that it was completely protected, then I apologize. It was not my intention. What we're trying to do is to minimize the hit on the core, and so if we did not pursue our opportunities on the outer ring, procurement and so forth, the hit here would be even larger. There will be hits here. We have already seen this in sociology. But what we are trying to do here is to minimize the damage, minimize the harm. I think everyone is interested in this part, it is extremely in our best interest to do what we can with the inner rings. I am sorry I misspoke and in any way implied that things would not happen. One last thing: if you hear things about the consultants in particular and wondering if that's true or not, that concerns me, give me an e-mail, and I would be happy to shoot Bill Fry an e-mail and be happy to try to address any concerns before it spreads.”

Speaker Beer: “Let me ask a question to Dean Bill Fry: is there any intention to make available the minutes of the special July meeting of the faculty and Senate?”

Dean Fry: “There will not be verbatim minutes but there will be some notes about it.”

Provost Harris: “If it is not on the website it will be within the next 24 hours – the website will grow over time.”

Speaker Beer: “I now call on Professor Bill Crepet, Chair Committee on Academic Programs and Policies for report from that committee.”

8. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES – BILL CREPET, CHAIR

Professor Bill Crepet, Chair of Academic Programs and Policies: “I would like to report on the action summary of the June 15th meeting this year. We approved unanimously the new masters of professional studies degree program in a field of Information Science. We approved unanimously the field name change from Zoology to Zoology and Wildlife. We approved a minor field name change from Lesbians, Bisexual, and Gay Studies to Lesbians, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered Studies. We also approved the request to change the subject of graduate degrees in the school of Electrical and Computer Engineering from Electrical Engineering for the Masters of Engineering, Masters of Science and PhD degree programs consistent with name changes in the schools and graduate degrees. We did due diligence in each case to check with people who are affected by these changes, and found no resistance to any of these suggestions.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions on the report that was made on behalf of the Committee? Seeing none, we will move on to a report from the University Faculty Committee by Professor Kathryn Gleason.”

9. REPORT FROM UFC – KATHY GLEASON

Professor Kathy Gleason: GLEASON: “I would like to report on the activities of the UFC and the process of reimagining Cornell. Thank you. I have to read my report.”
“Over the summer the University Faculty Committee met monthly with the Provost on budget cuts, committee formation and the larger strategic planning process, “Reimagining Cornell.” These meetings, although not frequent in number, preceded the Provost's main announcements and larger meetings with the Senate and faculty.

On June 17th, the UFC met with Kent Fuchs and David Harris. At the time of the announcement of the "Reimagining Cornell" process, Bain Consultants presented the scope of their work in reducing administrative costs, and the Provost shared information on the college task forces. While this was mainly an informational session, members of the UFC were relieved that Bain's role was limited to examining the administrative structure of the University, and we urge that this information be shared with the Faculty Senate and the faculty as a whole early in the process. Thus, on July 22nd, the UFC joined the rest of the Senate and all interested faculty present during the summer to hear a similar but updated presentation by the Provost and from the representatives from Bain. Again, Bain outlined their role in detail, working with the Provosts to show the exact nature and limits of their role, as David Harris has updated now for you in this meeting. A vigorous question-and-answer period also followed at that time.

On Tuesday, August 11th, the UFC and the FPC met to discuss steps to strengthen faculty governance. There was general agreement that the UFC should seek greater faculty participation in meetings of administrators that have a direct bearing on the welfare of the faculty, and there was also some discussion at this meeting about more direct involvement in meetings of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Finally, on August 28th, the UFC and the Financial Planning Committee met with the Provost to discuss the strategic planning process. Ed Lawler was also present. The Provost took a few minutes to seek some confidential feedback on matters he will be presenting to you next week, and we appreciate his requests for our counsel. A frank discussion about the strategic planning process ensued, in light of some allocated budget data that they shared with us and I believe will be shared with you next week and this will also include details will be discussed at the Faculty Forum with the Provost and President.

In sum, we appreciate the efforts of the administration to meet with us for feedback in advance of major decisions. This was a rapidly unfolding process over the summer, but we can report some meaningful discussion with the administration at key moments, and know that much of the details of the things that we discussed will be presented to you at the coming forum and meetings this fall. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Perhaps you would be willing to answer a few questions?”

Professor Gleason: “To the extent I can. I will have to share this with my fellow members of the UFC. We all were traveling and doing our field work.”

Speaker Beer: “Are there any questions for the UFC?

Thank you for the complete report. I would like to call on Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry, for remarks.”
10. **REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY – BILL FRY**

Dean Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I think this year is going to be a really important year for the University, and I think the faculty can play a very important role in this year, because I think decisions will be made and we will have a role in contributing to the deliberations of those decisions. I am going to couch my comments today in terms of budget adjustments, strategic planning and other planning. And I want to speak from the recommendations that came from the governance report that was given to the Senate about a year and a half or two years ago. A major theme from that report was, from the Senate, was that the Senate wanted the Senate to be involved more fully in decisions that are made at the University. They wanted the UFC to be more heavily involved, and they wanted the Dean of the Faculty to be more heavily involved in these decisions and being consulted by the administration.”

“As Kathy has just reported, there were three meetings this summer involving the FPC, the Financial Policies Committee; the UFC, University Faculty Committee; and I was present at all of those meetings, with the Provost and members of the Provost’s staff, where there was really significant interaction and consultation.

I also want to report, as you saw in one of David Harris’s slides, that I am a member of the project core team, and he said that group has been meeting with the Bain Consultants every two or three weeks. I can report back that indeed, that is a consultative interaction. They bring forward some ideas, and people say that won’t work; they say, it sounds good but you ought to go forward, or something like that. So it is a consultative interaction. As far as I know, there have been no decisions made, as David also identified.

Let me go to budget adjustments, and my concern is what David also identified as a concern. My concern is that the effect of the very significant budget challenge that the University faces will mean shrinking in size of the faculty. So my hope, my really fervent hope, is that the consultants will find a significant chunk of funds in those outer cores -- those outer regions in procurement and administration. This year we cut way back on faculty hiring. I think this year there’s also a very significant cutback on faculty hiring. That is something really bad for the University in the long range. So my hope is that Bain will come through with significant savings in areas that are not affecting the core function.

I would like to report also that not because of me or not because of the Senate or not because of the UFC, but I think because of the current Provost and because of the current President, there’s a real consultative interaction between the faculty and the current administration. I have been sitting in on many of the senior staff meetings with the President. Recently I’ve been a participant in the planning part of the Provost meeting with the Vice Provosts, and I’ve also been invited to some of the deans meetings that the Provost has with some of the academic deans, and -- Charlie, are you still here? Yes. I think that did not happen in previous times.”

Professor Emeritus Charlie Walcott, Neurobiology & Behavior: “That is correct. You should be congratulated.”

Dean Fry: “I should not be congratulated, but I think our current administration should
be congratulated for opening up and talking to us. I wanted to comment on one of the task forces, the Budget Task Force. That task force has a faculty member on it, a representative from the Financial Policies Committee. There are very, very few faculty on that committee. In fact, that might be almost the only one, the non-administrative one. But the Provost saw fit to appoint a member from the Financial Policies Committee to that Budget Task Force. That task force also will be meeting with the Financial Policies Committee later this semester.

I was really delighted to hear some of the first comments about the strategic planning that is happening. Ed Lawler is aiding in that process quite considerably. If Abby Cohn is here, she will be delighted to hear that. But due to her efforts, due to a lot of efforts of people, there will be a faculty advisory committee who will read and see all of the reports from the task forces, the college task forces, cross-cutting task forces, and those faculty will comment on all of those recommendations. That committee is in the process of being formed. It will consist of faculty. So I think that’s a really excellent issue in terms of having the faculty represented at the table.

Next I would like to turn to some other planning. The EPC has a really significant challenge this year. There are a lot of items on the table. David Delchamps agreed to chair the committee. Academic integrity is a huge issue. Some of you may have heard about the issue of plagiarism. Last week, sitting in a Honda repair shop, I was watching CNN, and I learned that one can purchase a term paper. It is not already written. You can describe what you want in it. So "turnitin" apparently won’t see it. But these are term papers for sale. I had no idea that such was the case. But the UPC is dealing with academic integrity and also the issue of plagiarism.

Last year the Senate adopted a change in the academic calendar to have Labor Day starting next year as a Cornell holiday. There were a lot of comments about the status of Cornell’s academic calendar. So I made a commitment that we would review the entire calendar. At this point there’s so much happening this year that I might delay the implementation of that commitment, but it’s something that I have committed to doing and certainly will do.

So I think I’ll close by saying that the meeting next Wednesday with the President and Provost is going to be very important. We are expecting a large crowd so it will be held in Call Auditorium in Kennedy Hall.

I do urge you to participate in that. I urge you also to participate in other fora that happen either in your department, in your college, or the university level so your opinion can be recorded. With that I will stop.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you, Bill. We do have a few moments possibly for questions for Dean Fry. Are there any? Thanks very much, Bill.”

Dean Fry: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “We will now move to the item on the agenda called "Good and Welfare." This is an area where people can speak at the Senate meeting on any topic that they desire as long as the Dean of the Faculty’s Office is informed in advance of the Senate
meeting and Vice Provost for Research Bob Burhman so indicated, and he has the rest of
the time allotted to the Senate meeting, 12 minutes, to speak if he so chooses.”

11. GOOD AND WELFARE

Vice Provost Robert Buhrman: “Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak
briefly. Last May, I gave a presentation on where Cornell’s position is on compliance
issues, particularly on financial conflict of interest. And I just want to follow up on that
and give you a prelude of presentation, if other events don’t overtake it. So at the next
Senate meeting I will give you more details.”

“Over the summer we have prepared a draft policy which has met with general approval
from the administration. It has been presented to the deans, actually yesterday. It was
done in consultation and with discussions and approval of the University Conflicts
Committee, so we’ve been moving through this process.

This "Financial Conflict of Interest Policy Related to Research" is its total, full title, is
motivated by the fact that due to audits from the National Institutes of Health, the
National Science Foundation, and two internal Cornell audits, we are basically judged as
not being in full compliance with federal regulations as currently implemented, and
certainly would not be in compliance with the regulations that we anticipate the NIH
to adopt over the next year. They have had a series of comments on those and the general
analysis is that if NIH says they’re going to do things, NSF -- and those are our two major
federal funders -- will adopt them quicker, because they have a faster way of putting in
new burdens on academic people. And it will be some additional burden, but hopefully
not too much.

The process will be complementary. This new policy will be complementary to the
current University Conflicts Policy. It will have the effect of centralizing the
identification of financial conflicts of interest that are related to research and centralizing
the management of those, so that the University will have a consistent policy across
campus.

The policy will be also adopted by the Weill Medical School, but they will have their own
separate procedures. In fact, we will be getting closer to where the med school currently
is. That is, there will be a Central Faculty Committee very similar to our Institutional
Review Board, which handles human participant research protocols and our ALAC,
which handles animal protocols. This faculty committee will identify and indicate when
there’s need to be a financial conflicts of interest.

The policy will be posted I guess on the Faculty Senate website in a couple weeks. We will
invite comments and suggestions for improvement, and I will discuss it here at the
Faculty Senate meeting if the Dean approves and the Speaker approves. And that’s it for
now, unless there’s a question or so.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions for Provost. Thank you very much. Prior to calling for
adjournment, I would like to indicate that we’re very thankful to the several speakers that
were on the agenda for not taking all the allotted time that you had, because now we’re
able to adjourn on time. And I would like to urge all members of the Senate and faculty
who attend Senate meetings to kindly arrive on time and be in your seats at 4:30. Because at that time, the Senate will be called to order, and we will begin our business of the day. With that, is there a motion to adjourn?”

Unidentified Speaker: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor of adjourning?”

Speaker Beer: Thank you. Meeting Adjourned AT 5:50PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fred Gouldin
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
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University Accreditation

through the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
What is accreditation?

• Cornell is accredited through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE, or “Middle States”)
• Our accreditation is up for renewal in Spring 2011
• Accreditation is required to access federal funds including student financial aid
• University accreditation is distinct from specialized/professional accreditation
What is the accreditation process?

- Decennial accreditation process involves
  - in-depth institutional self-study report
  - site visit by external review team
- Cornell must demonstrate that it meets fourteen “standards for accreditation” or “characteristics of excellence”
- External review team:
  - reads the report
  - visits campus
  - recommends action to Middle States
What is the self study?

- Overseen by the Accreditation Steering Committee
- Pieces drafted by six, topical Working Groups
- Demonstrates that Cornell meets each of fourteen standards
- Culminates in a ~200 page narrative
- Theme: “Any Person ... Any Study” within One University
- Due to Middle States early in 2011
Who is on the Accreditation Steering Committee?

- **Alan Mathios, co-chair** and Dean of Human Ecology
- **Kent Hubbell, co-chair** and Dean of Students
- **Bill Fry**, Dean of Faculty
- **Barbara Knuth**, Senior Associate Dean, CALS
- **Susan Murphy**, Vice President, Student & Academic Services
- **Paul Streeter**, Interim Vice President, Budget & Planning
- **Marin Clarkberg**, Associate Director, Institutional Research
- **Kristin Walker**, Manager of Support, Institutional Research
- **Nikhil Kumar**, undergraduate student, ILR
- **Gina Ryan**, graduate student, Microbiology
- **David Hajjar**, Weill Cornell Medical College

*And ... the six Working Group chairs...*
Six Working Groups & Fourteen Standards

Steering Committee

- Institutional Stewardship (Standards: 1, 2, 3 and 7)
- The Faculty (Standard: 10)
- Educational Offerings (Standards: 11, 12, 13)
- Integrity, Governance & Administration (Standards: 4, 5, and 6)
- Student Admissions & Supports (Standards: 8 and 9)
- Assessment of Student Learning (Standard: 14)
Institutional Stewardship: Standards 1, 2, 3 and 7

1. Mission, Goals, and Objectives
2. Planning, Resource Allocation, & Inst’l Renewal
3. Institutional Resources
7. Institutional Assessment

Chair: Kathy Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences
• Steve Cohen, Vice Dean for Administration, Weill
• Joanne DeStefano, Vice President for Financial Affairs
• Sandy Dhimitri, College of Human Ecology
• Cathy Dove, Engineering
• Dan Robertson, Institutional Research and Planning
• Robert Smith, Industrial & Labor Relations
• Kristin Walker, Institutional Research & Planning
• Kyu-Jung Whang, Vice President for Facilities Services
Integrity, Governance and Administration: Standards 4, 5 and 6

4. Leadership and Governance
5. Administration
6. Integrity

Chair: Charles Walcott, Neurobiology & Behavior

- Christopher Ahn, Graduate Student
- Judith Appleton, College of Veterinary Medicine
- Michael Esposito, Academic Personnel Policy Office
- Mary Beth Grant, Judicial Administrator
- James Kahn, Deputy University Counsel, Weill
- Beth McKinney, Cornell Wellness Program
- Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources
- Nelson Roth, Deputy University Counsel
- Carin Rundle, Office of the Provost
8. Student Admissions
9. Student Support Services

Chair: Charles Walcott, Neurobiology & Behavior
- Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis & Management
- Susan Cook, Graduate Student
- Doris Davis, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Admissions & Enrollment
- David DeVries, College of Arts & Sciences
- Betsy East, College of Engineering
- Chari Fuerstenau, Institutional Research & Planning
- Sarah Hale, Graduate School
- Timothy Marchell, Gannett Health Services
- Steve Morgan, Sociology
- Rebecca Smith, Undergraduate
- Jennifer Westling, Division of Budget & Planning
10. The faculty

Chair: Amy Villarejo, Theatre, Film & Dance

- Mark Albano, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs, Weill
- Cynthia Bowman, Law School
- Jefferson Cowie, Industrial & Labor Relations
- Ronald Hoy, Neurobiology & Behavior
- Rolf Pendall, City & Regional Planning
- William Searle, Institutional Research & Planning
- Kim Weeden, Sociology
- Randy Worobo, Food Sciences (Geneva)
Educational Offerings: Standards 11, 12 and 13

11. Educational Offerings
12. General Education
13. Related Educational Activities

Chair: Laura Brown, English & Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

- Steve Ceci, Developmental Psychology
- Matt Miller, Mechanical & Aeronautical Engineering
- Natalie Raps, Undergraduate
- Annelise Riles, Anthropology & Law
- Nick Salvatore, Industrial & Labor Relations
- Patricia Stark, Office of the Provost
- Carol Storey-Johnson, Senior Associate Dean for Education, Weill
Assessment of Student Learning: Standard 14

14. Assessment of Student Learning
Chair: David Gries, Computer Science
- Brian Chabot, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
- Mark Constas, Education
- James Cutting, Psychology
- Kathy Dimiduk, Engineering
- Marne Einarson, Institutional Research & Planning
- Kathleen Gemmell, Arts & Sciences
- Kathleen Gibson, Design & Environmental Analysis
- Katherine Gottschalk, Arts & Sciences
- Zsuzsa Koltay, Library
- Ed McLaughlin, Applied Economics & Management
- Terry Plater, Graduate School
- Don Viands, Plant Breeding & Genetics
- Kristin Walker, Institutional Research & Planning
- David Way, Center for Teaching Excellence
What is the time line?

Self-study plan devised; Working Groups charged and appointed (Spring 2009)

Final draft of Working Group reports due to Steering Committee (Spring 2010)

Steering Committee shares first draft of Self Study with campus (Fall 2010)

Final draft of Self Study submitted to MSCHE (March 2011)

External evaluation team visits campus (May 2011)
For more information

cornell.edu/MiddleStates
middlestates@cornell.edu

Alan Mathios, adm5@cornell.edu, 5-2138
Kent Hubbell, klh4@cornell.edu, 5-1115
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

The institution must possess the following:

• Clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, program, course)
• A documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning
• Evidence that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with constituents and is used to improve teaching and learning.
Plan for assessment

Colleges nominate delegates for campus-wide assessment discussion

Delegates attend “Meeting Middle States Expectations for Student Learning Assessment,” Sept 24-25

College delegates work with college deans and with Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education to develop an appropriate plan for assessment

Report back to Faculty Senate and other constituencies

Implementation of plan for assessment
Resolution from the University Faculty Committee - Amended

Whereas, the university anticipates a significant public health challenge during the 2009-2010 academic year posed by the spread of the H1N1 influenza virus.

Whereas, our students are among the at-risk population for this infection.

Whereas, the university is taking steps to minimize the spread of this infection.

Be it resolved that, the Faculty Senate encourages instructors to offer make-up exams following scheduled examinations, delayed due dates for other assignments, and excusal of classes missed due to illness, to facilitate the self-isolation component that is an essential part of the campus strategy to minimize the spread of this infection and the public health risk for the campus.
ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCIES

Deputy Provost David Harris
September 9, 2009
Reimagining Cornell: The Role of Consultants

Deputy Provost David Harris
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 9, 2009
Preserving and enhancing the core is critical to Reimagining Cornell

Consultants focus outside in

Task forces focus out from core

Core
Teaching, Research, Outreach

Student experience
Non-classroom learning

Academic support
University-specific operations

Admin & Facilities
Back-office business operations/infrastructure

Procurement
All purchased goods and services
Strategic Planning – Analysis and Recommendations

Cornell led academic task forces

- 10 Colleges/Schools
- Graduate School
- Life Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Management Sciences
- Budget & Planning

Consultant analysis

- Analysis of administrative functions across the university
- University-level decisions made by President and Provost

Strategic Plan document

- Faculty strategic plan advisory council
- Broad working groups (education, scholarship…)

- Libraries
- CIS
- CESS
- Student Enrollment
- Student Services
# Cornell Liaisons to External Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornell resources</th>
<th>Key roles and responsibilities</th>
<th>Individuals involved</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Project Leaders | • Provide visible leadership and overall governance  
                           • Evaluate comprehensive list of cost reduction options  
                           • Make decisions about which options to pursue and path forward  
                           • Resolve issues and conflicts as they emerge | • David Skorton  
                                                              • Kent Fuchs | • Monthly  
                                                             • Additional as needed |
| • Project Manager | • Provide detailed direction for the project  
                           • Make day-to-day operational decisions  
                           • Present cost reduction opportunities as they arise  
                           • Facilitate internal communications  
                           • Establish project deliverables/milestones | • David Harris | • Weekly  
                                                             • Informal contact likely multiple times a week |
| • Project Core Team | • Help develop, refine, and validate hypotheses  
                                • Vet emerging recommendations  
                                • Provide key perspective on value and ‘implementability’ for each major recommendation | • Kent Fuchs  
                                                              • David Harris  
                                                              • Joanne DeStefano  
                                                              • Bill Fry  
                                                              • David Hajjar  
                                                              • Susan Murphy  
                                                              • Mary Opperman  
                                                              • John Siliciano  
                                                              • Paul Streeter | • Every 2-3 weeks |
Input and Decisions

• University-level decisions will be made by:
  – President
  – Provost

• Formal recommendations will emerge from:
  – Academic task forces
  – External consultants
  – Strategic planning advisory committees

• Input and advice will be sought from:
  – Faculty
  – Students, Staff, and University Assemblies
  – Campus leaders (Deans, Vice Presidents, Dept. Chairs)
  – Cornell community
REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY,
WILLIAM FRY

September 9, 2009
COMMENTS FROM BILL FRY

Budget Adjustments

Strategic Planning

Other Planning
Minutes from the October 14, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

1. Call to Order by Speaker Steven Beer. "Good Afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to call to order the October meeting of the Faculty Senate." "First, I would like to remind all people here present that there will be no photos taken, no tape recordings made other than those by the staff. I would like to ask everyone to either turn off or silence your cell phone. When people speak, prior to speaking, please rise and identify yourself by name and department or other affiliation. We have no Good and Welfare Speakers at this point. I would first like to call on the Associate Dean of the Faculty Fred Goulding for a report from the Nominations & Elections Committee."

2. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

“I basically have two things. The Nominations & Elections Committee met and appointed chairs to various faculty committees. And these are the committees up here with their new chairs. Jerome Haas, David Delchamps, Will White, William Crepet, Steve Pope, Susan Ashdown, Muno Ndulho, Mary Beth Norton, Cliff Pollock and Mark Psiaki. I can do that very quickly. I’d also like to note that the Dean of the Faculty has been asked by the Provost with the help of the Nominations & Election Committee to nominate faculty to serve on several task forces that are being formed. These task forces include one on education, one on research and scholarship, one on public engagement and the fourth one is on infrastructure.”

“Any questions for me? Thank you very much. That was short and sweet.”

Speaker Beer: “Now, I’ll call on Vice Provost David Harris for some comments relative to the United Way.”

3. UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN

Deputy Provost Harris: “Thank you. I want to first thank Bill Fry for giving me time to talk about the United Way here today. So I’m Deputy Provost but here today as chair of Cornell’s United Way campaign for this year. And I have brought some other folks along who will be introduced as we go along in our 12-minute period. I’m here in this short period of time to address three questions, plus any questions that you have. Those questions are: Why, why now, and why through Cornell University?”

“So first: Why? Why give to United Way? The reason to give to the United Way I want to argue is in part that 100% of your gift goes to member agencies, thanks to the corporate cornerstone program. So 100% of it goes to the agency to do good in the community.

The second is the general fund. We all know that there are agencies out there that we’d like to support, but we don’t actually know which agencies are hurting the most. For example, in these times there may be many that assume that Loaves and Fishes, for example, is an agency that needs a lot of assistance. It might be that, because everybody thinks that, there’s actually some other agencies that need assistance that are just as worthy that aren’t getting the aid they need and our community is not being served. By giving to the Cornell United Way and letting them allocate to the agencies most in need,
we can do the most good. And last to say, there are a large number of agencies, a broad
group, for example, the Red Cross, Challenge Industries, Life Long, The Mental Health
Association, Suicide Prevention and Crisis in this community helped by United Way.
That’s the what to give.

Why give now? Well, I find out in talking with people at the Tompkins County United
Way what you might expect. The demand is high. The demand is higher than it was last
year. The next point is what I usually end up talking to you about. Because of the things
going on in the budget, because of the actions that Cornell will have to take over the
coming years and because of the actions that other employers in this county will have to
take over the coming years, we’ll see that demand increase. We’ll see an increase in the
number of people in this community who need services. We’re going to see a decline in
the number of people in this community who can help, who can provide assistance. And
so it’s incumbent, I would argue, on all of us, tenured faculty, untenured faculty, but
especially the tenured faculty who have a little job security that those in this community
don’t have, to dig a little deeper hopefully and help our friends and neighbors in this
community.

And why give to Cornell Tompkins -- why give to the United Way through Cornell?
Three reasons. One is payroll deduction. It’s easy. All you have to do is fill out a form. I’m
going to put some of them over here. Fill it out. Say you want to deduct it from your
payroll check, it’s easy. Second, if you don’t live in Tompkins County, you can designate
to another county.

And last, I think it’s actually a really important part of making a statement that Cornell is
a major institution and this community is committed to being a part of the solution to the
problems that are being created. And we have a role in those problems and increasing
problems for folks. So I hope that all of you will consider making a gift to the United Way
and doing so through the Cornell campaign. I’m going to come back at the end, but I’ll
introduce at this point Tom LaVigne, who is the co-chair of the county campaign.”

Tom LaVigne, Co-Chair, United Way: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much
for having us here this afternoon. We really appreciate it. On behalf of Andy Sciarabba,
my co-chair, I really thank you for this opportunity. Our theme this year is "In these times
more than ever live united." I think the meaning of that is fairly obvious. We’ve got very,
very tough times here. We’ve got people around our county who are hurting. And in
these times more than ever, I believe in the United Way. I’ve been involved with one
United Way campaign after another, since 1996.”

“And the reason I’m doing this is because I believe that the United Way touches more
people than any other agency in town. We’ve got 36 agencies that we help fund. We have
seven affiliated agencies that we help fund. We have the major RX program that helps
people that don’t have health insurance get prescriptions through this program.

We’ve got hunger and food security programs that we fund throughout all the pantries
around the county. So I think it is a very worthwhile entity to fund because it just helps so
many people. And I think there is not -- there is probably not one person in this room
that if you haven’t been personally touched by a United Way agency, you know somebody
who has been touched by a United Way agency. So this is the reason why I am so excited about doing this.

Now, we've got corporate cutbacks. We've got layoffs. We've got governmental cutbacks. And really the only way to make up for these cutbacks that we're seeing around us in our county that are a reality is to increase the base. And by increasing the base, I mean increasing the individual giving. And that is us in this room throughout the University. And the University employees have been very, very generous over the years. Last year, the campaign raised a little over $2,065,000. The University contributed, our employees contributed almost $900,000 of that. But that was only 17% of our employees. If we could get our -- if we could get our percentage up by a few percent, we could dramatically increase the amount of money that the employees from Cornell can give. And as David said, 1, 2, 10, 20, $50 a paycheck, that makes a lot of difference over time when you can increase the base.

And I know that some of you are in a position to help influence, if you can. That would be great. But really what I'm here to do is to ask. And that is, for those of you who give, if you can think about giving a little more. And for those of you who haven't given, please consider giving this year because it's a very, very difficult year.

And John Spence who will come up in a moment will talk to you about how the United Way serves his agency and how that in turn relates to help for people who need housing within our county.

Now, what I'd like to do is bring up Richie Moran, Cornell's Hall of Fame Lacrosse coach. He's got three national championships under his belt. And since he's retired, he has put the same effort that he put into his Lacrosse career into now helping our community. So I would just like to ask Richie to say a few things.”

Coach Richie Moran: “Good afternoon and thank you for this opportunity of being here. You probably are amazed that I'm carrying a football, but I actually came to Cornell in 1968 to help out with the freshman football program. And needless to say, it didn't work out. I'm still here. So consequently, I got here in ’68. Was going to be here for a brief time. Was given a Lacrosse job in February of ’69 and stayed here to ’95 as an active coach. I did spend some extra years here working in the athletic development and helping out raise funds for the athletic department.”

“Of the agencies that Tom mentioned, 36 of them. When I retired, my wife thought that I needed some hobbies. And her first statement was, it would be nice if you did the patio. And then the next one was, can you redo the kitchen? Well, I'll be honest with you. I'm not a carpenter. Definitely cannot put washers into the sink properly. So I went out and got involved in seven local charities.

And one non-profit that I really enjoyed the most, the first one I ever got involved in was the Racker Center. And the Racker Center means an awful lot to Tioga County, Cortland and Ithaca, New York and Tompkins County. What they do for young people, there are about 600 employees. There are many, many clients that we have from young babies all the way up to adults.
Watching that in action, I was president of the board for two years. And watching that in action and seeing the results were tremendous. My giving and caring started when I was in the fifth grade in grammar school. I remember Boys Town had solicited schools for funds from students. Not a lot of funds because we sure didn't have a lot. I used to save up my pennies and nickels and at the end of the month turn them in.

Remember the poster for Boys Town. There was a boy carrying someone on his back. And the priest mentioned to the boy, he said, Robert, isn't he heavy? He said, No, Father, he's my brother. We're going to reach out for carrying this year. We need help. Every agency in Ithaca does do a remarkable job of supporting people in need, caring, giving. I love giving back to this community. It's been very special to me. I intend to live here the rest of my life, and I love Cornell. Spent 30-plus years here. Spent a lot of time on this campus. Probably sat in on a few of your elections in disguise.

I love to go to some of the elections in the wintertime and sit in the back of the room and enjoy the beauties of Cornell and the great opportunities that exist here. I thank you greatly for this opportunity for us to be here today. I spoke with the Red Cross this morning. And they actually almost had like a pep rally. We talked about how important teamwork was. And, of course, with the Red Cross, there's a tremendous amount of teamwork. As we speak about teamwork, David, if you could get up.

Now, if David fumbles this ball, our campaign will not be successful. He told me when he played high school football, he did not have good hands. OK. He developed his hands when he became Provost. Now, what we have to do is pass the ball here. Don't fumble. It's like Rugby.”

[APPLAUSE]

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for a couple of questions. Or do you have another point?”

John Spence: ”Is this actually on?”

Speaker Beer: "Yes."

John Spence, Executive Director of Better Housing for Tompkins County: “And it clips on by doing something like this.”

“My name is John Spence. I'm the executive director of Better Housing for Tompkins County. I guess I'm here representing the agencies that benefit from all the efforts, all the dollars that go to the United Way. It's a humbling experience to try to represent all of the agencies. There are many, many that are doing great work. Better Housing, the first thing I'll tell you about Better Housing is we're not Ithaca Neighborhood Housing. INHS, you'll see their posters around. They also work with housing, affordable housing issues. They are in the City of Ithaca. Better Housing for Tompkins County operates everywhere else in the county. So we're in Dryden, Groton, Newfield and Enfield. We have programs that help people buy their first homes. Everybody we deal with is low-income. A lot of the folks we deal with are Cornell staff and Cornell grad students. Help them buy their first home so they are not paying rent, they are actually building some equity in their lives.”
"We have a housing repair program, major housing rehab program. A lot of the housing stock in Tompkins County is over 60, 80 years old. And it needs a lot of help. A new roof costs $9,000. Some people can’t swing that. Through Better Housing, we’re able to help them out. My favorite program is called Small Home Repair. Basically, this is the program that is supported by the United Way. Small Home Repair does, as it says, small home repairs for seniors and the disabled. Free of charge, labor free of charge. We ask the homeowner if they can afford the materials, if they can, great. If they can’t, we make some sort of effort to find them the money to cover the materials. The average client for the small home repair is a single woman living alone, 76 years old on an income of about $14,000 a year. And so we do everything from put up storm windows. A lot of it is preventive maintenance, e.g., stop the drippy faucet from becoming a rotted floor. United Way supports us, helps us, allows us to do this in this community. United Way helps us meet the need. The other important thing that the United Way does, as David mentioned, they know the need. I’ve been in non-profit management now for about 12 years. And some agencies, fund-raising is always hard. But some agencies struggle more than others.

It was easier when I was the director of the SPCA, and I could bring out a puppy or a kitten. A lot of people like animals a lot more than they like people. And it was an easy point for helping us raise money.

There are agencies that don’t have the puppies and the kittens. There are some agencies for whom confidentiality won’t let them talk about their clients, talk about the needs, talk about the work they do. It’s very difficult for them to raise a dollar. And that’s what the United Way looks at, makes decisions and helps. That’s why I give to the United Way because I know they are out there making those kinds of decisions.

Just quickly, I’ll echo what David said. Huge. The corporate cornerstone program means that the administrative cost for the United Way, those dollars are covered through the corporate cornerstone. Every dollar that you come up with goes to the agency that you select or to the general fund. So every dollar is going to the agency to do the good work.

And if I can just put in a plug for payroll deduction, I can tell you John and Carol Spence were $50 donors to the United Way forever and ever and ever. Last year I decided, OK, payroll deduction, 5 bucks a payroll, I’m now a $130 donor and it’s painless. I would ask you to consider making that little adjustment for a big, big, big impact.

I’ll leave it there. Any questions? I’m easy to find. The United Way folks are easy to find. Any questions? We’ll be glad to help, glad to come back and answer any other questions. Thank you.”

Deputy Provost Harris: “Number two, it would be great if you would send me an email if you have thoughts about why you or your colleagues either give or don’t give. Hopefully, it will be reasons to give, not just give because Cornell says you should. Lastly, if you are interested, we’d love it if you’d go around and tell people in your department.”

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. There are several speakers. I’d like to now call for approval of the minutes of the September 2009 meetings. Any additions or corrections?”
“All those in favor of approving the minutes of the September 2009 meeting of the University Faculty Senate say aye.”

[AYES]

Opposed?

“Minutes stand approved. I’d like to now call on Eric Cheyfitz for a report on the UFC.”

5. UFC REPORT

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, Professor, English Department and American Indian Program:

“I’m Eric Cheyfitz. I’m a member of the UFC, the English Department and the American Indian Department. This will be brief. We have been meeting with the Provost rather regularly. And we have basically focused our discussions on two entities. First of all, the strategic planning advisory council chaired by Ed Lawler. And I can give you the names of the people that are going to serve on that, which I will do right now. I’m sorry I don’t have a slide for this, but I’ll read them slowly and you can take them down, if you want.”

“The membership of that committee is Lance Collins, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; Jonathan Cullen, English; Sandra Green, History; Katherine A. Hajjar. I hope I got that name right. She’s from Weill Cornell in the Cell and Developmental Biology. Martha Haynes in Astronomy; Susan McCouch, Plant Breeding and Genetics; Ed Lawler, of course, from ILR, and last Michael Waldman, JGSM Economics. Those are the people that will be working with Ed and the Provost to work on the issues surrounding budget deficits.

And the Provost consulted with nominations and elections and also with UFC about members on this committee. Now, after that -- actually it’s already been reported on by Nominations & Elections. We met with Nominations & Elections to nominate faculty for these working groups that are going to be formed in Education, Research, Scholarship and Public Engagement. And that was already mentioned, so that’s in process. And again, that is a consultation process between the faculty, its representatives, and the Provost as well. Everybody here knows the other things we’ve been discussing, which everybody knows is the state of the budget, which now is $135 million in deficit. And, of course, the Bain projections are up on the Cornell website. We’ve been discussing those. Bain projects it can cover $90 million of that deficit.

So finally, we have just been setting the agenda for this particular meeting and discussing the resolution, particularly discussing the resolution and the amendment on getting these task force reports out to the faculty. And that will come up later in this meeting. So that’s it. Thank you.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “Thank you. Thank you very much. As we move ahead, I’d like to call on Dennis Miller and Tim Fahey for presentation of a resolution on behalf of the committee.” “It’s important to sign in so we’re short of having a quorum in the event a member of the Senate leaves or two. We do have a quorum, at least we did a few moments ago.”

“Minutes stand approved. I’d like to now call on Eric Cheyfitz for a report on the UFC.”
6. RESOLUTION ON CORNELL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

Professor Dennis Miller, Food Science: “Good afternoon, everyone. As I’m sure most of you will remember, President Skorton signed the American College and University President’s Climate Commitment back in February of 2007. This basically pledges Cornell to achieving a goal of climate neutrality. A lot has been going on in this area since that time, including the formation of a Climate Commitment Implementation Committee which is chaired by Tim Fahey, Professor of the Natural Resources and Kyu Whang, Vice President for Facilities and Services. And two items that are particularly noteworthy along these lines are a greenhouse gas emissions inventory that was completed last spring, which basically determines where our greenhouse gas emissions are coming from. And then just recently, on September 15th, a Climate Action Plan was published on the Cornell website. And this Climate Action Plan, or CAP as it’s abbreviated, has been adopted by the Buildings and Properties Committee of the Board of Trustees. In addition, it was unanimously endorsed by the student assembly, the employee assembly, and the graduate and profession student assembly.”

“A couple of weeks ago Michael Walsh, who is a doctoral student in BEE and student trustee came to Bill Fry with a resolution and urging the Faculty Senate to consider this resolution. And you have been sent a copy of this resolution and also you were given a link to the Climate Action Plan, which is on the Cornell website.

And so this afternoon, we want to discuss this resolution and decide whether or not we want to endorse it or support it. So I’d like to just read the resolution, which is also present in a handout that you got today. And it basically says, “Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca campus is needed to: One, achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050; two, establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality and mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and three, establish a portfolio of proposed action that is will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutral, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the university’s research, academic and outreach missions and programs.”

“Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate commends and supports the Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan. Be it finally resolved that this resolution be sent to Cornell President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President of Facilities Kyu Whang”.

Now, Tim is going to give us sort of an update. He spoke with us last spring, but he’s going to give us an update on where the Climate Action Plan is right now. And then we’ll open it up for discussion and a vote.”

Professor Tim Fahey, Department of Natural Resources: “So as many of you were probably here for the presentation last spring, I won’t go into any great detail revisiting what that was all about. We now have a plan. We’re galvanized into action. If you can keep it going forward there to the next one.”

“And we’re seeking the endorsement of the Climate Action Plan. Now, just a couple of points and then we can open it up to question-and-answer. And there were some folks
that were in the facilities department that helped develop the plan. So a lot of people put a lot of time into developing this plan. Hundreds of hours, perhaps thousands of hours of staff time from the facilities department and the consultant who worked on the plan. The president’s Climate Commitment is a national program. There are several hundred universities who have signed the commitment. We are one of the first ones to complete a plan. Our plan is really comprehensive. They put a very positive spin on language in hopes of getting the support of trustees and presidents for signing on to the plan.

So how does it provide opportunities? Next one. The principles that underlie the plan promote the fact that what we are -- what we have in the plan will, number one, improve - - now, how can you become climate neutral and improve the finances of the university you might wonder. If you can go to the next one, the assumptions that are in the plan that mean that the costs of the plan are not negative, assume that there's going to be an increase in energy prices, which I think we can all anticipate, and that there will be compliance requirements for CO2 emissions. It's now free to emit CO2 into the atmosphere and probably not too far in the future when we come to the point of decision and start charging for emissions.

So we took a median scenario for future energy costs and future CO2 compliance costs and then calculated the net rate of return of various investments. And all the investments are money saving under those assumptions. If we never put in CO2 caps, if the price of energy goes down, these things would be really expensive.

How it will support research is already evident. Jeff Tester in the Engineering College has a proposal into the DOE. It's going to be mostly in the energy sector of research. He has a proposal into the DOE that Cornell is proactive in implementing or in designing to go with our facilities system. So a demonstration project of what’s called EGS, enhanced geothermal, that's going to be much more competitive because it's easy to show how it will fit into Cornell’s energy system and be able to demonstrate this technology. So that's just an example. Smart grid is another type of research proposal that takes advantage of Cornell's campus to do research on demonstration projects.

In the area of education, this has also already derived benefits in terms of students participating in internships with the facilities department, using Cornell as sort of a laboratory for student learning. Seminars, courses that use the facilities department as their learning environment.

Finally, in the local community, there's plenty of opportunities for outreach in terms of, for example, carbon offset programs in the local community. So most of you are probably familiar with carbon offsets if you pay some extra money for your travel, then some of these are deriving carbon benefit somewhere else in the economy.

The idea in the carbon offset program in the community would be low-hanging fruit in the community that Cornell could invest in to improve the energy efficiency of, for example, local housing, low-income housing.

Yeah, next one. The plans, you might like to visit the website. It's a very long plan, but it's an easy to navigate website. And it's going to be a living website, so it will be updated continuously over the next decades.
Next one. OK. Yeah, maybe if you could back it up. I had a couple more slides in there, but I wanted to see if people were -- or we want today see if people had questions or comments that we could clarify what's in the plan, how we can actually come to climate neutrality in 50 years and hopefully get your endorsement of this plan.

Are there any clarifying questions? Very clear presentation. Last chance. One question? Two questions?”

Speaker Beer: “Excuse me. Can you please stand and identify yourself? The young lady will give you a microphone.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “Elizabeth Sanders in the Government Department.”

Speaker Beer: ”Please hold it close to your mouth.”

“Elizabeth Sanders in the Government Department. I was very disappointed when I read the plan, but I'm very glad that it's being done. I wish we had done it five years ago. We're very late. And we I think have not acknowledged some really terrible past mistakes.”

“But what is missing here is any real commitment to preserve the natural setting that we're in, which I think is a major advantage for attracting people to Cornell. But we have squandered it. We have concreted it over. We have built buildings we didn't really need. We have wiped out woods that could have been very important for campus as a living laboratory. In fact, those of us who are involved in the protest to save Redbud Woods proposed exactly that, using that woods for education for overcoming nature deficiency disorder.

But there's almost nothing here about preserving our space, being good stewards of nature, the nature that is all around us. Not concreting it over, not building buildings we don't need, emphasizing other kinds of education. I looked at the transportation links. And there's nothing there that would encourage people to get out of their cars and walk and bike. No bike lanes, no walking paths. There's even a remarkable picture of a person hauling his bike up the stairs, very unself-conscious admission it's very hard to get around here on a bike. It's very dangerous. And I have seen in only a year two very serious bike accidents right in front of me, involving students getting wiped out on their bikes.

There's really nothing here about trees. We have an entrenched rule David Lee tells me that no parking space can ever be lost. I propose we give ourselves a different rule, that no tree can ever be lost without replacing it. Look at the trees we've wiped out not just in Redbud but to cut down to build these buildings, big mature trees. So if I could, I would offer an amendment that the thing be recast to emphasize the preservation of beautiful nature here and not just this technological list of applications for federal funds to do techy things.”

Speaker Beer: “ I might suggest that you talk with members of the committee because amendments from the floor are not in order at this time.” “Tim, any comments on the comment?”

Professor Fahey:” “I support Elizabeth's point of view entirely. It has to be a happy
meeting between what trustees are going to endorse and presidents are going to endorse and those who like to be more proactive would like to get passed. Because it is a living document, it is up to us to make things change faster than what's in the CAP. And I think we're anticipating that is a possibility.”

Speaker Beer: “OK. Thank you very much. I’d now like to call on Bill Crepet.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “We do not have a quorum.”

Speaker Beer: “Oh, horrors. Has everyone who is a senator signed in?”

Speaker Beer: “So at this point, we can't take any formal actions. But I believe that Bill Crepet may make his report on the behalf of the committee of academic programs and policies.”

7. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Professor William Crepet, Plant Biology: “Thanks, Steve. Thank you, Steve. The CAP committee received a set of proposals from the general committee of the graduate school within the last few weeks. We have acted upon those and I want to report on them quickly. There were a set of proposals that included degree programs, name changes, minor field creations and dual degree programs. The first one was graduate concentration name change from collective bargaining, labor law and labor history to labor relations law and history pursuant to a parallel departmental name change. This was passed by the CAP committee without a negative vote.”

The second proposal that came before us -- by the way, all these proposals were well done, well documented. The second one was a plant breeding proposal for a dual degree with Tamilnadu Agricultural University in India. It was a master of professional studies on the Cornell plant breeding side and a master’s in technology and biotechnology and business management on the Tamilnadu Agricultural University side. We approved -- we lent our support to that proposal as well.

The next one was a new minor field that would be campus wide serving a variety of graduate fields. The new minor field would be demography. This was forwarded by the Cornell population program. We also found that to be well supported and we endorse that program.

Fourth, there is a dual Ph.D., J.D. proposal forwarded by human development and the law school. This was particularly well supported we thought. I thought from some personal knowledge that it was an extremely important and well reasoned program. And this would involve a Ph.D. in human development, psychology and a law degree in similar area. And it’s something that’s very important in areas such as capital defense law, post-conviction law, etc. We supported that without exception.

Finally, there was a proposal from Industrial Engineering and Operations Research. They wanted to change -- let me get their wording. They wanted to change the specialization data analytics to a concentration data analytics. We also felt that was quite sensible and endorsed that completely. Representatives of those units may be here to answer questions. Otherwise, that concludes my report.”
Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Bill. I’d like to now call on Eric Cheyfitz again for discussion of a resolution. Since we are lacking a quorum, we will not be able to vote on the resolution unless a quorum appears during the time of the discussion.”

Speaker Beer: "I suggest we take a straw vote. I would ask that we take a straw vote.”

Do we have a quorum?

Speaker Beer: “All right. I think that’s a point well-taken. I’ll ask Fred Gouldin, what is our status with respect to a quorum at this point?”

Associate Dean Fred Gouldin: “We have 48.“

Speaker Beer: “OK. So the gentlemen … would you accept the microphone, please?”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: “I’m sorry. I didn’t know it was coming. I believe we have a policy whereby we could take a straw vote here and cede to the U.F.C. some kind of official stamping ability. We have done this before in the past because we were having so many quorum issues.”

Speaker Beer: “That is correct in my recollection.

Professor Delchamps: “OK. I think even though we are now participating in an unofficial meeting and we actually took votes earlier on accepting the Nominations & Elections report and accepting somebody else’s report, too. So anyway, I just wanted to contribute that.”

Speaker Beer: “All right. So it’s the pleasure of the body to return to the consideration of the Cornell Climate Action Plan or Cornell CAP. Is there any further discussion on that before we will take a straw vote? Seeing none, a straw vote now.” “All those in favor, please raise your -- in favor of passing the Cornell Climate Action Plan, raise your right hand, please.

These are senators only voting.

Senators in favor of the Cornell Climate Action Plan, please raise your hand again.

Senators opposed to adopting the Cornell Climate Action Plan, please raise your right hand.

Senators who wish to officially abstain, please raise your right hand.

OK. Dean Fry, what’s the result of the straw vote?”

Dean William Fry: “40, 1, 4”

Speaker Beer: 40 in favor, one opposed, four abstentions.”

“OK. So now, we'll move to the next item on the agenda. And Eric Cheyfitz would kindly introduce it on behalf of the UFC. Eric. And again, we will treat this as a discussion to be followed by a straw vote.”

8. RESOLUTION ON TASK FORCE REPORTS

Professor Cheyfitz:: “There's the resolution. And it clearly is a resolution for publishing in
one way, shape or form the task force reports that have been done by the various colleges.”

“This was a discussion instituted by Abby Cohen who will speak as well. But it seems to me, I’m one of the endorsers of it, straightforward. And we discussed it in the UFC. That is in order for the faculty to give input on these task force reports and to advise the Provost and to register their pros and their cons, we have to read the reports. And hence, the purpose of the resolution.

The manner in which those reports are to be distributed is left open to decision making by the Provost in conjunction with the UFC, hopefully. But the need to get them out, it seems to me, is clear. It is simple. Without an informed public, you can’t have informed discussion. So that’s all I have to say on this. It seems to me to be a very transparent kind of resolution. But I’ll yield the floor to others who want to talk.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. As members of the Senate and faculty are aware, there is an amendment to the proposed resolution that Senator Howland will offer.”

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, NB&B: “I am Howard Howland, a member of UFC. Do we have a slide with the amendment on it? Yes. Down here in the italics, in the last point, now, therefore, be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports -- the amendment is for those parts of those reports which the Provost deems to contain viable responses to the present crisis be submitted at the earliest possible moment, etc. So it’s a modification. And this comes from the UFC. It doesn't necessarily have the endorsement of the UFC, but the endorsement is that we think it should be discussed. And I indeed support it. And I have two reasons for supporting it. The first one is that these task forces were commissioned by the Provost to go to the Provost. And the members of the task force were asked to think very broadly on these issues. And they, quite rightly, I think, thought they were talking to the Provost. I think it would be grossly unfair to our colleagues on these committees to simply take this and say, OK, you thought you were talking to the Provost, but here it is, everybody. This is what they have said.”

“So that’s the first point. I just think it’s inappropriate to ask the Provost to give these reports unredacted to the entire faculty.

And the second thing is I think it’s -- I think it’s a futile waste of time for the faculty to discuss those parts of the reports that the Provost simply doesn’t think are viable. I mean we’re not a debating society. We’re trying to do serious work. And to get into an argument about things …. recommendations to the Provost, which have no possibility or extremely small possibility of his taking, I think, is just a futile exercise. So the amendment tries to take this initial motion which has a bit of an air of a protest to it and make it, I think, a more viable and constructive statement. And that’s my defense of the amendment.”

Speaker Beer:: “Under the informal arrangement we have now, I think we can discuss the amendment and the main motion all together.

Emeritus Professor Howland: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer:: “One question occurs to me. And that is, has the Provost in fact decided at this point what the viable responses to the present crisis are? Or is the Provost and his
staff still trying to decide those points? Maybe it can be considered a rhetorical question.”

[LAUGHTER]

[INDISCERNIBLE - OFF MIC]

Speaker Beer: “Could you await the microphone, please?”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Middle Eastern Studies. “I was one of the endorsers of the original resolution. And although I see the wisdom behind this as defended, there are some problems with it. First of all, part of the reason I endorsed the original proposal was that it seemed -- it made sense that the reports be made available. To now suggest that the Provost will deem what is viable or what is necessary for the rest of us to see is to undermine the original intention of the original resolution. The idea is these reports are out there. We aren't a debating society; it's true. But we are a university. There’s no reason why these can’t just be made available. It’s not necessary that we all sit down, read everything and go up to the Provost and protest about them.”

“What I would suggest is that we further amend this as the recommendation to the UFC and have it say something like make the full reports available and have the Provost identify those parts that he deems viable. That way we know which parts he’s responding to or which parts he wants us to debate, if he in fact wants to debate at all, as opposed to going through with the black pen and saying, well, we’re going to release this part and not this part and this part and this part. Because that’s just going to create more questions, produce less answers and -- I don’t know about the rest of you. But this smacks of a kind of -- I don’t know. Those projects the Provost deems viable. It’s just not in the spirit of conversation and transparency. It’s in the spirit of corporate or legalistic control. And I’m very unhappy with the proposal. Which I will support if it’s -- well, it’s no quorum. Which I will support for demure, but I’m not happy at all with the amendment by the UFC. I’m sorry to say.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there a member of the faculty that wishes to speak in support of the amendment?”

“If not, then other comments. Ms. Cohen.”

Professor Abby Cohen, Linguistics: “I want to speak for the general motivation for the resolution and then talk on a couple of reasons why I feel that the original resolution is to be preferred. So many of us were at a forum.”

“The academic decisions lie in the hands of the faculty. And any academic decision or matter that cuts across colleges is the purview of the university faculty as represented by this body, by the Senate. And so when the Provost on our behalf commissions task forces, these necessarily are task forces not for the Provost, but for the faculty. These critically cover academic matters which are collective responsibility. And it is only if these task force reports -- and that includes both the individual ones that were intra college as well as those ones that cut across colleges because we can’t draw lines between these.

We can’t, for example, read the task force report about the life sciences without also understanding what both the task force reports of Arts and Sciences and CALS are
putting forward. So I don’t see how we can possibly carry out our responsibility as faculty to engage in the substantive discussion about academic matters without access to all of those reports.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Further comments on either the amendment or -- the gentlemen in the blue sweater, please. In the front.”

Professor Dave Lipsky: “I’m Dave Lipsky from ILR. I’m a member of the UFC. And we debated this issue at some length at our last meeting, probably for more than an hour. And I think we need to first recognize that it’s the Provost who commissioned these reports. In a sense, they belong to the Provost. It wouldn’t have happened if he hadn’t requested that these task force reports be done. So all this recommendation or all this resolution does is it recommends what’s silent in that language. I find it’s too bad it’s silent … If we pass the resolution, we’re recommending to the Provost who has these reports that he either make them entirely available to everybody on the faculty or those parts that are relevant to the discussion in the future.”

“So either resolution is only a recommendation to the Provost, whichever way we go, the Provost, we have to recognize, has the authority. He’s the one that commissioned these reports. They belong to him, not to the faculty. And he has to decide what action he’ll take in the future in regard to these reports. So passage of either resolution is only a recommendation to the Provost.” Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Further comments?”

Professor David DelChamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: “David DelChamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. I hear what you are saying and I kind of agree. And I have a feeling we might be spinning our wheels with these motions because it’s up to him. OK? And as far as the other comments about getting faculty advice, I think this was his way of consulting the faculty. He didn’t want to have a big, broad discussion. Now, whether I agree with that is another story. I would love to see these reports. And I would love to comment on them, and I would love for all of us to be able to comment on them. But I’m sure that they contain a lot of sensitive information. And I know it’s up to you to decide what to do with them.”

“The one question I have for people in the room, was anyone on one of these task forces who has misgivings along the lines of how he referred to about having his or her contribution to the task force made public?”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any further comments? The lady in the aisle.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “I just don’t see how we can vote to censor information from ourselves. I think it was the lack of transparency and very hierarchical decision making by a few people that got us into this trouble. If we are now so timid that we don’t want to get information and make our voices heard, we’re just going to perpetuate the same problems. And I think it’s a terrible idea to limit our voices.”

Speaker Beer: “OK. I think we have to move ahead. And I think the first thing we’ll do is have a straw vote on the amendment. Should we proceed to consider the amended version as appears before you, or the original version that is now before you? Better this way or better that way.”
[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “So let’s vote on the amendment first, the straw vote on the amendment. All those who would adopt the amendment if we had a quorum, raise your right hand, please.”

“All those who would oppose the amendment, raise your right hand.

It seems quite clear that we’re back to the original motion by the committee. So now, any further comments before we have another straw vote on the original motion, which is before you?

Seeing none, all those who favor the resolution before you, please raise your right hand.

All those who are opposed, in a straw voting sense, to the resolution before you, raise your right hand, please.

All those who would abstain if this was an official vote, please raise your right hand.

Thank you very much.”

Speaker Steven Beer: “So the main motion would be in favor by 35 with three opposed and two abstentions.”

Speaker Beer: “And so now that we’ve taken the straw vote and, as had been recognized by our professor of electrical engineering a little while ago, the university faculty committee will consider these straw votes at a subsequent meeting and perhaps can act on behalf of the full Senate with respect to this resolution. Now, I call on Dean Fry for comments.

“Dean Fry: “My comments are very short today. Can you hear me? Great.”

9. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

“First of all, I wanted to say just a few comments about the $40 million that you have heard that Bain thinks that we might actually obtain through procurement efficiencies. And I’d like to just indicate that those -- if we move to that realm, that it will make some change in our culture. But what I did want to say, remind you, that this is not e-Shop.

It is an improved e-Shop. E-Shop was developed before Bain made its recommendations, and there would be improvements to e-Shop so it would not be so clunky. I think we would not be prohibited from getting the items that we want. Abby, I think we'd have access to items at fairly efficient prices.

The alternatives to not getting onboard with going -- trying to get efficiencies through procurement --- are not really at all pleasant. We're still facing $135 million budget shortfall. If we can get and the procurement efficiency should enable us to make up at least $40 million of that without personnel actions which I think would be absolutely wonderful. So I just wanted to put my endorsement in for the developments in getting efficiencies through procurement.

Next I wanted to actually turn down here in terms of notices to the faculty. When I first talked with Charlie Walcott about responsibilities of the Dean of the Faculty, he indicated
that all faculty-wide notices had to be approved by the dean of the faculty. So it turns out that I get several requests. Today I had three requests to send out notices to the faculty. I have said no to some of those.

But, you know, it’s hard for one person to estimate what all the rest of you want. And I’d like a little advice. Are you OK with just getting email messages from others? Not exactly whoever wants to send out a message, but almost. Would that be OK? Or should I and people I consult with try to censor the messages that go out to the entire faculty? So that’s a question. Is it a pain to delete messages on your inbox? Should I abandon that activity? Yes, no? Please, somebody. Elizabeth.”

[INDISCERNIBLE - OFF MIC]

Dean Fry: “These typically don’t come from faculty. They often come from administrators. They come from groups. So the request to send a notice to every one of us comes from, typically, not a faculty member. What I have routinely said no to are requests to do surveys of the faculty.

So I can still leave that as a threshold. Comments, Abby?

Professor Cohen: “This raises the related issue of who is on the faculty list. At the beginning of every semester, for example, we get this very important set of notices, things that all teaching staff are responsible for following. As I understand it, it only goes out to the people defined as university faculty. That excludes in fact a lot of the teaching faculty at the university.”

“And so as we’re thinking about who gets what emails, I would like to raise the issue of having a more comprehensive list particularly for matters such as that, that pertain to all of us and are actual responsibilities that we have a mechanism for having the broader definition of the faculty. But please don’t send those surveys.”

Dean Fry: “OK. That will be below the bar, I guess. OK, if you have other comments, I would really appreciate hearing from those. In the interest of time, I will conclude my comments. Emeritus Professor Howland: “On this business of savings, what was it? $45 million.”

Dean Fry: “As I understand it, $40 million in terms of procurement.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “$40 million. I want to ask, does this include everybody, like research? Because if research is a large portion of the procurement, the University is not going to save any money this way.”

Dean Fry: “Yeah. My understanding, these are only on unrestricted funds. And restricted funds, sponsored research, are not included in the 40 million. And somebody can correct me if that’s incorrect. Correct? OK. Dave, sure.”

Dean Fry: “So the comment is that 40 million is procurement savings on unrestricted dollars but the expectation is the procurement policy will apply to all dollars.

[INDISCERNIBLE - OFF MIC]

“That’s not part of the 40 million and that large spend helps us get over that crisis.”
Speaker Beer: “Now we have before us the Vice Provost for research, Bob Buhrman. And he's going to address the issue of financial conflicts of interest related to research policies.”

**10. FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY REPORT**

Vice Provost Robert Buhrman: “Thank you. And thank, Bill Fry and the Senate, for letting me come here. This is actually the third time, and I hope the last time I need to speak to you. But that's up to the community.”

“This has to do with financial conflict of interest. And basically just to give you a very quick background, this is very important for Cornell's reputation and our research. Basically, there are principles regarding financial conflicts of interest that we need to report them, we need to manage them and we need to properly disclose.

Reporting is the new term for meaning reporting them internal to the Cornell organization, so that everyone -- the appropriate people here know what the conflicts are. And in order to do that, the reason we need to do that is we have to ensure that our research objectivity is not compromised by the possibility of individual financial gain. We don't rule out the individual financial gain. We want to make sure it doesn't compromise our research. We need to assure the public trust in that, that Cornell is doing what's true and correct. And I put this last, but in some ways this is first. In order to have continued access to federal funding, we have to have an updated financial conflict of interest policy.

And one of the things that must be taken into account and both by federal regulation and by maintaining the integrity and the perception of Cornell's integrity is that both real conflicts and apparent conflicts, situations where a neutral observer might reasonably conclude the conflict exists has to be identified and managed. It's just not appropriate to say, well, I don't think that's a conflict and it's OK.

And federal regulations and Cornell policy, existing policy for many years, has said that all or both real and apparent conflicts of interest should be properly reported and managed.

Next slide please. I'll give you a little bit of background. Research-related financial conflicts of interest receive a lot of scrutiny. I mentioned that and I think all of you have known Senator Grassley and public attention brought to research around the country, including the Med School at Cornell. There was a report out by the American Association of Medical Colleges and AAU, universities in 2008 that was a very detailed report on financial conflict of interest related to research. It covered both clinical which is not being done at Cornell, Ithaca.

It is done at the Med School, of course. And preclinical, which is growing at Ithaca, and nonclinical things that would impact in other areas. The Office of Inspector General of NIH last year said NIH was not in compliance on managing conflict of interest as required by federal regulations. In response, NIH then went out and reviewed all the universities. And guess what? The universities are not in compliance, so basically we're transducing down to the faculty member at the end.

We had a mail review of Cornell's policy and we had a letter saying we were not in
compliance and we needed to update. Our response was by the end of this calendar year,
we would be would have something in place. The other thing that happened in May of
this year, NIH solicited comments regarding a planned revision of this regulation; they
are tightening them up in response to federal, basically the congressional scrutiny. And
the AAMC, AAU and other representatives of universities and research institutions have
weighed in and they have basically supported most of the NIH proposed rulemaking.

Next slide, please. Just to give you what’s in those, one change would be that researchers
would need to disclose internally all directly and indirectly related financial interests
relating to institutional activities. The new thing is regardless of amount: no $10,000
threshold; no minimum threshold, $50 or $100. That, of course, is going to bite.

And we also would be required to post -- to report all interest related to an interest
project to the federal agency above $5,000. We will require management or elimination of
certain types of financial interests. We would require -- be required to have an
independent committee review of financial disclosures and mandatory development of
FCOI management plans for cases where elimination is not required.

There would be -- if NIH adopts this -- in some cases, investigators would be prohibited
from having clinical trial work where they had a significant financial interest in the
outcome, as you might imagine, some people think that’s very dubious. Again, that’s not
currently happening in Ithaca.

We also are required, will be required if these regulations go in, which are anticipated to
happen within the next 12 months, we have to have clear and better stated sanctions for
non-compliance with either the reporting or with the management plans.

And something which is not on the table at the moment, but NIH may require, we may
have an institutional conflict of interest policy for all major recipients such as Cornell.
Institutional policy means if the institution owns stock in the company and some
researcher who has no personal interest is doing research that can impact that company
in medical drug delivery or something, that’s an institutional conflict because I might
suggest to the researcher to make the data look better. I don’t think I would. I wouldn’t
even know it was happening. But that is a concern. And some universities have been
bitten by this in the public media. So this is something we’ll be looking at down the road.

Next slide, please. Remind you where we are as an institution. We have what’s called a
conflicts policy. It was adopted in ’86. It was amended in ’87. In ’92, the University
Conflicts Committee was established to help advise the university administration on the
implementation of that. In 2000, we started an annual disclosure process which is
currently working rather well. There was considerable opposition to it initially about
prying into private business. But the world has changed.

The other thing that happened I already mentioned. The NSF and NIH did findings and
stated Cornell by letter review, mail review we’re not in full compliance. The NSF also
weighed in on the same issues. They pointed out the deficiencies in our procedure and
our policy regarding reporting, management, and disclosure of FCOI’s. Also there were
deficiencies in stating what the sanctions were if an individual did not do the required
policies.
And we also were not telling the agencies at the right time when there was a managed conflict. We were reporting retrospectively as much as 18 months late. We're supposed to report on time when the proposal was submitted. And there was also a second of two Cornell internal audits from the audit office that mentioned all the concerns.

Next slide please. Those concerns are summarized here. This is just a direct quote from the summary of the last audit report. That should be 2009. I don't think I'll read it here. Excuse me.

But basically, they said we are not adequate. They said reviewers, those who look at this annual -- what we have called in the past disclosures will be called annual reports. Reviewers are not consistently engaging in conversations with the filers to obtain critical information so they can properly understand what's being reported. Disclosure forms have not asked for the right information. When a conflict or a potential or apparent conflict is identified, the management plans are not consistently completed across campus. Reviewers do not have sufficient training or guidance to develop a proper management plan and consistent management plan. There's lack of time. They follow up with people who did not properly file. And there is insufficient follow-up to make sure the management plan is in fact being followed.

Next slide. We agree with all those, by the way, from our own internal examination in my office.

So what's been going on over the last 12 months is there's been an internal process in the office of the Vice Provost of research, engaging the university Conflicts Committee and Dean Bill Fry and myself as co-chair of this committee. We coordinate this with our counterparts at the med school. We're expected to have consistent policies at both Ithaca and the med school and we intend to have that. Counsel's office has been involved and all offices have been involved. First thing we did is benchmark our current policy against regulation, peers and the AAMC, AAMU recommendations and found where we were deficient both in the regulations, both in the recommendations and with the peers. And we're taking best practices from our peers.

There was also finishing up a task by the president's task force which is a committee of administrators, trustees, Bill Fry, myself and my counterpart at the med school as co-chair, which is making recommendations on best principles and best practices - working principles and best practices for conflict of interest. And that report is consistent with what I am presenting right today. And basically it says we should comply, pretty obviously, with federal regulations and with the recommendations of the AAMC, AAU whenever we can. The consequence of this is we now have a draft policy on financial conflict of interest related to research. This would complement, not replace the overall conflicts policy.

Next slide. Almost done. It would cover all research, even if not federally sponsored. We don't think it makes sense to say that you can have financial conflicts that you don't tell anybody about if it's funded by Cornell money; but if it's funded by the Science Foundation, you can't. It seems the task force and I think that we should be consistent about that and make sure that the Cornell integrity is not impeached at any level.
The policy will improve annual reporting. Formerly called disclosure, it will be electronic and updatable online, eventually, hopefully as soon as possible. You only have to report an interest that you have. Next year the same interest you don't have to fill it in again. You just click and you're good to go. But it's going to take a year or two to get that in place.

We are also -- one of our major deficiencies is we don't have event-driven disclosure for reporting. Event-driven means when you file a proposal, federal regulations for quite some years say you have to file a report about what your interests are related to that particular research project.

If you file a human research protocol, IRB protocol, the same requirement. We're not following that requirement.

We have to fix that to be in compliance. This would handle conflict of interest related to research centrally. This would not address conflicts of commitment in non-research related financial conflicts of interest, such as purchasing, such as things having to do with the teaching that are not research. That would be handled by the unit, particularly on the area of conflicts of commitment. The units have different cultures, what's appropriate for the faculty to be engaged with and not engaged with. And my research office really does not want to get into that. That's up to the deans to decide. I should mention that this -- what's being proposed here has been presented to the deans and they have accepted it.

Next slide. We will implement this with a financial conflict of interest committee, faculty members appointed by my office. They would meet once a month. They would also include (and I think we said a minimum of eight) ex officio non-voting membership from the counsel's office, from sponsored programs, IRB and C-Tech. Why these folks? We need information so that when the conflict is being discussed, we can pull up the information on sponsored research, on human research protocols, tech transfer agreements, so that we can properly identify a conflict or say there is not a conflict.

If you don't have that information, you have a major problem. Emory, as I mentioned to some of you who were here earlier in the year, Emory University was under six months notice from NIH banned from doing all NIH funded research because they had an investigator who took, I don't know, $600,000 or $800,000 a year of speaking fees, pretty good lecturer I would think, in support of a drug that he had IP on and no one at Emory knew about it until the Tech Transfer Office accidentally mentioned this to the Compliance Office. We want to avoid that sort of thing. Emory has changed their procedures greatly.

So the committee would review the reports. Would talk to others who have -- and review those of others such as staff who had the responsibility for design, conduct, reporting of research. The committee will determine when there's a real or potential financial conflict of interest, will develop and approve management plans or require elimination of the conflict. The management plans will be developed in discussion with the researchers, as appropriate with the involvement of the college leadership.

But it will be done consistently across the campus and consistently with the same practices at the med school.
This central committee may be required, certainly strongly recommended. Comparable universities, Yale, Stanford, Columbia just adopted a policy very similar to this. And we will maintain electronic database in ARIA.

This is the final slide. If you have no research-related financial interest or financial relationships, there is no impact except for the standard impact that you have to complete in a brief online form basically the statements will ask you a series of questions. If you have no research-related interest or external relationships, you do it pretty quickly. You will also have to do it at a time there’s an event-driven report. For example, you’re submitting a proposal. We will ask you more than one question. Do you have tech transfer? Do you have some interest? It will be a series of questions. No, no, no -- you’re done. It will be done online once we get this implemented.

If you do have research-related financial interests and external commitments, there will be a more effective fact-based reporting process. The objective is assist and better guide to researchers to properly report so they are not called out by not forgetting to put something down, that someone else will say “that’s a conflict” and should have been managed and you were hiding it.

We want to protect the faculty. We’re not trying to catch the faculty. We want to make sure that Cornell reputation and Cornell research is properly viewed.

So the outcome of implementing this policy is we’ll meet the requirements of current and pending fed regulations. We will ensure that the integrity of our research is not compromised and we’ll ensure with confidence to the public that what we do here can be believed. Which I think is a good assurance. The draft of the proposal policy is on the web page. Hopefully a few of you looked at it. It’s in the standard somewhat tedious Cornell policy format. We’re open to suggestions. We really have to get it adopted this year. I’ll be happy to take questions for the little bit of time we have left.”

Speaker Beer: “Before the questions, make sure you have a microphone and identify yourself and stand.”

Professor Cohn: “Abby Cohn, Linguistics. I am wondering with respect to this new committee that you are talking about, you said that the faculty membership would be appointed by your office. Could I assume that would be in consultation with the Elections & Nominations Committee?”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “Well, I’m not sure. The IRB -- I understand that. And that’s something we’ll have to debate.”

Professor Cohn: “I’m not saying it should be appointed but I think it really minimally should be in consultation with the Nominations & Elections.”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “I will commit to that at least.”

Professor Cohn:: “Thank you.”

Vice Provost Buhrman:: “There is an issue of getting the expertise. We have the IRB and the IBC are appointed by the President. And what it really means is my office and then the president signs the letter I write for him. I don’t see the need for that last step but the
consultation I think is fine. My view, the first committee would be put together by going out to the colleges that have panels already doing this at the college level and getting people from that panel the expertise so we hit the ground running and start integrating our best practices across the campus. So I certainly -- consultation I certainly accept.”

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding & Genetics: “Lisa Earl, Plant Breeding and Genetics. What does managing conflict mean in this context?”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “Yes, excellent question. And I have slowly learned. When I came to this office, I had no idea. Management would mean, for example, it depends on the area and the nature of the conflict. It can be as simple -- and there’s a list of this in the principles section of the policy, draft policy. But an example would be disclosure. A very common thing is simply when you publish papers in certain areas, certainly in medical areas, you are required by the editorial policy to say I have interest in a company whose stock could be affected by the results of this research. Now, you might think they shouldn't do research on that. But it is acceptable in many areas as long as you disclose it to do so.”

“One of our colleagues at the med school and the university has IP in General Electric -- that we have licensed to General Electric in CAT scanning. That colleague published results that CAT scanning is effective for early screening of cancer. That colleague did not report in the paper the IP ownership. It was viewed by the colleague as being irrelevant. And I think it probably was from her perspective. However, it caused Cornell a lot of reputational loss. And that’s an example.

Another case would be you are doing research that could benefit your company. We might want to have a committee of neutral faculty examine the research results to make sure that they are OK. Just basically give a stamp that a second set of eyes have looked at it. It could be an example where you have a case where you enroll human participants in a research program and you have someone else do the enrollment or someone else do the analysis of the data so that the stream is broken, so that you cannot be accused of manipulating the data as you go through the process. Those are examples. Or it could be you can’t do it. That is, in clinical trials, that would be an example. You cannot benefit because the closer it gets to touching humans, the more stringent it becomes because the risk to humans becomes obviously greater. Sorry.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the center.”

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical Aerospace Engineering: “Steve Pope, Mechanical Aerospace Engineering. It is the case that different research communities have very different cultures. And also different federal funding agencies have different policies. Different journals have different policies. I understood from your presentation that the university intends to have a uniform policy so that all research will have to adhere to the most onerous requirements regardless of the funding or the discipline.”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “That's a statement.”

Professor Pope: “Well, could you comment on that? Did I hear you correctly? And is that the optimal thing for the university to do?”
Vice Provost Buhrman:: “Well, I mean I can frame that question many ways. One is, should we allow any of our research to be impeachable? To be accused -- reasonably accused of being done in a way to benefit my financial interests or yours or anyone else's? So whether or not it touches a human, it touches our reputation. And if I am in the same college as you or some other faculty member in another college and they say a Cornell researcher benefited from this, and people don't like it. They start thinking badly of Cornell research. They don't discriminate, well, that's in a different area. Everybody knows they are looosy -goosy there. I think it’s problematic. However, I think the management plans as I tried to indicate in Professor Earl's response or Professor Earl's question, the management plan should be consistent to the field. The principle should not be. The principles should be Cornell principles, I think.”

“That is, we are going to want to make sure that we don't let our interests taint our research, personal interests or the things that we actually encourage, starting companies and doing great things.

That's a big part of what many people at Cornell should do. Depends on the area. We don't want that financial interest to be viewed as a way of tainting what we do. But how much you have to report, it is true if you report in JAMA or the New England Journal -- Journal of American Society or New England Journal of Medicine, you better put down your interest. If they find out, they will withdraw your papers and accuse you of bad things. Probably correctly so. Applied Physics Letter where I publish in doesn't ask that. I don't think Cornell should be way out there ahead of people in management. On the other hand, I don't think we should be the last university to have a consistent and clear policy. So I think the devil is in the detail. But I think it’s better that we are clean and can argue that. I understand the concern, but I don't think we can have -- and the federal government will not allow. I will say NSF which NSF is almost certainly going to adopt every regulation NIH does and it will do it quicker because they don't have to go through the NIH process. I've been assured as soon as NIH looks like they are going to do it, NSF is going to match them and not exceed them.

And they followed us. NSF followed us. And I think you and I get money from them or we have in the past in that area. So it's not just -- the management plans can be adjustable to some degree, but the principles better be the same, I think.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for one last question.”

??”So the answer is yes?”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “The answer is yes. Well, but with the management plan allowing some adjustment. I would -- I'll stay. I don't know. People can leave. It’s important.”

Professor Ikhide Imumorin: “Ikhide Imumorin, Animal Science. So I disclosed an invention to C-Tech and we had a big discussion about this. I am wondering if some of this is how the university rules are written. So 1/3 goes to the inventor, 1/3 goes to Cornell and 1/3 goes to someplace I haven't figured out yet. The question that I'm asking --.”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “To pay our bills.”

Professor Imumorin:: “I'm not interested in the IP income. I’d rather have it go back into
my research program. They said I can't do that.” Vice Provost Buhrman:: “That's not true.”
Professor Imumorin: “Is that part of the issue here?”
Vice Provost Buhrman: “No, that’s not part of the issue here.”
Professor Imumorin:: “But that is part of the disclosure problem, right? Because you can
benefit from any IP that you release to CCTEC which puts us at conflict, if you –”
Vice Provost Buhrman: “No. If that was reported and we have the CCTEC there and they
say that’s not a conflict, it might be an institutional conflict because the institution would
benefit. There is a way of you returning your IP income, your personal income, tax-free --
I can tell you off-line how to do that. We have worked that out.”
Speaker Beer: “This is the time for adjournment.”
Speaker Beer: “All those in favor of adjourning?”
Speaker Beer: Thank you. Meeting Adjourned at 5:50PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fred Gouldin
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

October 14, 2009

Chairs Appointed

Jerry Haas, Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty (AFPS)
Dave Delchamps, Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
Will White, University Benefits Committee (UBC)
William Crepet, Academic Programs & Policies (CAPP)
Steve Pope, Financial Policy Committee (FPC)
Susan Ashdown, Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics & Physical Education (FACAPE)
Muna Ndulo, Lectures Committee
Mary Beth Norton, Library Board Committee
Cliff Pollock, Faculty Committee on Program Review (FCPR)
Mark Psiaki, ROTC Relationships Committee (URRC)

-
Concurrent Assemblies Resolution
Expressing Support for the Cornell University Climate Action Plan

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that Cornell University is a signatory of the American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC), which pledges the University to a goal of climate neutrality;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that Cornell University is uniquely positioned to demonstrate leadership in addressing global climate change by combining academic, research, and operational efforts along with campus community member participation under a comprehensive action plan for energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable energy;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate supports an institutional Climate Action Plan that is visionary; technically, financially, and programmatically feasible; capable of adapting new technological and scientific discoveries; responsive to evolving regulatory environments; and protects the university from risk associated with the potential for energy and fossil fuel scarcity;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate embraces the concept of the Cornell campus as a living laboratory for teaching and research projects confronting the challenge of climate neutrality;

Whereas, the Cornell University Climate Action Plan (CAP) seeks to dramatically reduce emissions of greenhouse gases associated with purchased electricity, on-site fossil fuel combustion, commuting, and university sponsored air travel by:

1) Conducting a rigorous review of the need for and scope of new construction, building materials and equipment and optimizing efficiency of space and systems in new construction;
2) Reducing future campus energy use and related greenhouse gas emissions through energy standards for new buildings;
3) Improving the energy performance of existing buildings by expanding energy conservation through renovations, new technologies, and occupant behavioral changes;
4) Replacing high-carbon energy sources with lower or no-carbon fuel and increasing the use of “renewable” energy;
5) Enhancing commuter options to reduce use of single-occupancy vehicles, including alternative work strategies to reduce commuter impacts; and
6) Promoting less carbon intensive alternatives for University-related travel; and
7) Developing a program of specific University-oriented offsets to make up for emissions unable to directly mitigate.

Whereas, on September 10, 2009 the Building & Properties Committee of the Cornell University Board of Trustees adopted the CAP and following that meeting Cornell University submitted the CAP to the ACUPCC in fulfillment of its pledge;

Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca Campus is needed to:
• Achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050;
• Establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality, and mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and
• Establish a portfolio of proposed actions that will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutrality, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the University’s research, academic, and outreach missions and programs.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate commends and supports Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan;
Be it finally resolved that this resolution be sent to Cornell University President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President for Facilities Services Kyu Whang.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis Miller
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Faculty Senate

Shane Rothermel
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Student Assembly

Gary Stewart
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Employee Assembly

Michael Jay Walsh
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Graduate & Professional Student Assembly

D. T. Nighthawk Evensen
President,
Graduate & Professional Student Assembly

Rammy Salem
President,
Student Assembly

Jason Seymour
Chair,
Employee Assembly

Professor William Fry
Dean of Faculty
RESOLUTION ON CORNELL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

Tim Fahey
October 14, 2009
Resolution to Support the Cornell CAP

• **Be it therefore resolved** that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca Campus is needed to:
  – Achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050;
  – Establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality, and mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and
  – Establish a portfolio of proposed actions that will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutrality, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the University’s research, academic, and outreach missions and programs.
Resolution to Support the Cornell CAP

• **Be it further resolved** that the Faculty Senate commends and supports Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan;

• **Be it finally resolved** that this resolution be sent to Cornell University President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President for Facilities Services Kyu Whang.
YOU SAID AMERICANS PREFER TO WAIT FOR A CRISIS TO \textit{GALVANIZE} THEM INTO ACTION.
WHAT'S OUR PLAN?

WELL, WE'VE ALREADY STARTED CUTTING BACK ON AUTO USE...
The Presidents Climate Commitment

Cornell’s Climate Action Plan

Mission-linked Actions to Advance Our National Leadership Position
Climate Action Plan

We are seeking
Endorsement of the Climate Action Plan
Presidents Climate Commitment

“develop and implement a plan with specific targets and timelines to achieve climate neutrality at a pace and in a manner that maximizes the opportunities for the university”

- From American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment 2007 Annual Report

*Deadline: September 15th, 2009*
Climate Action Plan Principles

Actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and:

• Improve Finances
• Support Research
• Broaden Education
• Enhance Outreach
Climate Action Plan Principles

Actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and:

• Improve Finances
  – Reduce Energy & Compliance Costs
  – Facilities Projects = + Net Present Value
  – Overall Portfolio: Real IRR of about 15%

• Support Research
• Broaden Education
• Enhance Outreach
Climate Action Plan Principles

Actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and:

- Improve Finances
- Support Research
  - Cross-Disciplinary Research Actions
  - Areas of Significant Funding Interest
  - Demonstration Scale (CURBI, EGS, Smart Grid)
- Broaden Education
- Enhance Outreach
Climate Action Plan Principles

Actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and:

• Improve Finances
• Support Research
• Broaden Education
  – Conservation Outreach and Student Leadership
  – Academic-Operations collaboration
  – Campus as Living Laboratory
• Enhance Outreach
Climate Action Plan Principles

Actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and:

• Improve Finances
• Support Research
• Broaden Education
• Enhance Outreach
  – Support Master Plan and TIMS
  – Support Community Carbon Offset Program
  – Collaborate with Coop. Extension across state
  – Support economic development/job growth
Climate Action Plan Principles

- Maintain a dynamic plan that will respond to changes in science, technology and society:
  - measure our progress against our targets
  - update the plan to reflect best use of human and fiscal resources
Here is a link to the Climate Action Plan  
http://www.sustainablecampus.cornell.edu/climate/  
*Also, here is an article describing the CAP in the Online Cornell Chronicle:

http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Sept09/CAP.html
Resolution regarding availability of the Task Force Reports

Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principle mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and

Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and

Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty,

Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

Endorsed by,
Eric Cheyfitz, English
Shawkat Toorawa, NES
Kent Goetz, Theatre, Film and Dance
Shelley Feldman, Developmental Sociology
Amendment to Resolution regarding availability of the Task Force Reports

Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principle mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and

Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and

Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty,

Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports or those parts of those reports which the provost deems to contain viable responses to the present crisis be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

Presented by the UFC
Financial Conflicts of Interest Related to Research Policy

Bob Buhrman
Senior Vice Provost for Research
Cornell Faculty Senate Meeting
Oct. 14, 2009
Principles Regarding Financial Conflicts of Interest

- Reporting, management, and appropriate disclosure of FCOIs is essential for:
  - ensuring research objectivity is not compromised by possibility of individual financial gain
  - assuring the public trust in research institutions
  - continued access to federal funding

- Must consider both real conflicts and apparent conflicts, i.e., situations where a neutral observer might reasonably conclude a conflict exists

- **Federal regulations and Cornell policy require that all real and apparent conflicts of interest are properly reported and managed**
Financial Conflicts of Interest

Research-related FCOI is the subject of significant federal scrutiny and public attention

– AAMC/AAU report (2008) on FCOI and research (clinical, pre-clinical and non-clinical)

– OIG finds NIH in non-compliance; NIH reviewed university FCOI policies, including Cornell’s (2008)

– NIH solicited comments regarding a planned revision of its FCOI regulations (5/8/2009); AAMC/AAU supports most proposed steps
Proposed NIH Regulations
(*generally AAMC/AAU recommended best practices*)

- Disclose all directly and indirectly related financial interests related to institutional activities, regardless of amount; report all interests greater than $5K to funding agency.
- Require management or elimination of certain types of financial interests.
- Require an independent committee review of financial disclosures and mandatory development of FCOI management plans for cases where FCOI elimination is not required.
- Prohibit investigators leading clinical trials from having a significant financial interest in a related or potentially impacted commercial entity.
- Enhance FCOI sanctions.
- Require an institutional conflict of interest policy for all major NIH funding recipients.
Financial Conflicts of Interest - Cornell

- Cornell Conflicts Policy covers Conflicts of Commitment and Conflicts of Interest
  
  [www.policy.cornell.edu/Conflicts_Policy.cfm](http://www.policy.cornell.edu/Conflicts_Policy.cfm)
  
  Adopted May 31, 1986; amended January 29, 1987
  
  October 29, 1992 (established University Conflicts Committee)
  
  October 28, 2000 (annual disclosure process established, partially electronic)

- Recent NSF and NIH audit findings stated that Cornell is not in full compliance with federal FCOI regulations. Deficiencies in:
  - procedure and policy regarding reporting, managing, and disclosing all research related FCOIs
  - identification of sanctions
  - timely agency notification

- Internal Cornell Audit (2008-2009) found “major audit concerns”
“Disclosure, review and conflict management procedures for conflicts of interest and commitment are not adequate:

• Reviewers are not consistently engaging in conversations with filers to obtain critical information necessary to assess the adequacy of disclosure;
• Disclosure forms do not provide adequate information for reviewers;
• Upon identification of a conflict, management plans are not consistently completed;
• Reviewers do not have sufficient training or guidance in the development and execution of management plans;
• Lack of timely follow-up with non-compliant filers;
• Insufficient follow-up for disclosures under review.”
Steps In-Process to Address FCOI Issues

• Review and update Cornell policy and procedures for research-related FCOI.
  – Internal process
    OVPR; University Conflicts Committee, Dean Bill Fry and Bob Buhrman (co-Chairs); coordination with Weill counterparts, Counsel’s Office, Audit Office
    Benched-marked policy against regulations, peers, and AAMC/AAU recommendations
  – President’s Task Force on FCOI: Charge: “Recommend working principles and best practices”
    Bill Fry, Trustees, Ithaca and Weill administrators, David Hajjar (Weill co-chair) and Bob Buhrman (co-chair)
    Final report in draft form: “fully comply with all applicable regulations, and with AAMC/AAU recommendations wherever feasible.”

• Cornell Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest Related to Research
  • Complements Conflicts Policy
FCOI Related to Research Policy

• Covers all research, even if not federally sponsored

• Improves annual reporting (disclosure) process - electronic and updateable on line
  – Report all research-related financial interests - *regardless of amount*

• Implements **event-based reporting of external interests**
  – at time of proposal submission (**required by NSF and NIH regulations**)  
  – at time of submittal of IRB protocols (**required by federal regulation**)  

• Units handle conflicts of commitment and non-research-related FCOI
Implementation of FCOI Related to Research Policy

- FCOI Committee, faculty members appointed by SVPR, meets monthly; ex-officio, non-voting membership by Counsel’s office, OSP, IRB, CCTEC

- ORIA FCOI staff supports FCOI Committee in review and management plan process, similar to support provided IRB

- FCOI Committee actions:
  - reviews the financial reports of faculty and all others who have the responsibility for the design, conduct, and reporting of research
  - determines when real or potential FCOI exists
  - develops and approves management plans, or requires elimination of conflict
  - management plans developed in discussion with researchers, and, as appropriate, with the involvement of the college leadership

- Annual reports and proposal-specific reports of external interests maintained in secure database in ORIA
Impact on Cornell Faculty

• If have no research-related financial interests or external relationships
  – *no impact, apart from completing, online, annual report and event driven reports*

• If have research-related financial interests and external commitments
  – Improved, and more effective, fact-based reporting process: Objective is to assist and better guide researchers in proper FCOI reporting
  
  – Central, confidential development and implementation of FCOI management plans: Goal is not to eliminate most intersecting relationships but to manage them appropriately

• Outcome
  – Meet requirements of current and pending federal regulations
  – Ensure that Cornell’s research integrity is not compromised and that the reputation of our researchers cannot be impugned
  – Assure public trust in Cornell research
Minutes from the November 11, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

Speaker Pro Tem Charlie Walcott: “I would like the call the meeting to order. A few general announcements: First off, no cell phones, tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and everybody please join me in turning off your cell phone.”

“When you rise to speak, please identify yourself and the department, and we will announce the number of good and welfare speakers and the number of minutes allocated to each speaker. At the moment, I have just John Weiss, who may or may not manage to appear at the end of the session.”

“So I would like to begin by calling on David Lipsky to give the University Faculty Committee Report.”

1. UFC REPORT

Professor Dave Lipsky, ILR: “Thank you, Charlie. Since the last senate meeting on October 14th, the UFC has had three meetings. On Wednesday, October 21 Dean Fry and the UFC met with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. Joining the meeting were the two faculty trustees, Rosemary Avery and Ron Ehrenberg. UFC engaged in a candid, but congenial discussion with the trustees about the University’s budget and financial problems, as well as the strategic planning process.”

“We expressed our hope the faculty might be represented at Executive Committee meetings, and Chairman Meinig (sp) assured us faculty trustees were welcome to attend all these meetings. We also pointed out that uncertainty about the future of the university was contributing to a climate of anxiety and insecurity among faculty and staff. The trustees assured us they were aware of the effects of uncertainty and noted that the best way to resolve the uncertainty was to expedite the process of decision-making.

“On Tuesday, October 27, Dean Fry and the UFC met with President Skorton, Provost Fuchs and Professor Edward Lawler, who, as you know, is chairing the strategic planning effort. The UFC once again expressed its concerns about the university’s budget difficulties and the strategic planning process. The president and provost stressed they shared our concern for the welfare of the faculty, and they expressed the hope that our budget problems could be addressed without significantly affecting the core academic functions of the university. “The UFC met again on its own on Tuesday, November 3. Once again, members of the UFC and Dean Fry discussed budgetary matters and the strategic planning process. We concluded that it was essential that the faculty senate attempt to influence the decision-making process on those matters, and we discussed various means the senate can use to exercise its influence. For example, the senate might establish an ad hoc faculty body to distill University-wide issues that arise in the strategic planning process. That body could then report to the full senate on its findings.

“Also, if there is a sufficient number of critical issues that emerge before the senate’s next meeting in December, the senate could devote the entire December meeting to a discussion of those issues.
“The UFC thought it might be desirable for the senate to sponsor its own faculty forum to discuss the critical issues likely to arise in the strategic planning process. The UFC invites your comments today on these ideas and your proposals for other means the senate might use to influence the strategic planning process.

“The UFC intends to bring a resolution to this body at its next meeting in December that will incorporate a plan for the senate to influence the strategic planning process and will also include a set of principles the UFC believes should guide the university's decision-making on these critical matters.”

Speaker Walcott: “Time for one question?”

“I would ask the body for the approval. Everybody in favor of approving the report from the UFC, say aye.

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: Opposed?

It passes. Dean Fry?”

2. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Dean of Faculty, William Fry: “Thank you, Charlie. Last time the senate in an unofficial meeting met and discussed the availability of the various task force reports, and that was an issue on the minds of many folks. The provost was present at that meeting, listened to the discussion, and I can assure you there's been a tremendous amount of discussion in the provost's office and also among the deans about the availability of those reports.”

“As you all know, the summaries of those reports are on the web, and six cross-cutting reports, and all of the reports are in six binders in the Dean of Faculty office.

“At this time, there have been 27 people who have taken the time to come over and read the reports -- at least some of the task force reports, but they are available, and I think the body appreciates very much the opportunity to review those reports.

“What I wanted to call to your attention to is the fact that there will be a series of discussions concerning the six cross-cutting task force reports. There will be five yet this year, and a sixth on the budget model will happen in January. Next Wednesday is the discussion on student enrollment, and there will be some very important issues discussed at that discussion. I really invite your participation.

“I believe the provost will moderate each of these reports; is that correct?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Try to moderate.”

Dean Fry: “The provost will try to moderate each of the reports. He will be present at each of them. There will be a short time for presentation, and I think the majority of the time will be for question and answer. Certainly, you can make your comments or ask your questions at those discussions. The provost will also read e-mail and other messages that are sent to him, so I would invite you, if you have a concern or comment, I would really invite your contribution in that regard.
“And then in a continuing discussion concerning the recommendations from the Governance Committee report from about two years ago, one of the major issues that I saw in that report was the committee felt there was a real need for the faculty to interact with the administration, and I want to tell you that’s happening.

“The UFC, as David just mentioned, is meeting about weekly, about half of the time with the provost or president, and I want to identify some other issues or committees that are meeting with the administration. The Financial Policies Committee has had available to them the budget task report or a draft of that report for some weeks. They have discussed that task force report with the co-chairs of that task force and will continue that discussion.

“They have also met on some personnel issues and provided advice to the administration on those, and those issues are confidential.

“The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has had one meeting with the provost recently, and the provost has requested a second meeting with that group to discuss an academic issue.

“And finally, I have been present at a lot of the provost meetings for planning and some of the president’s staff meetings for planning. Certainly, no one faculty member can speak for all the faculty, but there’s at least one non-administrative faculty member present in many of those meetings. I just wanted to bring your attention to that.

“Then I have a question concerning -- there was a concern we did not have a quorum at the last meeting, so do you need a paper reminder of the senate meetings?

“No. Is e-mail okay?

“And will you come? Great. All right.

“And I’m going to put a plug in for what Joanne Destefano will talk about later. Apparently, there’s opportunity for a really significant contribution to correct our budget problems through procurement. She’s going to describe how that’s happening, but up to $30 million to $40 million can be saved by changing our behavior concerning procurement. That will mean a cultural change for faculty. Hopefully the new, improved e-shop will not be the old, clunky e-shop. Joanne will talk about that, and I’m sure she’ll appreciate feedback on those things.

So, Charlie, that’s my report.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you, sir. Fred Gouldin, for our Committee on Nominations and Elections.”

3. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Associate Dean of Faculty, Fred Gouldin: “I’m reporting for nominations and elections this afternoon. My report will be brief. One, I want to bring the names of three faculty members to your attention. They have all agreed to serve on university committees, and they need your confirmation to actually serve in these committees.
“So we have contacted Charlie Walcott to ask him to be speaker pro tem. We’ve also asked Mary Pat Brady to serve on elections and nominations. She’s in the College of Arts and Sciences. Andrea Parrot has agreed to serve on the University ROTC Relationship Committee; and John Guckenheimer has agreed to serve on FACTA, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Appointments.

“So I think at this point, I should call for a vote of approval of this slate of candidates and your confirmation, so they can begin their service.”

Speaker Walcott: “All in favor of this motion, say aye.”

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: “All opposed?

“Carries.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “Thank you very much. Just to go on, as a matter of information, and this really has dropped off the bottom, is the following: Professor Kenneth Brown of Mathematics and Arts and Sciences and Professor Bruce Tracy of The Hotel School have agreed to serve on the University Hearing Board Committee. This does not require your approval, but this is only for information. So if there are no questions, thank you very much.”

4. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 14, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Speaker Walcott: “Moving briskly along, I call for the approval of the minutes of the October 14th faculty senate meeting. Do I hear a motion to approve?”

“Please, somebody? Vickie, thank you so much.

“I don’t believe they need a second, so everybody willing to approve, say aye.

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: “Anybody opposed, say nay.

“That one passed, good. We are now coming to a discussion and vote on the resolutions presented at the meeting of the 14th of October, when there was not apparently a quorum.”

5. RESOLUTIONS FROM 14 OCTOBER

“And so how do we proceed, Bill? I don’t see them here on the -- all right. There’s a resolution on the Cornell Climate Action Plan, and I presume there probably is a resolution, and you can read it probably better than I can and faster. I think what I’m going to do is simply call for any discussion on this motion.

• Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca Campus is needed to:
  – Achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050;
  – Establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality, and
mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and

– Establish a portfolio of proposed actions that will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutrality, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the University’s research, academic, and outreach missions and programs.

• Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate commends and supports Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan;

• Be it finally resolved that this resolution be sent to Cornell University President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President for Facilities Services Kyu Whang.

“Seeing no hands, I will ask for a vote of approval. All in favor of this resolution, say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: All opposed?

“I would say it passes unanimously.

“Moving now to the next one, there is an amendment to the motion on the availability of task force reports. Here it is. And is there any discussion on this amendment?

“Amendment to Resolution Regarding Availability of the Task Force Reports

• Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principal mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and;

• Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and;

• Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty;

• Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports or those parts of those reports which the provost deems to contain viable responses to the present crisis be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

“Yes, sir.

“Okay. Thank you for your -- I will take that as a friendly amendment. Is there any further discussion, Dean Fry.

“So a piece of information. This amendment was defeated in a straw vote in October. Seeing no further discussion, I will ask -- call the question, and who is in favor of this motion? Everybody in favor, please say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: All opposed?

“I would say that the ayes have it; but if you want to put up hands, let's try hands first. In favor of the amendment?
“And opposed?
“So the motion -- the amendment carries. We now move along to the main resolution. So we're done.
“It's going the wrong way. Sorry.”
“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We voted on the amendment before.”
“Speaker Walcott: I see. Now we vote on the whole motion. I'm sorry. I was not here last time, so I was not party to the excitement.
“Is there further discussion on this motion? Yes.”
“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this motion actually relevant to anything, or have events passed it by?”
“Speaker Walcott: Dean Fry?”
“Dean Fry: We've all wondered about that question. I think a vote by this body would be appropriate at this time, because the sense of the body last time, even though there was not a quorum, was certainly in favor of something like this. So I would encourage us to vote, even though events have indeed passed it by.”
“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? Yes, sir.”
“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- may we get another explanation of what's going on here. My main worry was that the support was for the -- following this one and there was a great deal of criticism. It's not clear to me that the vote we just had is actually reflective of all the issues involved in these two .”
“Speaker Walcott: Does somebody who proposed the motion want to try and answer that question?
“Yes, David.”
“Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: I put the question to the group, is there anyone here on the task force that would object to his or her contribution made public. I agree with you that this vote we just took now is kind of strange, since probably a lot of people didn't hear the discussion.”
“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? Yes.”
“Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: Last time the resolution only failed because there was not a quorum, but I recall there were only three votes in favor of it, and it was overwhelmingly opposed. People wanted the entire reports and have complete transparency. Those underlined portions could potentially gut the entire resolution and allow the administration to withhold any part of the reports that it didn't want people to know.
“I think we are really doing something without knowledge of what's being voted on, and we really should have, Charlie, can we have some kind of explanation of what happened last time and what the alternatives were, before we rushed into a vote.”
“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion?

“Seeing none, are you ready for the question? “So I pose the question; are you in favor of this motion? All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

“The whole motion, as amended.

“Excuse me. One person at a time, please. Is there further discussion? David?”

“Professor Delchamps: Point of order. Anyone who voted in favor of this motion just now may move to reconsider.”

“Speaker Walcott: Does anybody wish to reconsider the motion on the amendment?

“Excuse me?

“Thank you.

“So I guess we have to vote as to whether we are going to reconsider the vote on the amendment.

“We can discuss that. That’s a discussible point. All right. Is there discussion on the idea of reconsidering the vote on the amendment?

“Seeing none, I would call the question, is there -- oh, there is. I’m very sorry.”

“Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: Will we be discussing the pros and cons of the amendment here, then, if we reconsider the amendment? Is that what we’re doing?”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes.”

“Professor Calderone: Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes, sir.

“Where’s our parliamentarian when we need him?

“Peter, what’s the situation?”

“Emeritus Professor Stein: The situation is that I have laryngitis.”

(LOUGHTER)

“Speaker Walcott: Oh, dear.”

“Professor Stein: But at the moment, it’s appropriate for the whole party to vote on whether or not they want to reconsider the motion. If that motion passes to reconsider, then the previous -- you are back to before you decided the election. Then both sides can present the case for or against those words.”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you very much, Dean Peter Stein.”

“Speaker Walcott: Alright. Is there further discussion on reconsideration? Seeing none, I would like to call the question, and how many are in favor of reconsidering the vote on the amendment? Please say aye or put your hand up.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. How many opposed?
“Okay. Reconsideration wins, clearly, on that one. So now we are back at the beginning.

“And the amendment is before you and is on the table and is now appropriate for discussion. Please.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does the amendment only elude to the underlying portion of this motion? It does. Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we are voting whether to include that in the vote? Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Elizabeth?”

“Professor Elizabeth Sanders: The underlying parts pretty much make the thing moot. The whole idea was to make these reports available to everybody, fully transparent, because they’re enormously important to the future of the university. The addition of the lines -- I forget who offered those, but that essentially says that anything that people in Day Hall want to withhold, they can withhold. So I think it’s meaningless. There’s no transparency, availability of the reports.” “Does somebody have a record of the vote? I think there were three votes in favor of that, adding that underlying part. And 80 votes against it last time, so what we have done today just seems so extraordinary. Those who heard the full debate last time were overwhelmingly opposed to the addition of these lines, because they limited the power of the senate, and of the faculty generally, to know what’s going on in these self studies.”

“Speaker Walcott Yes.”

“Professor Mary Tabacchi, Hotel: I just have a question. If we vote against this, then what happens?”

“Speaker Walcott: If you vote against it, what happens is that this part is removed from the motion, and the motion returns to its unamended state.”

“Professor Tabacchi: Okay, so if we vote against this, we get to see all the reports. We get to vote for it. Okay, thank you.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes, sir.”

“Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: We have really important things to do here today and we should get beyond this. I encourage all of you to vote against the amendment and vote for the motion, and then hopefully we can hear the provost address us.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? All right. We are now going to vote on the amendment, and all in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand.

All opposed to the amendment, please raise your hand.

Okay. The amendment is defeated. We are back on the original motion. Is there further discussion on the original motion?
Resolution On Task Force Reports

- Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principal mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and;
- Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and;
- Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty;
- Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

Endorsed by: Eric Cheyfitz, English, Shawkat Toorawa, NES, Kent Goetz, Theatre, Film and Dance and Shelly Feldman, Developmental Sociology

“Seeing no further discussion, I call the question on the original –– I’m sorry. Nick?”

“Professor Calderone, Entomology: So the concern was about confidentiality, that some people had taken the responsibilities for these task forces under the assumption that they would remain anonymous. Is that a concern?

“I mean, I think that’s somewhat of a substantial issue; but could be easily addressed by redacting the names of people who object to having their names. In other words, keeping good faith with the original agreement.”

“Speaker Walcott: Dean Fuchs? Provost Fuchs. I’m sorry.”

(LAUGHTER)

“Provost Kent Fuchs: Sorry to interject myself. So the reports are public. I mean, they are done. They are there. You can go to Bill’s office and read them, the full report. I did have an issue on confidentiality, but the way I addressed that, in specific answer to your question, I gave the authors the opportunity to redact them. Not me, the author. And I felt that was important. There was very little redaction, as far as I could tell. I asked what they redacted; I didn’t want to compare them. As far as I could tell, there was little that was redacted. The main concern is not you all. It is our competition, our peers, because this stuff is on the Sun web site, it gets around the world; but the reports are there. Vote as you want, but the reports are there.”

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. We heard the call the question. All in favor of calling the question, say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: All opposed? Okay, we now have the question. All in favor of approving of this motion, say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: Opposed?”
“Motion passed.

“We are done. Now, I notice with interest that the Provost Fuchs is not listed, so sir, please.”

6. COMMENTS FORM PROVOST KENT FUCHS

“Provost Kent Fuchs: It’s okay. You ignore me and you promote me to a dean. Thank you. Yes.”

“Thank you all for letting me come. The theme so far has been task force reports and budgets, so I thought I would just continue it and maybe talk for just ten minutes, then open it up to Q&A. I think that’s probably more of what you are interested in. I’ll report on three parts of our planning activity, just to remind you all.

“One part is where we’re working really hard on extracting $90 million from what we are calling administrative operations. This is a target that we have established after six months of working with these external consultants that have told us that we can achieve $90 million. You are going to hear from Vice President Destefano about $30 million of that $90 million that is attributed to procurement. So we are done with that diagnostic phase, and we are now, this week, setting the process to implement the recommendations. It will take several years to actually achieve $90 million in reoccurring savings, and it will take an investment of one-time funds in system software and setting up processes to do that.

“The whole objective, very, very crudely and simply, is to save faculty lines. If we don’t save it, the $90 million, it will come out of the faculty lines. We have a $135 million reoccurring problem to solve. This solves most of it. As for the remaining $45 million, I’m very optimistic with my great knowledge about the economy, that the economy is going to help us with this $45 million. As endowment goes up, that $45 million problem goes down, and parts of it, frankly, we can wait on solving.

“The real issue is this $90 million. So the diagnostic part is done. We are working now in setting up the process. We’ll have an office that will oversee the process, with staff members working full-time on this. We’ll have deans involved, vice presidents involved and others to help us in the administrative savings. And you will hear about the largest piece, the procurement piece. So that’s one-third of what we have done.

“The other part is what you voted on, the task force reports. There are 20 academic task force reports. These reports are not about visions of the future of colleges. They are really about how we can, in a very constrained resource environment, make our units and make the University stronger in these 20 different areas. So as you heard from Bill Fry, I would encourage you to come next week to the first of the open forums. I have decided to manage the communications and input process for six of them. The six that I’m managing are student enrollment, the budget model task force, social sciences, life sciences, management sciences and libraries. I didn’t say libraries twice, did I?

“There are forums set up for five of the reports. Not the budget model. That we’ll wait until you come back from the holiday break. This task force has issued an interim report,
and I have asked them from the beginning to finish their report by the beginning of January. That one is equally important to any of the other reports.

“So student enrollment is important. It’s next week. It’s what size should our undergraduate student body be? Should we have 3150 undergrads next fall, new students? Should it be larger? Should it be smaller, given that our faculty size, because of the previous budget cuts, will be smaller? It’s an important decision for the future.

“I have my own biases, after reading through that report, but we’ve opened it up to students. They have a stake in this, and staff as well; but feel free, if you didn’t have a chance to speak, feel free to send me e-mail, provost@cornell, or you can go to the strategic planning web site. There’s a link you can click and send comments as well, on any of them.

“The other 14 reports, I’m asking the authors to manage the communications and for you to send them comments. You can always copy me, but most of them are deans of colleges. There’s also vice president Susan Murphy for Student Academic Services, and I mentioned the budget model task force.

“So I view the month of November and early December as a discussion period for these 20 task force reports, and then we have to begin to make decisions on those that we can, important decisions. We talked about student body. How many libraries should we have, physical libraries across the university? Are there ways that we can keep the core library excellence and yet have reduced investment in our large library operation? That will be discussed as well.

“So important, important discussions on these 20 task force reports. Some of those decisions will just have to be delayed. We might say that student enrollment will stay what it is this coming fall and we’ll reconsider it, based on how the economy changes. So don’t expect all the decisions to be made in the next few months. That’s not wise nor possible.

“The third part of our planning was also mentioned by Dean Fry, and that is the planning for what we want to be as an institution in the future; this document will set our guidelines for the future. I want to remind you that this is totally faculty-driven, which I think is quite a statement by the president and others about the core future of the university being in our hands and your hands, as faculty.

“So let me see if I can read -- if you go to the web site, you will get all the names, but the ones we have announced are the core faculty that -- the center group we are calling the advisory council, so that’s Lance Collins from Engineering, Jonathan Culler from English, Sandra Green, History; Martha Haynes, Astronomy; Susan McCouch, Plant Breeding and Genetics; Ed Lawler, ILR; Michael Waldman, Economics.

“In addition to that, we are about to announce four working groups that will provide input into those faculty, a working group on education, a working group on public engagement, a working group on research, scholarship and creativity and a working group on organizational stewardship, basically, all other parts of the university that aren’t contained in the three core areas. The total number of faculty and staff and students
involved is so far 35 faculty, five students and nine staff.

“The idea is that this fall they are seeking input; then come January, when classes start, Ed Lawler and I will make trips -- not just to this body, but to all the colleges and schools -- telling you all what’s in those initial drafts of document. I’m not -- I am involved, I’m not leading it. To get input on what the thinking is feel free to send Ed Lawler, me or the web site input on what you would like to see on the plans for the future, once we get around our current issues on budget.

“I should acknowledge that I’m leading three searches -- maybe not leading, but responsible for three. We expect to make, in a few days, an announcement of the new vice president for planning and budget. That appointment will be public by Friday or Monday. Then we have an engineering dean search that’s underway. We have nothing to announce yet. We just launched the dean search for CALS, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Ron Seeber is leading that, and Jonathan Siliciano is leading the engineering dean search, and I’m leading the vice president search. I think we have ten minutes for Q&A. “Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Governor Paterson addressed the state senate and announced potential drastic -- additional cuts, especially towards education, so have we factored that into how it's going to impact us, if those cuts are made?” “Provost Fuchs: Yeah, we don't know the extent of those yet. Our best -- does this go into the minutes, if I give a number? I would just as soon not give a number in public, because we have a good estimate of what the number will be for this year, which is never good when it's the middle of the year. We are going to work our hardest to absorb that centrally.

“I am not promising the contract college deans that, but I told them we are going to work our best to absorb that cut, which is a significant cut centrally. What's really important is what's reoccurring and permanent. That never can be absorbed. It will be significant. The state is facing a $10 billion deficit. A large part of our revenues of the state comes from Wall Street, so if that improves, the state revenues improve; but we can certainly assume there's going to be a decrease in state revenues. “We have ways of offsetting that. In the next two months we'll have to decide on tuition for our students. On the contract side last year, the highest percentage increases were in the contract side for tuition increases, and part of it was to compensate for what we expected the State would take.

“So I should just tell you all -- and this is frustrating to the trustees -- it's impossible to tightly manage the budget, because we have faculty bringing in grants and contracts on a daily basis, we have students declaring new financial need, we've got a state that's unpredictable, but we are worrying and thinking about all those, and I think we'll be okay.

“This $135 million - unless the state gets dramatically worse and they do bad things to the SUNY budget and our budget - I think we're okay with the number we have, but it's a big number. You're right.

“Yes.”

“Professor Delchamps: I'm curious about the interplay between the college -- these are the academic -- the college task forces and cross-cutting. Say the CALS task force says that this is what we want to do with AEM, and the cross-cutting says this is what we want to
do with our business programs.”

“Provost Fuchs: No, it wouldn't say that, would it?”

“Professor Delchamps: Suppose that happened. What would you do? How would you get those things to work out?”

“Provost Fuchs: Just hypothetically, right? You're absolutely right. There are -- any given task force, some of them actually present different options; like student enrollment, do we do go with the Dartmouth plan, but there's a set of options with the recommendation. One of the central issues is do we let individual colleges -- this is a fundamental issue going forward -- make decisions that impact other colleges or do we, in the provost office, to be straight-forward, manage that process?

“I feel I have to manage the process. I don't think I'm going to do it perfectly, but we'll do our very best. In those areas where there's strong contradictions, it's likely -- and they affect the institution -- likely, the provost will have to make the final decision. Lots of input, lots of discussion, and that's a very good example. The example is do we create a name school, a business in CALS, which is the proposal that's being put forward in one of the task forces, or do we consider one of the alternatives, which would be, for example, creating a one single school of management for undergrad and grad.

“When that gets discussed, and it will be one of the public forums, I'd love to hear your input; but there are many other interesting possibilities as well.

“Did that answer your question, David? So send your complaints to me before and after the decision.

“Anyone else?

“Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mentioned the search is ongoing. In the last several searches, the positions I have been involved in, there's been a single candidate. Can you comment on this trend and the reasons for it and whether it allows sufficient faculty input in the decision?

“Provost Fuchs: Say the first part? I'm sorry.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the previous three searches I have been involved in for senior positions, there's been a single candidate.”

“Provost Fuchs: Yes. It's a good point. So as you will hear with the announcement of the vice president for budget and planning, there is only one public candidate for that position. There were a number -- there was a search committee, as there are for the dean searches, that had a combination of faculty and vice presidents and others for that vice president for budget and planning. There were a good number of people interviewed from around the country and internally.

“We got to the point where there were four candidates that came out of that search that the search committee recommended go forward, some internal, some external. And I decided to stop that process, after getting what I felt was really strong input that there
would be one offer, an offer to one person, and I decided not to go forward with having a public process for all four of those candidates.

“This is the vice presidential search, which is different than a dean’s search. I feel that the most important outcome of these processes is that we get the strongest person here. And often, those candidates bring a set of constraints, a set of constraints. So to give you an example on the engineering dean search, this past summer, the candidate was looking at an -- the committee, the search committee, which is primarily engineering faculty, was looking at a sitting dean at another top institution. I went to that institution, met with that person, spent the day with them and invited them to campus, hosted a 4th of July barbecue at my house for that person, but it was not public.

“And I probably would have made an offer to that person, if it looked like it was going to be viable, just based on the strength of that person - National Academy of Engineering member and really strong person. That person’s no longer in the picture.

“They have withdrawn. So I’m quite willing to have a process that is public, as long as I think the candidate -- I mean everybody, by public, knows who the candidates are, if I think we’ll end up with the strongest pool at the end; but if it means the strongest person’s going to drop out because it’s a worldwide public search, I’m not going to do it. I’m going to pick the best person. I’ll have as much faculty input as I can, but I can’t sacrifice the strength of a college or future of a college, just because I want it to be on the web.

“So it’s a compromise there. My ideal is to have four candidates for every search public, everybody gives me input, all the staff, students, and faculty; but if that process is going to compromise a search, I don’t do it.

“Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences. The process that you have described for restructuring academic programs emphasizes the input of internal stakeholders, faculty, students, staff, administrators and so on, yet we know there are in influential stakeholders that may have strong feelings about how we do things. How are you, or are you managing to buffer yourselves from possibly inappropriate influence from stakeholders?”

“Provost Fuchs: Inappropriate influence? I’m distracted by the light. Are you talking about the planning document for the future or the 20 task force reports, or all of it?”

“Professor Pelletier: Any of the restructuring in the coming years.”

“Provost Fuchs: Okay. We actually welcome external input from stakeholders, and our alumni, our friends of the university, sometimes companies, foundations, but they’re not going to be making decisions. Sometimes they have valuable input. I just read a long letter today from a former faculty member who’s no longer here, with a strong opinion about a certain area, and I learned a little bit by reading that; but I don't think any of us would allow it to be inappropriate. Their suggestions may be inappropriate, but the input will not be inappropriate. That I can promise you.

“Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There’s also the void for Director of Biotechnology. I’m just curious if there’s also a search for that position as well.”
“Provost Fuchs: Yes, there is. As many of you know -- well, number one, I'm reducing the number of vice provosts. I got more criticism about that. I didn't know you wanted me to have more vice provosts. I'm willing to hire more, but I just don't think it's wise. Each vice provost -- well, I won't go there. My colleagues in the room will kill me, the vice provost sitting in the back.

“It is true that I eliminated the position -- Steve Kresovich did leave, a valuable colleague and also had a huge impact in the whole Life Sciences initiative over the past ten years. He was the first faculty member hired under that initiative. He served as leader of the Biotech Institute and the vice provost for Life Sciences. The Biotech Institute director will be filled, and Bob Buhrman is leading that search, so that will be filled.

“Secondly, instead of having a vice provost that reports to me that has $6 million in budget as the Life Sciences Advisory Report suggests, if you all want to read that one, what we are going to do is have a person that works in the vice provost research office who has life sciences expertise. There used to be three people working on the research: Bob Buhrman, Joe Burns and Steve Kresovich. Now we just have Bob Buhrman. That's not sustainable, so I'm going to let him add a faculty member from the Life Sciences, but part of that organization. Their domain is all scholarship, all research across the university. It's unlikely they'll have $6 million in budget.

“Thank you, sir. I'll be back.

“Thank you all.”

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. We are on to the next item. I would like to call on Linda Nicholson and colleagues of her resolution on the Marcellus Shale.”

7. RESOLUTION ON MARCELLUS SHALE DRILLING

“Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology & Genetics: So I am thrilled to be here today to bring before you a resolution to this body, the faculty senate. So I, along with four colleagues, Peter Hinkle, Claire Futrell, Ted Clark and Ron Booker bring you resolution that deals with two key issues regarding Marcellus Shale gas drilling: First of all, who at Cornell is given the power to decide whether or not to lease Cornell lands for gas drilling. That's one issue.”

“The other issue is how Cornell should exert its influence on the State of New York to protect this region from the potential damages that are associated with gas drilling. “So before I go to the resolution itself, I would like to give a little background that might assist us in understanding why we need this resolution and we need it now.

“So first of all, what is natural gas? Natural gas, the main component is methane, just simply CH4. The burning of methane, the combustion of methane involves or it needs two oxygen molecules and produces, in addition to heat, carbon dioxide and water. So it's a relatively clean form of energy, except for the fact that both methane itself and CO2, once in the atmosphere, are greenhouse gases, meaning that they absorb ultraviolet light and dissipate that absorbed energy in the form of heat; therefore, increasing the heat in the atmosphere commonly known as the greenhouse effect.
“So that’s natural gas. It’s methane. And I bring this up, because at the end of my presentation of this methane, I will point out that cows are one of the main sources of greenhouse methane gas in the United States.

“Okay, so you may or may not be aware of the fact that the Northeast United States sits on a massive geologic rock formation called Marcellus Shale; it extends along the Appalachian Range here. It’s estimated the Marcellus Shale contains on order of 516 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, an immense amount of energy we are sitting right on top of here.

“So currently, the high energy costs, so we have seen gas prices go up tremendously, so this current increase in gas prices, and also the political need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil has made this enormous gas reserve very tempting for people.

“So in addition to our knowledge of this great reserve, as well as the economics, technology has been geared up to access these trapped gases down deep below the earth, and also Wall Street is more and more accepting of tapping into these unconventional sources of energy, so the financing for this kind of extraction of energy is now available.

“So just to give you an idea or to review, or to give you the picture, if you haven’t seen it before, the way that these gases are proposed to be extracted from the earth is it involves drilling a well vertically and then horizontally; vertically down into the shale deposit, which in this region is 2,000 to 5,000 feet deep, then going horizontally within a mile of that formation.

“So that’s drilled -- water is first mixed with sand and chemicals and then inserted into the well at high pressure, and the idea is that cracks that are already in the shale are widened and larger fissures are created. They are held open by these -- by the suspended sand and chemicals, then the water is extracted again and gas is able to flow through these more open and new fissures into the well and be gathered in storage tanks and then either trucked or piped to the market.

“So the main issue here is the use of a lot of water. This is 3 to 5 million gallons per well. That’s about how much water the city of Ithaca uses in a day. This is fresh water. Also the chemicals mixed with it and what do we do with all that water, because all that needs to be brought back out and then somehow dealt with, so we have recovered water -- initially, it is stored in a pit on the surface at a well pad, then subsequently, either trucked -- probably trucked or somehow injected back into the earth, so trucked to a treatment plant for processing.

“So here is an aerial view of what a well pad looks like. It occupies three to five acres. It is essentially a cleared industrial area with drill rigs, trucks. Here’s a holding pit, a large holding pit for the wastewater and pipelines that would come to each pad or close by, and then storage tanks as well.

“So it is quite an industrial site. So the hydraulic fracturing method itself requires a large volume of very high-pressured water. This water could be removed from local streams and ponds at no cost to the gas companies, given the current regulations or lack thereof.

“In order to suspend the sand in water, chemicals are added at the level of 1% of the total
volume. So it’s 30,000 to 50,000 gallons of toxins that are added to the 3 to 5 million gallons of water. These chemicals, it’s a proprietary formulation. This is not public information or information that is made public; however, we do know that the chemicals do include known carcinogens, endocrine destructors, arsenic, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, benzine, xylene and formaldehyde. So this is not the kind of stuff you want to drink.

“The flowback water is even worse, because after it goes through the shale rock, it absorbs or solubilizes salts and other solids, as well as heavy metals, some of which are radioactive. So in addition to the drilling and chemicals added before injecting, it comes back out with additional toxins.

“So the hydraulic fluid -- fluids associated with those practices are suspected sources of impaired and polluted water in three states; Pennsylvania, Wyoming and Colorado currently.

“So what are the disposal options? We can use existing municipal wastewater treatment plants. There are certainly questions about the feasibility of this. We really should require specifically designed treatment plants in order to remove all those chemicals, some of which we don’t know what they are, because of the proprietary nature of additives; so there’s talk of constructing new plants, and this has a cost associated with it that goes to the municipalities and not necessarily the gas companies. They are talking about the possibility of just injecting those wastewaters deeper into the ground, and so there’s a lot of uncertainty about where the rock formations are stable enough and what is the long-term effects of such practice.

“Two minutes. Okay.

“So some of this comes close to home, even though we don’t have any of this hydraulic fracturing close by. Walter Hang has just submitted a report, where his office has looked at some DEC data and pulled out pretty alarming things. The Village of Cayuga Heights last March accepted 3 million gallons of contaminated drilling wastewater. This was eventually processed incompletely and discharged into Cayuga Lake. So there’s certainly things to be concerned about.

“The aesthetics of area are affected. This is 40 acres per drilling pad. This is in Wyoming, and that’s the level at which things have reached there. Gas lines going in would also add additional surface disruption. Local impacts, a summary would be the consumption of massive amounts of water, what do we do with that; if we get leakage from these pits, if there’s a storm, and we have overspill and things like that; affects on our aquifer, surface disturbance, noises, air quality issues.

“There is current drilling activity; we have wells. They are restricted to vertical wells at the moment in New York. Full scale drilling, hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling is taking place in Pennsylvania already. Permits for horizontal drills in the Marcellus Shale in New York are currently on hold during the development of a supplemental generic environmental impact study that’s currently been in the newspaper. You have probably seen a number of things flying around about that.

“So just to show you, here we are in Tompkins County. There are existing wells around us.
These are vertical wells. The horizontal well drilling has the additional issue of compulsory integration of 60% of land within a given unit leased, then you have no choice; they can go underneath your land and tap into -- put those toxic chemicals under your wells, et cetera.

“And this is the current level of leasing in Tompkins County; the important colors are those dark brown here. So if we are not at 60% already in Groton, we are very close to it. This is available for you to see at this website, tompkinscountygasmap.org.

“Just one quick one -- non-sustainable energy is what we are talking about here. These deposits are 400 million years old. We are bringing them to the surface, burning then, creating CO2. Cows eat vegetation. Vegetation takes up CO2. Cows make deposits that are a couple of days old perhaps, and can be put into an anaerobic digester, which methanotrophic bacteria can produce methane. The methane can be burned, and we have a nice sustainable cycle.

“We are not limited to tapping into the earth in order to solve our energy crisis problem, and this is being done very successfully in the state of Vermont. There are numerous examples on the web of farms, dairy farms doing this. Okay, so here’s our resolution. Should I read it?”

“Speaker Walcott: Somebody said yes.”

“Professor Nicholson: Okay. So there are four whereases.

WHEREAS, it is estimated the geological rock bed known to the Marcellus Shale may contain up to several million cubic feet of natural gas and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil and corresponding need to reduce dependence on foreign oil have resulted in an increase in interest in activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing.

WHEREAS Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership, exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton.

WHEREAS Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources and quality of life for current and future faculty, staff and students.

WHEREAS Cornell University is positioned to take a leadership role on the issue of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, sustainability education and research on water management, soil health, as well as animal and human health and medicine.

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges president David J. Skorton to, number one, establish a committee of faculty, staff, students and alumni empowered with the decision of whether to lease any university-owned lands to natural gas drilling companies.

Two, to urge the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to delay the issuance of permits for gas drilling until such time as New York State has completed all necessary and appropriate studies and has in place an adequately funded, as well as
staffed inspection and enforcement program.

Three, to urge New York State to enact a severance tax and adequate permit fees on gas drilling companies to pay the costs of regulation and oversight of drilling and to mitigate the cost of repairing roadways and resolving environmental impacts, due to drilling.

And four, to urge New York State to require all chemicals and specific formulations of those chemicals intended to be introduced to wells be identified and the information be made public with special notification to local emergency response personnel and health care providers, before use of such chemicals is permitted. That's our resolution.

“Speaker Walcott: Is there a second?”

“There's a second.”

“Is there discussion?”

“Professor Davies.”

“Professor Peter Davies, Plant Biology: I would suggest this resolution is excessively weak and we should be doing more than this. In other drilling places, numerous spills have occurred, and the one thing we have in this area is water, and the contamination of our water supplies would be disastrous; not only for individual householders, but -- secondly, methane has leaked up into people's houses. And while methane in the open environment is no problem, methane in houses has caused sickness.”

“Thirdly -- appear to be exempt from almost all environmental regulations -- should be communication to the State to make sure that our regulations do not exempt these gas companies from such environmental regulations.

“And lastly, previously the law is that anybody more than 1,000 feet from a drilling rig cannot sue a gas company for any damage to their property, water supply or anything. So if anybody lives near one of these and they have to leave their house, they have no recourse whatsoever. We need, as an academic body, to really stand up for this.”

“Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior. I think we have heard an elegant defense of the whereases of this motion. Unfortunately, we haven't heard anything directed at the motion itself, and I would like to speak to that. And I have to say, I'm against the motion.”

“And much as I agree with the seriousness of the situation and I agree with everything you have presented, I think the motion's wrong for two reasons. There are two sections of the motion, the first proposes a committee of faculty, students, staff and alumni to take over the decision from the administration, as to whether or not the university should lease its lands for such a procedure.

“I think we all agree that the university shouldn't do that, unless it's found to be absolutely safe and supervised. I agree these are rather improbable things that are going to happen, but ladies and gentlemen, why are we taking this decision out of the hands of the administration, where it belongs, and putting it in the hands of a committee, very unspecified parameters in the committee? I think that's simply a non-starter. I think it was ill-considered. That's my first point.
“The second point is that, like it or not, what we are suggesting here is that the President act as a kind of lobbyist, a political lobbyist, because this is a political question, and he take that lobbying to the State and a committee of the State.

“Now, it’s a duty of the senate, I think, to advise the administration and it would be perfectly correct for us to advise the administration on how we thought they should handle their land. It’s quite another thing when we send our president trotting off in the world as a kind of lobbyist for a political program. That is not the duty of this senate. We have many important problems facing us right now that involve the history, the future of the university. This is a diversion.

“If we start down this street, we’re going to turn the university into a kind of a political lobbying situation. We are going to find ourselves -- if we do this, why not talk about things that are also very serious, like the war in Iraq, or the drafting of our -- possible drafting of our children for the armies?

“People, I know that we are all upset about this shale business, but this is not the proper action to take. Thank you.”

“Professor Robert Kay: On behalf of the faculty of the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, I oppose Resolution 1 on the ground it’s premature. We agree with the importance of the particular issue, which is gas production from Marcellus Shale, but also with the importance of addressing it within the more general context of energy policy and interrelated topics. “

“We take no position either for or against the development of the Marcellus Shale gas. We simply argue that such decisions should be fully informed on all the relevant considerations and that Cornell should remain an unbiased source of accurate information in the area of energy and environment. The Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, the Cornell Water Resources Institute and the Paleontological Research Institution stand ready to organize and host a forum on the Marcellus gas play for the benefit of the Cornell community.

“So that’s a statement that we agreed on as a department. And Susan Riha is here from the Water Resources Institute. If specific questions are directed in that direction, I’m sure you would want to talk to her, not me. Thank you.”

“Speaker Walcott: Technically the time for our discussion is up, but we have one good welfare speaker, so I propose we continue for another four minutes, before we bring the matter to a close. Is there further discussion?”

“Professor Robert Oswald from Molecular Medicine. I would like to speak on behalf of the motion. In terms of the first one, the question has been raised whether it’s appropriate to have faculty, staff and students, alumni empowered with the decision. My argument would be that the faculty is where the expertise is, and that’s the reason why the faculty have to be involved in this decision, so I think it’s actually a very good idea.”

“In terms of the question of whether this is just a political issue or whether it’s an issue that directly affects the University, I would argue strongly that this is different from the war in Iraq or the war in Afghanistan. This is something that’s affecting us on a local level.
This is going to affect the university directly. This is going to be a factor in the decision whether students want to come to school here, so I think this is a very appropriate topic for the faculty senate. Thank you.”

“Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management: I would like to move to table this motion. We've been given 10 to 15 minutes of discussion by a single person, who may be a wonderful person, but I'd like to hear more views on this subject. I would like to know both the costs and the benefits of the actions we are being asked to agree on, and like to think more carefully its implications. It seems to me an academic body doesn't rush to judgment based on 20 minutes of discussion on an issue as important as this. I would like to table this motion.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there a second for the motion to table?”

“There's a second. Okay. Discuss the motion?”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, you cannot discuss .”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you. So all in favor of -- to motion the table, please raise your hand.

“All opposed to the motion to be tabled -- it is clear the ayes have it. The motion is tabled.

“That brings us to the next part, Joanne Destefano.”

8. COMMENTS ON E-SHOP

“Joanne DeStefano, Vice President, Financial Affairs: Good evening, everyone. Can you hear me?”

“Now can you hear me? Okay.

“Well, how about talking about procurement savings before dinner?

(LAUGHTER)

“I don't know whether the shale or the procurement is more interesting, but I will try to make this quick. As Provost Fuchs mentioned, in the $90 million that we are attempting to save in the administrative areas, $30 million of it has been assigned to procurement. And because procurement is within my area of responsibility, I drew the short straw as leading this initiative, so I was asked today to talk about e-shop, which is a tool that we use in procurement; but I can't talk about the e-shop tool without talking about the real goal of the procurement savings.

“So the $30 million, as you can see from this slide, is a cumulative amount that we'll be saving over time, and the first couple of years, through fiscal year '11, the projection is $7.5 million. Then the next couple of years, there's an additional $16 million; and then finally to the $30 million. The way the consultants have come up with the $30 million is they believe that, without any changes to practices of who and -- who you buy from or what you buy, I should say, that if we can use some different tools, we can have better information and we can save $30 million.

“I am not 100% convinced that we can save $30 million in procurement without making
some -- what I'll call behavioral change on campus, but I do believe we can make a good chunk of the savings by putting in some tools and some disciplines into our practice, and I want to talk about that for a second.

“So to get through our -- what I'm calling our Phase 1, which is the first set of savings through fiscal year '11, we have come up with four goals. One is organizational. The procurement office needs to really be updated, so that the staff can use the tools and make decisions based on the tools. We need to use the e-shop tool, which e-shop, for those of you that aren't familiar, is an online cataloging system.

“Right now, the suppliers that we have within the e-shop tool, their catalogs are in the system. Only 20% of the purchases using those suppliers that are in the system were actually using the system. So our goal, through fiscal year '11 is to get the suppliers we have within the system up to 95% compliance. So if the suppliers in the system, we want you to use the system.

“We also have a very low amount -- we negotiate prices with certain vendors, maybe not all the prices within a catalog, but we'll pick the items that we purchase the most of, and very few people actually use the systems that are in place and the dollar on the items that we have negotiated prices on; so what we would like to see by the end of fiscal year '11 is a 50% improvement on the buying of items that we have actually negotiated prices on. And we believe that by doing these things, by the end of June, we'll have saved the first $7.5 million.

“The consultants looked at the savings in both short-term and long-term. Basically, they are saying the short-term, what we are calling near-term -- I am calling that our Phase 1 -- they are basically saying that's the low-hanging fruit, and they believe that we can save between $7.5 and $10 million. Phases 2 and 3, to get from the $20 million to the $30 million -- the next $20 million worth of savings, we don't know where that's going to come from yet. We need to spend some more time, we need more data, and where the data’s going to come from is the from the e-shop tool.

“The easy things to do are on the left of this slide, and so the two yellow, the spend aggregation and the vendor negotiation is exactly what we are going to do in Phase 1. Our current procurement system has -- if you order something and you use a purchase order or blanket order, the only information we have in our offices that we bought from Staples and we paid $1,500, we don't have any data on what you actually purchased. As a result, we don't have the information to go negotiate better prices. So the e-shop tool takes all your data all the way down to what’s called the SKU number or bar code, so when you use the tool, we know the specific item that you purchased and we can track that data, then we can go out for better pricing.

“The Weill Medical College has implemented e-shop also. They have a different procurement system, but we never realized, until we started comparing our data, how much overlap and what we actually buy between the two campuses. So we think with better data, if we only have 20% of our data in our system now that we can identify, if we can add our 80%, plus take a look at what Weill Medical College spends, we have much more leverage to negotiate prices. “Then the further you go in the slide, the more it is for
the savings. So right now, we are trying to develop a very strong plan to get the first $8.5 million. In the middle, it talks about limiting discretionary spending. We are seeing that happen already, and we actually saw it happen in fiscal year 2009, that just completed in June, because of the budget situation.

“Travel, for example, was down 20% in general appropriated funds. And that was just -- we had no mandates to reduce travel, but using general appropriated funds, the dollars have already dropped. So we'll see significant savings just in changes being made elsewhere on campus.

“I mentioned organizational improvements. The existing procurement office is very transaction-oriented. We are going to be restructuring the entire office. We are going to move the transactions out, so that the existing staff -- they are very comfortable managing transactions, managing compliance, but not doing the strategic going out and figuring out where we should be focusing on efforts on trying to get better pricing. We hope to have the plan -- we have a rough idea what the plan is. We hope to have it in place and the new staff set up by the end of this fiscal year.

“So again, e-shop has caused some concerns on campus. What e-shop is, it's an electronic tool, a cataloging system from a vendor called Cy Quest, and the best practiced universities -- and Penn is recognized as one of the best practicing universities in procurement; they have used this tool for quite some time. And the amount of data you can get out of this tool, when we purchase through e-shop, is what's going to help us come up with our savings.

“The issue that we have here at Cornell is the e-shop tool was not an institutionally supported system. We recognized the importance of putting in a system that would eventually be able to help us, so we, within my organization, actually eliminated a couple positions a couple years ago, to carve out some funding to actually put the system in.

“So it's in right now, very bare bones, and we know that there are some enhancements and some investment that needs to go into the tool; but we believe if we can put those investments into the tool, we will be able to improve the process, the cost to the University and, hopefully, without having any impact on the faculty or staff.

“So one of the things that will I would like from all of you is comments on your experiences -- and it doesn't have to be today, because we are about out of time, but your experiences with e-shop, so we know where to start prioritizing and targeting the improvements for the tool.

“Any questions?”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you, Joanne. Time for a question, I would say.”

Vice President DeStefano: Yes.”

“Professor Steve Poole, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. So we hear a lot about reducing the costs and getting a good price, but the price you pay is only one aspect of the cost. There's also the cost involved in faculty time, in making the purchase.”

“In many of our experiences, the cost of -- in terms of faculty time is greater than the
savings on the price, so I wonder what steps you are going to take to make it more efficient and maybe have a lower limit on the amount that you require to process through e-shop.”

“Vice President DeStefano: E-shop, if we put it in place correctly, could be very efficient and should be one of the most efficient transaction processes. That’s what we have been told at other institutions that use it and have used it for some time.

“We are -- our processes, because we haven’t fully invested in the workflow tool, are not as efficient. We are going to work with people. Our goal is to have it not take your time. Do you have another method that you felt was more efficient, before we put in e-shop?”

“Professor Poole: PCard.”

“Vice President DeStefano: PCard, okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you very much, Joanne. If people have further comments.”

“Vice President DeStefano: Yes, please send me an e-mail. I’m happy to understand your comments and issues.”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you. Is John Weiss here? He’s not?

That brings us, then, to the end of the meeting, and I suggest we all vote with our feet.”

(LAUGHTER)

Respectfully Submitted,

Fred Gouldin
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Bill Fry
Task Force Availability/Discussion

(College Reports in Colleges)

**Student Enrollment:** Wednesday, Nov. 18, 12:15-1:15 p.m.
Hollis E. Cornell Auditorium, Goldwin Smith Hall;

**Libraries:** Tuesday, Nov. 24, 12:15-1:15 p.m.
G10 Biotechnology Building;

**Social Sciences:** Tuesday, Dec. 1, 4:30-5:30 p.m.
Lewis Auditorium, G76 Goldwin Smith Hall;

**Management Sciences:** Wednesday, Dec. 2, 12:15-1:15 pm.
G10 Biotechnology Building

**Life Sciences:** Monday, Dec. 7, 4:30-5:30 p.m.
Lewis Auditorium, G76 Goldwin Smith Hall.

**(Budget Model:** January, date, time and location TBD)**
Provost – Faculty interaction
  (some confidential)

UFC (~weekly)

Financial Policies Committee - Budget Task Force
  - Personnel issues

CAPP - one meeting completed (CAPP request)
  - advisory meeting upcoming (Provost request)

DoF: participant in many “planning” discussions
  (most are confidential)
quorum at meetings:

Do we need paper reminders?

Budget corrections – Procurement
  hope for major savings ($30-40 million)
Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

November 11, 2009

-Speaker pro tem-
   Charlie Walcott, CALS, emeritus

-Nominations & Elections Committee-
   Mary Pat Brady, A&S

-University ROTC Relationships (URRC) Committee-
   Andrea Parrot, CHE

-FACTA COMMITTEE-
   John Guckenheimer, A&S

-Assemblies-

-University Hearing Board Committee-
   Ken Brown, A&S
   Bruce Tracey, Hotel
Resolution regarding availability of the Task Force Reports

Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principle mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and

Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and

Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty,

Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

Endorsed by,
Eric Cheyfitz, English
Shawkat Toorawa, NES
Kent Goetz, Theatre, Film and Dance
Shelley Feldman, Developmental Sociology
Amendment to Resolution regarding availability of the Task Force Reports

Whereas the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principle mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and

Whereas these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and

Whereas the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty,

Now therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports or those parts of those reports which the provost deems to contain viable responses to the present crisis be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

Presented by the UFC
Concurrent Assemblies Resolution

Expressing Support for the Cornell University Climate Action Plan

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that Cornell University is a signatory of the American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC), which pledges the University to a goal of climate neutrality;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that Cornell University is uniquely positioned to demonstrate leadership in addressing global climate change by combining academic, research, and operational efforts along with campus community member participation under a comprehensive action plan for energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable energy;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate supports an institutional Climate Action Plan that is visionary; technically, financially, and programmatically feasible; capable of adapting new technological and scientific discoveries; responsive to evolving regulatory environments; and protects the university from risk associated with the potential for energy and fossil fuel scarcity;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate embraces the concept of the Cornell campus as a living laboratory for teaching and research projects confronting the challenge of climate neutrality;

Whereas, the Cornell University Climate Action Plan (CAP) seeks to dramatically reduce emissions of greenhouse gases associated with purchased electricity, on-site fossil fuel combustion, commuting, and university sponsored air travel by:

1) Conducting a rigorous review of the need for and scope of new construction, building materials and equipment and optimizing efficiency of space and systems in new construction;
2) Reducing future campus energy use and related greenhouse gas emissions through energy standards for new buildings;
3) Improving the energy performance of existing buildings by expanding energy conservation through renovations, new technologies, and occupant behavioral changes;
4) Replacing high-carbon energy sources with lower or no-carbon fuel and increasing the use of “renewable” energy;
5) Enhancing commuter options to reduce use of single-occupancy vehicles, including alternative work strategies to reduce commuter impacts; and
6) Promoting less carbon intensive alternatives for University-related travel; and
7) Developing a program of specific University-oriented offsets to make up for emissions unable to directly mitigate.

Whereas, on September 10, 2009 the Building & Properties Committee of the Cornell University Board of Trustees adopted the CAP and following that meeting Cornell University submitted the CAP to the ACUPCC in fulfillment of its pledge;

Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca Campus is needed to:

- Achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050;
- Establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality, and mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and
- Establish a portfolio of proposed actions that will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutrality, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the University’s research, academic, and outreach missions and programs.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate commends and supports Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan;
Be it finally resolved that this resolution be sent to Cornell University President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President for Facilities Services Kyu Whang.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis Miller
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Faculty Senate

Shane Rothermel
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Student Assembly

Gary Stewart
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Employee Assembly

Michael Jay Walsh
Representative to Presidents Climate Commitment Implementation Committee,
Graduate & Professional Student Assembly

D. T. Nighthawk Evensen
President,
Graduate & Professional Student Assembly

Rammy Salem
President,
Student Assembly

Jason Seymour
Chair,
Employee Assembly

Professor William Fry
Dean of Faculty
RESOLUTION ON MARCELLUS SHALE DRILLING

Linda Nicholson and Colleagues
November 11, 2009
Marcellus Shale Gas Drilling Resolution

Brought by Faculty Senators:

Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Peter Hinkle, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Clare Fewtrell, Department of Molecular Medicine
Ted Clark, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Ron Booker, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior
natural gas (methane)

\[
\text{CH}_4 + 2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}
\]
Untapped riches

The Marcellus Shale formation, which stretches all through the Appalachians, holds as much as 51.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Current, high energy prices have made drilling for the gas attractive.

http://www.post-gazette.com/images4/20080720Marcellus_Shale_map.gif
Why Now?

- Increase in reserve estimates
- Economics
- Technology to access
- Wall Street acceptance of unconventional plays (sources)

Source: WVSORO  Drill Rig in West Virginia
Hydraulic Fracturing

Hydraulic fracturing, or "fracing," involves the injection of more than a million gallons of water, sand and chemicals at high pressure down and across into horizontally drilled wells as far as 10,000 feet below the surface. The pressurized mixture causes the rock layer, in this case the Marcellus Shale, to crack. These fissures are held open by the sand particles so that natural gas from the shale can flow up the well.
Aerial View of Well Pad

- 3-5 acres
- cleared industrial area
- drill rig(s)
- trucks
- holding pits
- pipelines
- storage tanks
Hydraulic Fracturing

- Fracturing with large volumes of high pressure water = hydrofracturing
- To suspend sand in water, chemicals* are added (~1% of total vol.)
- 364+ water trips per well (3 – 5 million gal)

Source: Cheasapeake Energy 2008
Hydrofrac’ing a Marcellus Well, West Virginia

*PROPRIETARY formulation, including known carcinogens, endocrine disrupters, arsenic, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, benzene, toluene, xylene and formaldehyde

(Estimate Denton TX Oil & Gas Task Force)
Flowback water has high levels of:

- Brine (salt), Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)
- Heavy Metals, Radioactivity (radium 226 and 228 brought to surface)
- Drilling & frac’ing chemicals

Source: J. Henry Fair  Dimock PA
Disposal Options

- Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants
  - Questions about capacity, cost, down-stream effects
  - Specifically-designed Treatment Plants
    - Construction of several plants being planned/discussed
      (Towanda, PA; Waverly, NY)

- Injection Wells
  - Are rock formations here suitable?
  - Long-term science/safety impacts are less known
  - Test well planned for Chemung Co.
For example, the Village of Cayuga Heights disclosed last March that it received more than 3.0 million gallons of contaminated drilling wastewater. Without undertaking a state-required "headworks analysis" or enforcing local pretreatment requirements, the wastewater was accepted at a sanitary treatment plant that discharged into an impaired section of Southern Cayuga Lake, where approximately 30,000 local residents obtain their drinking water downstream of the facility's discharge point.
New Spacing – 40 acres

- Source: Skytruth.org

Jonah Basin, Wyoming
More Pipelines

Source: Fortuna Energy
Local Impacts

- Water Consumption
- Waste Disposal
- Groundwater Well and Surface Water Contamination
- Surface Disturbance
- Noise trucks/drilling/frac’ing/compressors
- Air Quality truck exhaust, flaring, emissions from pipelines

Source: All Consulting 2008 Lined Pit in Pennsylvania from a Marcellus Well
Current Drilling Activity

- Active drilling in Marcellus Shale in PA
- **Well information is posted on DEC’s website**
- Active drilling in other rock formations in NY
- Active vertical wells in Marcellus formation in NY
- Permits for horizontal Marcellus drilling in NY on hold during DEC’s SGEIS review

Source: Sky Truth
Vertical vs. Horizontal Drilling

compulsory integration

Source: Chief Oil and Gas

~1 mile

2000 – 5000 ft
Tompkins County Lands Leased for Gas Drilling

www.tcgasmap.org
More Information

http://gasleasing.cce.cornell.edu
www.tcgasmap.org
www.propublica.org
www.shaleshock.org
www.endocrinedisruption.org
Non-Sustainable Energy Use

\[ \text{CH}_4 + 2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \]

400 million year old deposits

greenhouse gases
Sustainable alternatives for Cornell

\[ \text{CH}_4 + 2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \]
Cash Cows: Vermont Dairy Farm Converts Cattle Manure into Electricity

By Jace Shoemaker-Galloway | October 30th, 2009 | 5 Comments

A Vermont dairy farm is producing something other than milk. Earlier this month, state officials were on hand to visit Vermont's newest methane facility. Westminster Farms Inc., along with Green Mountain Power (GMP), have been working together in an on-site plant that converts methane gas released from cow manure into electricity.

Cow manure is one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gasses and the runoff from manure pollutes water. Taking a liability and converting it into an asset, just made environmental and economic sense to the farm's Shawn Goodell. An anaerobic digester is used to mix, heat and break down the manure. The raw manure and ag substrates produce methane biogas, which is captured and then generates electricity. And with an estimated 1,200 cows on the Westminster-based dairy farm, finding a supply of manure is not a problem! Sure gives new meaning to the term “natural gas”

Liquid waste will be used as fertilizer. Leftover solids will be used as cattle bedding, saving the farm about $80,000 on the cost of sawdust. And that is good news, especially considering the state of the economy. Like other businesses and industries, the dairy industry is also feeling the pinch. It is estimated that less than 1,100 dairy farms remain in Vermont. That's about 300 less than five years ago.

While the technology is not new to Vermont, Westminster Farms is the latest dairy farm in Vermont to convert methane into energy. Westminster Farms will receive a fixed price per kilowatt hour generated. Since July, the project has been producing about 225 kilowatts of electricity, enough to power about 250 homes on a daily basis. GMC customers will be given the option of purchasing the renewable energy.

The project took about three years to bring to fruition. Funding for the $1.5 million project was a collaborative effort between both state and federal agencies. According to the GMP press release, Westminster Farms invested about $700,000 and Vermont-based Green Mountain Power committed $175,000. Other agencies involved in funding the endeavor include the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Vermont Department of Agriculture, Vermont Agricultural Credit Corporation (VACC) and Vermont Clean Energy Development Fund.

WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil and the corresponding need to reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is positioned to take a leadership role in the issue of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, sustainability education and research on water management, soil health as well as animal and human health and medicine;
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges President David J. Skorton:

1. To establish a committee of faculty, staff, students and alumni empowered with the decision of whether to lease any university-owned lands to natural gas drilling companies.

2. To urge the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to delay the issuance of permits for gas drilling until such time as New York State has completed all necessary and appropriate studies and has in place an adequately funded as well as staffed inspection and enforcement program.

3. To urge New York State to enact a severance tax and adequate permit fees on gas drilling companies to pay the costs of regulation and oversight of drilling, and to mitigate the cost of repairing roadways and resolving environmental impacts due to drilling.

4. To urge New York State to require that all chemicals (and specific formulations of those chemicals) intended to be introduced into wells be identified and the information be made public, with special notification to local emergency response personnel and health care providers, before use of such chemicals is permitted.
Resolution on Marcellus Shale Drilling

• **WHEREAS**, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil and the corresponding need to reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

• **WHEREAS**, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

• **WHEREAS**, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

• **WHEREAS**, Cornell University is positioned to take a leadership role in the issue of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, sustainability education and research on water management, soil health as well as animal and human health medicine;
• THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges President David J. Skorton:

- To establish a committee of faculty, staff, students and alumni empowered with the decision of whether to lease any university-owned lands to natural gas drilling companies.
- To urge the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to delay the issuance of permits for gas drilling until such time as New York State has completed all necessary and appropriate studies and has in place an adequately funded as well as staffed inspection and enforcement program.
- To urge New York State to enact a severance tax and adequate permit fees on gas drilling companies to pay the costs of regulation and oversight of drilling, and to mitigate the cost of repairing roadways and resolving environmental impacts due to drilling.
- To urge New York State to require that all chemicals (and specific formulations of those chemicals) intended to be introduced into wells be identified and the information be made public, with special notification to local emergency response personnel and health care providers, before use of such chemicals is permitted.
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil and the corresponding need to reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;
WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;
WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;
WHEREAS, Cornell University is positioned to take a leadership role in the issue of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, sustainability education and research on water management, soil health as well as animal and human health and medicine;
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges President David J. Skorton:
1. To establish a committee of faculty, staff, students and alumni empowered with the decision of whether to lease any university-owned lands to natural gas drilling companies.
2. To urge the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to delay the issuance of permits for gas drilling until such time as New York State has completed all necessary and appropriate studies and has in place an adequately funded as well as staffed inspection and enforcement program.
3. To urge New York State to enact a severance tax and adequate permit fees on gas drilling companies to pay the costs of regulation and oversight of drilling, and to mitigate the cost of repairing roadways and resolving environmental impacts due to drilling.
4. To urge New York State to require that all chemicals (and
specific formulations of those chemicals) intended to be introduced into wells be identified and the information be made public, with special notification to local emergency response personnel and health care providers, before use of such chemicals is permitted.

Background.
Gas production by hydraulic fracturing involves drilling 2,000 to 5,000 feet deep into the Marcellus Shale and then drilling as much as one mile, horizontally. Three to five million gallons of water laced with sand and 30,000 to 50,000 gallons of potentially toxic substances (approximately 1% of the total volume of water), including known carcinogens, endocrine disrupters, arsenic, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, benzene, toluene, xylene and formaldehyde, are then pumped into the well under very high pressure to fracture the shale and release the gas. At least 65 of the chemicals currently in use are classified as hazardous under federal laws, but are not treated as hazardous during drilling and disposal because of gas industry exemptions to the Clean Water Act, the Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also known as the Superfund law), the Resource Conservation and Recovery act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act. Companies can withhold all proprietary chemical formulations of the chemicals they use in the hydraulic fracturing process. Without complete proprietary information on every chemical used, it is impossible to test for contamination of water supplies. Because compound-specific toxicity data are very limited for many chemical additives to fracturing fluids, it is of the utmost importance that studies on short and long-term health effects of such chemicals be done before the start of drilling, not afterwards.
Hydraulic fracturing fluids can be pumped under the homes and land of people who have not signed leases, as well as under natural areas and Cornell lands, if 60% of a designated land unit is leased (compulsory integration). The water (more per well than the City
of Ithaca uses in a day) can be removed from local streams and ponds at no cost to the gas companies. The hydraulic fracturing fluid dissolves salts, radioactive material, and heavy metals (including lead, arsenic, and mercury) as it passes through the underground shale layers, so flowback from the well (essentially the same volume initially injected in the well) is more toxic than the hydraulic fracturing fluid. Once at the surface, it can accumulate as sediments in holding tanks and ponds.
To dispose of flowback fluid, gas companies may inject it deep underground and leave it, truck it to Pennsylvania, or have it treated and released locally. Current wastewater treatment facilities in the state are not able to deal with these high volume wastes without serious upgrading, and it is not even clear whether upgrading will enable them to remove these chemicals adequately. If those plants accept the water, they will have to establish testing and monitoring systems to ensure the discharges will not pollute neighboring bodies of water—Cayuga Lake, its inlet, reservoirs, surrounding creeks and streams.
Well pads, which may host one or many gas wells and are three to five acres or larger, are cleared, industrial areas with roads, drill rigs, pipelines, storage tanks, dozens of tanker trucks, buildings for workers, and holding pits for hydraulic fracturing fluids and drilling refuse. The holding pits attract wildlife and cattle (due to the salt) and can be lethal to birds and other wildlife that drink from them or are coated by the fluids. Pit liners may leak, pits may overflow, or fluids may be spilled, contaminating soil, surface water, and ground water. Hydraulic fracturing is the suspected source of impaired or polluted drinking water in Pennsylvania, Colorado, and Wyoming.
Drilling for gas is a highly industrial undertaking creating both air and noise pollution: numerous truckloads of equipment, chemicals, sand and water along with generators, pumps, drilling rigs and hoists, running at all hours of the day producing noise and exhaust fumes. For example, the hydraulic fracturing process for one well requires nearly 1,000 tanker truck trips to the site.
Given the important environmental issues associated with this new industrial process that will have a major impact on the University itself and the quality of life for students, faculty, staff and members of our community, it is essential that careful consideration be given to leasing Cornell land. Currently, studies are underway (funded by Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Cornell Center for a Sustainable Future) to assess the environmental impact of natural gas drilling, but the results are not yet available. Furthermore, the commitment of the University to a sustainable future requires that it take a leadership role in New York State in this important issue.
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Procurement Savings

$ Millions

FY 10  FY 11  FY 12  FY 13  FY 14

4.5   7.5   12.0  24.0  30.0
Draft Goals FY10 & FY11

- Organizational changes identified and implemented by June 2010
- 95% of spend with eShop enabled suppliers goes through eShop by June 2011
- Improve the dollar volume of spend under contract by 50% by June 2011
- Achieve $7.5 million savings by June 2011
Sources for Savings

Near-term (quick-wins)
- Focused on near-term cost reduction efforts
- Require minimal/no capital investment
- Less lead-time to implement
- Lower level of organizational process change required

~25-35% of savings opportunity*

Long-term (capability building)
- Focused on fundamental changes in the way procurement is executed at Cornell
- May require capital investment (e.g. technology)
- Often requires process redesign
- Organization improvement to enable savings capture required

~65-75% of savings opportunity*

*Note: Opportunity represents savings identification, not cash realization
Levers to Obtain Savings

- **Spend aggregation**
  - Aggregate spend
    - Across disparate campus units
    - Across spend category
  - Drive e-Shop and preferred contract utilization

- **Vendor negotiation**
  - Improve contracts relationships
  - Offer volume commitments, contract incentives
  - Introduce competition and auctions

- **Spend standards and regulation**
  - Design regulation to standardize non-core spend types
    - Segment spend based on item, user, & expected use
  - Introduce mechanisms tied to upgraded systems to ensure contract compliance

- **Post-contract tracking**
  - Introduce mechanisms tied to upgraded systems to ensure contract compliance

- **Spend reduction policy / budget cuts**
  - Limit spend in targeted non-academic areas; unit procurement budget cuts

= primary initial focus

Source: Bain Analysis; Cornell Interviews
Organizational Improvements

- Strategic planning process outlines verifiable goals
- Alignment between purchasing goals and university strategy

- Cross-university teaming to balance objectives across administration and faculty
- Decision-driven roles and organizational structure

- Talent recruitment and development
- Sufficient resource allocation to drive high-performance culture

- Data tracking and repository
- Integrated ERP system
- E-sourcing and e-procurement tools

- Superior execution of ‘mission critical’ activities
  - Strategic sourcing
  - Supplier development
  - Ordering
  - Innovation
eShop

Opportunities

• Best practice schools use eShop
  – Detail spend data
  – Efficient process
  – Pricing compliance tool

Challenges

• Implemented within DFA, not yet supported as institutional system
  – Needs better search tool
  – Better return process
  – eInvoicing for better unit information
1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Steve Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to order the December 2009 meeting of the University Faculty Senate. First I would like to remind the people present here to please turn off your cell phones, and there will be no recording of the proceedings, either orally or visually or photographically, except as authorized. And when members of the body speak, please stand and identify yourself by name and your department or other administrative unit. Also please wait for the two people who will have microphones to get to you so that you can speak directly into one of those microphones and everyone in the room can hear your comments.”

“At this point, there are no good and welfare speakers, so our time is a little looser, and we'll perhaps utilize that in the consideration of the several issues to come before the body at this time.

“So at this point, I’d like to introduce the Professor William Olbricht, who will give a report on behalf of the University Faculty Committee. “

2. UFC REPORT

Professor William Olbricht, Chemical Engineering. “Thank you. My name is Bill Olbricht, Senator from Chemical Engineering and a member of the UFC. This is the UFC’s report. Since last meeting on November 11th, the UFC has met three times. On Thursday, November 19th, the UFC met with Provost Fuchs. Professor Fred Gouldin chaired the meeting, in the absence of Dean Fry. The provost discussed budgetary matters and strategies to realize possible savings from implementation of the findings in the Bain Report over the next two to three years.”

“The UFC and provost also discussed gas drilling in Central New York and the resolution on gas drilling that was tabled at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Provost Fuchs suggested faculty members should take a leading role in organizing and leading campus discussion and forums concerning this important issue.

“The UFC met again Tuesday, December 1st. Members of the UFC and Dean Fry discussed task force reports and various forums that had been held during the previous two weeks. The UFC was especially concerned by the library task force report and the publication of a separate report from faculty members of the library task force.

“In view of significant differences in the findings contained in these reports, the UFC thought the issues raised in the library task force report should be examined closely before any decisions are made regarding the libraries; therefore, the UFC produced the motion under consideration at today’s faculty senate meeting to delay implementation of the library task force report until the faculty senate has had time to deliberate its findings and alternatives.

“The UFC met again with Provost Fuchs earlier this week. At that meeting, the provost
discussed his perspective on the 20 task force reports. He asked for and received comments and questions from UFC committee members and an active and lively discussion ensued.

“In this last report, the UFC indicated it would propose a resolution to the senate to influence the strategic planning process. Since the last senate meeting, it’s become apparent each of the task force reports is distinct and each report raises complex issues that are specific to that report. Therefore, the UFC decided not to propose the general resolution, but instead to consider each task force report individually.

“The committee started with the library task force report, and our resolution concerning that report is on the Senate’s agenda today. UFC again invites your comments on these ideas, and it solicits your proposals for other ways in which the Senate can influence the strategic planning process.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I would now like to call on Professor Linda Nicholson to present a motion.”

3. DISCUSSION OF MARCELUS SHALE RESOLUTION.

Professor Linda Nicholson, Department of Molecular Biology & Genetics: “Thank you. So we have a motion on the table from last month that I would like to leave on the table, and I would like to present a new resolution that addresses that tabled resolution, which I hope you will agree is a much more appropriate resolution.”

“So it is concerning the Marcellus Shale gas drilling issue, and these are the senators, same ones who presented the motion last year -- last month. This is the resolution. The whereases are still very similar, and then the therefore be it resolves are a bit different. “Number 1, we are proposing a moratorium on the leasing of Cornell lands for -- so what we are using here is the term horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and this is until certain conditions are met. So it’s not an absolute moratorium. It is a wait; let’s make sure we have all the information before we proceed.

“We also are proposing an advisory group that should be constructed. I would like to just make very clear that the role of the senate is to simply express the opinion of the faculty. This is not binding; this is not any sort of requirement of the central administration. We are simply expressing our opinion.

“Before I go into this in detail, I’d like to propose an amendment. It’s a very simple amendment that would replace the term "horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling" with "horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing." So that makes it crystal clear.

“So the next slide is a proposed amendment that I would like to bring forth at this point; and if we could just go to everywhere in the whereases, where this term used to appear, we are replacing it in this first case with "the combined use of horizontal drilling and slick water hydraulic fracturing," to make it very clear. And in subsequent places we are using "horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing."

“WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of
crude oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, the natural gas of the Marcellus Shale is not going away (i.e. it is "gas in the bank"), while its rapid extraction via the combined use of horizontal drilling and "slick water" hydraulic fracturing (never before implemented in the state of NY) will require industrial type development that could impact wide areas of land and water; furthermore, EPA studies of the impact of horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling are currently underway in areas where this process has a history of use, and DEC regulation of gas drilling in NYS is currently being debated;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is in a position to take a leadership role on the issue of horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, on sustainability education, and on research in water management, soil health, animal and human health and medicine;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate hereby conveys to the executive administration, including President David Skorton, Provost Kent Fuchs, and the Board of Trustees, our opinion that

1. A moratorium should be imposed on the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing until a scientifically informed consensus is reached at federal, state and local levels on the long-term environmental, health, economic and community impacts of this activity, federal and state legislation for adequate regulation of this activity is in place, and the infrastructure is in place to enforce these regulations.

2. An advisory group should be constructed to advise the executive administration on future decisions regarding the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing, and its recommendations should be reported and made widely available to the Cornell community. This group should be composed of experts in areas such as fracture mechanics of shale, watershed and aquifer dynamics, analytical chemistry, environmental protection law and policy, water law and policy, sociology and community development, climate change, climate policy, renewable energy technology, energy economics, geologic faults of New York state, and other subjects as deemed necessary to gain an in-depth understanding of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and of alternatives for sustainable energy production. Undergraduate and graduate student representatives should also be included.

“So it occurs twice in the whereases and I believe twice also in the next slide, in the
Number 1 and Number 2. Again, the same substitution, "horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing" in both cases.”

Speaker Beer: “This is a non-substantive amendment; and therefore, it is allowed to be made at this time. So the amendment is now on the floor for discussion. Is there any discussion or questions relative to the change in wording? Seeing none, are you ready for the vote? The gentleman in the –“

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “As I read the Number 2 there, I think it’s probably relevant to put in that that group should also have representation from someone who’s very well-versed and experienced in oil and gas leasing contracts.”

Speaker Beer: “The discussion and debate should be strictly on the amendment. The substitution of the blue font –“

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Oh, I’m sorry.”

Speaker Beer: “So are you ready to vote on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment as proposed by Senator Nicholson, signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? It passed. Would you like to speak to it?”

Professor Nicholson: “I think there’s been a lot of discussion already. There was a forum hosted by Earth and Atmospheric Science Department last week. I think everybody has had ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with this issue, so I would like to just simply turn it over for discussion.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we will have discussion. And again, people who wish to make comments, any member of the university faculty may do so. Please wait for the arrival of the ladies with the roving microphones, and stand and identify yourself by name and department or other administrative unit. The gentleman in the light blue shirt.”

Professor Robert Howarth. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: “Thank you. Bob Howarth, from the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. I want to speak in favor of the resolution. Briefly, I’m a biology chemist, aquatic ecologist. I work largely on water quality issues. I have worked on oil and gas, water quality issues for 33 years, served on a National Academy of Sciences panel on the environmental effects of oil and gas development.”

“I have also worked with the State of New York a lot in water quality and I represent the governor on the Chesapeake Bay Program, so I worked closely with the Department of Environmental Conservation, and the impact statement produced by the DEC in this case is really sub-standard, in my opinion, compared to most impact statements I have seen. It’s clearly a rush job, it does not adequately consider many, many issues.

“Let me just throw out one. There’s a compound listed in the impact statement, 4-nitroquinoline oxide, an extremely hazardous substance. The impact statement says it’s there, they have seen it in every sample. They have looked for it in Pennsylvania. It’s a mutagenic substance, present in milligrams per liter concentrations, which are six orders of magnitude more than one would consider hazardous.
“Nothing is said about why this is a terrible idea. It’s just there. I have talked with experts on the analysis of this compound, and most people think it’s a mistake. They probably can’t have measured it at all, and probably that nasty compound isn’t there; something else is instead. But I raise it as an issue of lack of considerations been given to date. The fact this incredible mutagenic compound could be listed as there when it probably isn’t and without comment about what this means is a shockingly poor analysis, so there clearly needs to be more analysis of what the impacts are.

“For those of you that don’t know, oil and gas drilling at the moment in the United States is totally exempt from The Clean Water Act, The Clean Air Act and other environmental regulation. That’s been true since 2005, and that alone would be reason to not move forward with the drilling. So I applaud the faculty who proposed this. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution? The gentleman in red.”

Professor Larry Cathles, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: “Yes, I’m Larry Cathles, a member of the Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Department, and I speak fairly much as a consensus of our department. We don’t have strong feelings against the language of the resolutions themselves, but we feel it would be a disservice to Cornell to adopt this resolution because of the background material, which will be implicitly supported by a positive vote.”

“This background material fails to mention any of the environmental energy or economic benefits of the Marcellus Shale in their major. The methane that the Marcellus contains is an important contributor to transition fuel to sustainable sources of energy. And the Marcellus is an important part of the New York State energy plan.

“The citations in the background material did not include a single refereed report, nor links to web sites of neutral organizations, such as the Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Paleontological Research Institute, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Department of Energy, much less links to the arguments of the proponents in industry.

“And the language in the supporting material is intemperate and misleading. There are many benefits to horizontal drilling. For example, one horizontal well is the equivalent of about five vertical wells. Each time you drill through the shallow subsurface, you encounter risks of encountering unexpected gas pockets. This is really the main risk of drilling. Once you get the well in place and drilling from a single site, means you only encounter that risk once, rather than many times, if you drilled the equivalent number of vertical wells.

“And the hydrofracking from horizontal well need only fracture a thin shale bed, rather than -- vertically, rather than a shale bed much more extensively horizontally. So we feel that the language in the supporting material will deprive Cornell of its opportunity to serve as an unbiased referee in this very, very important area, and we think it would be unwise to adapt it. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Is there another member of the body, who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution? The lady in the second row.”
Professor Cynthia Bowman, Law School: “I’m Cynthia Grant Bowman, the Dorothea
Clarke Professor of Law. The past semester I have been co-teaching a water law clinic
with Keith Porter, who is the former director of the New York State Water Resources
Institute at Cornell and an expert on groundwater. Our students have now been studying
the issues involved in drilling in the Marcellus Shale for more than a year, and we’ve also
perused the draft supplemental generic environmental impact statement, which was
released for comment by the State Department of Environmental Conservation.”

“Today I mailed off the water clinic’s comments on that statement, along with
recommendations for ways in which it could be improved, right here. We have 23 very
specific recommendations, and they involve major issues. The document, as it stands, is
seriously flawed in a number of ways. I could go on and on about them, but I won’t; and
even if it were not flawed, even if it presented a perfect way of protecting the environment
in Upstate New York, it involves the Department of Environmental Conservation taking
upon itself at least 187 -- my students counted them -- new tasks that it says in its chapter
on mitigation, Chapter 7, are necessary in order to monitor the drilling so as to make it
safe for the environment in this part of the country.

“The Department of Environmental Conservation of New York State doesn’t have the
resources to do that. It has about 17 employees and three field investigators. As you
know, the state budget is not particularly well-suited to expanding regulatory capacity at
this time.

“In short, I think Cornell should think long and hard about leasing any lands for gas
drilling, and should begin to play a leadership role on this issue. Thanks.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak
in opposition? The gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor Larry Brown: “My name is Larry Brown, Chair of the Department of Earth and
Atmospheric Sciences. My opinions are mine alone. I agree it is a flawed document, but
it is not a regulation; it is a draft that’s been put out for comment and a draft that’s been
receiving comment. To make decisions about what the final document will look like and
whether it will be up to snuff or not seems to me as premature.”

“Secondly, I think Cornell does need to take a leadership position, but it needs to take a
leadership position for the world, not for Ithaca. If we aren’t going to use natural gas,
what are we going to use? What are the impacts of the alternatives? Are they worse for us
in Ithaca? If they aren’t worse for us in Ithaca, who are they worse for? Somebody will
pay the price. It will be either be a natural gas from somewhere else, most likely, nuclear,
coal, which is worse than gas in many respects; and if we don’t want to pay that price
locally, will it wind up in the laps of the people in Bangladesh in terms of increased
greenhouse gases, increased global warming and sea level rise?

“So if you are going to frame this issue, it simply shouldn’t be put in terms of not in my
back yard. Thank you.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolution? The gentleman in
the black vest.”
Professor Ted Clark: “Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. I’m one of the co-sponsors of the resolution, and I just want to address the two comments made in opposition.”

“You know, this issue, for me, is certainly one that I recognize the importance of this resource and, in considering the resolution, we heard all kinds of comments, many of which were incendiary comments about why drilling should not occur; but many of us, I think, recognize the worth and value of this resource and the importance of this resource. So we didn’t just, you know, react to this as a knee-jerk opposition to this particular source of energy.

“So the bottom line is that I think we’re voting on the resolution, and the resolution is fairly unbiased. I don’t think we’re voting on anything else. I think we’re just voting on this resolution, regardless of the background statement or anything like that, so I think people should consider the resolution and not anything that anyone else has said or what’s in the background necessarily.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Before we hear from the next speaker, I’d like to ask, are there any questions of information that the mover and her colleagues might clarify? The lady in white.”

Ellen Harrison, Sr. Extension Associate, retired from Crop and Soil Science. “There’s been discussion about -- I think Larry, you mentioned, and perhaps both of you Larrys mentioned that natural gas is a good transition fuel. I am unaware of any good documentation about the full life cycle analysis of greenhouse gas and natural gas development from the shale. I have heard that if you take fugitive emissions into account, both from transmission lines and also from the fluids that will come up, which will have methane in them, that in fact, the equation doesn’t come out with natural gas through this source looking so good. I’m not asking for an opinion, because I don’t have an --.”

Speaker Beer: “Senator Nicholson, would you kindly clarify?”

Ellen Harrison: “Exactly. Thank you.”

Professor Nicholson: “I have the same information that you do, Ellen. I don’t know of a thorough analysis that has been done, and I might ask Larry Brown to comment. He’s raising his hand.”

Professor Brown: “The fact is, the argument is, there is no mention of this debate in the resolution or in the background material. And if we are going to compare life cycles of natural gas, we should compare it against nuclear, coal and the other alternative energies as well. We need to have a fair basis for these decisions, and we have to have a fair measurement of this.

“And these impacts go beyond Ithaca. It’s the lack of recognition that these issues exist, which is our main concern, not necessarily an argument over the facts of one particular aspect of the drilling.”

Professor Nicholson: “May I address that? So Larry, I was hoping you would give me feedback on the document. I was waiting for that, and I’m a little disappointed that it’s
coming up now and it didn't come up before this was --.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other points of information -- not debate, but information? Senator Cohn.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “My understanding of this is it is rather procedural in nature. The resolution, as I read it, is procedural and not really substantive, as far as taking a position on these matters that have been raised. Could you comment on that?”

Professor Nicholson: “I think that's a good point. It's just -- basically, the first part is simply to wait until we have more information, so it's a let's wait and see. And the second part is let's form a committee of experts. Absolutely. That's a good take on it.

“We're not taking a position gas drilling is bad. I think their concern primarily, the two Larry's, is with the background information and not the resolution itself.”

Speaker Beer: “So now we'll switch back to debate, and we'll hear from someone who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution. There's a gentleman on the far right.”

“Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences.”

Speaker Beer: “Can you kindly stand?”

Professor Kay: “Yes, I am in the process.”

[LAUGHTER]

Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: “I would like to address the word "consensus." And this is directly out of the resolution, and the consensus is supposed to be reached at the federal, state and local levels, and it's -- practically speaking, I'm wondering whether the drafters of this resolution have considered that it's easy to negate something; just one person can say the consensus is off. It seems to me very strong to require that, so I'll just make that point.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a speaker in favor of the resolutions? The lady in the third row.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders: “I want to address the NIMBY argument.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you identify yourself.”

Professor Sanders: “Sorry. Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department, Senator. I want to address the NIMBY argument, which I see coming up again and again. I think it's the last refuge of those who want to drill and often who have an economic interest in doing so. The companies are bringing this up a lot, trying to make us feel guilty, because we don't want to suffer these conditions, but presumably we want other people to. And that's really a false argument, I think.”

“It ignores -- it assumes that we have to go on consuming the same amount of fossil fuel; that we can't use conservation in a country that uses twice as much energy per capita as almost any other country besides Canada, that we can't go to alternatives-- solar and wind and sources that don't poison the land forever, as this undoubtedly will do.

“Once we get to the point we have to recognize what's going to happen, what's happened
in other areas, then our motives are impugned, but this completely ignores the alternatives and assumes a continued increase in fossil fuel consumption. And that's just really wrong.

"If everybody said NIMBY, if everybody said no, you can't poison this beautiful area; no, you can't destroy my property values; no, you can't destroy my water; no, you can't poison the air around me, if everybody did that, then energy companies, and other companies that would come forward would find a better way for us to have a high standard of living without poisoning our earth."

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another person who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution? Gentleman in the fourth row.”

Professor Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: “Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I don’t live in Ithaca. And when I drive home and when I live in a couple of places in Cortland, there’s a lot of economic depression out there. You know, Upstate New York has been in economic depression for decades, so the downturn we've recently had hasn't even affected most of these small towns in Upstate New York, because they have been in a depression. You can't go anywhere from the bottom. There's no place left to go.”

“Ithaca Journal recently was quoted as saying this could create as many as 20,000 jobs. I don't think we should drill, if we are going to poison our water and if we can't drill responsibly; but on the other hand, I think what we should have is a balanced view of the idea of drilling.

“And if wells do become poison, the question is how often does that happen? What’s the probability that drilling may go awry and we may end up poisoning water locally? So I want to hear more of a balanced view.

“I actually think that the second part of this proposal is completely on the money, that we should have an advisory group and we should listen to this. I'm really concerned when this proposal was put forth by simply members of the biology community and not enough people from geology or Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. It seemed like a really unbalanced view that mostly biologists were going to come with a decision to say this isn't going to hurt biology.

“So I'm sort of concerned that we haven’t been presented a balanced view on the subject and that we should. And so I actually move -- I would like to put forth a motion that we strike -- is that out of order?”

Speaker Beer: “Substantive amendments have to be presented to the body 24 hours before the meeting.”

Professor Garcia: “I want to do an addendum to the amendment. Hold on. I just want to make -- so even a -- okay. I just want to strike the first part.”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “That’s quite substantive.”

Professor Garcia: “You know, we've practiced parliamentary procedure in our
Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Well, we’ve had quite a debate, and it seems we are reaching our time limit for consideration of this issue. Are we ready for the vote?”

“Does anyone wish to call a question on the motion? Okay, question’s been called. All in favor of voting on the resolution say aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay? We’ll proceed to vote on the resolution, as you see presented on the screen, as amended. The amendment deals with adopting the blue-colored font in preference to these stricken red fonts. All those in favor of adopting the amendment, signify by sighing "aye."

(Ayes)

Unidentified Speaker: “The resolution. We already voted on the amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “I stand corrected. The main motion, which has been amended as indicated, please say aye.”

(Ayes)


[APPLAUSE]

Speaker Beer: “The speaker erred, and I will hear from abstainers. All those who wish to abstain, senators who wish to abstain from the vote, please indicate by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “The minutes should note there were several senators who abstained. Senator Earle.”

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics. “Just as a point of procedure, I would suggest that when we take important votes of this sort, we do it by a count, rather than by a voice vote.”

Speaker Beer: “Are you calling for a division?”

Professor Earle: “No, I’m not calling for that, but I would like it to be on record than we should consider that for the future.”

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Okay, so we will now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the approval of the minutes of the November 2009 meeting. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the November meeting as distributed, please signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay?”
“The minutes of the November meeting are approved. I would now like to call on Professor Steve Pope; and later, Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano for a budget update.”

5. **BUDGET UPDATE – FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATION.**

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: “Okay, thank you. So I’m Steve Pope, a senator from Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering and Chair of the Financial Policies Committee. So this presentation will be in two parts. So in the first part, I will give the Financial Policies Committee's involvement in the budget process for next year and, in the second part, I thought David Harris was going to speak, but I understand John Siliciano is going to speak instead, and he’ll describe the connections between the budget process, the Bain’s exercise and the task force reports. And after that, we will be pleased to take questions.”

“Next slide. So on the right-hand side; you will see the membership of the Financial Policies Committee. I’ll just spend a few minutes talking about the committee’s work so far. We meet typically every two weeks. We meet with Paul Streeter, who is the interim vice president for Planning and Budget. You may remember Carolyn Ainslie left that position in 2008, and Elmira Magnum will join in February next year as vice president for Planning and Budget.

“So we’ve had very good discussions with Paul through the semester. We’ve had open discussions, in which he shared confidential information with us on essentially all the topics we’ve discussed. We spent four meetings talking about the Budget Model Task Force; and Cathy Dove, along with the co-chairs of that task force, joined us for these meetings. So that was an opportunity for the Financial Policies Committees to have input on that matter.

“With respect to the budget, last week we had a lengthy meeting with Paul, going over the major assumptions going into the budget for next year. In some previous years, this information has been shared with the senate prior to going to the trustees. This is not the case this year, so there’s a limit on what I’m able to say here. One other matter we are going to take up next week is one raised in the senate last semester, and that of part-time appointments for faculty.

“So just to give an overview of the budget issues, looking at the current year's budget, this is showing the major components for the revenues, the big items; tuition and fees, sponsored programs, the endowment payout, New York State. Those add up to 79% of the revenues. On the expenditure side, salaries are over 50%; and then financial aid, those two add up to 71%.

“So at our meeting last week, Paul Streeter presented proposals that are going to go to the Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee. I think, as we speak, they will be talking about it. On the three major items that the administration and the trustees really have the most control over, namely the bold items, if we could go back -- so namely the setting of the tuition and fees, the endowment payout and the salaries.

“So we had a two-hour meeting, in which Paul Streeter described the proposals, the
rationale for the proposals. There was extensive discussion with the Financial Policies Committee, expressing a range of opinions, and our views were clearly heard.

“Okay, next one, please.

“So the timeline ahead, as I said, at the moment, these major assumptions are being presented to the trustees of the Finance Committee. They will take action in January on those major assumptions; namely, the tuition, the salary improvement program and the endowment payout. And then in March, the budget allocations will go to the colleges and units. This is a little bit later than the normal process, for reasons that John may explain. And then presumably, the final budget will be approved in May.

“Okay? So I will turn it over to John and, after his presentation, we can take questions.”

Vice Provost John Siliciano: “Thanks. Thanks, everybody, for having David Harris here. Unfortunately, David took ill this afternoon and I’m pinch-hitting. I have been handed a script. I understand most of it, but I have to confess I have not been involved in -- we are all involved in this up to our necks, but David has been working more on the Bain part of it, the consulting and some of the budget stuff, so there will be some gaps in my knowledge, but I will do my best. I do have a working knowledge of it.”

“In terms of a budget update, the goal is to address things -- why don’t we move to the next slide. Okay. This is what I gather is one of the reasons that we have been invited here today, is an understandable inconsistency that people are hearing between -- what you have been hearing lately is that it is our hope and expectation to solve a large portion of the remaining budget deficit through administrative cost savings. That is intentioned with the fact the task forces’ reports, the 20 task force reports, which began to come in in October and now have been made public in various ways, do discuss some very significant potential changes in the academic area, such as closing libraries or reducing faculty lines in some units.

“So how do we reconcile this? On the one hand we are saying we are relieved we’ll be able to do most of this through administrative, rather than academic side savings, in the fact the task forces are speaking in terms of things that are core academic pursuits.

“There are four reasons for this: One that the task forces were launched in a period before we retained Bain to help us work on the administrative side, and we didn’t know the scale or the ways in which we were going to deal with the budget deficit. So at the point at which these committees were charged, these units were charged, we asked them to do something very significant.

“As you recall, at the outset of the crisis, out of necessity, we imposed a 5% budget cut across all units. It was a very crude tool, not strategic, but necessary under the circumstances, knowing that we would need to do more cuts in the future. So part of the initial charge to the task forces was to imagine how they would function and function as well as possible with an additional reduction of up to 10%. So they were asked to imagine moving forward with their overall reduction in the 10% to 7% range.

“Those task forces worked and what they are showing you now is the product of that charge, so they were asked to sort out how you would deal with this if things were that
bad, without accounting for the fact at that point, we were going to go through a separate exercise aimed at identifying savings on the administrative side of the thing.

“So they do speak of things that are quite scary, but have become less necessary, given the fact we have been able to identify substantial administrative savings. I don’t know if that’s clear; but basically, we’ve relieved some of that pressure, a very significant amount, through the subsequent work on the administrative side, so some of the things that have been identified in the reports will not be necessary, unless we, in some sense, face really extreme budget pressure, should we have another economic shock.

“The second point is that we do, even with the projected administrative side savings, we do face a budget gap that will need to be closed, and that will likely involve engaging in some of the things identified in the academic task force reports.

“As you recall, the total budget deficit, the annual budget deficit we are facing -- that’s opened up underneath -- is in the range of $215 million as an annual budget. In the first year cut, we were able to reduce this by $80 million, so the current figure is $135 million to go. We believe that the reductions and the savings on the administrative side -- and some of this is in non-personnel, like more efficient procurement processes, greater energy savings. Some is in personnel, and that’s the one we worry about most -- but we are projecting that we will be able to get about $90 million in annual savings on this function, which leaves $45 million to go in terms of a number to be involved.

“In all likelihood, that number will be less. That is a conservative estimate. Things have gone better in terms of our thinking about the endowment payout and the market performance than we have expected, so the number will be less; but we still have a number to solve for. So the second point is we will need to consider things on the academic side that help address the remaining budget deficit.

“Third issue is that the goal of this whole process -- and it’s a huge unwieldy process, 20 task force reports, the examination of administrative spending, the launch of a strategic process going forward -- has two components: One is to balance the budget. That’s the sort of hard edge, but the second is one that, I think that’s been widely embraced, to use this difficult time as an opportunity to rethink a number of questions about where we are going, how we are focused, how we can best discharge our academic mission.

“And so the task forces, along with proposed budget savings, also proposed things that we would want to think about in ordinary times; about our alignment, about our deployment, about our focus of the academic mission, and they appear side-by-side and would continue to appear and they are things we need to think about, even if they have no budget implications, per se.

“I think that ties into the fourth point of this side -- at least I’m intuiting that -- is that when we get through the challenge, we will, for a long time, be in a situation with reduced resources. And so that will keep on the pressure to think very carefully about how we deploy resources. So even within a college, I think it’s going to be a constant need to think about whether the college is making the right kind of expenditures for substantive purposes, so we’d want to think about that going forward.
“That’s really all I have to say. I’d be happy to respond for questions, if that’s appropriate.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions for Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano?

Senator Hoffman. Sorry.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “So I don’t know if you are in a position to comment on how severe the staff changes are likely to be as a result of trying to capture these savings and how much of that’s likely to be in things that we actually will consider to be academic spheres, because some of the staff we really see as pretty tangential to what we are doing and some of the staff is absolutely critical to what we do.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “To respond to Abby’s question, the way I would frame it -- and there may be better ways to frame it -- is that our priority in the budget reduction, our core priority is to protect the academic enterprise, which is teaching, research and our outreach to the world. That's our goal.”

“So we're trying to put as much as possible in what you would call nonacademic. And part of your question, I think, is appropriately challenging whether that line is as bright as we sometimes refer to it.

“In that world of -- let’s just call it nonacademic budget cuts, our goal there is the appropriate one of trying to focus those as much as possible on non-personnel savings. That's in the interest of all of us, is to preserve as much in that sense as possible, but there will be layoffs. It's a difficult, but in-escapable fact, as we try to do this. We can't make it all up in the non-personnel savings.

“The degree of the layoffs is not clear at this point. That's one of the big questions. You will see President Skorton saying openly what we all hope, is that we want to minimize those to the extent possible, for all sorts of obvious reasons.

“To the extent that we need to do layoffs and personnel actions, then we get to the heartier question; are those we need to focus on things as much as possible that don't affect the academic enterprise. So they would be things in areas that are remote from it, as opposed to areas that are quite integral to how we function academically.

“And we could think of examples of that, but what happens closest to us, we -- that said -- and there are things we would view as nonacademic, maintenance of facilities, really quite essential for us to move forward. Obviously, there's lots of judgments along the way; but those, I think, are the biases in the way we are trying to think about it.”

Speaker Beer: “Other questions?”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: “I've been to a number of these sessions where the budget's been discussed, and there's this sort of -- the common theme I hear is that priority to retain on the academic side, research, teaching and outreach to the world. In my annual review, outreach is a separate category from extension, and I very rarely hear extension mentioned as something the university wants to preserve. Could you comment on that?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: "I think when we use -- this is how the provost formulates it in terms of what we are trying to protect, is research, teaching, research instruction and
outreach. I think that’s a broad umbrella, and it includes extension and it includes all the other efforts we make internationally, in terms of the public service education for our students. So I don’t think that embeds in it any disqualifications or conclusions around that, in terms of speaking about that.”

“It may be that in looking within a college; for example, within CALS, that the leadership of the college has to make choices about different resource allocations, and those may affect formal extension, as opposed to other forms of outreach. But in terms of this sound bite, which is what our vow is around, it’s broadly configured to speak of outreaches, the many ways that Cornell interlaces with the world.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the far, furthest aisle.”

Professor Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management: “Thank you. I realize I’m a little obscure back here. Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management and a member of the Financial Policies Committee. And John, please recognize what I want to say is really not addressed to you personally, but rather as a representative or vehicle to administration. And it’s prefaced on the information that’s been available to the committee, which indicates that the university is and remains in a very difficult economic situation right now; and it is also very apparent that if the Bain cuts are really not successful, that the budget’s still going to need to be balanced and the savings are going to have to come directly or indirectly out of the academic aspects of the university.”

“And yet, when we have discussions about these, President Skorton's discussion on the budget last spring and yours now, there are no numbers. I don’t understand how the administration thinks the faculty and the community can grasp and become part of the process of balancing the budget when we see no numbers.

“You know, I think it’s clear the administration really needs to get the entire Cornell community on board and re-envision the university and make these Bain cuts succeed; but unless they begin to be open to us about what the situation is, what the plans are, what the expectations are and so on, I really don’t see that’s going to happen. And I really hope that the university recognizes the importance of being open about these matters and does it really soon and in detail. Thank you.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Thanks. I unfortunately am not in a situation to respond in a sort of robust way, because I have not been on the budget side of this. I have been in other areas of crisis, but I understand the concern and I share the concern; is that we need to get the savings that we hope out of the projected $90 million. It is the big worry. It is the big hope, but it’s also the big worry.”

“We have a remaining gap we’ve already talked about, and we need to figure out how to solve for that, and that will have impact. If we aren’t able to get all the administrative savings that we hope, it’s going to have an even bigger impact. We agree completely.

“I don’t know, again, what information has been produced in terms of hard numbers, in what forums it’s been shared in, and I agree with that and I can convey that.”

Speaker Beer: “Still have several minutes for questions. The lady in the third row from the back. Second row from the back? All right.”
Emeritus Professor Peter Stein: “Well, I’m in the in the second –“

Speaker Beer:”Kindly pass the microphone to the lady behind you.”

Emeritus Professor Stein: “Oh. Lots of ladies here.”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “We would like to hear from you.”

Emeritus Professor Stein: “Thank you. After grabbing the microphone, I’m speaking out of turn, but I have not -- I must confess, I haven’t read a lot of stuff about the reports of the task forces. I haven’t gone and read them. I periodically read something in the newspaper, but I imagine that you must have models that predict the future and there are models that predict future of lots of things.”

“There’s something I’m a little confused about. It’s a simple question I have. With what you see at the moment, could you make -- are our people willing to make an estimate of two numbers that I think are rather important; one is, what will the change be, percentage change be, say, in 2015? How many students will there be at Cornell in Ithaca, and how many people will there be working for Cornell at Cornell in Ithaca?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “So with the repeated disclosure that I may not be the right person to ask, I can tell you there’s been enormous amount of study, seven days a week for literally the last year, with many people trying to make these projections, and a lot of it is hard and a lot of it is just estimates.

“In terms of the number of students, here’s what I can say at this point: There was one task force dedicated solely to the question of student enrollment, and the theory there was that one way to solve the budget issue would be to increase the number of students, increase the number of tuitions and so forth.

“They studied that extensively, and their conclusion was that that was a bad idea; that the negative effects of further expanding the undergraduate class at Cornell significantly outweighed the potential savings and, in fact, the potential savings were much smaller than what they would look like. We are already, in some sense, beyond capacity in terms of our residence halls, in terms of our health services. Significantly increasing the undergraduate population without devoting commensurate amount of resources is something that we are unwilling to do.

“So that task force was very clear. The deans and the academic leadership believe this will be something that would hurt Cornell, and we don’t want to do that simply to resolve what is a painful, but limited duration economic crisis. The question on the graduate level is different, and there have been some plans to expand in some units, particularly professional masters programs. Those aren’t as highly regulated. They don’t raise all the same questions in terms of the undergraduate experience, so there would probably be some expansion there.

“We are, in the provost office, requiring that be done in a very thoughtful way, for a variety of reasons that are important. Masters professional programs tend to generate a lot of resources, but they tend also to draw faculty out of things that are more core,
undergraduate teaching and research. They are a very mixed bag, and we are not trying to script that, but trying to induce levels of caution. So that's in terms of the -- I apologize, Peter. I forgot the second part of the question. Can you --.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “So we've already, through the staff retirement incentives and through attrition and through layoffs, the staff has been reduced by approximately 700. I think that's right. Again, I think that's -- Bill's nodding. 800 -- 700 from last year. So we have seen, in the overall staff at Cornell, I think including faculty, is around 10,000, so we have seen a significant drop already.”

“Running the Bain numbers and depending on what the amount of that comes out of the personnel as opposed to non-personnel and where they come out, whether -- it depends on who is being laid off and what their salary band is. Anyway you run the numbers, we are looking at significantly more, not in that magnitude, but we're looking at a more layoffs.

“I think the harder question is what changes will endure in the future. And I think the answer is, at least in the next five-year time frame, given how the budget is going to be constructed going forward and given our need to avoid some of the situations that got us here, we will be a smaller university.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “I wish I could say we have, Peter, but we haven't. Even the president, who is very motivated to avoid further reductions, will acknowledge that some will be necessary. The math here is imperfect, and -- but it's unfortunate, I think there will be.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we can take another two or three minutes. The gentleman with his hand raised. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: “Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. This is a related question to Peter's. It's directed to the administration. What's the likelihood of offering another round of early retirements, staff retirements?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Great question, and I have no idea. Mary Opperman is the vice president for Human Resources. She's out of town today, but I have not heard discussion of that, but I think there are no tools that have been taken off the table at this point.”

“Well, in terms of the SRI last year, our projections were that somewhere in the 100 to 150 range was what we expected. We got 436, so it was very -- there was a large uptake on that. Whether there's sort of residual demand is not clear. It was for people over 55. As you move to younger ages, obviously, that would create additional concerns. It is not a cheap thing to do; because obviously, you are investing money on the belief that people will retire earlier than they would otherwise.”

Speaker Beer: “One further question?”
Professor Cohn: “Only if there’s no one else. Just to follow-up on that, it seems to me it would be very useful for the administration to take seriously the possibility of a retirement incentive on the faculty side. It seems to me that we are at a point where for each and every senior faculty retirement we have, if we were able even at a parity basis to make appointments, we would see numerous benefits. We would have huge financial savings, but we would also be able to meet many of our other collective objectives on maintaining and enhancing diversity and also addressing the fact that we have an aging faculty, and I would really call upon the administration to take that very seriously.”

Provost Siliciano: “I appreciate the point in terms of increasing incentives for faculty retirements. I know that is among the things being discussed. I can’t say what stage it’s at. We have talked to the deans about their own ability to facilitate retirements in ways that are informal, but are similar; but in terms of the university-wide program, that’s not something that’s reached any point of sort of solidity.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Provost Siliciano, we appreciate you filling in at the last moment. I would like to call on Professor Eric Cheyfitz to present a resolution on behalf of the University Faculty Committee concerned with the library task force.”

6. DISCUSSION ON LIBRARY TASK FORCE RESOLUTION

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department: “The resolution is generated by -- let’s say a conflict between or an understanding of how the task force report for the library was produced, and significant report coming from the faculty involved with that, that they were not properly consulted. “

“That prompted the UFC to generate this particular resolution; particularly because I think the library is a universal institution here at Cornell and at the core of the academic mission, so that before anything is done with it, we want to make sure that there’s proper procedure in making decisions about its restructuring, to the extent that restructuring is going to take place, and the report does recommend significant restructuring in terms of the closing of libraries.

“So I’ll read the resolution. It’s up there for everyone to see and -- pardon?

“Well, we need a pointer? I think you could probably follow. It says:"

*Whereas the bylaws of Cornell University recognize the faculty has the function to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college" -- and that’s in Article 2, Section 3 of the bylaws -- "whereas the university libraries are a major component of a Cornell education, in terms teaching and research, and whereas the five faculty members of the library task force neither participated in the writing of the task force report, nor were their opinions about the report ever solicited by the members of the task force who wrote it" -- this comes out from reportage coming out of that committee -- and then finally, "The faculty senate recommends the provost delay any implementation of the report until the senate has had time to deliberate its findings and the alternatives at the beginning of the*
“There was a minority report as well, issued by two members of that committee. So that’s the resolution.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. We’ll have discussion and debate on the resolution. We’ll first hear from someone in support of the resolution. The lady in the multicolored sweater, please.”

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History Department: “I am Mary Beth Norton from the History Department, and I am currently the chair of the Faculty Library Board, which is appointed by this body, or at least by the nominations and elections committee of this body. And I wanted to report on behalf of the library board that we had a long discussion of this resolution and of the circumstances that produced it at our meeting on Monday.”

“I know there’s one other member of the library board here at least, because I have seen her in the audience, but I don’t know whether other people are here. They my also want to have something to say.

“Those of you who were at the forum on the library task force know that the librarian, Anne Kenney, basically said that in her opinion, we could either maintain the acquisitions level in the library or we could maintain the number of libraries, but we could not do both and that that was the conundrum she faced when presented with the charge to the task force of a significant reduction of library funding, given the current budget constraints.

“I want to say that the library board voted on Monday to support this resolution, that we agree with it, and also to say that the librarian, Anne Kenney, has proposed in her response to the task force the acquisition's budget for the library system be held harmless; in other words, that any cuts that would be made to the libraries would be made through internal review and the possibility of closing or consolidating libraries, some of the individual 18 libraries that exist currently on this campus and all of which take up space and personnel and so forth, and that that’s where she thinks most of the pressure should come.

“But she believes -- and this is true from the task force report and this is true from the library board that these decisions need to be made in the context of the strategic planning resulting from the other task force reports; that is, it should not be made in isolation or before other decisions are made about the university’s priorities.

“And that’s one reason why we think this is an excellent idea to delay implementation of any decisions until further decisions have been made, as a result of the Bain report and as a result of the provost and the president’s response to the other task force reports.

“I might also add that those of you who did attend the forum might realize or know very well that there was a lot of upset at the forum, expressed by a number of faculty, especially from the Humanities and the Arts College, about wanting input into decisions being made in the library about priorities in the library system; and as a result of that, there is already in the works a proposal to have a humanities council established basically by the chairs of the humanities departments to offer input into decisions made in the library about such things as acquisitions and the movement of certain books out to the annex.
and other sorts of things like that. Not to micromanage the library, but to offer input on behalf of the humanities faculty.

“One of the points I want to make today is that the library board is interested in knowing whether members of other disciplines are interested also in establishing similar councils; that is, a social science council and a sciences council that might have similar input into decisions made with respect to the library. That's not something that the library faculty board understands. We don't know whether there's interest, and I thought that the appropriate forum to express this was at the Senate, because there are members from all the different disciplines here.

“So if anyone here from the social sciences or the sciences are interested in the kind of informal thing that is now underway with respect to the humanities and offering liaisons to the library, the library board and the librarian Anne Kenney would be interested in knowing about it. That's basically what the library board charged me with saying here today. So that's my comment; that we are fully in favor of this UFC resolution.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak in opposition? The gentleman in the gray shirt.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications: “Tarleton Gillespie, Department of Communications. I’m one of the five faculty members that were on the Library Task Force report, so I want to comment a bit on this resolution and its reflection of how the task force report worked or how the task force met.”

“Two simple points: One is that the resolution, as written, is misleading. It is not as if the writing of this task force report existed separate from consultation with us. We met partially as a group, and then the librarians were tasked with drafting the report that was brought back to us. And that may have been a mistake in terms of timing, which means a lot of the further discussion has now happened in public, rather than what could have continued in the task force space; but we were consulted. A lot of our feedback that happened when that draft arrived was incorporated into the task force report.

“So it’s actually a misrepresentation. There are a number of faculty who don’t love the task force report, and that’s been expressed in the minority report, which has already been delivered to the Provost and to anyone who wants it.

“The second is that having this resolution, I think, would be over-kill. So those of you at the public forum saw the task force report was presented, there was criticism of it. Some of it was helpful, some of it was venomous. There was a whole range of things, but I think the provost saw that clearly. The minority report expresses different opinions. That’s been clear.

“The humanities council that's been suggested is a terrific idea. That’s already being considered. I like the idea of the other ones. I think that both the suggestions that were made in the task force report, the concerns with them and the variety of opinions about how we might resolve the budget have been made perfectly clear, and my worry is that this body could add to the pile-on that I think has already made its point to have been unnecessary.
“So I think that the task has been accomplished. The report has been written, the criticism has been raised. I don’t know that we can add anything by adding another resolution that says see, I told you so. With all due respect, there was lots of dispute, but I think that’s been clear. So I don’t know that we have anything that we need to add with this. And I’m worried, because it is a misrepresentation, that the risk is that we pile on with something that’s actually flimsy.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolution? Gentleman on the wall, on the far right side.”

Professor Alan McAdams, JGSM. “Alan McAdams, from the Johnson School. We have had a number of luncheon discussions, especially with former librarians, for the Johnson School and the Hotel School, and we think that it is short-sighted, if you do have these new groups being created, that you leave the professional schools out.”

“We have special needs in the professional schools, and they have to do with the access of our students who are facing case assignments weekly and so forth, and they do have heavy interaction with persons in the libraries. And we are told that the people in the Hotel School have the same, and I would imagine it’s true also of the Law School. So I think -- this is another group that has special needs, and they should be taken into account.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another speaker in opposition. The gentleman in the sweater in the center.”

Professor Dan Buckley, Crop & Soil Sciences: “Dan Buckley, Crop and Soil Sciences. So I believe the Provost has laid out a plan for evaluating these task force reports, whereby he’s going to have a sort of preliminary report and then that’s going to have a public comment period before there’s any kind of implementation. I think he’s already announced that to this body. If anybody knows differently, I’d like to be corrected.”

“My concern is that having a special sort of statement here, a special resolution opens us up -- now there are 20-some task forces out there. If we were to pass this, do we have to reconsider and pass 20 more resolutions for each one of these task force’s reports, many of which controversial things?

“My reason for saying this is I think the provost has laid out a plan, where we all have an ability to feed back, whether it’s this body or the rest of faculty, on the comments that are going to be made. These reports are already out there and already getting a lot of feedback. So I think this resolution is largely moot, because the process in place already accounts for this kind of feedback.”

Speaker Beer: “You. Another speaker in favor of the resolution? Gentleman on the aisle in the red sweater.”

Professor David DelChamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. It was my understanding, from the remarks at the beginning of the meeting from the UFC chair, that this was the first report that they were going to bring to us and yes, we were actually probably going to be talking about 20 different things, you know, one at a time, because they were so complicated. That’s one
“The other thing is, in response to Tarleton Gillespie’s comment about piling on, when I read about this report in the paper, I thought wow, we have to say back as loud as we can that we don’t like what we see. I don’t feel guilty at all about piling on this issue.”

Speaker Beer: “Another speaker in opposition? Gentleman close to the front.”

Professor Charles Brittain, Classics: “Charles Brittain, Classics. I think the report was handled so badly that the pushing back has happened. I’m one of the humanities chairs that pushed for humanities chair input, and Anne Kenney has been extremely receptive to that. If there’s a problem at the professional schools, you should do the same thing we did, which is get our dean to help and really make a lot of effort to get and to actually pay attention to us, which she did and we have a good plan going.”

“And as I understand it, the library board itself is planning to be a bit more active and they are doing their own sort of repair. So one thing I want to say is something’s actually happening. Not that I agree with the way the task force went down, but something actually is happening, so that’s one thing.

“The second thing I’d like to say is more general, which is the -- I think it’s a mistake to think these task forces are representative at all. The only one I’ve had anything to do with was the Arts and Sciences one, aside from this.

“It doesn’t represent my views. They didn’t ask me. None of the recommendations, the ones that I want to do, and I wasn’t asked who was going to be on it, so I think to think a couple of faculty being on this board makes a huge difference is completely a mistake, that even the faculty who were on it, they didn’t ask me, they didn’t ask -- my faculty’s around all the time -- no one asked us what happened.

“So I think there’s a misunderstanding what the task forces are doing. They don’t represent the view of the faculty. They represent some view of somebody, and we’ve got to hassle them when they come; but this seems to me to encode a mistake as if oh, yeah, we agree with task force. And I don’t agree with any of the task forces. It depends on what they say.

“So that’s -- I’m not really against this recommendation. I don’t think this matters very much because something’s happened; but I do think it’s important to say it’s not as if we all chose these people and we shouldn’t take them to be more authoritative than they are, any of them, just because some faculty signed up to some plan. Who chose the faculty?”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another speaker in favor?”

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: “Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior. I think this particular task force report stood out, because the reaction to it was far beyond what any of the other task force reports received, and I think that’s why it came to the attention of the University Faculty Committee.”

“I do think it makes a difference. I do see a difference between an individual chair having a conversation with a librarian and the Senate itself taking a stand and saying look, we think things have happened too fast. There was obviously a disjunction between the
faculty and the librarians; and therefore, we want to examine it publicly, before any action’s taken. So I think it’s important we pass the motion.

“Frankly, I have looked at the various aspects of the library’s report, and I simply don’t see the logic of closing more libraries. I do understand why Physics was closed; it had very low user usage, had very high cost, but the ones that would be closed now are largely on the periphery of the campus, they are specialist collections, and their closure would do enormous damage to the -- I think, to the programs of those colleges. So I think this has to be aired in public, and I support the motion.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for another opposing view, and then we could consider the possibility of voting on this resolution.”

Professor Martin Hatch, Music: “Martin Hatch, Music. Could you explain what is a timetable for deliberating findings and the mechanism for doing so, and the alternatives? The senate, you have -- the senate has time to deliberate. What do you envision a committee of the senate to come forward and do a separate job?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Well, I haven’t thought this through fully. The Provost has a timetable for trying to come to some sort of conclusions.”

“Well, if the Senate does debate it, decides to debate it, that there are some clear recommendations in the report, the closing of libraries being one of them, that could be -- we could offer an alternative report. Just as a minority report was offered, we could offer a report too, an alternative to what is being proposed now, which is the closing of at least half the libraries on campus. And in the report as well, it says they are envisioning having only five libraries finally.”

Professor Hatch: “My question is only who are -- we will discuss which libraries to close as a body, or are you envisioning a separate committee?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “I haven’t thought that through. We’d have to think that through, but I think there should be an open Senate debate, to have some sort of sense, if the Senate approves of what are the substantial recommendations in the report -- and there are major questions here.”

“This is an institution, by the way, unlike the other task force reports that serves the whole university. It’s not a distinct division or unit, and since the bylaws of the University gives faculty control explicitly over this operation, the faculty should take control. That’s another thing that’s raised here.

“And the third thing, why should the budget cuts be applied uniformly to the Library, as they are being applied to separate units when it serves all the units? Perhaps there should be a reduction in budget cuts for the Library.

“And the other thing that needs to be thought of is the fact that the Library has fallen in acquisition rankings from 9th to 19th or 20th in the last six years -- okay, but I say there’s some very specific things that need to be considered.”

Speaker Beer: “So I think we’ll move now to a final speaker in opposition, and then we’ll consider a vote. Is there a speaker in opposition to the resolution? You are going to
speak in opposition? Calling a question?”

Professor Cohn: “No. I guess to -- Abby Cohn, Linguistics -- to follow up on what Marty Hatch just said, my understanding is it's the University Library Board who represents us and if, indeed, the University Library Board, as they have suggested, is in favor of this, it seems to me what we are doing is asking them to continue to deliberate on these matters and then bring it back to the Senate for further decision, because they are the representatives of this body relative to library matters.”

“And so it's in recognition of the Library Board's, I understand, consensus, that they support further consideration that I would support this amendment, but not in favor of us, in some vaguer way, pursuing a discussion of this report.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, are we ready to vote on the resolution?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Call the question.”

Speaker Beer: “Question's been called. All those in favor of voting on the resolution, signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay. Okay. We'll vote on the resolution as presented on the screen. All those in favor, signify by standing. All those -- we are going to do a count.”

Dean Fry and Associate Dean Gouldin. I would remind you, only senators are standing now, correct?”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “Okay. All those opposed, please stand. Senators opposed, please stand. All those who abstain, please stand. The resolution clearly carries, with how many affirmative votes? 50. And 5 in opposition, and 11 abstained. Thank you very much. We will now move to remarks by Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry.”

7. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean William Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I think all of us have been really, really busy. Everybody I’ve observed and talked with has more than enough to do. Many of us are reading papers, preparing finals, and I can also say that even in the administration, there's just a fantastic amount happening. I think someone mentioned everybody in the Provost's office and the President's office is working 24-7. I think that's really correct. There's just a fantastic amount happening.”

“The Provost is actively considering the recommendations from the 20 different task force reports. He is planning, I think, to come public with some tentative opinions in the not too distant future, and I think we'll all be extremely interested in those opinions. He is listening to faculty comment, certainly as we have heard, about the library report. He's listening to faculty comment at the forums, the brown bag luncheons and in e-mails. So I think that before the end of this calendar year, there will be some report from the Provost about initial directions.”
“One of my pleas about the budget correction, I think a plea from many of you has been for the administration to go slowly in implementing the budget corrections. And I can tell you, because I have observed it, that the administration is under tremendous pressure from the Trustees to go faster, and they have argued fairly successfully to go as slowly as they have. It’s not as slowly as I would like us to go, but it’s certainly a lot more slowly than some of the trustees would like to go. So the timeline that we are already on is a compromise.

“And I think, Steve, I’ll stop with that. If there are questions that I can address, I’d be happy to do that.”

Speaker Beer: “Still have a few minutes. If there are questions for Dean Fry, we can hear them now. Seeing none, an order for -- motion for adjournment would be in order. All right. All in favor, please leave.”

[LAUGHTER]

Meeting Adjourned 5:55PM.
DISCUSSION OF MARCELLUS SHALE RESOLUTION

Linda Nicholson and Colleagues

December 9, 2009
Proposed Amendment to Marcellus Shale Gas Drilling Resolution

Brought by Faculty Senator:

Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology & Genetics
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, the natural gas of the Marcellus Shale is not going away (i.e. it is "gas in the bank"), while its rapid extraction via horizontal, “slick water” hydraulic fracture gas drilling the combined use of horizontal drilling and “slick water” hydraulic fracturing (never before implemented in the state of NY) will require industrial type development that could impact wide areas of land and water; furthermore, EPA studies of the impact of horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling are currently underway in areas where this process has a history of use, and DEC regulation of gas drilling in NYS is currently being debated;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is in a position to take a leadership role on the issue of horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, on sustainability education, and on research in water management, soil health, animal and human health and medicine;
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate hereby conveys to the executive administration, including President David Skorton, Provost Kent Fuchs, and the Board of Trustees, our opinion that

1. A moratorium should be imposed on the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing fracture gas drilling until a scientifically informed consensus is reached at federal, state and local levels on the long-term environmental, health, economic and community impacts of this activity, federal and state legislation for adequate regulation of this activity is in place, and the infrastructure is in place to enforce these regulations.

1. An advisory group should be constructed to advise the executive administration on future decisions regarding the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing fracture gas drilling, and its recommendations should be reported and made widely available to the Cornell community. This group should be composed of experts in areas such as fracture mechanics of shale, watershed and aquifer dynamics, analytical chemistry, environmental protection law and policy, water law and policy, sociology and community development, climate change, climate policy, renewable energy technology, energy economics, geologic faults of New York state, and other subjects as deemed necessary to gain an in-depth understanding of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and of alternatives for sustainable energy production. Undergraduate and graduate student representatives should also be included.
Marcellus Shale Gas Drilling Resolution

Brought by Faculty Senators:

Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Peter Hinkle, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Clare Fewtrell, Department of Molecular Medicine
Ted Clark, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Ron Booker, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior
Elizabeth Sanders, Government
While gas drilling has been performed in the state of New York for decades, the combination of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has not been previously implemented in NYS.

serious new concerns:

• enormous volumes of fresh water consumed
• flowback water must be processed as toxic waste.

Source: J. Henry Fair  Dimock PA
“Slick Water”
Hydraulic Fracturing

- fracturing with large volumes of high pressure water = hydrofracturing

- sand is added to keep new fissures open

- To suspend sand in water, chemicals* are added (~1% of total vol.)

- 364+ water trips per well (3 – 5 million gal)

Source: Cheasapeake Energy 2008 (Estimate Denton TX Oil & Gas Task Force)
Hydrofrac’ing a Marcellus Well, West Virginia

*PROPRIETARY formulation, including known carcinogens, endocrine disrupters, benzene, toluene, xylene and formaldehyde
Gas Industry Exemptions

- Clean Drinking Water Act
- Clean Water Act
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- Safe Drinking Water Act
- Clean Air Act

EPA testing of gas drilling impacts on water and air was not required and was not performed
What do we know?

- The gas industry has only recently disclosed some of the toxic chemicals used in slick water fracturing. *Time is now needed* to test for impacts on aquifers, water wells, and other sources of drinking water where this process has been employed.

- In response to complaints, the EPA recently tested water wells near gas drilling sites in Pavillion, Wyoming: 11 of 39 (28%) of the water wells tested were contaminated with substances used in nearby gas drilling.

- Hydraulic fracturing is the suspected source of impaired or polluted drinking water in Pennsylvania, Texas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

- *Hundreds of cases of water impairment or pollution related to the oil and gas industries in NY state* have been documented by the DEC, but a majority have not been properly remediated ([www.toxicstargeting.com](http://www.toxicstargeting.com)).

Will DEC regulations ensure safety, and can NYS enforce them?
Legislation in the Works

• On June 9, 2009, the *Fracturing Responsibility and Awareness of Chemicals (FRAC) Act (S. 1215)* was introduced in the US Senate and was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works in the US Senate. This *pending bill* would *amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing* by the gas industry.

• On Oct. 30, 2009, President Obama signed into law the *Interior, Environment and Related Agencies fiscal year (FY) 2010 Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2996)*. The Conference Report of this bill includes a request that the EPA re-examine the impact of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water by performing a scientifically robust and peer-reviewed study “*using a credible approach that relies on the best available science.*” This requested study will require time to complete.

• If the *pending NYS DEC draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement* is approved, the current moratorium on issuing permits for “slick water” hydraulic fracturing of horizontal wells in NYS will be lifted.
Untapped riches?

The Marcellus Shale formation, which stretches all through the Appalachians, holds as much as 51.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Current, high energy prices have made drilling for the gas attractive.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Geology.com, Catskillmountainkeeper.org

Ed Yozwick, Keith McCafferty/Post-Gazette

http://www.post-gazette.com/images4/20080720Marcellus_Shale_map.gif
So How Much Can Marcellus Gas Help U.S. Supplies??

That's 23 TRILLION Cubic Feet

http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/dnav/ng/ng_cons_sum_dcuslu_m.htm

slide courtesy of Prof. Tony Ingraffea
Total estimate of NYS Marcellus gas

- 500 trillion cubic feet total
- 10% can be extracted via current technology
- 15% of this is in Southern Tier of NYS
  \[(500)(0.10)(0.15) = 7.5\]
- 7.5 trillion cubic feet TOTAL

This is \(\frac{1}{3}\) of 1 year of US natural gas consumption. TOTAL.
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, the natural gas of the Marcellus Shale is not going away (i.e. it is "gas in the bank"), while its rapid extraction via horizontal, “slick water” hydraulic fracture gas drilling (never before implemented in the state of NY) will require industrial type development that could impact wide areas of land and water; furthermore, EPA studies of the impact of horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling are currently underway in areas where this process has a history of use, and DEC regulation of gas drilling in NYS is currently being debated;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is in a position to take a leadership role on the issue of horizontal hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, on sustainability education, and on research in water management, soil health, animal and human health and medicine;
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate hereby conveys to the executive administration, including President David Skorton, Provost Kent Fuchs, and the Board of Trustees, our opinion that

1. A moratorium should be imposed on the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling until a scientifically informed consensus is reached at federal, state and local levels on the long-term environmental, health, economic and community impacts of this activity, federal and state legislation for adequate regulation of this activity is in place, and the infrastructure is in place to enforce these regulations.

1. An advisory group should be constructed to advise the executive administration on future decisions regarding the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and its recommendations should be reported and made widely available to the Cornell community. This group should be composed of experts in areas such as fracture mechanics of shale, watershed and aquifer dynamics, analytical chemistry, environmental protection law and policy, water law and policy, sociology and community development, climate change, climate policy, renewable energy technology, energy economics, geologic faults of New York state, and other subjects as deemed necessary to gain an in-depth understanding of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and of alternatives for sustainable energy production. Undergraduate and graduate student representatives should also be included.
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and increases in the price of crude oil have resulted in increased interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, the natural gas of the Marcellus Shale is not going away (i.e. it is "gas in the bank"), but its rapid extraction via horizontal, "slick water" hydraulic fracture gas drilling (never before implemented in the state of NY) will require industrial type development with serious impact on wide areas of land and water; furthermore, EPA studies of the impact of horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling are currently underway in areas where this process has a history of use, and DEC regulation of gas drilling in NYS is currently being debated;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its land and water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is in a position to take a leadership role on the issue of horizontal hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, on sustainability education, and on research in water management, soil health, animal and human health and medicine;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate hereby conveys to the executive administration, including President David Skorton, Provost Kent Fuchs, and the Board of Trustees, our opinion that

1. A moratorium should be imposed on the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling until a scientifically informed consensus is reached at federal, state and local levels on the long-term environmental, health, economic and community impacts of this activity, federal and state legislation for adequate regulation of this activity is in place, and the infrastructure is in place to enforce these regulations.

2. An advisory group should be constructed to advise the executive administration on future decisions regarding the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and its recommendations should be reported and made widely available to the Cornell community. This group should be composed of experts in areas such as fracture mechanics of shale, watershed and aquifer dynamics, analytical chemistry, environmental protection law and policy, water law and policy, sociology and community development, climate change, climate policy, renewable energy technology, energy economics, geologic faults of New York state, and other subjects as deemed necessary to gain an in-depth understanding of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and of alternatives for sustainable energy production. Undergraduate and graduate student representatives should also be included.

Background.
The proposed resolution is motivated by the following summarized facts, which are followed by a more detailed narrative:

a) While gas drilling has been performed in the state of New York for decades, the combination of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has not been previously implemented in NYS. This combination introduces serious new concerns associated with the “slick water” hydraulic fracturing procedure that consumes enormous volumes of fresh water and generates flowback water that must be processed as toxic waste.

b) The gas drilling industry has been exempt from the Clean Drinking Water Act, Clean Water Act, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Clean Air Act. As one consequence of these exemptions, EPA testing of gas drilling impacts on water and air was not required and was not performed.

c) The gas drilling industry has only recently disclosed some of the toxic chemicals they inject into wells under very high pressure to hydraulically fracture shale and release gas. Time is now needed to systematically test for the

http://www.theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/meetings/agendas_minutes/09_10/120909/MarcellusRes.htm
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of n

Pennsylvania, or have it treated and released locally. Current wastewater treatment facilities in the state are not

To dispose of flowback fluid, gas companies may inject it deep underground and leave it, truck it to

and ponds.

more toxic than the hydraulic fracturing fluid.

lead, arsenic, and mercury) as it passes through the underground shale layers, so flowback from the well is more

Hydraulic fracturing fluids can be pumped under the homes and land of people who have not signed leases, as

Fluids, it is of the utmost importance that studies on

proprietary chemical formulations of the chemicals they use in the hydraulic fracturing process.

Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also known as the Superfund law), the

as hazardous during drilling and disposal because of gas industry exemptions to

At least 65 of the chemicals currently in use are classified as hazardous under federal laws, but are not treated

as hazardous under federal laws, but are not treated as hazardous during drilling and disposal because of gas industry exemptions to the Clean Water Act, the

The Conference Report of this bill includes a request that the EPA re-examine the impact of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water by performing a scientifically robust and peer-reviewed study “using a credible approach that relies on the best available science.” This requested study will require time to complete.

http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111_cong_reports&docid=f:hr316.111.pdf, page 109

It is important to note that the “slick water” hydraulic fracturing process is distinctly different from current and past gas drilling methods implemented in the state of NY. As explained on the well-researched MAP – Tompkins website (www.tcgasmap.org): "Although hydraulic fracturing has been done in NY since the 1940s, it has not been done on horizontal wells, and it only has been done using water mixed with gels or foams and other chemicals as the fracking fluid (Ref: Grannis Testimony 10/15/08). These processes use much lower volumes of fluid (20,000 to 80,000 gallons, which is roughly 0.5 to 2.3% of the volume required for the Marcellus Shale) for each well fracturing (Ref: GEIS: See Chapter 9, Part F). The new type of hydraulic fracturing to be used in the Marcellus Shale, developed in the late 1990s, is called “slick water hydraulic fracturing.” It uses different chemicals, reducing the amount of gelling agents and adding friction reducers (thus the term “slick”), and requires much more fluid. Because of the increased fluid, it is also known as “high-volume hydraulic fracturing.” (Ref: Final Scope: See Section 2.1.2)."

Gas production by “slick water” hydraulic fracturing involves drilling 2,000 to 5,000 feet deep into the Marcellus Shale and then drilling as much as one mile, horizontally. Three to five million gallons of water laced with sand and 15,000 to 50,000 gallons of potentially toxic substances (approximately 0.5% – 1% of the total volume of water), including known carcinogens, endocrine disrupters, hydrochloric acid, benzene, toluene, xylene and formaldehyde, are then pumped into the well under very high pressure to fracture the shale and release the gas. The water used in this process (more water per well than the City of Ithaca uses in a day) can be removed from local streams and ponds at no cost to the gas companies.

At least 65 of the chemicals currently in use are classified as hazardous under federal laws, but are not treated as hazardous during drilling and disposal because of gas industry exemptions to the Clean Water Act, the Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, also known as the Superfund law), the Resource Conservation and Recovery act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act. Companies can withhold all proprietary chemical formulations of the chemicals they use in the hydraulic fracturing process. Without complete proprietary information on every chemical used, it is impossible to test for contamination of water supplies. Because compound-specific toxicity data are very limited for many chemical additives to fracturing fluids, it is of the utmost importance that studies on short and long-term health effects of such chemicals be done before the start of drilling, not afterwards.

Hydraulic fracturing fluids can be pumped under the homes and land of people who have not signed leases, as well as under natural areas and Cornell lands, if 60% of a designated land unit is leased (compulsory integration). The hydraulic fracturing fluid dissolves salts, radioactive material, and heavy metals (including lead, arsenic, and mercury) as it passes through the underground shale layers, so flowback from the well is more toxic than the hydraulic fracturing fluid. Once at the surface, it can accumulate as sediments in holding tanks and ponds.

To dispose of flowback fluid, gas companies may inject it deep underground and leave it, truck it to Pennsylvania, or have it treated and released locally. Current wastewater treatment facilities in the state are not
WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Pennsylvania, or have it treated and released locally. Current wastewater treatment facilities in the state are not able to deal with these high volume wastes without serious upgrading, and it is not even clear whether upgrading will enable them to remove these chemicals adequately. Plants that accept flowback fluids will have to establish testing and monitoring systems to ensure the discharges will not pollute neighboring bodies of water —Cayuga Lake, its inlet, reservoirs, surrounding creeks and streams.

Well pads may host one or many gas wells and may be three to five acres or larger. These pads are cleared industrial areas with roads, drill rigs, pipelines, storage tanks, dozens of tanker trucks, buildings for workers, and holding pits for hydraulic fracturing fluids and drilling refuse. The holding pits attract wildlife and cattle (due to the salt) and can be lethal to birds and other wildlife that drink from them or are coated by the fluids. Pit liners may leak, pits may overflow, and fluids may be spilled, contaminating soil, surface water, and ground water. Hydraulic fracturing is the suspected source of impaired or polluted drinking water in Pennsylvania, Texas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Drilling for gas is a highly industrial undertaking creating both air and noise pollution: numerous truckloads of equipment, chemicals, sand and water along with generators, pumps, drilling rigs and hoists, running at all hours of the day producing noise and exhaust fumes. For example, the hydraulic fracturing process for one well requires nearly 1,000 tanker truck trips to the site. Clearly this process will have a major impact on quality of life in our area for the next decade or longer.

Given the important environmental issues associated with this new industrial process that will have a major impact on the University itself and the quality of life for students, faculty, staff and members of our community, it is essential that careful consideration be given to leasing Cornell land. An important element of Cornell’s competitive advantage over peer institutions in recruitment of faculty and students is the natural beauty of the local environment surrounding us. Currently, studies are underway (funded by Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Cornell Center for a Sustainable Future) to assess the environmental impact of natural gas drilling, but the results are not yet available. Furthermore, the commitment of the University to a sustainable future requires that it take a leadership role in New York State in this important issue.

Additional information on this issue is available at the following Web sites:

Local and well-researched resource: www.tcgasmap.org

Draft SGEIS: http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/58440.html
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FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

December 9, 2009
Financial Policies Committee

• Meets every two weeks
• Paul Streeter
  – Interim Vice President for Planning & Budget
  – (Carolyn Ainslie – 9/2008)
  – (Elmira Mangum – 2/2010)
• Administration shares confidential information
• Budget Task Force
  – 4 meetings
• FY 2011 budget (2010-2011)
  – December 2, 4:45-6:50 p.m.
• Part-Time Appointments for Faculty
  – December 17
• Charles Walcott, NB&B, CALS
• Donald Campbell, Astron., A&S
• Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR
• William Lesser, AEM, CALS
• David Lewis, City & Reg. Plan., AAP
• Stephen Pope, MAE, Engr.
• Donald Rutz, Entomology, CALS
• Charles Seyler, ECE, Engr.
• Donald Smith, Clinical Sciences, Veterinary Medicine
• Peter Wolczanski, Chem. & Chem. Biology, A&S
• Bill Fry, Ex Officio
• Paul Streeter, Ex Officio
Major Budget Factors  
(2009-2010 Ithaca Campus)

• Revenues: $1,867M
  – 38% Tuition & fees
  – 20% Sponsored programs
  – 12% Endowment
  – 9% NY State

• Expenditures
  – 55% Salaries
  – 16% Financial aid

• Proposal for 2010-2011
FY 2011 Budget Timetable

• December 2009 – review preliminary major assumptions with Trustee Finance Committee

• January 2010 – Trustee action on major assumptions (tuition, SIP, endowment payout)

• March 2010 – FY11 budget allocations and adjustments to colleges/units

• May 2010 – Trustee approval of Operating & Capital Budget
BUDGET UPDATE

FACULTY SENATE
December 9, 2009

David Harris
Deputy Provost
Budget Update

Goal for today:

Address concerns about the deficit and cost-cutting strategies
Budget Update

Apparent inconsistency between:

1. Expectation of solving the vast majority of our budget challenge through administrative cost savings; and

2. Proposals to save money through such academic area changes as closing libraries and reducing faculty lines in some units
Budget Update

Explanation

1. Context for Task Force Reports
2. Remaining Deficit
3. Two Goals of Reimaging Cornell
4. Priorities and Constrained Resources
Budget Update

Looking forward, we will work with deans and faculty to identify academic area actions that will:

• Have a positive budget impact and little or no negative impacts on our academic mission, and

• Position Cornell for future excellence
We have completed the diagnostic and are about to embark on the solution design phase.

- **Diagnostic (5 months)**: Identify and prioritize opportunities to reduce cost.
- **Detailed Solution Design (0-6 months)**: Develop detailed implementation plans to capture value.
- **Execution (3-36 months)**: Implement workstreams and drive change in organization.

What to do: We're here! 
How to do it: Detailed solution design
Do it!
Refined set of savings targets will result from redesign analysis

Diagnostic results provide savings target guidance

**Diagnostic savings opportunity**
- Completed
  - Provided to each Initiative team
  - Driven by diagnostic analysis
    - Identified high-potential savings areas and quantified achievable savings
    - Established Cornell cost baseline
    - Savings targets quantified based on benchmarking and Bain experience
    - Savings made conservative with "haircut"

**Budgeted savings target**
- Validated savings targets vetted or challenged by Steering Committee
- Final budget figures approved by Steering Committee for input to FY2011 budget process
- Savings target for FY 2011 delivered to Steering Committee by 3/1

**Validated savings target**
- Set to begin
  - Initiative team validates baseline & determines how redesign will be executed
  - Revised targets to be approved by Initiative Sponsors
  - Initiative Sponsors deliver new estimates as recommendation to Steering Committee
  - Should be determined by 2/22
UFC Resolution on the Library Task Force Report

Whereas the by-laws of Cornell University recognize that the faculty has the function “to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college” (Article XII, Section 3)

Whereas the University Libraries are a major component of a Cornell education in terms of teaching and research;

Whereas the four of the five faculty members who were part of the library task force dissented from the report and offered a “minority report” with alternative ways to produce efficiencies;

The Faculty Senate recommends that the provost delay any implementation of the report until the Senate has had time to deliberate its findings and the alternatives at the beginning of the spring semester, 2010.

Endorsed by

The members of the UFC
1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Steve Beer: “I would like to call to order the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate for 2010. I would like to first ask that all people here present turn off or silence their cell phones. There shall be no photos taken or tape recordings made of the proceedings. I ask also that persons who wish to speak, please stand and identify yourself as to department or other administrative unit, and await the arrival of a roving microphone, so that you will be heard better by all those in the room.”

“Near the end of the meeting, we have one Good and Welfare speaker, who will address us on the topic of the Statler Club. That is Professor Yuval Grossman. At this point, I'd like to call on Provost Kent Fuchs for a series of presentations having to do with strategic planning and the budget. He has several associates with him and, all told, Provost Fuchs will have 40 minutes, and we will allocate those 40 minutes as he sees fit. And also, hopefully we'll include some time for questions and answers.”

2. BUDGET UPDATE

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Thank you. I'm going to hand it off to someone, so thank you. I would like the record to note I asked for 90 minutes, and Dean Fry said you have nothing more worthy to say that would consume 90 minutes, so 40 minutes is what we get.”

“We will do three things. My colleague, Paul Streeter, why don’t you come up and -- oh, change the slides. I am changing the order here. We'll start not talking about the strategic plan. We will talk about the present, the reality. We will give you a brief update on the status of the budget, where we are in our deficit today, and we'll take about five minutes of presentations and then five minutes of Q&A. And then Paul Streeter will introduce this topic regarding our plans, our ideas around how we change the budget model, specifically how we allocate resources to colleges and vice presidents and others, so a really important topic.

“We will spend about five minutes on presentations, and another five minutes or so -- probably more than that -- 10, 15 minutes of Q&A, and then my colleague, Ed Lawler, will come up and talk about thinking about the future. So three quite different, but interrelated topics.

“So the first part is about the budget status. I wanted to introduce you to someone, and that is our new vice provost -- vice president, excuse me. Almost promoted you-- Vice President for Planning and Budget, Elmira Mangum. Elmira is an adjunct faculty at the Johnson School, has a doctorate degree from SUNY Buffalo and, most recently, had a similar position at the University of North Carolina. So she's joining our team in Planning and Budget, but this presentation will be about Paul Streeter, by Paul Streeter, and we'll talk about the status of the budget and we'll transition into how we are going to talk and think about the way that we allocate resources. So Paul?”
Paul Streeter, Associate Vice President, Planning and Budget: “Thank you. We want to spend a few minutes updating you on our current budget status and what the outlooks look like going into next year. So if you could.”

“Just to step back, where we ended in fiscal ’09, so last fiscal year -- fiscal year is July 1 through June 30 -- so last fiscal year, we ended the year with an $88.7 million deficit, a one-year deficit last year. What we were projecting and reporting to you last year, that as we looked at the financial picture over a number of years, over a five-year period, had we done nothing, we were estimating the deficit could grow to $215 million. That was over a multi-year period; but one year, last year, it was $88.7 million.

“For the current year, fiscal ’10, which ends June 30, we are projecting it to be down to $62.5 million. That’s a current year deficit; but if we don’t do anything from this point on, we expect that deficit would grow. So we are by no means out of the woods in terms of actions to solve this, though we are heading in the right direction. Should we decide not to take any actions, it would grow back up into, very conservatively, $135 million, but certainly well over $115 million.

“As we look to fiscal ’11, our target is to reduce the deficit down to about $32 million. That’s what our target is next year. Again, if we don’t take any actions, that deficit next year alone, from what we know today, if we did nothing, would grow from the $62 million back up into the mid-80s.

“If you go to the next slide, as we look to next year, our revenue picture, which is really the driver on much of this, we have two things going against us in terms of resources. One is that we have -- the trustees have authorized the endowment payout for next year, and it is a decreased net payout. So it is really important to understand -- you may hear things that the market is recovering, you may see it in your personal account, but for managing the endowment, there’s always a tail on how quickly we respond in the negative and how quickly we respond in the positive.

“The depth of our endowment loss last year means we are still going to be paying for it next year. We are going to decrease resources from the endowment by 13.7%. So our payout rate is how we express it, and it is going down 13.7%. What that means financially is a loss of resources across the institution -- across the Ithaca campus – a $19 million loss of money.

“We also, from what we have learned from the State, are projecting our loss of state funds on a year-to-year basis -- this includes an $8.7 million loss of state funds we received this year -- but on a year-to-year basis, including the $8.7 and what we are expecting to receive, the year-to-year change is roughly $20 million. Much is yet to be settled, but, based on the governor’s proposed budget, we are fairly confident it will be in the $18 to $20 million range, the loss of revenue.

“The trustees approved tuition increases both at the graduate and undergraduate and professional school level. I am showing you here the net revenue, after we factor in the financial aid cost associated with both those /have a couple things going to the positive on undergraduate tuition, net of financial aid being $10.3 million; and professional school, $7.6 million.
“As you know, those monies hit differently across the institution. That is something we'll talk about in the Budget Model Task Force. That's the revenue change. So that's what drives -- when I said on the previous slide we are sitting at a $62 million deficit this year, and if we were to do nothing, we would project the deficit would grow to the mid-80 range; but we are going to do something. In the expense reduction -- to now talk about how we're reacting to this, there's three big things we are focusing on: One, we are going to reduce our debt obligation in the budget. We are going to pay down some debt that is currently -- the budget needs to support principal and interest for. I will talk about this a little more in a second, but that's one strategy we are doing.

“Second, as you probably heard, we are aggressively pursuing administrative cost savings. You heard in the fall, most likely, about some work being done, diagnostic work by consultants, to help us identify opportunities where we may have savings. We have a series of initiatives underway currently that are aggressively pursuing ideas that are going to drive our budget action--. Work that's supposed to be reported out in a few weeks to help drive how we think about expense reductions next year. That's being aggressively pursued now.

“After that activity, we still think there will probably need to be some level of assigned unit budget reductions, depending on how much we get out of the administrative savings. That is not talking about taking it from the center. That's talking about a combination of activities in the center and activities in the colleges, but that are in the administrative realm; facilities, IT, HR, finance, things of that sort, but it is not -- not talking about it simply from the center.

“So that's the budget outlook real quickly. We do want to talk about something many of you may have heard about. Over the last year, we have done something that has been called the reserve capture. We've gone out and taken money back from the units, monies that have been held and accumulated over the years, but I wanted to explain how much we did and why we did it, what we needed to do it for and how it is being used.

“We have done this twice now. The second one we are actually just implementing; bills were sent to the colleges earlier this week. For last year, fiscal '09, we pulled back $75 million of resources from a combination of monies that we were holding in the center and monies that were out in units across campus. It was $75 million. Fifty million of it was from a single resource; institutionally we have tapped out. Twenty-five million came from units across campus; roughly $18 million of that came from colleges, roughly $7 million came from central administrative units. It was an across-the-board reduction, but we pulled back, took control over those resources. And we needed to do it because we had to pay down our line of credit. We were in a deficit position as an institution, we were using borrowed monies to help pay bills. Note -- we have been doing that for a few years, but it had gotten far beyond what we were planning, and we needed to pay down that line of credit.

“So we took $75 million and essentially went to the bank and paid down the line of credit. That was last year's $75 million. This year, we're taking back -- taking control of $100 million. And the distribution of that is roughly $75 million of that is coming out of
central administrative units and campus life; $25 million of that is coming out of academic units. What we are using that for is we still have to pay back a deficit for last year.

“If you may recall, I said a slide or two ago we ended last year with an $88 million deficit last year. We have to pay off that deficit for last year. The first 50 of this is paying off what remains of that, what we weren't able to fund last year. So $50 million gets used to pay back the deficit. The other $50 million, we are using it in a strategic manner. The $46 million of it, we are using to pay down debt obligations. Part of our strategy going to fiscal '11 is to pay down debt, relieve our debt burden.

“Think about in your personal situation. If you can relieve your mortgage payment, you give yourself more room out of your income. We are doing that. We are paying down debt. By putting back $46 million, we can get reduction in our debt service next year of $13 million. That's what we are doing and that will buffer reductions out to units, one to one.

“And then the remaining $4 million, there are some investments we'll need to make in systems that will enable us to make administrative cost savings. So in case you were hearing about cost reserve capture, this is what we have done and why we have done that.

3. BUDGET TASK FORCE REPORT

“So with that, I will move on to the budget task force, if I could. I co-chaired a Budget Model Task Force charged by – co-chair with me is Cathy Dove, sitting on the side. We will take questions in a few moments, but we wanted to report out on this what we had done.

“If you go to this slide, these are the key requirements. This essentially was the charge we were given. That was to consider -- recognize where we are starting from, and that's multiple budget models across campus, at least four major budget models on campus right now. The provost charged us with making recommendations to achieve first a single budget model, so that as we think about how resources and costs are distributed across campus, that we are doing it within one budget model framework. That was the first part of our charge.

“Two that we really had to think about the process that was an open, transparent process. So the campus community, both senior leaders and the community, could have a better understanding of how resources are allocated and how funds flow; to come up with a process that was simple, understandable and predictable.

“An item we talked about a lot in our task force was to make sure we looked at a budget model, developed a budget model that enabled and motivated actions by the faculty, by the colleges that enhanced our academic excellence, that when we thought about the trade-offs and how to frame up a budget model, that we did it, first and foremost trying to improve and enhance academic excellence in mind. That did drive a lot of our conversations.

“I am mixing the charge and objectives of what we were trying to do. One of the
objectives we talked about is did we want to be data-driven, so a formula budget model, in which there's not a lot of thought given, let formula drive it; or do we want to be data-informed. This was an important concept for us, to be data-informed. We want to use data. We went to the community, senior administrators to understand data on how it is informing the budget process, to do it in a transparent manner, but to use it on an information basis, not necessarily the sole driver on how resources are allocated. The concept of data-informed is important in this.

“We talked a lot about the common treatment of revenues and expenses; something that we needed to achieve out of this. I will talk more about that in a second. Then the last two points are about checks and balances, first with the Chief Financial Officer; so recognizing what we are going through currently with our financial situation, there does need to be a check and balance between the provost, who is the person responsible for allocating resources to the campus, with the Chief Financial Officer, who is the person responsible to make sure we maintain the good financial health of institution. So we needed to think about that checks and balance and make sure we designed for that.

“And lastly, going to the point I made earlier about an open and transparent process, we were looking at a budget model that would be an open annual review with senior leadership to understand, one, our financial position and, two, how resources are being allocated and the priorities within that. So I mixed in their requirements we were given as a charge and objectives we were trying to achieve.

“Let me step back for a second, if we could. So to frame up what we were doing, if you could go to the next slide, task force members -- we could probably go past this in the interest of time -- but we had a broad group of representation. Task force process, I want you to understand, we spent a fair amount of time looking at our current budget model, as you would expect. We did research alternative budget models; we did talk to other universities, particularly Penn, University of Michigan, Stanford and Syracuse. There's a mix of budget models across those institutions.

“This work was done -- Kent charged us in June. We reported out on an interim basis in October, and our final report in December. Through that process, we had a series of consultative meetings, particularly with the Financial Policies Committee, faculty senate -- thank Steve Pope and his members. They were helpful to us in the process in the fall of helping us think about issues and giving us reactions to concepts we were thinking about. So the FPC, as well as the deans and vice presidents, we did issue an interim report in October -- which prompted a lot of conversation and led to some significant revisions as we got to our final report.

“If we could go to the next slide. As we see the primary improvements about what I'm going to give you -- some of the major decision points of this model in a second -- wanted you to understand before we go there, what we see is the primary improvements from what we are recommending. One, we reduced complexity. By getting to one model and greater consistency, we'll significantly reduce the complexity of how folks think about financial operations on campus and how we make decisions going forward. Two, we really do improve the transparency. Reducing the complexity will make it simple to
understand and simple to monitor, to make sure that we are in balance and we know where we are at.

“Consistent treatment of key resources. I will talk about a couple of them in a second, but we want consistency in terms of thinking about the type of revenue or type of expense. Right now we tend to think about both the type of revenue and then the organization that’s hitting. So is it undergraduate tuition, is it going to a general purpose college or a contract college. We have to think about both dynamics now. We were trying to construct a model that says let’s talk about undergraduate tuition or talk about space costs or talk about financial aid costs. So we were trying to get to a common -- and we think we achieved it -- a common treatment based on nature of revenue or nature of expense. Consistent treatment.

“We proposed a model decision that recognizes it from an institutional standpoint, the nature of undergraduate education as more of a shared experience, rather than something particular to the single college. We provided a model -- recommended a model that provides flexibility that can be adaptable to the changing nature of the organization. It is not something that will be stale on day one. We think the framework works and provides flexibility.

“And one of the things we talked to other institutions and spent a lot of time talking internally in the task force, we believe it provides a framework to provide sufficient resources at the institutional level to advance the institution. There’s a tension there. How much do the units control, how much does the provost control. Our objective was a framework that allowed decisions to be made; gives a framework for that. We think we have that; that would define enough resources to support priority investments.

“A particular concern by many is to make sure that budget model -- we are talking a model that allocates resources -- works with an appropriate process and governance process, advisory process on how reverse sources should be allocated, that provides an ongoing -- the check and balance realm -- an ongoing control and oversight of whether the process is working to the ends that we believe.

“We did talk a lot -- there’s many aspects that a budget model will not solve that are really management issues; so again, please understand what this is. This is a framework for distributing resources. There are many issues around process and prioritization that have to still be worked out.

“If you could go to the major budget model decisions -- I have alluded to a few -- but we think these are the major items of change we are recommending. First is to pool all undergraduate tuition. At a gross level, that’s valued at about $432 million right now. It gets spread. Some comes to the provost for the general purpose colleges. Those are Architecture Art and Planning, Arts and Sciences and Engineering. For the undergraduate colleges, contract colleges, it flows to them; and to Hotel, it flows to Hotel. What we are recommending, that resources in the first instance be pooled and then be redistributed to those undergraduate colleges on a set of predetermined criteria that would look at the college enrollment as an example -- our committee did not define
them out. There’s more work to be done -- it would get pooled and then it would get redistributed back to those colleges, again, based on enrollment, teaching, cost of education, priority areas, growing areas, et cetera; but there would be a predefined set of criteria that would redistribute the tuition back out of the undergraduate colleges, and we would redistribute the net of financial aid.

“That is really point Number 1 and 2. That’s the data-informed basis. We are not suggesting that be a purely formulaic-driven model, but the data would largely inform that, and everyone would understand the data.

“The third point, common treatment of revenues and expenses. I mentioned that before. One of the things Kent emphasizes is we need to treat like revenues in a similar manner, F&A recoveries being one of those. So facilities and administrative cost recovery on sponsored awards. If you are in a contract college, those monies flow to the deans. If you are in an endowed college or research center, involved with a research center, those monies generally flow to the provost. That causes difficulties, the difference in treatment.

“So as a task force -- Kent would probably say it differently -- but the task force view is our recommendation was it would be treated in the same manner. We had advocated it move out of the colleges, but the first principle is it be treated in the same manner.

“Another example are endowed professorships; the way we manage them is different across the different models. Those in general purpose units; endowed chairs get managed from a central budget standpoint. For those in the designated -- Hotel, Law, and the contract colleges, it gets managed within those colleges. It causes many difficulties in terms of financial administration, in terms of development activities. We want to treat them all the same.

“And space costs was a topic we talked a lot about within our task force, and we advocated the distribution of space costs on some manner; the cost of utilities, maintenance, the cost of building care, that we should align that with the units where it is occurring and put the revenues out in those units, so they can pay those costs as well.

“Again, we wanted to treat space costs in a common manner, because currently it is not in a common manner. I talked about providing sufficient resources for the provost. We advocated a concept, what we called an institutional support pool -- or university support pool, I think was the final language. This would be that revenue streams would be taxed. There would be an assessment against it that would provide resources to the provost. We did not determine those assessments within our task force.

“We had talked about that the range of resources is that the provost should have roughly 10 to 15% of -- this is measured on an unrestricted budget basis -- 10 to 15% of the unrestricted budget should be at the provost’s ability to advance, the institution, through priority investment; and that the provost needs that kind of decision and resource. As we have talked to other institutions who have looked at budget models in the past, this was the biggest point of emphasis: Make sure you get this balanced right between how much the provost has -- if you want to advance your institution, folks were advocating, we firmly believed in the task force -- the provost needs to have some level of resources to do
that. And the mechanism we created or advocating is the creation of this university support pool. Lastly, we advocated the establishment of appropriate governance and oversight structures to go with this. So that's quick, what we talked about. And I'll turn it to Kent, to maybe invite Cathy to join me for questions and answers.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “I was going to make other comments, but time goes quickly. Cathy and Paul were chosen in this because they spent time in leadership positions and also time in administration, so they have a comprehensive view. You saw the list of other members.”

“They are having a bunch of public forums about this. Tomorrow, 4:30, Statler Auditorium, there will be over an hour dedicated to this, for anyone that wants to talk with us. Let's open it up for Q&A for a few minutes.

“There were two pieces here. One is the current budget and the other is how we are looking at possibly changing the way we look at allocating resources.

“He's going to answer the questions.”

Speaker Beer” “Are there questions? Professor Peter Stein. Wait for microphone, please.”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “I can see the advantage of a consistent way of doing this thing, and I'm familiar with the fact it's been done in a lot of different ways, but lots of times, inconsistent ways have been worked out over time in a way that makes the system work, and if you do it all of a sudden consistently, there are always winners and losers in each one of these situations. Have you analyzed that and made it public who are the winners and losers in this -- a uniform distribution of resources?”

Provost Fuchs: “This is the bottom line: Every vice president, dean wants to know - will my budget go up or down. I'll take it, Paul and Cathy, to save time.”

“The next stage is actually implementing this in the sense of designing it, not actually rolling it out, but designing and going through each of the colleges and vice presidents and other units to see what the impact is. They have not done that yet.

“Based on these guidelines, I could take Physics, for example, or the Art College and make the budget go up or down. There's a lot of flexibility here and a lot of implementation details yet to be proposed. That would be the next stage.

“My objective -- and we are having 22 forums around the budget model and then also the work of Ed Lawler -- is to come to some consensus, get input on the principles that were listed. The major concepts of pooling undergrad tuition, treating F&A the same, endowed professorships held centrally or in the units, those things. Then we'll ask another group to go out and come back with the proposed implementation. Then we'll know who the winners and losers are, but -- I don't like that phrase, but yes, I understand.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “I assume that currently the provost's office has discretionary funds. I mean, is this more or less than you have currently to support the university functions?”

Provost Fuchs: “I don't have a clue. To be honest, I don't know what I have now. That's the problem. That's why we are having the first part of the discussion and the second
part. Right now, the provost actually has none. The provost is in the hole a big major way, so it depends on what the tax is, depends on the implementation detail; but one of the good things is the provost's budget will be clear. The provosts will know -- to talk in the third person about the provost -- will know what he or she will have; and secondly, will be very countable, it will be public, and we'll debate about how the provost should spend her or his money. So we don't know the answer to that. Didn't we start late?

Yes. I think we should do two more questions.”

Speaker Beer: “Please identify yourself.”

Professor Rosemary Avery: Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis & Management: “I don't see any guiding principles in what you presented that explicitly acknowledged the land grant mission and the difference between the contract colleges and endowed colleges. Can you speak to that issue and how that will be recognized, such that the mission will go forward?”

Paul Streeter: “So we spent a lot of time in the report. The only piece of the state funds that we're talking about -- two things: The state funds right now come in support of the four contract colleges, and they are presented by the provost to those four contract colleges. It comes to the provost and allocated back to the colleges. We are not disrupting that, except for one element, and that one element is that as we value -- recognize the value of undergraduate education as a common experience. We are talking about taking a piece -- the value that we have sized it as is roughly $24 million -- a piece of the state appropriation and putting it into the undergraduate pool, recognizing the difference in tuition between resident students in the contract colleges, which pay a lower tuition rate, and all other students.”

“So we want to create the undergraduate tuition pool to allow all students to be financially valued the same as we distribute it out. Beyond that, the remaining piece of it would get distributed based on what -- we want to develop a methodology that's based on a data-informed and prioritized basis across the four contract colleges to support land grant and research. The whole land grant mission.”

Provost Fuchs: "As you will hear from Ed, he's proposing all the colleges adopt the land grant goal. Not the monies, but the goal. One more, then we should move on.”

Professor Emeritus Muawia Barazangi: “Muawia Barazangi, from Earth Sciences. I would like to, if you have a quick answer and the wisdom and rationale of board of trustees for the endowment payout. My understanding - endowment is to secure the future of the institution, and this is a crisis of national, international economy, as well as New York State. Why not consider little more payout and continue your managing Cornell the way you are proceeding, to soften the blow and produce the possibility of more layoff from the staff? What the story? Are you telling us that Law School, it will not be semi-independent -- the Law School completely in your model?”

Provost Fuchs: “Which question should I address? Endowment payment, Paul's the expert; but simply, what percentage of the market value do you think we should pay out? Last year we paid on the 10%, we spend 10%. I think that's a high percentage. We
have to be really careful that we don't spend the next generations of resources, so we're
down to -- total payout from the endowment for this current year to what, Paul?”

Paul Streeter: “We are spending just under 7%. 6.9% of the current value of the
endowment, this year and next year.”

Provost Fuchs: “So I would argue we are dropping it to protect the value, but between 8 to
10% of market value. We don't talk about that much, because they are huge numbers, so I
would say we are doing that. Law School, come see me later. You and Dean Schwab,
yes.”

“Thank you. Thanks, Cathy. Thanks, Paul. Ed, could you come up, please? Again,
there's a whole hour on this in the Statler Auditorium about 4:30 tomorrow. It's a really
important topic. Why don't you introduce the topic?”

4. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Ed Lawler, Professor, ILR: “Hello. I am going to move quickly. Some of you have seen a
couple of these slides, I think. Let's go back further. Stop there.”

“There's a draft outline -- it is not complete -- of the strategic plan on the web, and I hope
you have had a chance to access it. If you haven't, I hope you will and give us feedback. I
would like to explain how we got to this point, and then I want to hit a few highlights on
the next slide and then review how you can make input.

“I am Ed Lawler. I chair the Strategic Advisory Council; it consists of eight faculty. The
listing of the members is on the web site, and there are four working groups consisting of
63 faculty, staff and students around these four areas.

“And here's how we got to this point: The advisory council in October, when we were
informed, came up with a series of questions, issues that we gave to the working
groups. And then the working groups drilled down deeper and, around the beginning of
December, came back to us with input, ideas in the form of informal reports. This group
did not come back. We phased in this group later and they are yet to report.

“Later, because we thought these other parts of the plan should be drafted before this
group completed its work, we took -- meaning the advisory council -- the feedback from
the education public engagement working groups, developed a set of draft objectives and
action items, the first draft of what you see on the web, gave it back to those groups.

“Those groups gave us feedback, we revised, we talked to deans, vice presidents, the
president, the provost about them, that's how we got to this point. The next step is we are
-- meaning the advisory council -- going back through these sections, the sections you see
on the web, and we are setting priorities among the objectives in those sections. We are
asking which objectives should the University emphasize, stress over the next five
years. That's the first step.

“The second step, after we set the objectives for each area, we are going to develop a series
of smaller set of initiatives we think the university should focus on in the next five
years. That's in a section of the plan -- again, the outline is on the web -- called strategic
initiatives.
“That is where we are, and we are also developing a metric section. All of the material, an expanded outline will be available sometime in March, and it will be complete in that sense and it will probably be 50 pages, something like that. And then after that, we’ll do another round of feedback with the community, and then we’ll draft the text in April. That’s April 7th, an all-day retreat we have with the trustees about the outline that we’ll be distributing at the next stage.

“So moving on. Highlights. These are some themes in the document, that some will be pretty evident, if you read it, but a couple may not be, and I just -- I want to hit the first one in particular. We are looking at Cornell as a single unit. We assume that the strength -- the fundamental strength and quality of Cornell is grounded and lodged in the colleges, but that Cornell is greater than the sum of its parts. And we are looking at that greater than sum, so to speak. We are focusing on the University as a whole, and looking at cross-cutting issues, themes, and that’s our fundamental focus.

“Culture in the support of teaching, that’s an important theme, an important item to us. Leadership and research, you will see that also. We are suggesting that the University make concerted efforts in various ways to move more departments into the upper reaches of their professions.

“Embrace public engagement. It is a redefinition of broadening of the outreach mission beyond the contract colleges, but inclusive within them; and we took the term "public engagement" from the President’s State of the Union address in October.

“Faculty renewal, that’s a big issue for us. Given the coming retirements, nearly half of the faculty at the university are 55 or over. We are looking at a period over the next ten years, obviously, of -- or 15 years, but we don't know when people will retire -- of a substantial need and opportunity to renew the faculty. And diversity and inclusion is also a major theme that runs through the document. The strategy we have is to set explicit targets and hold ourselves accountable for achieving them, and we have articulated an overarching aspiration for the University, strive to become a top-ten research university in the nation, the world over the next ten years or so. Five years is too short, given current circumstances. We think ten years is reasonable.

“And we are in the process of considering, in addition to this aspiration, something about impact or engagement, based on feedback we have gotten in the various meetings that Kent Fuchs and I have been having around campus.

“One more slide. This is how you can make input. Please send out e-mails. Kent Fuchs and I are going around to colleges. Some of you may have attended some of those meetings, and thank you very much. I don’t know if there’s any time for –“

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. I think the agenda requires that we move ahead, so the next item is the approval of the minutes of the December meeting, December 2009. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Ayes.)
Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay?”
“Abstentions? The minutes of the December meeting are approved. I now call on Associate Dean Fred Gouldin to give us the report on nominations and elections.”

6. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Associate Dean Fred Gouldin: “I think my report is short and sweet. This is really appointing various people to the committee. So the first slide, Tony Simmons will be on the Financial Policies Committee. The Library Board, Jeremy Braddock will serve on that. Myra Besheroff and Steven Morgan, on the Childcare Committee; and Mary Beth Norton on the Music Committee.”

“This is the last one. For the Financial Policy, Institutional Bio-safety Committees - appointments are Rosemary Laurie, David Wilson, Martha Munsler-Chui and Wilfred Patterson. For Institutional Review Board appointments, Jasmine Miller, and Wilfred Patterson is up again -- he's going to be a very busy person -- Alice Eisen, Mary Anne Walker and Sukhoi Pi.

“Finally, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, Susan Bliss and Maurice White. That concludes my report.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. We will now go to several -- to the resolutions on the status of the libraries, and a resolution will be offered by the University Faculty Committee by Professor Howland.”

7. RESOLUTIONS ON THE LIBRARY

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland: “Can you hear me? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In the last senate meeting, we passed a motion recommending the provost delay any implementation of the Library Task Force report until the senate has had time to deliberate its findings and the alternatives at the beginning of the spring semester 2010. Accordingly, the UFC and Library Board began looking into the advisability of that report’s recommendations.”

“So this has two points -- actually two errors -- the first point; on November 24th, the provost chaired an open discussion developed at that meeting. There was a disagreement between the faculty members and library staff about the contents of the report, and here's the correction: The task force report recommended reducing the budget by approximately 11%, and the central library by 3%. I made a late night calculation error and somehow came out with a 17. I appreciate the faculty members who corrected me on that.

“The task force report also recommended placing all the library budget in the hands of the central librarian. On January 5, Charles Brittain, Chair of Classics, sent a letter to Provost Kent Fuchs, sent by 15 chairpersons pointing out the budget had fallen from 8th to 13th place. I lost a little yellow type there. He actually said 9th to 20th place, but subsequent calculations showed it was 8th to 13th, and he made this correction. So, falling to the 13th place among the libraries on the continent and appealing for restoration to the office of the previous year and eventual restoration of the top ten
libraries.

**Motion**

*Whereas* the Library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest of the University Senate, and

the Library Task Force Report recommended the closing of some unspecified number of small libraries to achieve cost reduction goals, and

*Whereas* the faculty and students of the units served by the small libraries have not been consulted as to the advisability of their closing, and

*Whereas* there has been a long tradition of locating library materials and reference consultants near the academic workplaces of the various colleges and departments, and it is the faculty and students served by the small libraries of Cornell that are in the best position to assess the academic value of these libraries and the direction their development should take.

Therefore be it resolved that:

1. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that none of the small libraries (Ornithology, Veterinary, Entomology, ILR Catherwood, Africana, Johnson Management, Music, Fine Arts, Engineering, Hotel or Law) be closed without first consulting the wishes of faculty and students of the unit that the library serves, assessing the impact on the accreditation of the units concerned, should their library be closed, and at the same time determining that the necessary reduction in costs cannot be achieved by reducing the staff of units of the central libraries (e.g. Library Administration, Information technology, Research and Learning Services, etc.).

2. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the materials budget of the library be restored so as to place Cornell in the ranks of the top ten libraries on the continent.

3. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the budget supervision of the small libraries be located in the units (laboratory, department or college) that the library serves.

“So here are the whereas’s. First one, simply asserts the senate’s role in overseeing the library. The second one points out the Library Task Force reported closing some unspecified numbers of small libraries to achieve cost reduction goals; and the next one says that the faculty and students of those libraries had not been consulted; and then points out there has been a long tradition of having — locating library materials and reference consultants near the academic workplaces of various colleges and departments. And it is the faculty and students served by the small libraries that are in the best position to assess the academic value of these libraries and the direction their development should take.

“So next slide. The UFC thought we could put a motion in three parts and vote on those parts separately. I have simply been told that we actually can’t do that. We have to vote them holus-bolus; however, we can separate them if we have a suspension of the rules,
which requires two-thirds of the body.

“So at the appropriate time, I’ll ask for that suspension of the rules and will try to vote them one at a time. We wanted to vote them because they say different things. First says the senate recommends the university administration that the small libraries -- and they are listed there -- not be closed without first consulting the wishes of the faculty and students the library serves, assessing the impact on accreditation of the units concerned and, at the same time, determines the necessary reduction in costs cannot be achieved by reducing the staff of the units of the central libraries. It means some of those central things, library administration, et cetera.

“The second one says the senate recommend to the university administration -- in all cases, when we say university administration, we mean all those people making the decision about closing these libraries -- recommends that the materials budget of the library be preserved to line Cornell in the ranks of the top ten libraries in the continent.

“Senate recommends the university administration to the budget supervision of the small libraries be located in the units, laboratory department that the colleges serve. I want to say a few words about that last portion. We think it’s inappropriate and unwise to gather those budgets together in the central budget, library budget. That’s because many of these libraries are supported by endowment and donations from donors. Many of them come down -- what used to be line item appropriations from the State, and it would be inappropriate to take those and put them in a different place than where they were intended. I think it’s also unwise to do that. It is unwise because, surely, if the donors find out this money isn’t really going to the library they thought it was going to; particularly if the library isn't there, you aren’t going to get any more money from those donors. Also, the State budget, the legislatures may take notice of that, and you are going to have a reduction in those budgets too.

“So that’s the motion that we are presenting.”

Speaker Beer: ”The motion is on the floor on behalf of the University Faculty Committee, which includes three resolutions.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “They will be, when we –“

Speaker Beer: “Is there any discussion? Professor Norton.”

Mary Beth Norton, Chair of Library Board Committee: “On behalf of the University Library Board, I want to present a substitute motion for consideration by the body; that is that motion that was sent out with the agenda for the meeting. I would ask the body to support the substitution of the resolution coming from the Library Board for the one that's been presented by the UFC.”

“And my reasons for doing that are the following: First, events have moved very swiftly, and the content of the resolution that’s just been presented by the UFC is already out-of-date. That is, it refers to the Library Task Force report on several occasions, but that’s already moot. That is, we are two steps beyond the task force report at the moment. The librarian responded to the Library Task Force report with recommendations to the provost. The provost then replied to the university librarian with a charge to her, and she
is now operating on the basis of that charge. So what the Library Task Force report that was given over the summer and into the fall, what it said is irrelevant to what's going on now.

“Secondly, reviews are already about to begin of the small libraries under a procedure established by the university librarian. I suppose it is technically true that -- to this very moment, the stakeholders of the small libraries have not yet been formally consulted about what might be done with them; but in fact, procedures are now in place, whereby they will be consulted. Various units are establishing committees of faculty, library staff and undergraduate and graduate students to consider what’s to happen with the various small libraries around campus that are at issue. And all of those -- the results of all those reviews under the procedure established by the university librarian will come before the Faculty Library Board.

“Now, in addition, the UFC resolution contains inaccuracies and contradictions. For example, the UFC resolution suggests one of the places that might be cut in the central library administration is the division called Research and Learning Services, but that's the division of the library that contains the subject specialists that are essential to the selection of items and would be therefore essential to the resolution Number 2 of the one that Professor Howland just presented.

“In addition, the UFC resolution assumes central library administrative cuts have not been or are not being considered, which is of course not true, because that's precisely what Bain Consulting has, in fact, recommended; some considerable cuts in the administration of the central library. But more important than those specifics is the fact that as the Library Board resolution that I'm presenting to you states, the Library Board exists to be the liaison between the faculty and the libraries. There is, in fact, a standing committee of the faculty involved in this, so let us do our job.

“The senate does not have to do our job for us. We can do it. In fact, the Library Board, although we meet normally once a month, has already agreed that if/when the records begin to come in from the various unit libraries, we'll be able to meet more than once a month to consider all of them.

“And as a final part of our resolution states, we are, in fact, perfectly prepared -- I will come to every senate meeting for the rest of the spring, that is the rest of my chairmanship of the board, and report to the senate every time on what's going on. So there's absolutely no reason for the senate at this point to inject itself into the specifics of decisions that frankly have not yet been made.

“I would argue that indeed the UFC resolution is, to some extent, not only outdated, but also premature. So I would hope that senators would vote for the resolution that the Library Board unanimously indeed accepted at its last meeting. Thank you.”

Resolution

Whereas the library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest to the Senate; and

Whereas, in the current financial crisis all units of the University are being asked to make
substantial cuts to their budgets; and

Whereas, at a forum with the Provost and the University Librarian and subsequently many members of the faculty and staff have expressed their concern over the impact of such cuts on acquisitions of both print and electronic materials and on the continued existence or successful functioning of smaller libraries on campus; and

Whereas, the University Librarian and her staff are currently engaged in a wide-ranging review of library expenditures and policies as a result of the Provost’s response to the library’s Strategic Plan to implement budgetary cuts; and

Whereas, the Faculty Library Board is appointed by the Senate and directed by Senate legislation “to review and help formulate broad library policy” in conjunction with the University Librarian and to inform the Librarian “of the needs and concerns of the faculty and students”;

Be it therefore resolved that:

The Senate directs the Faculty Library Board to work with the University Librarian to ensure that faculty and students from units affected by proposed changes in acquisition policies or library facilities be fully consulted before any significant changes are implemented and to report regularly to the Senate on the development of plans for such changes so that the Senate might then take any further actions it deems appropriate.

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Just to clarify the parliamentary situation now, we have the motion on the floor by the University Faculty Committee, Professor Norton has offered a substitute motion, and the body will now consider whether to consider the substitute motion or the main motion. So we'll have debate first on the UFC motion versus the substitute. I assume that the two motions are clear. Yes.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “This motion is now on the floor, the substitute motion; so we should talk about the substitute motion first and then go back to the main one.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, I will ask Professor Stein, the parliamentarian, if the senators’ interpretation is correct.”

Peter Stein: “With all due respect, I don’t think so. I think the -- debates the advantages and disadvantages of the two motions, which have equal weight.”

Speaker Beer: “So based on advice of the parliamentarian, I think the body will discuss which of the motions to consider at this time. So would anyone like to speak in favor of considering the motion offered by the University Faculty Committee? Gentleman on aisle.”

Stuart Bazsefsky, ILR Library: “Stuart Basefsky, a lecturer in human resource studies, School of Industrial Labor Relations and a librarian at the ILR school. The first motion, I would recommend personally that it be passed, and the second one be passed as well. Not as a substitute, because I think they both inform each other.”

“And to the notion that the Library Task Force report is moot, I have a question: Have the members of that task force, the faculty members of the task force been notified that that is moot? As far as I know, that task force still exists and, to my knowledge, the
faculty members have never been informed that it’s moot.”

Speaker Beer: “Would a proponent of the Library Board resolution care to speak to the question or to why that motion should be considered rather than the University Faculty Committee’s? Professor Cohn?”

Professor Abby Cohn: “I actually don’t think the two resolutions as compatible. I think they’re contradictory in a number of regards, so I think we each need to then take a position on which one we want to support and why. I strongly endorse the one being put forward by the University Library Board. I’m a bit confused as to where we are, though. Are we discussing to decide which one we are putting forward first, or are we actually discussing the substance of one or the other?

Speaker Beer: “Any other points? Professor Howland?”

Professor Howland: “Yes. When the UFC met, we thought these two motions were going to be both brought before the faculty, and not as a substitute. I would like to support the position that there is really no contradiction between these motions. They are saying rather different things, however. Ours, I don’t think, is meddling in the specifics of the process. We are simply laying down statements as to what we desire, namely the faculty and students will consulted, that they look to the accreditation question, et cetera.”

“So I don’t think we should waste time on which one should be discussed. I think just go ahead and discuss what we seem to be discussing anyway and, when the time comes, let’s call for the first question on the substitute motion and then on the main motion.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, just for point of information, we have approximately five minutes to consider this matter, and is there -- gentleman in the light blue shirt, please.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: “I think the point, as I see it; we have a faculty group charged with dealing with the library system. Unless there’s some compelling reason not to trust them to represent our interests, I think Mary Beth Norton’s point about letting them do their work is a good one; and when I look at the UFC motion, I think it’s all in good faith and good-hearted, and I pretty much agree with all the points they are making, but it does look a little bit like micromanaging a process from a distance that a standing faculty committee is charged to do as its job.”

“So unless I hear a compelling reason not to trust their assertiveness to represent our interest, I would vote in favor of substituting this motion for the UFC motion.”

Speaker Beer: “Is the body ready for the substitution of the motion? Let’s have a vote on whether to substitute the Library Board motion, which is before you now, as opposed to the University Faculty Committee’s motion, which is now before you. Library Board here. All those in favor of substituting the Library Board, please stand.”

“Can you count? I should remind you, only senators should be standing at this point. Okay.

“Those opposed to the substitute -- considering the substitute motion, please stand. Those senators abstaining from voting, please stand.
Vote

43 Approve
12 Opposed
1 Abstain

“Okay, it is clear the substitute motion shall now be under consideration. So the substitute motion as offered by the Library Board, which is on the screen in front of you, is now open for debate. The lady in the middle. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “This is just a question. I always find --
Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department. We never seem to quite discuss things enough before we vote for them, but I don’t see any antagonism between the two. The first motion, it seemed, was instructing and pressing the importance of the restoration of the research libraries and the importance of having libraries close to where students are likely to use them, and I just don’t see those as antithetical. I wish they could be combined.”

“And I’m sorry if we have to see one of them as a substitute for the other, rather than seeing the first as a sort of strong instruction posed to the existing committee. Is there no way to do that?”

Speaker Beer: “The body has voted to consider the substitute motion at this point, and so the initially offered motion by the University Faculty Committee is not under consideration.”

Professor Sanders: “So it's this one and nothing, and the first one is lost?”

Speaker Beer: “Not at this meeting. The gentleman in the -- now standing.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “work together?”

Speaker Beer: “Please address the whole body, not an individual member of the body.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “m asking you; can you ask her?”

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: “The speaker would not consider that in order.”

“Okay. Is there a speaker that wants to address the motion before us? There's a gentleman very close to the gentleman who just spoke.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications: “Tarleton Gillespie, Communications Department. There was a question proposed earlier about whether the faculty on the task force had been alerted to its being on the task force. I took the message to be it is moot because it moved on, not because it was rendered irrelevant. I think the committee understood its work ended when the report was delivered. I don’t think there's some sort of back-handed process going on.”

“I would support the motion for the primary reason that much of the discussion in the task force report about how to go about closing a library, if that was deemed necessary by
the provost, included a number of the elements already in the rejected statement, and the Library Board is ready and in a position to ensure those things are taken seriously; accreditation, discussion with faculty and students, and it seems to me that is the process already underway and the university librarian wanted underway and came out of the discussion in the public meeting to make sure it was underway. So I think this motion ensures that our subcommittee is in the right position to watch that process.”

Speaker Beer: “At this point, the body has exceeded the time allocated to this issue, but it would be appropriate, if it’s the body’s wish, to vote on the motion that’s before us, which is now on the screen.”

“Okay, all those in favor of the Library Board’s resolution that’s before you on the screens, signify by standing.

I don’t think you have to count, but -- all those opposed, please stand.

All those abstaining, all senators abstaining, please stand.

Vote:

55 Approved
0 Opposed
7 Abstained

“The resolution proposed by the Library Board is passed. We'll move on now to a report from the CAPP Committee. Professor Crepet will make that report.”

8. **CAPP REPORT**

Professor Crepet, Chair of CAPP Committee: “I am here to report on the -- what’s first? The department or two field change motions? Okay. The department. The CAPP Committee received a proposal to create a new Department of Information Sciences in the faculty of Computer Sciences and Engineering. Anyone who lives in the word today realizes we are in a revolutionary state within our society, and the dimensions of the revolution involve communication and information -- cascade of information we are all experiencing.”

“The committee found the proposal to be carefully wrought. We felt that it was -- the proposal reflected what was going on. The proposal is for a trans-collegiate entity that will cope with issues that require attention immediately or that places Cornell University at a competitive disadvantage. I'll talk through the rest.

“All right. They have a graduate field that’s functioning as a department now. It’s distinguished in every aspect. I believe that -- well, let me say my committee supported it fully after careful deliberation. There was one abstention, only because there was some fear that enough of the affected faculty had not been consulted. I tried to remedy that by active phone interviews, and I found no objection to such a department, and a great deal of support. I believe Geri Gay, who is a member of the Department of Communications in CALS left a letter to read; one of our outstanding information scientists, and I think her opinion is worth hearing. Professor Geri Gay from the Communications
Department: I know that Dan Huttenlocher and Claire Carter are here, as well. Jerry just ask -- I can give you the gist. The Communication Department has been supportive of this program for quite a long time. We have seven faculty coexisting and teaching and advising across them, and it's been a really compelling program. It's very successful placement for students into the careers of their choices, and we support -- it's been functioning as a department in parentheses for quite a while and it is ready to be solefully.”

Professor Crepet: “Anything more specific that Geri wanted to convey? Okay, Dan, would you like to say anything about this?”

Dean Dan Huttenlocher, CIS: “So I just thought I would remind everybody, because it's been quite a while now -- I'm sorry. I'm Dan Huttenlocher in the Computer Science Department and the Johnson Graduate School of Management, the dean of Computing and Information Sciences. I thought it might be useful to remind people there's a long history here, that's in 2003, we had undergraduate majors approved in both CALS and Arts and Sciences. The information science major had full faculty votes in both the colleges in establishing those majors; then a year later in engineering from the ISST major.

“So I wanted to remind everybody, because it's been seven, eight years now, there was very broad faculty deliberation around the educational programs this group is now offering, and to say that Claire Cardie, the director of the program; Eva Tardos, the computer science chair; and Geri Gay, who couldn’t be here, are strongly supportive on behalf of their departments and faculties. And we are happy to answer questions.”

Professor Crepet: “Let me reiterate the CAPP Committee felt like the proposal grappled with the complexities of having, again, a trans-collegiate entity, and not having one dispersed the faculty and placed us at a great disadvantage by not allowing the intellectual commerce that would be desirable in an area that’s a burgeoning significance at this point in time.

“I understand my role here as a chair of CAP is simply to report on our strong support of the proposal, and no more. So I then go to the next two issues, which -- well, what is the procedure here? Should we have discussion? Yes.”

Professor Abby Cohn: Abby Cohn, Linguistics. “I am wondering what the budgetary implications are and whether, by virtue of becoming a department, it becomes a tenure granting unit. And I’m also wondering about the current precedence relative to having a department that reports to an entity that’s not a college, whether that puts it in the kind of limbo situation that -- what the consequences and potential implications are.”

Professor Crepet: “Dan, you want to address that?”

Dean Huttenlocher: “So with respect to budget, there's no budgetary implication. In fact, I think Charlton said, it is already functioning as a de facto department in the fact that CIS is funding a number of faculty positions, administrators, et cetera. That wouldn't change with this proposal.”

“Then the question about -- yeah. So there actually is already a department the computer science dean is managing, which is Computer Science. We have a structure there for
Computer Science, which this report outlines. We would propose a similar one for Information Science, where the tenure is done -- the departmental level vote is done by the department faculty, so that the faculty member up for tenure isn’t put through having to satisfy multiple departments’ views; but then the ad hoc review is done jointly by the CIS dean and a college dean.

“In the case of Computer Science, that’s always jointly between the CIS Dean and the Engineering Dean, but a single ad hoc review. There would be a similar process here. But in Information Science, because it has a broad set of colleges involved, there might be sometimes different college deans working together with the CIS dean, but -- would always be done jointly with the college dean.”

Professor Abby Cohn: “By virtue of granting a unit within the faculty for Computing and Information Sciences, the status of department, we are de facto creating a college. And since that was one of the central issues this body took up a number of years ago, I would want that question addressed, if that is covertly going on.”

Professor Crepet: “I don’t believe that’s covertly going on in the sense that it’s the same structure that we already have for Computer Science, and so it’s no different than that structure. So it’s hard for me to see why it would be something overt. But Kent stood up. Did he have something to say?”

Provost Fuchs: “This is not a move to create a college or a school. These people have tenure in colleges and schools, so this process of having -- for Computer Science Engineering dean, really ran the process and with tight coupling of the CIS dean. It seemed to work well. I was skeptical myself eight years ago, but I’m a fan of it now and support this.”

Professor Crepet: “Thanks, Kent. We only have a couple minutes. We have a couple concentration -- one minute now -- concentration changes.”

Professor Carl Frank, Physics: “I’m concerned -- I feel singly uninformed on the subject, and I would really wish that the motion could be tabled. I see many physics departments within the university, many biochemistry departments within the university, and I’m not sure this is all a good trend, and I would be very concerned about it in this regard. I would like to learn more about the committee's work before I can responsibly vote on it.”

Professor Crepet: “There’s no motion on the table. My function here is just informative, to report on our vote on the subject. All right. I have two things -- two changes in -- field change proposals before us. They are very straight-forward. One is in Mechanical Engineering, and essentially proposes concentrations that are de facto in operation today. The next one is in Aerospace Sciences, and it is the same situation. These changes reflect the faculty who are existing now that the former or the current concentrations are way out of date and do not reflect either the faculty or the graduate activities taking place or the recruiting guidelines the departments have in place. So we pass these unanimously with very little discussion. And that is the end of my report. I am told my time is up.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I now call on Steve Pope of the Financial Policies Committee for a brief report.”
10. FPC REPORT

Professor Steve Pope, Chair of the Financial Policies Committee: “Over the last year or so, in response to the university’s financial issues, the faculty, through the senate and elsewhere, have made several suggestions on how the faculty can help the situation through some changes; three specifically.”

“The first suggestion was for voluntary reductions in faculty salaries. The second was appropriate incentives for early retirement for faculty, and the third was measures to facilitate tenured faculty going to part-time appointments.

“So the Financial Policies Committee is the appropriate body to take these things forward, and so we have considered all these of these, and my purpose here is to tell you the outcome of our considerations.

“So the voluntary salary reduction was considered thoroughly, and there are subtle issues here. Basically, we decided almost unanimously it was not the right thing to do, to suggest that faculty take a voluntary salary reduction. The various issues to do with peer pressure and Cornell’s competitive compensation position; however, I will remind you it is possible to donate to the University, including through payroll deduction.

(LAUGHTER)

“The other two issues, namely early retirement and part-time, we discussed again extensively. And mentioning this to the provost, he invited the committee to address him and his meeting of academic deans, which we did, and we brought to that meeting a specific proposal on part-time appointments.

“So we were very pleased with the thorough discussion these proposals received for an hour and a half at this meeting and we had several follow-up discussions with deans. The bottom line is that, as we understand how things work in the University, it turns out that the existing policies and programs are adequate.

“Hopefully — well, I’m sure the discussions we had led to a greater appreciation for the opportunities of using the existing policies. To be more specific on the part-time policy, there is an existing policy on part-time appointments described in the faculty handbook that allows faculty to go part-time, meaning 50% or more, if it is mutually agreed with a dean, and the benefits and sabbatical accruals are then prorated. The Financial Policies Committee was to add an incentive to provide full benefits and sabbatical accruals. After thorough discussion, the deans were not in favor of this, for reasons we fully understand; some of those being that they can already do this and that there was a cost associated with it and, in their opinion, this is not always the best way to use the resources. So the Financial Policies Committee is completely satisfied with the considerations and appreciates the opportunity to bring these to the Provost and the Deans. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I would like to call on dean of the faculty, Bill Fry, for remarks.”

11. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Dean Bill Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I would like, first of all, to publicly congratulate John
Muckstadt, our newest Weiss Presidential Fellow. Jack is in the Operations Research and Information Engineering. This award in recognition is one of the most outstanding recognitions the University can give to a faculty member, so we all appreciate his award.”

“In the nomination letter, it was described he inspires and motivates both colleagues and students with -- his teaching is clear, methodical, enjoyable and challenging; and his students were wonderfully appreciative of his accomplishment. I think if you teach courses -- at least from my perspective, if you teach courses like the design of manufacturing systems and supply chain management or principles of supply chain mechanics, I think you would indeed have to be inspiring and motivating.”

(LAUGHTER)

“Next slide, Steve. So congratulations to Jack. I think I have a few series of announcements. One is that Gannett does not give medical excuses. I think this is a confusion within the faculty. Last year we asked that the faculty not ask Gannett for excuses for students who miss class because of H1N1, but it turns out they haven’t produced excuses for some time. So you can’t go to Gwannett and have a -- have them verify a student was ill. That is not a possibility.

“I wanted to also say, the 2010 Faculty Handbook is currently online, and there was a confusing statement in this handbook about medical excuses. That statement has been removed in the 2010 version. It’s on the University Faculty web site, and it is available virtually.

“I have a few comments about the Statler Club. Many of you know that the lunch has been moved from the basement to the Regent’s Lounge in the Statler Hotel. And we’ll -- I think you could tell us a little more about that later on. Kent Fuchs has asked me to survey the members of the Statler Club and others about this desirability of how this arrangement is working at the end of the semester, which I will do.

“Additionally, I would like to mention that the Provost has provided some funding through Human Resources to aid networking among faculty across colleges, and one of the first targets would be new faculty coming in to Cornell. I also want to announce that the third Faculty Institute for Diversity will be held June 14th through the 16th. There will be notices available -- you saw a letter already today, announcing that institute.

“Finally, today Kent Fuchs and I, I guess, have appointed the committee, as this Senate requested last time, to assess the Marcellus shale drilling. The goal of that committee is not to make recommendations, but to set up a series of principles by which the President would decide whether to lease Cornell lands for drilling into the Marcellus shale.

“And Steve, that concludes my talk.

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. So now we have come to the Good and Welfare section of the meeting, and we have one speaker, Professor Grossman.”

12. GOOD AND WELFARE

“Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: Thank you very much for letting me speak here. My name is Yuval Grossman, from Physics. I want to talk about the Statler Club. I have five
minutes, so I have one minute for four topics. First, let me tell you about the facts as I know them.”

“I am kind of new here so I do not know all the history. Second, about why I think it is important that we have a Faculty Club. Third, how I see the near future, and I emphasize, the near future of the club. And the fourth minute, I will spend as to what I think the Senate can do to help and what I hope to gain by coming here.

“Let me start with some facts. As far as I know, since the beginning of the Faculty Club, it was in the Hotel School, and roughly in the last 20 years, it was in the configuration that we had until recently. We had lunch down in the basement and a coffee place on the first floor, and this has been going on for roughly 20 years; probably you know better than I am.

“In the beginning of the semester changes had been carried out. As of now there's no lunch at the basement, and basically this was just kind of notify us of the change. There was not a big discussion between faculty about the move. The move had been done.

“So why do we need a Faculty Club? That is the big issue. I think the point I would like to make is as follows: for our group, I do high energy physics, lunch is crucial in the way we work. It is amazing how we don't have faculty meetings and we don't have group meetings. Everything is done at lunch. We discuss all at lunch: physics, teaching, everything. It is quite interesting that I went back and talked to one of our senior faculty members. I was told that even the idea of big bang inflation came at lunch. I don't know if you know what it is, but it is probably the most important development in cosmology in the last 40 years. It's really, really interesting. In the book of Alan Guth, he said that it all started at lunch by a remark of Henry Tye. I went to Henry and asked him about it, and he said, "Of course, we always go to the Statler.'

“My point is that for us lunch is a big deal. It is really an important part of our working day. It is not just ‘okay, let's go for lunch." Personally, I am trying very hard not to set any appointment around lunch, because lunch is the time that I know it's where we go together as a group.

“We are not the only group. You go the Statler and see several other groups that do the same. It is a time for groups to get together and work. It is part of our life as researchers.

“There are other reasons why I think we need a club. It is not only because our group is using it. I know, and I asked people, and there has been a survey, and people know it is important. I know it's important because it's also on the Provost's list, The B-list, but still on the list. In the long run, we all agree that we want a Faculty Club. We need a Faculty Club.

“Yes of course the last thing we want to mention is that all other peer institutions, the Ivy League institutions and all the universities that we want to be like, have Faculty Clubs.

“Next I talk about the future of the club, in fact the near future. Right now, the Provost said that he had a lot of other things to do and he got it out of his hands and gave it to the Dean of Faculty.
“Practically that's what's going on. And on the other hand, basically, the people who hosted the Faculty Club, the Hotel School, as far as I understand, they aren't really eager to have us there. So the point is, that's what the provost said, we need some model, something that would work. So putting 1 plus 1, I see the chances are high that by the end of the semester we are going to have basically nothing that's going to work for us.

“I am really worried. I'm not saying it will happen, but I think if we don't do anything to make it clear that it's very important for us, I think nothing will happen. I want to emphasize here that people work differently. For some people, it is crucial for them to have a library. Some, a lab. For other faculty, it is crucial to have a Faculty Club. I really think it is a part of our things to do.

“That brings me to number four, what I want, what I hope to get from the Senate. Basically, what I hope to get from the Senate, and I don't know how it is done, is to get some support. To show that we come together as a faculty. That we declare that we understand that this is a problem, and that no matter what solution we are going to have, this solution should be something that keeps what we have now for the short-term. I don't want to look for long-term; but next semester, we have to make sure we keep something.”

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
KEY QUESTIONS

• Who are we?
• Where do we want to go?
• How can we get there?
• How will we tell if we have?

THE CHALLENGE

HOW CAN CORNELL PRESERVE AND ENHANCE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE IN A PERIOD OF CONSTRAINED RESOURCES?
STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

• Strategic Planning Advisory Council (8 faculty)
• Four Working Groups (63 faculty, staff, and students)
  – Education
  – Research, Scholarship, and Creativity
  – Public Engagement
  – Organizational Stewardship

SOME HIGHLIGHTS

1. Cornell as a Singular Unit
2. Culture in Support of Teaching
3. Leadership in Research
4. Embrace Public Engagement as the Outreach Mission
5. Faculty Renewal
6. Diversity and Inclusion

LONG-TERM ASPIRATION

• Strive to become a top-ten research university in the nation and world within the next 10 years.
HOW YOU CAN PROVIDE INPUT

• Today’s meeting

• Upcoming public forum:
  – February 24, 2010 from 4:30-5:30p in G10 Biotech

• A brown bag lunch:
  - March 3 from 12:15-1:15p in the Ramin Parlor Rm of Sage Hall

• Send e-mail comments on the draft to:
  strategicplanning2010@cornell.edu (see the website: http://www.cornell.edu/reimagining/)

• NOTE: You will have a chance to provide input on two drafts
  • The first draft currently on the web at: http://www.cornell.edu/reimagining/plan.cfm
  • The second and complete draft to be posted the week of March 8th
Budget Model Task Force

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 2010

Budget Model Key Requirements

• Single budget model
• Open and transparent budget process and information
• Simple, understandable, and predictable
• Enables and motivates actions that improve quality, strength, efficiency, and academic excellence
• Data informed
• Common treatment or distribution of like revenues and costs across all operating units
• Supports critical “checks and balances” with CFO
• Annual review of major revenue and cost distribution actions with Deans and Vice Presidents

Budget Task Force Members

• Cathy Dove, Co-Chair, Associate Dean of Administration, College of Engineering
• Paul Streeter, Co-Chair, Interim Vice President for Budget and Planning
• Steve Golding, Senior Consultant to the President
• Kevin Hallock, Professor, School of Industrial and Labor Relations
• Kent Kleinman, Dean, College of Architecture, Art, and Planning
• Michael Kotlikoff, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine
• Kellie Page, Director of Finance and Administration, Student and Academic Services
• Jane Pedersen, Associate Dean for Administration, College of Arts and Sciences
• Bob Swieringa, Professor, Johnson Graduate School of Management
Task Force Process

- Evaluated current budget models
- Researched alternative models
- Consulted other universities (Penn, U. Michigan, Stanford, Syracuse)
- Conducted several consultative discussions
  - Financial Policy Committee of Faculty Senate
  - Deans
  - Vice Presidents
- Interim report issued – modified based on feedback

Primary Improvements

- Transparency – simple to understand and to monitor
- Consistent Treatment of Key Resources
- Common valuation of undergraduate tuition and recognition of institutional nature of UG education
- Flexibility within the model – accommodates evolving organizational structures and priorities
- Defined resource for institutional priority investment
• Meaningful governance and oversight

**Major Budget Model Decisions**

• **Pooling Undergraduate Tuition** - $432M gross tuition, unrestricted financial aid - $136M – net approx. $296M

• **Distributing Net UG Tuition on a Data-Informed Basis** - considering cost, quality, and priority

• **Common Treatment of Like Revenues and Expenses:**
  - F&A recoveries - $79 million
  - Endowed professorships - $40.6 million
  - Space Costs - $120 million (excluding debt)

• **Establishing Sufficient Institutional Resources for Priority Investment** – 10-15% (unrestricted) is approximately $125-$175M
Budget Status Update

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 10, 2010

Budget Status Review

• 12 Months Ago
  – Deficit of $88.7M for FY09
  – Would have grown over multiple years to $215M deficit

• Today
  – Projected Deficit of $62.5M for FY10
  – Unless additional actions taken, will grow over multiple years to $135M
• Future
  – Committed to approximately $32M deficit for FY11
    • If no action taken the FY11 deficit will actually be over $80M
  – Committed to balancing the budget

Fiscal 2011 Budget Outlook

• Major Revenue Changes
  – Reduction in endowment payout – 13.7%, $19M
  – Estimated reduction in NYS appropriation - $20M
  – Net UG tuition increase - $10.3M
  – Net professional tuition increase - $7.6M

• Expense Reduction Strategies
  – Reduce debt burden
  – Aggressively pursue administrative savings opportunities through the Initiatives Coordination Office (ICO)
  – Assignment of unit budget reductions
Reserve Actions in Past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central FFE</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Admin Units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Units (colleges)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line of Credit Payment</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Budget Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

2/10/10

Financial Policies Committee
- Tony Simons, FPC committee

Library Board Committee
- Jeremy Braddock

Child Care Committee
- Marya Besharov
- Stephen Morgan

Music Committee
- Mary Beth Norton

INSTITUTIONAL BIOSAFETY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
- Rosemary Loria          Martha Mutschler-Chu
- David Wilson            Relford Patterson

Institutional Review Board Appointments
- Yasamin Miller          Mariana Welker
- Relford Patterson       Sukyeong Pi
- Alice Isen

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)
- Susan Bliss
- Maurice White
Proposed draft resolution for Senate from University Faculty Library Board

Whereas the library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest to the Senate; and

Whereas, in the current financial crisis all units of the University are being asked to make substantial cuts to their budgets; and

Whereas, at a forum with the Provost and the University Librarian and subsequently many members of the faculty and staff have expressed their concern over the impact of such cuts on acquisitions of both print and electronic materials and on the continued existence or successful functioning of smaller libraries on campus; and

Whereas, the University Librarian and her staff are currently engaged in a wide-ranging review of library expenditures and policies as a result of the Provost’s response to the library’s Strategic Plan to implement budgetary cuts; and

Whereas, the Faculty Library Board is appointed by the Senate and directed by Senate legislation “to review and help formulate broad library policy” in conjunction with the University Librarian and to inform the Librarian “of the needs and concerns of the faculty and students”;

Be it therefore resolved that:

The Senate directs the Faculty Library Board to work with the University Librarian to ensure that faculty and students from units affected by proposed changes in acquisition policies or library facilities be fully consulted before any significant changes are implemented and to report regularly to the Senate on the development of plans for such changes so that the Senate might then take any further actions it deems appropriate.

Motion Regarding the Closing of Small Libraries

Background

On November 24 the Provost chaired an open discussion of the library task force report. It developed at that meeting that there was a disagreement between faculty members and library staff on the task force about the contents of the report. The task force report recommended reducing the budget of small libraries by approx. 11% and the central library by 3%. Thus it would appear that the budget cuts weigh more than three times on the small library staff than on central library staff. The Task Force Report also recommended placing all the library budgets in the hands of the central librarian.

On January 5th Charles Brittain, Chair of Classics, sent a letter to Provost Kent Fuchs, signed by 15 chairpersons of departments in the College of Arts and Sciences pointing out that our library's materials budget had fallen from 9th to 20th place among the libraries on the continent and appealing for its restoration to that of the previous year and eventual restoration among the top ten libraries.

Additionally it is to be noted that library materials include both hard copy and digital materials, and that some of the latter may be useless without necessary support.

Motion in three parts (to be voted upon separately)

Whereas the Library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest of the University Senate, and

the Library Task Force Report recommended the closing of some unspecified number of small libraries to achieve cost reduction goals,
and

Whereas the faculty and students of the units served by the small libraries have not been consulted as to the advisability of their closing, and

Whereas there has been a long tradition of locating library materials and reference consultants near the academic workplaces of the various colleges and departments, and

it is the faculty and students of the units served by the small libraries of Cornell that are in the best position to assess the academic value of these libraries and the direction their development should take.

Therefore be it resolved that:

1. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that none of the small libraries (Ornithology, Veterinary, Entomology, ILR Catherwood, Africana, Johnson Management, Music, Fine Arts, Engineering, Hotel or Law) be closed without first consulting the wishes of faculty and students of the unit that the library serves, assessing the impact on the accreditation of the units concerned, should their library be closed, and at the same time determining that the necessary reduction in costs cannot be achieved by reducing the staff of units of the central libraries (e.g. Library Administration, Information technology, Research and Learning Services, etc.).

2. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the materials budget of the library be restored so as to place Cornell in the ranks of the top ten libraries on the continent.

and

3. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the budget supervision of the small libraries be located in the units (laboratory, department or college) that the library serves.
# Mechanical Engineering

## Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program Title (field, subject(s) and concentrations): | Concentrations:  
- Biomechanical engineering  
- Combustion  
- Energy and power systems  
- Fluid mechanics  
- Heat transfer  
- Materials and manufacturing engineering  
- Mechanical systems and design  
- Multiphase flows | Concentrations:  
- Biomedical Mechanics  
- Dynamics and Control  
- Energy and Sustainability  
- Fluid Dynamics  
- Micro- and Nanoscale Engineering  
- Solid Mechanics & Materials  
- Thermal Sciences |
| Award (e.g., degree; certificate): | No change                                                              | No change                                                              |
| HEGIS Code:            | No change                                                              | No change                                                              |
| Program [SED]Code:     | No change                                                              | No change                                                              |

---

## Aerospace Engineering
### Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title (field, subject(s) and concentrations):</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentrations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerodynamics (Minor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerodynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Biomedical Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dynamics and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Materials and Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Propulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerospace Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thermal Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Award (e.g., degree, certificate):                    |         | No change |
| HEGIS Code:                                           |         | No change |
| Program [SED]Code:                                    |         | No change |

**Information Science Department Proposal:**

- To move Cornell's IS Program to the level of department within the Faculty of Computing and Information Science (CIS)
Existing Programs

- Three Undergraduate Majors in IS (A&S, CALS, Engineering)
- Minor in IS in all 7 colleges
- Ph.D. Program in IS (Graduate Field)

Graduate Field Members now Functioning as a Department

- 32 Field Member/13 departments
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

BILL FRY

February 10, 2010
2010 Stephen H. Weiss
Presidential Fellow: John Muckstadt

• No medical/health excuses from Gannett
• 2010 Faculty Handbook available: university faculty website
• Statler Club
Minutes from the March 10, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Speaker Steve Beer: “I would like to call to order the meeting of the University Faculty Senate for March 10, 2010. The agenda is before you. I will remind the body that there will be no photos taken nor audio recordings made during the meeting. I will ask everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phones and, when you speak, please stand and identify yourself as to name and administrative unit that you represent.”

“We have no Good and Welfare speakers today. I would first like to call on Mary Beth Norton for a report from the Library Board.”

1. REPORT FROM THE LIBRARY BOARD

Professor Mary Beth Norton, Chair of Library Board Committee: “So this is the first of the reports that I promised I would give to the senate about what’s happening with the Library Board. You have in front of you a memo that I wrote. I won’t go over the details of it. You can look it over.

“It is not immediate, but the Library Board, I will just say briefly, did agree to the library administration’s desire, plan to stop the indefinite loan program for faculty members. You will see the reasoning for that in here. If anybody has major, major objections, please let me know or Anne Kenney know; but if we hear no serious objections, we will go ahead.

“It is not clear when the policy will end or exactly how it will be implemented, other than there will not be grandfathering for books that are currently out. There are about 40,000 books currently charged out under this system to 1,745 faculty members, and the library would like to know about where they are and what we are doing with them.

“You can look over the details of that. I really want to talk briefly about what we did at our last meeting, which was the end of February. We have been reviewing the new online catalog, the WorldCat Local, to which faculty and students have very mixed reactions. Some people like it a lot, some people hate it. There are people like that on the Library Board, and we are very interested in feedback from faculty members about your encounters with the new library online catalog. You can e-mail me or someone at the library with that feedback, either positive or negative.

“In any event, the classic catalog is not going away. You will still be able to always access it, even if you have to go through a couple screens to get to it. It will always be available to those who want to use it and, indeed, the library is keeping tabs; they can tell who is using the new catalog and the old catalog to find things, and so they are keeping tabs on how often things are being used. And frankly, it fluctuates from month to month, as to whether people seem to prefer the new catalog or the old catalog.

“In addition, there is going to be a great deal of movement of books from Olin Library to Uris Library before the Olin fire safety renovations begin. I’m sure anyone that goes in and out of Olin Library sees there are signs about asbestos and so forth. That’s all prefatory to major work in Olin Library to improve the fire safety standards of Olin, which will require moving a lot of books, by which I mean 100,000 or more books out of
Olin temporarily or permanently. So there will be a large-scale transfer of books from Olin to Uris, with the movement out of Uris of the duplicate books that have been sold to Shingella University, and that will happen later on this spring. The plan is to move books to Uris that will stay in Uris. There will be other books that will be moved from their sites in Olin to other places in Olin, and then will be moved back again.

“The Olin renovations will proceed floor by floor. It is expected that every floor in Olin will be closed for about two months and will be inaccessible, except for paging once a day to that floor. There’s absolutely no way to avoid this, no way at all, so I’m just warning people that’s what’s going to happen.

“There is a Humanities Collection Committee on which I am sitting as a liaison from the Library Board that is currently considering which books are going to be moved permanently from Olin to Uris. In this context, and because I know there was a lot of concern about the sale of the books to Shingella from the Uris collection, I would like to note that of all the Ivy League schools, only Columbia today maintains a duplicate collection for undergraduates, and that’s only because Columbia absorbed the Barnard College library a few years ago. Harvard actually gave away all their duplicates a few years back.

“Another matter that people I know are concerned about is the unit library reviews. Those are currently underway. The Library Board has not yet seen any of the reports from those, but we will see the first ones or the first one perhaps at the end of this month. The first report will most likely be from the Vet College; also the Entomology library, where the question is will the Entomology Department library be incorporated into Mann Library. We do not yet know those reports. They are being prepared by committees within those units, composed of faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students and library staff. When these reports come to the Library Board -- the first one will come to us at the end of March -- we will be given a report that gives the pros and cons of different options for the unit libraries. “And we will -- our plan is to give our advice to the Library about those unit reports and I can, of course, report to all of you on what both the report says and what the Library Board says about that report. Subsequently, we expect reports on the Engineering Library and on the Hotel, Johnson School and ILR libraries; these three libraries together, the possibility of consolidating those libraries, which was one of the options.

“So that’s my report. I’m happy to answer any questions, if I can. Yes.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “What is being done to recover these unreturned books?”

Professor Norton: “That I can’t tell you, but I’m sure the library is trying to track them down. I think the real problem is if these books aren’t checked out on a regular basis, the library just loses track of them and they are gone. I’m -- we did not have a report on what they are doing, but who knows? They may be sending out the cops.”

Speaker Beer: “I would remind the members of the body that we have roving microphones. If you wish to speak, wait until the microphone gets to you to speak. The lady near the back.”
Professor Norton: “A roving microphone is appearing.” UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Is the Bailey Hortorium Library being under consideration?”

Professor Norton: “Not to my knowledge.”

Speaker Beer: “The agenda has some extra time. There is time for some more questions for Professor Norton.”

Professor Norton: “There aren’t any? That’s fine, okay. Pass this on to someone else.”

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2010 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call on the body for consideration of the minutes of the February 10th, 2010 meeting. I would like to have the minutes approved, if there are no objections. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the February 10th, 2010 meeting, please signify by saying aye. (Ayes.) Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Abstentions? “The minutes of the last meeting are approved. Now we will have Steve Morgan, who will present a resolution on -- regarding the Cornell Child Care Center.”

3. RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CORNELL CHILD CARE CENTER Professor Steve Morgan, Sociology: “Thank you. I bring before you a resolution endorsed by 33 faculty members. 27 of the members have had children at the Cornell Child Care Center over the course of the past year and a half since it opened. They are a broad cross-section of the University’s recently recruited faculty. Sixteen16 of them are assistant professors, ten are associate professors, one is a full professor. They span six colleges. Six other members who have expertise and interest in child care have also endorsed the resolution, and we thank them.

“I would also like to note many staff and graduate students who also have children at the center expressed equal or even greater levels of enthusiasm for the resolution, but they can’t endorse the resolution for this body.

“The nine whereas clauses of this resolution -- I apologize for how many there are, but it is a somewhat complex story. These have been vetted by the Dean of Faculty, by the Child Care Subcommittee, by Lynette Chappell-Williams and Mary Opperman in Human Resources, who I have talked to on many occasions. The clauses are largely a matter of fact. No one objects to the particular facts stated within them. I think I should read them, however, just because not everyone has probably bothered to read as fully as they can. “Whereas the university support of the needs of the faculty, as a relevant matter of educational policy, is appropriate for the faculty senate to consider.

“Whereas the child care needs of the faculty will grow substantially over the next two decades because of recruitment of younger faculty will accelerate in lieu of expected retirements and because more of these new faculty will be partners in dual career families.

“Whereas the University Faculty, in pursuit of excellence, diversity and inclusion, has a steadfast commitment to increasing the number of women in its ranks through aggressive recruitment.

“Whereas the Faculty Work Life Survey of 2005 indicated the need for the central
administration to devote resources to expand high-quality child care options for faculty.

“Whereas the then provost announced the plan for the Cornell Child Care Center in 2006, indicating its creation was a direct response to the needs identified in the Faculty Work Life Survey of 2005.

“Whereas the then provost granted administrative control to the Division of Human Resources who, in consultation with the then provost, chose to enter into contract with a for-profit company, Bright Horizons Family Solutions, founded by a Cornell alumna and donor, Linda Mason, but currently owned in whole by the private equity firm Bain Capital.

“Whereas a competing management proposal by the Ithaca Community Child Care Center was rejected, even though the center had an established record for providing care of current and past Cornell faculty.

“Whereas the performance of the Cornell Child Care Center, since opening in August 2008 has been poor, such that many faculty who were offered spots at the center have since left for reasons including unacceptable rates of incident reports and unacceptable rates of teacher turnover.

“Whereas a recent parent survey of the Cornell Child Care Center conducted by the Division of Human Resources indicated the dissatisfaction with the Center is high, even among those parents that have chosen to remain at the center.

“The levels of dissatisfaction were uniformly high among staff, students and faculty who sent their children to the center. The levels of support were slightly higher among the faculty, because more faculty had left the center.

“So then the three "be it resolved" sections of the resolution have likewise been vetted, and I’m happy to report the Child Care Services Subcommittee of the University Assembly and both Lynette and Mary Opperman support these parts of the resolution as well, and they have been developed.

“Be it resolved the Dean of the Faculty appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty members with expertise or interest in child care issues to recommend a course of action to allow the center to perform at the level of excellence envisioned at its initial conceptualization.

“Be it further resolved that the Dean of the Faculty request the President direct the Division of Human Resources to provide access to documents and information that will allow the committee to form complete answers to crucial questions that include: Are the priorities of the center aligned with the core mission of the University? Can the center budget model deliver the quality of care demanded by the Cornell Faculty? Can the facility be modified in cost-effective ways to modify serious deficiencies in design? Should the management contract with Bright Horizons be renegotiated or terminated? Does the oversight model of the center give sufficient influence to parents and faculty at Cornell with relevant expertise? How should the Cornell Child Care Center fit into the broad university strategy for supporting faculty work-life balance?

“And be it further resolved, the committee prepare a written report before the Fall Semester
of 2010, and that, in the course of preparing their report, consult with Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources, who expressed her commitment to charting a new course for the Cornell Child Care Center.

“I hope you will join together and support the 33 faculty members who have endorsed the resolution; but in case there's one reason why you may not want to support it -- and I would like to argue against that position briefly, by giving it a chance here.

“So there's one reason not to support this resolution. There is an existing Child Care Subcommittee of the University Assembly, and one could argue that a new committee is redundant. Our response to that argument is the following: If the existing University Assembly's Child Care Committee were sufficient to address these problems, we feel that we would not be in this position now. “Both the University Assembly's Child Care Services Subcommittee and the University Assembly Family Services Committee support the creation of the ad hoc committee the resolution calls for. They crafted their own resolution, expressing their support for this resolution before you, which they forwarded to the University Assembly for adoption.

“I am a faculty representative on the University Assembly’s Child Care Services Subcommittee. I don't know if the Dean of Faculty will ask me to serve on this potential new ad hoc committee; but either way, I pledge to do all I can to make sure the committees work together.

“So why am I so worried about this issue? Am I paranoid? Well, a little but; but the reality is I learned this morning, in spite of our efforts to build broad-based support for this resolution, I learned the University Assembly tabled the resolution of its General Child Care Services Committee and Family Services Committee and that members of the University Assembly may well appear to argue against this resolution.

“The argument for doing so, based on my listening to the audio recording of the meeting, was less about the problems with the child care center and more about whether or not the Faculty Senate should interject itself into this process when it is thought to be something capably handled by the University Assembly. “And our response to this, after canvassing the endorsers throughout the day today, what I learned of this, this morning, is the following: This is really a distraction. Everyone recognizes changes are needed at the center. Everyone recognizes changes will only come about after considerable discussion and consultation between lots of people on campus. The ad hoc faculty committee assembly, backed by the Dean and Faculty, should be given a chance to come up with recommendations and see if they can build a consensus to make them happen; but I was worried that support had eroded within the assembly, so I wrote to the chair of the University Assembly's Child Care Committee, Brenda Marston, and asked her for an updated statement in case we confront some opposition.

“Brenda wrote, Steve, you can convey to the Faculty Senate that both the Child Care Services Subcommittee and Family Services Committee support your resolution. I support it strongly. I think we need an ad hoc committee to address this particular problem. I don't think there's any need to stew about who should be in charge. The intent of our resolution was to convey we support the initiative to bring together experts
to focus on the number of serious, crisis level problems at the center and to make recommendations in a short period of time. We are glad to collaborate, and we don’t see it as a usurpation of our activities.

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Morgan. The resolution concerning the Cornell Child Care Center has been introduced by a group of Cornell faculty, and it’s now open for discussion. So Mr. Morgan has presented some arguments in favor of the resolution. Are there -- is there a speaker who wishes to speak in opposition to the several resolutions? The gentleman on the aisle toward the rear. Please await the microphone.

Professor Ellis Loew, Biomedical Sciences, VET: “I am one of your faculty representatives to the University Assembly, and first I want to start by saying we are not against this resolution. To say we are against the resolution at the level of the University Assembly, you either didn’t hear it correctly, listening to the transcript of that meeting.”

“What we are -- at least you must have heard my voice -- the University Assembly exists to address exactly these kinds of problems. I saw nothing here that said there was going to be representation of graduate students, professional students. The University Assembly has created ad hoc committees at the request of the President in the past to address issues that span the entire population of constituency of the University, but we are not against this resolution. “As a matter of fact, if you took this resolution and simply said the President will appoint an ad hoc committee of the University Assembly, I would cite it immediately. There’s no doubt in my mind the University Assembly supports the issues raised by this. It is simply a question to point out what’s the University Assembly for; is to basically provide a forum for all interested constituencies at the University to address common problems.

“So I don’t know exactly where to go. Do you table this -- I don’t know what to do, but I want to make it clear the University Assembly is not against this resolution in principle. It’s simply basically looking out for itself in terms of why it exists, why it was created. This is not just a faculty issue.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We take that as a point of information only.”

Professor Morgan: “So I can clarify?”

Speaker Beer: “Yes.”

Professor Morgan: “I may have misspoken in stating the University Assembly had decided they were against the resolution. If I did that, I very much apologize. What I meant and intended to say was in fact they had tabled a resolution put forward by its own subcommittees that are charged with addressing child care issues to support this particular resolution.

“Now, whether that’s opposition to this resolution or not is for other people to interpret, but it is a matter of fact from your own meeting that you tabled a resolution in support of this resolution

Speaker Beer: “Thanks for the clarification. Now let’s hear from someone who is in favor
of the several resolutions relative to the child care center. Anyone wish to speak in favor of the several resolutions? The gentleman in the extreme rear, in the black clothing.”

Professor Kevin Morrison, Government: “I am an assistant professor. My son is in the day care, and I don't really have anything to add necessarily to Steve's excellent presentation, but I would just like to perhaps convey a bit of the urgency of this matter.” “If you don't have children in the child care center, perhaps you can't really understand what an important issue this is, particularly for people who have dual career families; and it just needs to be addressed as soon as possible. And so this -- my second year here, so I don't understand all the bureaucratic undertakings, but something has to happen soon on this, and tabling things and talking about who is in charge is really, I think, besides the point. And the more voices we have on this, I think, the better. Thanks very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Speaker in opposition to the several resolutions? Gentleman in the blue sweater.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: “I am not speaking for or against, but I would like clarification on this question, which is if the University Assembly exists to deal with questions like this, why hasn't it? Why has this resolution come forward and why hasn't the Assembly dealt with it? I mean, I have been a senator for ten years. I have never had as many people come to me and say, "Please be at the Senate meeting today." (LAUGHTER) "So it's obviously an urgent issue, so -- and if the Assembly should be dealing with this, why are they not? I guess that's my question.”

Speaker Beer: “Mr. Morgan, are you qualified to address that question?”

Professor Morgan: “I can relay to you what I have been told, though I joined that Committee officially only as of last Faculty Senate meeting. Brenda -- but I have heard in the couple meetings I have attended statements that are consistent with what I have been told, and that the University Assembly’s Child Care Services Committee was told that it should be focusing on broader issues than just the child care center. The child care center was experiencing some growing pains associated with a new center, and that they should not look so carefully at it.”

“And I think since this resolution has come before the University over the past month that sentiment has changed quite a bit.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we are ready for a speaker in support of the several resolutions. Lady in the --.”

Professor Kim Weeden, Chair of Sociology Department. “I don't have a child at the center. I see this as a faculty issue in two ways. I'm a department chair. I have a hard time looking faculty recruits in the eye and telling them that we can offer world-class child care here at Cornell. We can't. It's kind of embarrassing.”

“The other way I think this is a faculty issue is that we have a Department of Human Development. We have experts in child care development. These expert faculty members were consulted early on in this process of the Bright Horizons development, and their feedback was essentially that the Bright Horizons business model was not going
to work, was not going to provide adequate child student ratios, there was going to be too many kids per teacher.

“And what I find so distressing about all this is that that advice from your faculty experts was essentially ignored. There may have been a lot of reasons for ignoring it, some of which may have been financial, but I think it is a faculty issue, insofar as the faculty has unique expertise they can bring to bear on this issue of child care, and hopefully for our prospective faculty.

Speaker Beer: “Member of the body to speak in opposition, in the extreme rear, on the wall.”

Professor Ron Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior. “I am not sure if I’m speaking in opposition, but I’m a little confused because it seems as though it may be an administrative matter. We seem to know something is broken. The administration comes in support of a resolution that essentially says the administration believes it’s broken; and yet, despite the fact the administration is responsible for this particular unit, no action is going to be taken until the work of the ad hoc committee is completed.”

“To me, I find it amazing - the parents that actually have children in the child care center could actually wait that long for resolution of a problem. It sounds like it needs to be resolved sooner as opposed to later, so why is it the University feels it cannot act until a committee has completed its work, when it sounds as though it is a dysfunctional unit within the University?”

Speaker Beer: “I interpret that question as a question of authority for administration of the child care center, and I wonder if there’s anyone present in the body this afternoon who could address that question, other than Mr. Morgan. Lady in the front and center. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: “I just want to say to that question, and more broadly, that I hope we learn something from this and from the many other dysfunctional situations that we are in now because one person, a provost and/or a president, made truly disastrous decisions.

“If you read that last resolution, we have a committee of faculty members with broad expertise on the subject who will make a decision, who will come to a decision, come to a recommendation with the administration. If we made more decisions like that on this campus, we might not be in the deep hole we are in. How many decisions did your former provost and president make that have caused the terrible destructive situation that we are in now?

“That is why, even though I’m a member of the University Assembly, I have to support this resolution. I like the way the group will be constituted. I think because children are involved, it’s urgent that we act fast. I would hope, in response to what the gentleman said, that the meeting will be fast. I think the problems are well-known. I see no reason why it would be dragged out, but we can’t just say to the administration, "Okay, now there’s a problem. Please deal with it.”

“We have to act, we have to bring our expertise to bear. We have a situation where the
provost is asking for extraordinary power to control the finances and decide which parts of the university will be emphasized. I think in this case, as in every other case, bringing more minds into the room to argue, to bring their expertise and their different perspectives to bear, that’s a much better way to make decisions and, in the long run, it’s much more efficient, because you don’t come up with disasters like this that are so damaging. Thanks for letting me make a little speech.” Speaker Beer: “Thank you. I think we can hear from the former dean, dean of the faculty in the extreme rear.”

Emeritus Professor Charlie Walcott, Neurobiology & Behavior: “For my many sins, Chair of University Assembly. I would like to report that I think the intent of the group in tabling the motion was -- and to answer the question that you raised, Professor Clark, why haven’t we done anything, we had not heard anything as the University Assembly, our committee had not reported back that there were difficulties and problems, so we were presented with this motion, which sounded as if the faculty wished to develop a committee which would duplicate the efforts of the University Assembly Committee.

“And rather than just say no or yes, we tabled the motion until we could learn more. I have learned today that the University Assembly Committee that’s responsible for child care would welcome the formation of a faculty group to assist them with trying to straighten out this mess, and that seems to me to be a fine arrangement. And it seems to me it does not under-cut the authority of the University Assembly, such as it is. It’s simply something that’s going to be helpful in what is clearly a very difficult situation. I just wanted to clarify the logic, at least as I understand it, of the University Assembly. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. As a point of information, should the resolution pass, a study group would be formed and then report, as the final resolution indicates, six or seven months from now. Before that time, apparently nothing administratively would happen. Is that correct?”

Professor Morgan: “So response to the question, comment posed earlier about the timeliness and whether or not it was an administrative matter that can be worked out; I have to say, the group of parents, a subset of whom who have endorsed this -- there are many staff and grad students with them -- have been in a dialogue for about a year with the University about how to get the child care center back on a course to where it should be. And it has, in fact, been in a dialogue with the University Assembly’s committee as well. What we are -- our overall position is it is an extremely complicated situation.

“I would like to be able to say there are faculty experts that could come in and give the clear marching orders that could be implemented as of July 1st. It is not that simple. And all the decisions made by the administration may well look bad presently, but a lot of them were quite reasonable at the time and it is simply going to be difficult to figure out what the range of potential courses of action happen to be and, for that reason, Mary Opperman very much wants the committee to be formed, because she really needs advice on what the most reasonable ways forward happen to be.

“I think the faculty committee -- depends how the Dean constitutes it -- will move as quickly as possible, but it is such an important issue for the next 25 years and beyond that
they can't get it wrong. It's already been wrong for too long.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks for clarifying. Now we will go back to discussing -- by those in favor, those in opposition to the resolutions. The gentleman on the aisle. Wait for a microphone.”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: “Thank you. Nick Calderone, Entomology. I'm really seeking clarification here. Do any of these situations that you outline here in terms of dissatisfaction, teacher turnover, cases reported to the child services, do any of these things put the company in contractual violation”

Professor Morgan: “The University Assembly's committee, which I am on, recently asked Human Resources to share with us what's in fact in the contract, and Human Resources was unable to do so. Part of this resolution is to ask the President to work out whatever confidentiality agreements are necessary, so this faculty committee could look at the contract and see what it actually says. So I can't answer it, and I think only a very few people at the university have, in fact, seen what the contract says.”

Speaker Beer: “The question's been called. All those in favor of calling the question, signify by saying aye.

(Ayes.) Opposed? Nay? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nay

The ayes clearly have it, and we will proceed to vote on the resolution. The several resolutions are before you, beginning on the bottom third of this slide, and you should have printed versions also, continuing with resolutions on this slide, and ending with the resolution on this slide. All those in favor of the several resolutions concerning the Cornell Child Care Center, please stand. Senators only.”

Dean Fry: “ 55.”

Speaker Beer: “All those opposed to the resolutions, please stand. Those senators who wish to abstain, please stand. Six abstentions.” “The resolutions pass by a majority vote. Thank you very much. We will now move to the next item on the agenda, and the next item on the agenda concerns the report on reaccreditation. And this report will be given by Professor Laura Brown.”

4. REPORT ON REACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT

Laura Brown, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies. “I am sure all of you have some acquaintance with the plans we have underway to set up an ongoing assessment process within the Colleges. As vice provost for undergraduate education, I have primary responsibility for assessment at Cornell, and as you can see, Bill invited me to come here and go over our process with you today, and I think we may have some time for you to ask questions about the process as we have set it up.

“My aim is to explain how we are proceeding and to introduce our web site, which, if you turn to it at your leisure and if Bill turns to it now, we'll do a more thorough job of explanation than I could do in the next ten minutes. My effort here is PR. I want to encourage you to support the activity and to respond generously to your associate deans when they come to you to ask you for ideas about assessment and to contribute your own
perspective on assessment in your departments and your programs.

“I am going to structure the next few minutes as a tour around the web site, in the hopes that it will inspire you to consult it and look at it at your leisure. This will give me an occasion to talk about some dimensions of the process now underway. First, let’s locate -- let me let you know the web site is located under the provost area, under Administration on the Cornell site, and it’s to be found under Tools for Faculty. So I think it’s easy to locate.

“And the opening page, the assessment overview provides some definitions of the assessment process. If we go down the page, we can see an account of assessment. I just would like to call your attention at the very bottom of the page to the statement that we’ve made about -- as a reflection, situating assessment within the context of higher education. I don’t think I need to point.

“As a reflection of the learning centered movement, as well as calls for accountability in government, the Higher Education Act of 1998 placed a great deal of emphasis on outcomes assessment as a precondition of the Title IV funding, federal student financial aid. Cornell University has been accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1921.

“Since 1965, federal financial aid, Pell grants, is provided only to students attending accredited institutions. At the behest of the Higher Education Act Reauthorization of 1998, Middle States rewrote the standard for accreditation in 2002 to require that institutions assess student learning.

“Now, this gives me an opportunity to introduce the immediate incentive, which is our accreditation process, so I want to turn to our accreditation body, the Middle States Commission On Higher Education. And there was a handout at the door, which I hope most of you got, which describes assessment of student learning.

“As some of you -- as most of you know by now, we are just now in the process of applying for reaccreditation through Middle States, which happens every ten years. It is important to note that in private institutions, self-regulation through representative accreditation bodies is playing the role that would be taken by the Department of Education in the absence of those self-regulating representative accreditation bodies. So it is absolutely essential for private educational institutions like Cornell to maintain the strength and credibility of our representative accreditation agencies. The alternative is supervision by the Department of Education.

“So we are lucky, by the way, that our accreditation commission, Middle States, has a very flexible and -- compared to other assessment agencies in the country, less expensive and less invasive understanding and interpretation of the process of assessment.

“So the document that I have handed out, published by our commission for you to take a look at, describes what Middle States understands by assessment. You can take this home and treasure it and read it at your leisure, but I wanted to highlight a few passages here to imprint on your consciousness the significance of this project of assessment and its persuasiveness in relationship to Middle States’ understanding of our reaccreditation.
“So I’ll just highlight three moments here. First, at the bottom of Page 63, that passage in bold tells us because student learning is at the heart of the mission of most institutions of higher education, the assessment of student learning is an essential component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness, which additionally monitors the environment provided for teaching and learning and the achievement of other aspects of the institution’s mission, vision and strategic goals and planning.

“In other words, assessment pervades all other standards of excellence as Middle States defines them, including the overarching one of institutional effectiveness. Assessment dominates the standard of educational opportunities, which defines our curricula, programs and courses. All dimensions of our educational activities are now to be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness of the process by which they are assessed. That’s the bottom line.

“On Page 64, the middle of the page, assessment is not an event, but a process that’s an integral part of the life of the institution, and an institution should be able to provide evidence the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the use of results is an ongoing institutional activity.

“Page 65, toward the bottom of the page, this passage tells us assessment must be planned, organized, systemized and sustained. Planned assessment processes that clearly and purposefully correspond to learning outcomes that they are intended to assess; organized systemized and sustained assessment processes are ongoing, not once and done. There should be clear interrelationships among institutional goals, program and unit-level goals and course level goals. Assessments should clearly relate to important goals and improvements should clearly stem from assessment results.

“Finally, on the last page, there’s a list here, and let me highlight the fact that the fundamental elements of assessment should include clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels; institution, degree, program, course and for all programs.

“And a little farther down, a documented, organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate an improved student learning that meets the following criteria: Systematic, sustained and thorough.

“So I’ll leave it to you to peruse other dimensions of the Middle States standards, but I wanted you to understand the context in which our accreditation process is underway and the situation in which we are seeking to put into place an assessment process that makes sense for Cornell.

“So now let’s turn back to the web site, to the area on the campus resources. Left-hand side, find campus resources below. Down that way. There, campus resources.

“This list, go down the list a little bit. That’s good. Little bit tiny farther down. This list and the structure it lays out gives me a chance to talk about the administrative consideration of the process, and I want to emphasize two things: First, I would like to underline the fact that we are taking an approach that is centered in the colleges and in the faculty. It’s based on individual colleges, distinctive approaches to their educational
goals, all of which are different, and on the particular nature and needs of their individual programs and courses. There is a structure -- so this list of college assessment liaisons represents those individuals in the colleges that have been working on assessment and interacting with their faculty and programs on this topic.

“There is a structure at the center, which are intended to facilitate the process, intended to document what’s going on, to provide oversight, to maintain a timetable to check information about what we are doing across the campus. As I said, I am representing the provost in taking responsibility for assessment, and with me is our key facilitator for this activity, Katherine Edmondson, whose name is listed as University Assessment Manager at the top, and Kathy is here to wave at you and introduce herself.

“And we have college assessment liaisons, as I indicated here, who constitute our core assessment committee. That group works together with Kathy and me in a collaborative way to consider and plan our assessment process. Meanwhile, the individual members of that group, as I said, work within their colleges and with departments and faculty to think about assessment in relationship to the particular needs of the colleges. “In addition, this page tells us a little farther down that institutional research and planning is available for data collection and that the Center for Teaching Excellence is available for specific support for faculty and department chairs. There they are.

“Second, my other point related to this page is I would like to call attention to something we all know: There are many assessment practices already in place on campus that the professional schools, through their own assessment and accrediting and certifying processes have assessment activities in place; but in addition, that many programs and courses have various activities in place, as we all know, that look closely at what students are learning, that make adjustments based on that information.

“In fact, all of us think about our students in that way, all of us assess the outcomes of our teaching on a regular basis; so in that sense, the assessment process is a way, to a certain extent, is a way of making that thinking explicit, about placing the emphasis of that thinking process on student learning and on the outcomes of our teaching.

“Briefly, let’s turn to getting started, which provides a basic summary and definition of assessment and putting it into practice, which is most useful for its examples from different disciplines. So toward the bottom of the page, there are a range of examples that you can choose to consult in a range of different areas of study and disciplines. So to get a taste for what the process looks at at other institutions or at Cornell, you could take a look there.

“Finally, learning outcomes at Cornell.

“We need to go back over there. Thank you.

“This provides for both university-wide educational goals and college educational goals. If we start at the bottom with the college goals, you can see the list of undergraduate college learning goals. Why don’t we click on Human Ecology. That will take us to the Human Ecology web site.

“As I said, each college has enunciated its own educational goals. The Human Ecology
web site includes those goals down below the statement of their mission, on their home page.

“Undergraduate student learning outcomes, then we have a list of learning outcomes. You can see that they are stated and defined by Human Ecology. Each of the undergraduate colleges listed goals. Each one is different. How did we generate these goals? They came from within the colleges, from the associate deans' interactions with their educational policy committees, curriculum committees or other faculty groups within the colleges. Many of these goals were already, to a large extent, in place in the colleges and were simply gathered together and reformatted to generate this list.

“Now back to our site. At the top of this page, we have a list of university-wide educational goals that describe learning outcomes at Cornell, disciplinary knowledge, critical thinking, communication skills -- I'm not going to read each one.

“How did we generate the university-wide goals? They are collected from the college goals, and they represent the overlapping or common denominators of those college-level goals, as well as the language and contents from university and campus-wide mission statements; for example, our Cornell mission statement, our university statement on diversity. So these college and university goals come from long-standing explicit representations of educational goals that we are bringing together here in a single format.

“Finally, back to campus resources, please, I want to invite you to contact the college assessment liaisons or me or Kathy or Theresa Pettit, the Director of Teaching Excellence. Those of you who have questions or would like to engage farther in the process of assessment, please take a look for yourselves at the web site. We will all be engaged with this process in one way or another in the next several months, and thereafter indefinitely. I think it will be constructive, by and large, and I think it will fit into the context of our curricula rather easily, from what I have seen so far, and I think it will generate opportunities that we're not yet fully aware of. So I don't know if there's time for questions, but –“

Speaker Beer: “Yes, there is. We do have time for questions.”

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: “As we all know, the graduate degrees are in the hands of special committees -- graduate education is in the hands of special committees, and just wondering, how does this program, which seems to be oriented at courses primarily, what's going to happen in the graduate school?”

Vice Provost Brown: “Well, we have a representative on our committee that's interacting with the graduate school and, certainly, the standards that Middle States is providing for us in relationship to assessment permits us to engage in a flexible way with the requirements and the structure of graduate education at Cornell, so we will describe to Middle States the nature of the committee system and the ways in which educational goals are designed and implemented by the individual students committee, and that will be sufficient for them.” Emeritus Professor Howland: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Further questions for Vice Provost Brown? We have time. Thanks for the presentation. I would now like to call on dean of the faculty, Bill Fry, for presentation
of resolutions concerning OPUF, the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty.”

5. RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (OPUF)

Dean Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I want to report that the UFC spent considerable time dealing with the governance report presented to the faculty senate about three years ago, before my time, and there are several recommendations in the report. We have not been able to address all of them at one time; so instead of waiting until we could address them all at the same time, I wanted to bring to the senate a single resolution at this point.” “It deals with the first part of the Governance Committee report, which had to do with consultation. Many parts of that report are not actions to be taken by the senate; but instead, for example, it asks that the provost meet with UFC on a monthly basis. That has happened. The provost has been meeting with UFC on a monthly basis.

“It also asks the president meet with UFC on a semester basis, and that also is happening. So I think that’s an action from the senate. But there’s a specific recommendation concerning the University Faculty Committee, the UFC, in this Governance Committee report, and that’s the resolution that I bring today.

“So the resolution is that the Senate received the report in 2007, called on the Dean of Faculty and the UFC to initiate further consideration of the recommendations; and whereas the Governance Committee of the Senate recommended the University Faculty Committee be expanded to allow non-senators to be elected to the UFC, and their wording was five members of the UFC shall be current Senate members at the time of their election, four need not be current members of the Senate at the time of their election.

“And whereas the UFC and Dean of Faculty agree the UFC should be expanded to allow non-senators to be elected to the UFC. Therefore, be it resolved the Operation Procedures of the University Faculty, OPUF, be amended as follows -- and this has to do with the constitution of the University Faculty Committee -- that the items to be eliminated are crossed through. The words to be added are underlined.

“So it will read the University Faculty Committee shall consist of the Dean and the Secretary ex officio and nine members of the Faculty. Five members of the UFC shall be current Senate members at the time of their election, four need not be current members of the Senate at the time of their election.

“The process -- if you approve this resolution, I would suggest the following process, and that is Nominations and Elections Committee will nominate a potential non-senator candidate or will nominate potential non-senator candidates for three-year terms during each of the subsequent spring elections; one non-senator to be elected each year. And if that process follows, this will achieve and maintain a non-senator membership of three non-senator members on the UFC at the conclusion of three years and will maintain that there will be three non-senator members on the UFC for the duration, until it's changed.

“If we approve of this recommendation, OPUF needs to be amended, and the process is that the amendment will be submitted to all voting members of the University Faculty for
referenda by e-mail ballot; and if adopted by a majority of the valid ballots cast, the proposal shall be deemed adopted and this document amended accordingly; this document being OPUF. So that's the resolution, and I'm happy to hear comments or questions either way.” Speaker Beer: “Any clarifying questions first? Gentleman in red. Wait until the microphone -- please wait for the microphone.”

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson School: “I see an error in the identification of the Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty. Title is not complete, and I think it should be complete.”

Dean Fry: “Okay.”

Professor McAdams: “On Number 1, "consists of the Dean and Secretary" should read "consists of the Dean and the Associate Dean and Secretary."

Dean Fry: “Okay. Shall do.”

Speaker Beer: “I believe that will be considered a non-substantive amendment and can be adopted by the resolver. Professor Earle.” Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics: “The resolution speaks of having four -- the possibility of having four members who are not senators, but the implementation plan makes it sound as though there would be three. How do those fit together?”

Dean Fry: “I think they fit together very easily. The recommendation in the Governance Committee said up to four, and the UFC and I have suggested three. It's easier to implement that way, because nine members of UFC; you could appoint a non-senator each year and it is easy to have three members of the UFC be non-senators that way. So they are really not in conflict, because the recommendation says up to four.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other clarifying questions for Dean Fry?”

Dean Fry: “Or supportive or negative, opposition.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. So we'll proceed to debate on the resolution. Can we hear from someone who is in opposition to the resolutions for modifications of the Organization and Procedures for the University Faculty? Anyone opposed to the resolution? Seeing none, would anyone like to speak in favor of the resolution?” Speaker Beer: “Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of going direct to the question, signify by saying aye. (Ayes) Opposed? Nay? We'll go to the question. All those in favor of the resolution as presented by Dean Fry, please signify by standing. Senators only.”

Dean Fry: “59.”

Speaker Beer: “All those senators opposed, signify by standing. Those wishing to abstain? Senators only. Three abstentions. I ask at this point unanimous consent for the count by the Dean and the Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty to the ballot. Any opposition to that?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. So the resolutions for amendment of the Procedures of the University Faculty have been passed, and we now move to remarks from Dean
6. REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean Fry: “I wanted to report that the members -- selected members of the board of trustees meet with the University Faculty Committee once a semester, and that meeting will happen for the Spring Semester tonight.”

“If you have any agenda items you would like the University Faculty Committee to bring to those members of the board of trustees, please let me know, or David Lipsky, Fred Gouldin, or any other member of the UFC. Rosemary Avery will also be at the meeting tonight. So if you have agenda items you would like us to bring to the members of the Board, please do so soon.

I wanted to report again, the Provost has been meeting with the UFC on a regular basis; also report the Provost responses that he's given to the UFC concerning Senate resolutions. The library resolution asks that the Provost go slowly. That’s happening. You heard from Mary Beth Norton about the actions of the Library Board. The Provost agrees the Library Board is a very effective faculty voice for the library. The Marcellus Shale Committee has been instituted. There are members here who are on that committee.

“And then the Senate also asked that the 20 task force reports be available, and those were made available both in the Dean of Faculty’s office and in the -- I think the Assembly office, the two-page summaries were put on the web. “Finally, I would like to bring to you -- transfer a request from the student assemblies, their Resolution Number 42, which implores all Cornell faculty to do their utmost in abiding by the book list submission deadlines, when those are not in conflict with pedagogical aims. The idea is if we and you get your lists late to the book store, they can't get as many used books in, and it costs the students more.

“So I guess I have a mid-April deadline to get my book list in, and the rest of you also have a mid-April deadline to get your book lists in, just to help students save money.

“And finally, I would also like to ask, if you have items or issues for the Senate to consider, please do send those to me. I’m wef1@cornell.edu. I would be happy to hear from you. And I think that’s my report for today.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. Are there any questions for Dean Fry? We do not have any Good and Welfare speakers, so there is time. If you would be willing.”

Dean Fry: “Always willing, but I think people want to leave. Saying yes, let me out of here.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the front. Wait for the mic, please.”

Professor John Weiss, History Department. “Bill, I would just like the minutes to record that an inquiry was made about the situation of the request that you made that members of the senate ask their departments about their interest in the voluntary reduction of effort issue and recommendation that Charlie Walcott had brought up and introduced.”
“I am interested to see -- this could have financial implication for the entire University, and yet decisions are being made on the basis of not having that information about the possible favorable impact of giving departmental chairs greater flexibility in working deals on voluntary reduction of effort.”

Dean Fry: “Steve Pope could address that very effectively.”

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering: “This was reported, I believe, at the last Senate meeting, so this was considered by the Financial Policies Committee, and the short version is we decided it was not a good idea to recommend going forward with that proposal.”

Jeff Niederdeppe, Communication Department: “I wonder if you could report on the status of the vote we did electronically, about the Information and Science Department.”

Dean Fry: “I hope that most of you received it yesterday or today. Did that not go out? I blew it. Okay. I meant to send it. It was, as of last weekend, it was 59 in favor, 2 opposed and 3 wanting further discussion. I really had meant to send that out as a note last night, but apparently it didn't go.”

Speaker Beer: “If there are no further questions for the Dean, we are entertaining a motion to adjourn.”


Speaker Beer: “All in favor, please leave.”

(LAUGHTER)

Meeting adjourned at 5:40. Respectfully submitted: F. C. Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
1. All academic staff (including lecturers who now can check books out for no more than 6 months at a time) will have 1-year terms for books checked out of the libraries.

2. There will be no grandfathering; that is, all books currently out on indefinite loan will be converted by the library to 1-year loans (in whatever way is easiest to implement).

3. All books on 1-year loans will be able to be renewed electronically; they will not have to be physically returned to a library.
Resolution for consideration at the March 10th meeting of the Faculty Senate

[ Note: The paragraphs enclosed in brackets convey supporting information and will not be included in the final resolution that is put to a vote.]

WHEREAS the university’s support of the needs of the faculty is a relevant matter of educational policy that is appropriate for the Faculty Senate to consider,

WHEREAS the child care needs of the faculty will grow substantially over the next two decades because the recruitment of younger faculty will accelerate in the wake of expected retirements and because more of these new faculty will be partners in dual career families,

WHEREAS the university faculty, in pursuit of excellence, diversity, and inclusion, has a steadfast commitment to increasing the number of women in its ranks through aggressive recruitment,

WHEREAS the Faculty Work Life Survey of 2005 indicated the need for the central administration to devote resources to expand high quality child care options for the faculty,

[Support: See the May 2006 document, “Child Care Needs Among Faculty,” produced by Institutional Research and Planning at the request of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Faculty Work Life.]

WHEREAS the then-Provost Biddy Martin announced a plan for a Cornell Child Care Center in September 2006, indicating that its creation was a direct response to the needs identified by the Faculty Work Life Survey of 2005,

[Support: See Cornell Chronicle Article of 9/26/06, in which Lynette Chappell-Williams, as Director of the university’s Office of Workforce Diversity, Equity and Life Quality, said “Part of the motivation of this new center is that we have heard of faculty who have experienced challenges in finding child care here and we have lost them; they moved elsewhere.” She continued, “There are also those who applied for positions at Cornell and then declined offers because child-care services appeared inadequate. The new center is designed to help with both the recruiting and retention of faculty ….”]

See also the Cornell Chronicle article of 8/28/08, which states “In 2004, Provost Biddy Martin charged an Advisory Committee on Faculty Work Life ‘to examine the tenured and tenure-track faculty work life and working climate, with a special emphasis on the experiences of women faculty.’ The resulting Faculty Work Life Survey, completed in November 2006, indicated that 12 percent of faculty respondents were using or in need of childcare, with five percent indicating that they anticipated needing child care in the next year or so, most likely for an infant ….”

WHEREAS the then-Provost granted administrative control of the center to the Division of Human Resources, who, in consultation with the then-Provost, chose to enter into a contract with a for-profit company, Bright Horizons Family Solutions, founded by a Cornell alumna and donor Linda
Mason, but currently owned in whole by the private equity firm, Bain Capital,

[Clarification: A press release on 1/14/08 indicated that Bain Capital had acquired Bright Horizons Family Solutions for $1.3 billion, which was a 47% premium over its existing stock price. The press release described the new ownership as “Bain Capital, LLC (www.baincapital.com) is a global private investment firm that manages several pools of capital including private equity, venture capital, public equity and leveraged debt assets with more than $65 billion in assets under management. Since its inception in 1984, Bain Capital has made private equity investments and add-on acquisitions in more than 300 companies in a variety of industries around the world, and has a team of almost 300 professionals dedicated to investing in and supporting its portfolio companies, including such leading companies as Dunkin’ Donuts, Michaels Stores and Domino’s Pizza.”]

WHEREAS a competing management proposal by the Ithaca Community Child Care Center was rejected, even though the Ithaca Community Child Care Center had an established record of providing care for many of the children of current and past Cornell faculty,

WHEREAS the performance of the Cornell Child Care Center since its opening in August of 2008 has been poor, such that many faculty who were offered spots at the center have since left for reasons including unacceptable rates of incident reports to Child Protective Services and unacceptable rates of teacher turnover,

[Support: Between its opening in August 2008 and the end of January 2010, the Cornell Child Care Center was cited for 38 separate regulatory violations by the New York State Office of Child and Family Services. Of these violations, 17 were deemed “serious.” Over the same interval, the Ithaca Community Child Care Center, which is the most comparable child care center in the county, was cited for only 4 violations, and none of these violations were deemed “serious.” Details are available at the website, http://it.ocfs.ny.gov/ccfs_facilitysearch/default.aspx, through a search for Tompkins County centers.

[Human Resources has reported that at least 22 teachers have left the center between its opening in August 2008 and February 2010. Bright Horizons has conceded that the level of teacher turnover at the Cornell Child Care Center is more than double the rate that is common in the child care industry.]

WHEREAS a recent parent survey of the Cornell Child Care Center, conducted by the Division of Human Resources, indicated that dissatisfaction with the center is high, even among those parents who have chosen to remain at the center,

[Support: In October 2009, Human Resources conducted an online survey of parent satisfaction, and 93 parents responded. The full results are available at https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/WORKLIFE/Cornell+Child+Care+Center+Parent+Survey+Results. The results include the following concerns:
1. Teacher turnover: Even though 25% of respondents had had children at the center for less than 6 months, 41% of parents reported that their children had “5 or more” teachers since joining the center (not counting additional transitional appointments). When asked whether “Teaching staff turnover” met their expectations, 70% of parents indicated that the turnover rate was higher than they expected. The rate of dissatisfaction was highest in the toddler wing, where 89% of parents felt that turnover was higher than expected.

2. Bright Horizons administration: When asked whether Bright Horizons was responsive to parent feedback and concerns, 62% of parents indicated that Bright Horizons had performed below their expectations. 55% of parents indicated that they did not receive enough information about changes at the center, and 41% of parents indicated that they did not trust the Bright Horizons administration. 51% of parents felt that the Director was performing below expectations, and 54% of parents felt that the overall Bright Horizons administration was performing below expectations.

3. Overall satisfaction: When asked whether or not they would recommend the center to a friend, only 45% of parents indicated that they would.

4. These results do not reflect the views of the substantial number of parents who have decided to leave the center since it opened.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Dean of the Faculty appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty members with expertise or interest in child care issues to recommend a course of action that will allow the Cornell Child Care Center to perform at the level of excellence envisioned at its initial conceptualization.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dean of the Faculty request that the President direct the Division of Human Resources to provide access to documents and information that will allow the committee to form complete and informed answers to crucial questions that include:

1. Are the priorities of the center aligned with the core mission of the university?

2. Can the center budget model deliver the quality of care that is demanded by the Cornell faculty?

3. Can the facility built by Cornell be modified in cost-effective ways to rectify some of the serious deficiencies in design?

4. Should the management contract with Bright Horizons be renegotiated or terminated?

5. Does the oversight model of the center give sufficient influence to parents and to faculty at Cornell with relevant expertise?

6. How should the Cornell Child Care Center fit into the broad university strategy for supporting faculty work life balance?

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the committee prepare a written report before the fall semester of 2010 and that, in the course of preparing their report, consult directly with Mary G. Opperman,
Vice President for Human Resources, who has expressed her commitment to charting a new course for the Cornell Child Care Center.

Resolution endorsed by

Twenty-seven faculty members who have (or have had) children at the Cornell Child Care Center:

Anurag Agrawal, Associate Professor, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Kevin D. Attell, Assistant Professor, Department of English

Anindita Banerjee, Assistant Professor, Department of Comparative Literature

Taryn L. Bauerle, Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture

Marya L. Besharov, Assistant Professor, Department of Organizational Behavior

Sofía Cerda-Gonzalez, Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Sciences

Ruth N. Collins, Associate Professor, Department of Molecular Medicine

Brian R. Crane, Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Peter K. Enns, Assistant Professor, Department of Government

Maria J. García-García, Assistant Professor, Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics

François Guimbretière, Associate Professor, Faculty of Computing and Information Science

John P. Hausknecht, Assistant Professor, Department of Human Resource Studies

Mark E. Lewis, Associate Professor, Department of Operations Research and Information Engineering

Corinna E. Löckenhoff, Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development

Daniel R. Magaziner, Assistant Professor, Department of History

Jordan D. Matsudaira, Assistant Professor, Department of Policy Analysis and Management

Tracy K. McNulty, Associate Professor, Department of Romance Studies

Stephen L. Morgan, Professor, Department of Sociology

Kevin M. Morrison, Assistant Professor, Department of Government
Maxim Perelstein, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics

Troy A. Richardson, Assistant Professor, Department of Education

Jocelyn K. C. Rose, Associate Professor, Department of Plant Biology

Holger Sondermann, Assistant Professor, Department of Molecular Medicine

Jennifer S. Thaler, Associate Professor, Department of Entomology

Sofia A. Villenas, Associate Professor, Department of Education

Joseph J. Wakshlag, Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Sciences

Gary R. Whittaker, Associate Professor, Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Six additional faculty members who have interest and/or expertise in child care issues:

Christopher J. Anderson, Professor, Department of Government

Marianella Casasola, Associate Professor, Department of Human Development

Stephen F. Hamilton, Professor, Department of Human Development

Barbara C. Lust, Professor, Department of Human Development

Sharon L. Sassler, Associate Professor, Department of Policy Analysis and Management

Kim A. Weeden, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Amendment to the

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (OPUF)

Whereas the Senate received the Governance Committee report in 2007 and called on the Dean of Faculty and University Faculty Committee to “initiate further consideration of the recommendations”, and

Whereas the Governance Committee of the Senate recommended that the University Faculty Committee (UFC) be expanded to allow non Senators to be elected to the UFC (“Five members of the UFC shall be current Senate members at the time of their election; four need not be current members of the Senate at the time of their election.”) and

Whereas the UFC and the Dean of Faculty agree that the UFC should be expanded to allow non-Senators to be elected to the UFC,

Therefore be it resolved that the Operational Procedures of the University Faculty (OPUF) be amended as follows:

VIII. Committees.

B. Membership

1. The University Faculty Committee shall consist of the Dean and the Secretary, ex officio, and nine members of the Faculty Senate elected at large by the Faculty. Five members of the UFC shall be current Senate members at the time of their election; four need not be current members of the Senate at the time of their election. Elected Members elected from the Senate shall serve a complete term on the University Faculty Committee even if their Senate term expires prior to the end of their University Faculty Committee term. No person shall serve more than two complete consecutive terms on the University Faculty Committee. The Dean shall serve as chair of the committee.
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

BILL FRY

March 10, 2010
- UFC/members of the Board of Trustees meeting -- agenda items?
- UFC meetings with the Provost (Governance Committee)
- Provost responses to Senate Resolutions
  - Library Resolution (no action yet)
  - Agrees that Library Board is faculty voice
  - Marcellus Shale (committee formed)
  - Task Force Reports (availability)
- Student Assembly Resolution #42: (to lower book costs)
  - The SA “implies all Cornell faculty to do their utmost in abiding by the booklist submission deadlines … when not in conflict with pedagogical aims…” (mid April, early November).
- Senate agenda items → wefl@cornell.edu
Minutes from the April 14, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to order the University Faculty Senate meeting for April 14th, 2010. I would like to remind the body that there will be no photos taken or audio recordings made during the meeting. I would like to ask everyone to silence or turn off your cell phones, and when speaking to the body, please rise and identify yourself as to name and administrative affiliation.

“We have two Good and Welfare speakers this afternoon, and they will speak on subjects of interest to the faculty when the agenda items as listed on the screen have been covered. I would first like to call on the chair of the Library Board, Professor Mary Beth Norton for our report of the Library Board Committee.”

1. REPORT FROM LIBRARY BOARD

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History Department. “I am glad to be here again and to report on what the Library Board is doing. At our last meeting, we had the first of the unit reviews of the satellite libraries that we were expecting. We got an excellent report from the veterinary library. The veterinary faculty, we thought, put together a very fine report in a very short period of time. They surveyed the students, the graduate students, the residents, the faculty and so forth, and even -- and they had then melded these opinions into their own set of recommendations.

“The Library Board had some questions about what they gave us, and we asked for further information. For example, one of the things the report did not contain was a comparison to other veterinary libraries in terms of staffing and in terms of the number of volumes, and we wanted to have some idea of comparison to vet libraries. So the plan now is that the veterinary library people will come back to us, the task force will come back with more information presumably in the next meeting, in a couple of weeks at the end of the month. At that next meeting we will also receive the unit review from the entomology laboratory, which is the next up.

“And the procedure we are going to follow with these reviews is that when our own review of library reports is complete -- and we expect now, on the basis of what happened with the vet library report, that each of these reviews will take two meetings; one to have the first review of the initial report and then we'll ask for further information, and then they will come back with that information -- that the Library Board will then make a recommendation to the librarian concerning the contents of the report from the unit library, either agreeing entirely perhaps with the recommendations or perhaps coming up with somewhat different recommendations than the unit library has come up with, and then once we make a recommendation to the librarian, she will then make a recommendation to the provost and the provost will make the final decision as to what to do about the particular unit library in question.

“We will probably have added meetings before the end of the term to be able to complete these reviews. We expect to be done with the veterinary library review and the etymology
library review by the end of this term and then everyone, including myself, will disperse for the summer; but there are further library reviews to come in, including one about -- involving the possible consolidation of Hotel, ILR and -- now I have forgotten the third one, but there are other reports to come in and those will be considered next year.

“In other words, the plan is for all the reviews or all the decisions that are being made about the maintenance of unit libraries, that is either consolidation of them, the potential closing of them or the retention of them in some form; all those will come through the University Library Board for our consideration and recommendation before they go to the librarian and to the provost.

“So there will be faculty input, not only at the level of the unit libraries themselves of the units themselves, but also at the level of the University Faculty Board. And that is my report. So I’m happy to answer any questions, if I can.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I think we can take a little time for a couple questions. Professor Howland? If you would kindly wait for the microphone.” Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: “Thank you. Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior. Will the senate have any opportunity to hear the Library Board’s report before it actually goes to the provost?”

Professor Norton: “Well, it is not our report that goes to the provost. Our report goes to the librarian. We can certainly do that. It might -- since there's only one more senate meeting of the spring, there might not be a chance. I mean, if we do complete the review of the vet library at the next meeting without -- which is the last week of this month, we could come back to the senate with the final meeting in May. I’m not sure. It just depends, because we don’t know how long it’s going to take that new information to arrive.”

Professor Howland: “May I suggest, then, if during the summer you may send the report to the UFC that acts for the senate during the summer.”

Professor Norton: “Yes, we could do that.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman about half way back, please.”

Unidentified Speaker, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. “While speaking to the faculty associated with the etymology library, the question came up -- and probably that was already answered earlier, but it was kind of a viable question, the question that how much money can actually be saved when these libraries are closed. Is there some rationale behind that?

“One can imagine that moving those libraries is also expensive, and so the question is what are the trade-off and the benefits and the costs.”

Professor Norton: “That’s one of the issues the provost and library will consider and the Library Board will be considering. I can say that the -- one of the nice things about the vet library report that we got was the consideration of several different possible scenarios, shall we say, with respect to savings in this way or that way and, certainly, yeah, that’s all factored in.
“In terms of money that’s saved by closing a library, the most obvious thing that gets saved is staff salary, but there are lots of other kinds of things, too, such as the librarian pointed out to me, maintenance of Xerox machines and other sorts of equipment that have to be maintained if the library is open. Those are not necessarily negligible expenses.

“On the other hand, if there are great reasons for keeping the library open, it will be kept open. I think it has to do with what the reviews show. I think the idea is to examine carefully, given the current budget situation of the university, to examine carefully all these expenses just the way expenses in all the colleges are being examined, to see where savings can be made without losing vital services. So I can’t answer in general about savings, but I do know that savings can be had.

“On the other hand, there’s always the trade-off. If you stop buying certain books or stop buying certain journals, then can that ever be made up? Maybe, maybe not. That is another issue.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Norton.”

Professor Norton: “Okay.”

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call on Professor William Crepet for a report from the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.”

2. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS & POLICIES

Professor William Crepet, Plant Biology: “I have a rather simple report today. Two things came before the committee that were approved. The first of them was kind of exciting; a new concentration in the field of geological sciences. That concentration was Ocean Science and Technology. It consolidates many of the strengths we have at Cornell in these areas, and it has an innovative feature, and that is a memorandum of agreement with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, though it involves graduate students spending a semester there. It would also involve faculty or staff from Woods Hole teaching at the Isle of the Shoals in the summer, interacting with undergraduates and graduates in that setting.

“We felt it was an exciting proposal. It would enhance our program in graduate education and was approved unanimously by CAPP. Chuck Greene was the contact person. I don’t know if Chuck is here for this.

“The second thing was just a routine update in Biological and Environmental Engineering, BEE, which was to change the major subject from biological environmental -- change the major subject in the major field of biological and environmental engineering to match the major field name. The name presently is agricultural and biological engineering, causing confusion, because it doesn’t agree with the major field name, so the proposal is to make the name the same; that is the major field would be biological and environmental engineering.

“Also in the realm of updates, they proposed changing the concentrations to match what actually goes on at this time, to reflect the realities of their concentrations. And those are
straightforward -- I will read the list.

“The new concentrations would include biological engineering, environmental engineering, bio-environmental engineering, bio-energy and integrated energy systems, bioprocess engineering, food engineering, industrial biotechnology, nano-biotechnology, sustainable systems, synthetic biology. Those are the proposed changes. We felt they were routine and a reasonable update. They were also approved unanimously by the committee. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for questions. Professor Cohn, wait for microphone, please.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Professor of Linguistics: “Hi. Abby Cohn, Linguistics. I have a question of clarification. What academic matters do we, as a body, need to vote on and which ones do not require a vote?”

Professor Crepet: “Well, for this I always consult Dean Fry, and I understand with respect to those two suggestions, we don’t have to vote on a change -- to change them or to update them. Is that not so, Bill?”

Professor Cohn: “So we did need to vote when there was a formation of a new department, and it’s also my understanding any time there’s an academic program that cuts across colleges, like if we were forming a new major, I would assume that that is also a matter we’d vote on, so I’m wondering whether we are in the approval of a new concentration that might not also be a matter that requires a vote. I don’t know if it should require a vote, but I would just like clarification.”

Professor Crepet: “Bill? It’s a new concentration in an old major.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other questions for Professor Crepet?

“Okay, thank you very much. I would like to now call on two things, Professor Schuster and Professor Walcott. I presume that you are Professor Schuster.” Speaker Beer: “You can stick this in your pocket. A report on updating desktop support, please.”

3. UPDATE ON COMPUTER “DESKTOP” SUPPORT

Steve Schuster, Interim Director, CIT: “Are you going to drive my slides for me? Charlie elected to sit in the back. That might be wise.

“So I’m Steve Schuster, the current leader of CIT. I’m also the administrative sponsor of the Reimagine IT initiative in the broader Reimagine process. That means I’m part of the core team. The core team, we have myself as the administrative sponsor, the academic sponsor is Dean Huttenlocher, Dean of CIS; we have an initiative manager, which is Craig Higgins from the College of Human Ecology; then we have Charlie Walcott as our factually representative on that body. We also have subcommittees under that.

“I am going to dig in. I know there is lots and lots of questions about what’s going on here. I am going to try to provide some context in the Reimagining activities and dig down into some of these with more specifics. So please.

“I think it’s worthwhile talking about why this is important for us in thinking about the
I will provide a quick overview of the individual IT activities within the broader scope of Reimagining and, like I mentioned before, there's three of them that I will dive a little deeper into, because I think it will hit you more closely; but I'll talk about the other ones, given some time or questions.

“So why are we doing this? Bottom line, we have around 800 IT staff across campus, and we are not well-coordinated. We don’t plan very well. Our processes are inconsistent. At the end of the day, generally, you all and everybody else on campus is generally unhappy with our IT environment. We have to do something. In addition to the 800 staff, we are spending $78 million on IT. For that type of money, we all ought to be very pleased with what we get. We are not. So we have work to do.

“The scope of our effort, it's limited to staff and expenses that are directly or not directly associated with sponsored funds. So basically, Cornell money is what we are talking about. Sponsored funds are intentionally left out of the scope of this activity.

“Here are our major activities. We know we don’t do a good job by way of governance and decision-making. We are not strategically aligned with our investment and with the institutional direction, so we've created a governance body called the IT Governance Council. Four members sit on that, and that’s the top of that body. Those four members are the provost; the CFO, Joanne Destefano; the CIA, myself, and Dean Huttenlocher. That’s the highest level -- we'll have subcommittees under that body. Those are committees that will look at academic computing, administrative computing needs and general IT campus services. The idea here is we really have no strategic plan in any of these areas; we don’t make good decisions; we have little governance, and we need to get aligned here. So that’s what we hope to go through.

“The end user and desktop support, I will spend more time on in the subsequent slide, so I’ll hit on that in a second. Same with academic computing and the same with application of service development. We also have data center needs. So right now, our primary data center is in Rhodes Hall. We are running out of space. We are not managing our server space real well; so a small initiative, looking at is there cost efficiencies and effectiveness. Changes we can make within that space are another area we are looking at. That’s about all I will hit on that piece now.

“So desktop and end user support. Here’s our challenge: How can we do things more efficiently while at the same time not reduce -- better yet, at least not reduce, but better yet, increase the support that we are getting for our computer systems around campus. Here’s some emerging recommendations. We feel we need to standardize on a smaller set of computers than we are supporting. The bottom line is when we call our IT support staff, it is an exploration to figure out what type of computer you have, what type of OS you are running, what’s the age of the operating system, what applications you have on there. That’s an enormous amount of time each and every time they visit people, so we feel we need to contain that a little bit.

“We have to update our technology and processes. The typical way our tech support supports us right now is they come to our office. We have to hunt them down, either phone calls or cell phone or pagers, if we are lucky, or run to their office and pull them
into our office. There's new technologies out there that we think could do a heck of a lot better. It is time to refresh, so remote management, remote troubleshooting and things are processes we need to explore.

“We are going to cluster IT resources. A clustering is -- we feel we need to standardize on a lot of this, so driving consistently as an IT community, but we also can't break the individual closeness of the people that support the units they are in. So this is really, really a balancing act, because we know there's local efficiencies and focus that we simply can't break. And hey, at the end of the day, there's certainly faculty -- maybe some administrators, but faculty that are simply going to have special, unique IT needs. That have to be supported and we have to figure out how that works. Now, it might be that if it's for sponsored research, that higher level of support needs to be on that -- some of those funds, but we need to work that out, at least think it through as we move forward.

“Academic computing. So Anne Kenney, myself and a small group have been really thinking about how to rationalize and better collaborate how we support academic computing on campus. The bottom line here is we are doing little, if any, real strategic investment in the way that we are moving academic computing forward. And that, I think, is a problem. So some of the emerging recommendations; the libraries, the Center for Teaching Excellence, CIT and all the local units need to define what our roles and responsibilities here are, and then what is the path -- what is the strategic direction that we want to move forward. So one example is that perhaps the library should take a more direct role; so like front-end support and CIT takes a very back-end infrastructure role in how we are supporting faculty and students in this space.

“And I have already mentioned the strategic plan for academic computing. We are not thinking strategically, not thinking about what our investments should be as an institution in this space. We are doing it in a very ad hoc way, and I think that's presenting lots of challenges and problems for us.

“Next, please.

“So application and service development; again, every unit, CIT and every college and every local unit -- any administrative unit does their own development in their own way. Sometimes it's sustainable, sometimes it is not. Lots of times we don’t have the staff that's refreshed and up-to-date in things we are doing, so how do we ensure that we are strategically aligned, that we can optimally perform what we need to do and that is sufficiently maintainable.

“All too often, we have applications and services that are stood up across campus, then that person retires or that person leaves and the system’s no longer sustainable or maintainable, so we have to address those pieces. Emerging recommendations that come out of this, we have to move from a build-here-first approach to a purchase approach. There are lots and lots of solutions, lots of capabilities out there that we just have to examine better. Building things ourselves is not always the best way to do it, and we have to examine - can we buy this system before we look at building it ourselves first. Again, we are looking at clustering IT resources, again, to not only standardize what we are doing, but also preserve local efficiencies.
“And then we need to really think about pieces that we’re missing in providing services across campus. We don’t do good quality assurance testing. We don’t understand how it fits into an overall architecture, we don’t understand what it means to do actually through a release process, so lots of times we end up with half-baked solutions or solutions that don’t meet the needs and requirements of our users, so our requirements collections or gathering is not sufficient. Then we have to think about an outsource management component as well. So there are functions that we just have to invest in as an institution.

“So timeline. We meet with our steering committee next week to flesh out all the recommendations across this set. We expect those recommendations to move to decisions in the May time frame by the President and the Provost. We are looking at at least initial changes happening in the next academic year, 2010 and ’11. Right now, we are focusing an awful lot in the way we are doing application and service development, understanding that, boy, we can’t rip out end user support without better processes and better technologies in place. The worst-case scenario is we change everything and your support goes into the tank, worse than it is now; so we have to really think about that. This is absolutely a multiyear process. We hope to have most of these recommendations and decisions completed in the first couple of years.

“There will indeed be a staff reduction that goes along with this. We are working through those numbers now and what that means. In an organizational institution this size, 800 feels heavy.”

Speaker Beer: “We do have some time for questions. Professor, wait for a microphone, please.”

Unidentified Speaker: “I was interested in your comment on outsource management. Are you talking about cloud computing and moving everything off-campus?”

Steve Schuster: “I can’t see moving everything off-campus, but it’s something we have to think about. Our cloud computing is either the infrastructure that is the cloud or applications that are the cloud, and we have a whole gamut in between all that. We have to think about that as a tool in our tool kit, as a piece of our solution and understand that we don’t necessarily have to build everything and house everything here. So that’s part of something that we absolutely have to examine. Obviously, thinking about data latencies and policy and compliance issues with legal issues, all those components have to be considered, but that’s absolutely a piece of what we are looking at.”

Unidentified Speaker: “Is there a cost reduction that you would see in terms of going to cloud computing, at least for part of the structure?”

Steve Schuster: “So the hype says yes, but we all know what hype means. There’s a lot of bundled costs in these cloud computing solutions, so it might look really cheap, as you think about moving applications up into the cloud. Where they get you is actually the bandwidth charges, as you access these, right. So we really have to examine what the hidden costs are there, we have to also have to understand what our service level agreements are with the vendors, and we can address all that through contractual needs; but the hard part also is how does that integrate in with our architecture, right.
“So if I start outsourcing or moving into the cloud, can I still use CU web log-in? Am I going to use different things? How does that work together? Because I don’t want it to appear to be multiple hops. We have to think about this as a cohesive environment for us. So yes, it is absolutely on the table and it’s absolutely something we are looking at.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the plaid shirt, with the blue jacket.”

Professor Carl Franck, Physics Department: “I would also say the problems I have had with computers, I always found the CIT help desk fantastic and saved me many times.

Steve Schuster: “I very seldom hear that. Thank you.”

Professor Franck: “One thing I would appreciate is knowing to what extent we could have a wireless campus. A lot of ways, when I go home, life is a lot easier in my wireless-routed house, and I’d sure appreciate it if we had that all over the place here.”

Steve Schuster: “Totally agree. I hope what you are seeing is an expansion of our wireless footprint. This takes time to roll out. The other thing I’m surprised I didn’t hear also -- maybe you are not in the situation -- the whole Ethernet project. This is all time and upgrade pieces. We know without a doubt -- a year ago, we were thinking of wireless as a supplemental network; that it really wasn’t a primary network. That has shifted. Wireless is actually, for many cases, our primary network and we are treating it that way, so I think you will see expansions as we go out with access points. We moved to Chantry, which is a phenomenally good product as well. So we have upgraded those pieces. So thank you for your compliment, too, for the help desk.”

Speaker Beer: “Senator Cohn?”

Professor Cohn: “Thanks for a very refreshing report. I am wondering what sources of information you are using for your end user support and, depending on the answer to that, have a couple suggestions for you.”

Steve Schuster: “So what sources we are using?”

Professor Cohn: “Where you are getting your information.”

Steve Schuster: “So we have been all over campus. Of the two primary teams -- and the two primary teams are the end user support one, and the development one. The development team caucused everyone on campus, everyone they could get a hold of, they get with Gartner, with other vendors, they chat with our peers multiple times, then they sat back and now let’s figure this out.

“They did exactly the opposite thing on the end user support. They sat down -- so the interesting thing is there was no CIT involvement on that end user support work group, zero. So they looked at it from really a college support perspective. We pulled from college people and said what are the challenges you are working with, then they went out and started trying those pieces.”

Professor Cohn: “So I would like to suggest the faculty, per se, have probably been under-pollled, and I’m just giving you a one data point: I have not been asked for input and I would absolutely not want my college level support IT people speaking for me about what my needs are, because there’s an enormous gap between what I wish my support were and
what I'm getting. And I would strongly encourage you to think of a direct mechanism that to poll the faculty -- as you have noted, CIT, there's been a mismatch where faculty are getting their support, what our needs are. I would suggest either making a very open invitation for us to provide input or actually doing some kind of survey and giving us, through a survey, a rather open-ended opportunity to give you input.”

Steve Schuster: “Your feedback is wholly accepted. As I mentioned, we will go through the requirements with -- we have collected that, kind of finished the design phase now. As we work through the implementation, there will be opportunity for more involvement and I will explicitly look and make sure -- Craig, did you have something to offer?”

Craig Higgins, CHE: “There is also faculty focus groups -- Craig Higgins, initiative manager for the IT group. There is a faculty focus groups formed across campus through the initiative coordination office under Paul Streeter that will solicit some of those things in a broad way. Just wanted to let you know about that too.”

Professor Cohn: “I really don't think that cuts it. Focus groups really under-attend to the range of concerns that people have. Some of our concerns are even at the level of the department or even sub-department, and I think you would be very wise to give us all the opportunity to give you as much input as we would like. And if you don't get much input, then that's a signal that it is not an issue at that level, but I really encourage you to let every faculty member in some form or another tell you about their concerns.

Steve Schuster: “I think that's fair.”

Speaker Beer: “Professor --?”

Peter Stein, Physics: “Peter Stein. I used to be in Physics. Now I'm a free agent. I have a couple of comments to make. One is that I want to second what my colleague Carl Franck said. I think the help desk is really good, really first-class. It is the best help I ever get over the telephone, talking to anybody, and I think that outsourcing, that would be a disaster. They are smart, they seem to know what they are talking about, the response is good. It's the best support I have gotten over the telephone that I can think of.”

Steve Schuster: “Thank you.”

Professor Stein: “The second thing I want to say is I have been working with computers for more years than you think computers have been around, and one of the things that I have heard consistently was something that I heard on the slide over there. Well, we have made a mistake. We used to write our own software; now the person's gone. We haven't gotten documentation for it and it doesn't work. We have a lot of patches going in and it is so complicated, nobody can fix it. We learned our lesson, we will buy commercial software packages in the future and let them maintain it. I have heard that many, many times in the past and, apparently, you haven't learned the lesson. It's -- well, I just wanted to comment on that.”

Steve Schuster: “I appreciate the comment. Let me clarify. We can't and will never be in a situation where we outsource everything. We have to, as much as we are looking at cloud computing, consider outsourcing as an option. I would say consider it and really
look at the cost benefit of doing so.

“The other thing, the failure to maintain our systems, the poor documentation has nothing to do with outsourcing, has everything to do with the way we develop and deploy services. I don't care whether they are outsourced by way of development and we integrate or we develop them here locally. We have to get better at our processes in documenting and making sure your systems are maintainable. I don't care who develops them. Those processes have to change or we'll end up in the same situation regardless, but I understand your point. We have to look at the suite of options available.

“There will be times we simply have to develop. Developing is expensive, not only in maintaining, but also meeting the requirements. When we develop our own systems, we believe that we can develop systems that meet sometimes our antiquated and terrible business processes that are inconsistent across campus, and it just reinforces what we are doing. Sometimes we just have to implement things. We have to consider that as an option. And I would say we have to consider it as a first option as opposed to just a final option.”

Professor Stein: “One more comment and a suggestion? One thing that I think you are missing is an agile front end on the web, when you go into CIT. When you want to find out things about the computer you have or office or anything like that, you just go into Google and start typing and you get an answer. And I think that we probably at Cornell have a series of problems like that; that if you could go into the Cornell web site and just talk to it, you know, just type in what your problem is with key words and have some kind of a program that found answers to that or found other things that people have found, that’s, I think, something we really need. I find that they never change the interface that you meet when you go onto it. Situations change, and the things you get on it are yes, we have a big problem now or something like that.”

Steve Schuster: “I agree, by the way. That is something you and I wholly agree on.”

Speaker Beer: “One more question from the left side of the hall.”

Professor Greg Poe, Applied Economics & Management. “You say you are going to standardize computers to choose three types. Have you considered the ways of funding computers? Because as we are doing it, I think we are very odd mix and match, as everyone gets the money here or there, and if you are going to standardize something, it implies you might actually provide funding for computers?”

Steve Schuster: “That was a little off the cuff there, but I’m thinking a good way of standardizing things is have central provision of these. Some schools do, and Cornell has historically not.

“Funding is something I try to stay away from, because it takes us down paths quickly. That would solve not only the problem, the challenge of standardization, it would also solve another problem that we sometimes have, and that is the belief that the computers at the institution purchased for us are our own. And we run into that quite a bit. So this belief that this computer that my institution has purchased for me is something that I own and I should be able to do anything I want to with it is a challenge
“There was something that I didn’t highlight on the slide, but I’m hoping you picked up. As we think about standardizing and managed desktop and really try to be more efficient, that doesn’t mean taking away things like administrative control and being able to install things. It means just managing things a little better. I don’t know how to address the financial aspect of it; but certainly, there has to be this belief that it is an institutional asset, it is institutional funds that pay for it -- I don’t know how to draw these lines because they are a little bit odd on where they are, but that’s certainly a possibility as we start looking at budget and funding models moving forward.”

Speaker Beer: “Is it a quickie?”

Professor Kathy Gleason, Landscape Architecture: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. Professor Gleason.”

Professor Gleason: “We had the opposite problem where we had budget cuts, told we had to buy our own computers. I found out I wouldn’t have support and the computer would essentially be for my departmental work.” Steve Schuster: “So, one, I’m surprised to hear that. Two, I’m disappointed to hear that. Prior to me leading CIT, I was the security officer here. So I worry very much about the Cornell work that we do on our personal machines. When Cornell owns the machines, we can put -- we stand a better chance of putting some rules around the use of those and what data we have on there and where the data are. When you own that, I really stand no chance of being able to set up those expectations, so that process worries me a little bit. I hope we don’t get to that situation. Could you send me an e-mail and let me know where you are? I would like to at least discuss what that means overall.”

Professor Gleason: “I am in a field that doesn’t -- there are not a lot of grants available in that field, so the assumption we buy on our grants doesn’t completely apply in our department.”

Steve Schuster: “I think through the IT governance council is exactly the mechanism to think about the institutional directions and some of the consequences of some of these funds and where we should just put a stake in the sand and say this isn’t the way to address our budget issues. So yeah, please.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Mr. Schuster, for a very enlightening report and discussion. I would like to now call on Associate Dean of the Faculty Fred Gouldin for a report from the nominations and elections committee.”

4. NOMINATIONS & ELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: “Thank you very much. So I’m basically going to give you a list of faculty that have agreed to serve on various committees for the faculty and also list the names of the committees that they will be serving on.

“So first, on Elections and Nomination, Nicholas van de Walle has agreed to serve a three-year term; Steve Sangren agreed to serve on FABIT, and that will be a three-year
term. For the Emergency Grant Fund Committee, Mike Walter has agreed to serve. Looks like his term of service is indefinite. He has my condolences.

“Then for the North Campus and College Town Council committee, my colleague in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Michel Louge is serving a three-year term. And the University Hearing Board, a number of faculty are serving there: David Galton, Dale Grossman, Jim Jenkins, Michel Louge, Porus Olpadwala and Deb Turnbull, Ralph Obendorf, and also Dean Fry indicated Katherine March would also serve on that committee. So that completes my report. I assume there are no questions.” Speaker Beer: “Thank you. It would be appropriate to hear a motion to accept the report.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “And is there a second?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Second.”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor of accepting the report from the Nominations and Elections Committee, please signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes.)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Abstentions?”

The report is accepted, without opposition and unanimously.”

Professor Gouldin: “Thank you very much.”

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: ”Like to now consider the minutes of the March meeting of the University Faculty Senate. I would like to indicate that there has been a correction to the minutes in the characterization of a vote that the speaker was in error in characterizing, and Professor Saunders pointed out that error, and the minutes have been corrected to indicate the correct characterization. So at this point, the minutes, as corrected, are open for approval. Any further corrections? If not, can we accept the corrected minutes without opposition?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Ayes.)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed, nay?

Abstentions?

“The minutes are approved unanimously. I would like to now call on the agenda, which involves a report from the University Faculty Committee. I am not certain who will be making that report.”

6. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Dave Lipsky, ILR: “I want to acknowledge Dean Fry’s assistance in preparing
the report. The UFC met with the leadership of the Board of Trustees on March 10 in the Statler Hotel. Chairman Peter Meinig was present, as well as Diana Daniel, Robert Katz, David Selznick and Jan Rock Zubrow, and chair of the executive committee and several other chairs of committees of the trustees were also present. Faculty trustee Rosemary Avery was also present.

“We discussed several critical issues, including the role of the trustees in the Reimagining Cornell process. The trustees indicated academic planning was firmly in the hands of both the university administration and the faculty. We discussed strategic planning for quite some time at that meeting. Another question was concerning Cornell interactions with Albany and with the State University of New York, particularly in view of the pending budget cuts for the contract colleges. The trustees were convinced that Cornell is doing as much as possible, they gave us every assurance that Cornell was doing as much as possible in terms of communicating with Albany and that appropriate channels of communication were through the office of the provost.

“On March 23, the UFC met with Provost Fuchs. That meeting also focused on strategic planning. We learned from the provost that the university is on track to make additional budget corrections. The provost explained the need for the reserve draw, essentially the tax on college and university reserves; and since that meeting, the additional budget corrections have been made public.

“On April 6, the UFC met with President Skorton. We meet twice a semester with the president and twice a semester with Provost Fuchs. A major topic of conversation with President Skorton was his role in the strategic planning process. The president assured the UFC that he was very much involved in that process and supported the process fully.

“Many changes have already been made, particularly in regard to the management of spending. The senior leadership of the university now receives monthly updates from Mary Opperman, the vice president for human resources, and from Joanne Destefano, the chief financial officer, concerning the status and future of Cornell employees, including reports about possible layoffs and reductions in force and our current budget situation. The information is also shared with the trustees on a monthly basis; thus, the senior leadership has a much better understanding of revenues, expenses and obligations currently than it has had in recent history. Trustees appreciate the activities and actions of the senior leadership; they also made that clear in the meeting that the trustees had with the UFC in March.

“The UFC is concerned about animal care and the infrastructure that supports animal care in research laboratories. We have urged Vice Provost Buhrman to appoint an advisory committee to make recommendations about the infrastructure for caring for animals and for evaluating protocols necessary in conducting animal research. And my colleagues and I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you might have.” Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Any questions for Professor Lipsky and the University Faculty Committee?

“Gentleman in the --.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. “I am wondering if you could
elaborate on the last point about animal care, where that’s coming from and what, if any, concerns there are, and why there’s an initiative.”

Professor Lipsky: “Probably not the best member to respond to that question, but I have colleagues here. Howie Howland, I think, can give you a good response.”

Professor Howland: “You may know that Michelle Bailey, who was director of care, has left, and there had been a large number of complaints about the way that proposals had to be submitted to the IACUC. A major complaint compliant was the sudden rise in per diems for vertebrate animals, which occurred in the summer. At that point, Senior Vice Provost Buhrman said he would appoint a committee in the fall of faculty and administrators to look at this and report back to the faculty. That committee was not formed in the fall, and the UFC met with him, I think at the end of the semester, and asked him please to do this. We were hoping that would occur before the appointment of a new director of care. Again, he said he’d do it in February, and that didn’t happen. So we very recently addressed a letter to him, pointing out that we thought this was really a very serious situation, and we really did want action on it. So that’s pretty much what that issue is about.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any other questions for Professor Lipsky or other members of UFC who may be present? Thank you very much. We'll move to the next item, remarks from the dean of the faculty, Bill Fry.”

7. UPDATE FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean Bill Fry, Dean of Faculty: “Thanks, Steve. I wanted to report on a few things that have been on my plate for some time, and a couple of these issues also have been on the plate for many of us, especially recently. I think many of us are concerned about academic integrity. We have heard some real horror stories about mass cheating and that sort of thing. It happens at Cornell; it is happening all over. There’s a tremendous amount of concern about what to do about it and sort of the culture of the lack of appropriate academic integrity. Seems like most of us want to correct the situation, but nobody really knows quite what to do about it, I should say.

“The Educational Policy Committee has been dealing with this for the entire year. That committee within the University Faculty sort of owns academic integrity. They have ideas of tweaking it; but so far, a real major overhaul has not yet occurred, but that’s what we are attempting to do and thinking about.

“One of the really nice features that will become available very soon is a website that will be on the University Faculty website, dealing with how to negotiate academic integrity within the university. That should be up very soon. It was developed by a group of persons from the Academic Integrity Hearing Boards, and it’s a really useful tool for both students and faculty to use. That will be available soon.

“I wanted to report also that there will be an electronic election in the next week or two that we will have elections for a trustee, for the UFC, for nominations elections and for at-large senators. There will be the OPUF amendment that we approved here on the ballot and also a referendum from University Assemblies.
“And the issue that has grabbed all of us is the student deaths, ten student deaths in this academic year, six by suicide and three just by the spring break. That’s a cluster of suicides which really is a contagion. The university responded very quickly, put fences on the bridges, as we have all heard about. And then in his April 5th editorial in "The Sun," David Skorton said that "I have asked the Vice President Susan Murphy, Provost Ken Fuchs and Bill Fry to coordinate in comprehensive examination of the student experience and to share with the community ideas and plans to support our students."

“So I would like suggestions as to what that means. I have had -- personally, I have had letters from faculty, from students, undergraduate and graduate students, from alumni and from parents, all concerned about it. It’s an issue that we do need to deal with. Cornell is known as a rigorous place. There is some stress. I am not willing to say that we are too rigorous and there’s too much stress, but we have that reputation. There are -- I think there are some issues we should look at; the classes, the grading system, our exams, approaches in scheduling exams. One faculty member said we should eliminate evening exams.

“And then I have also had several questions concerning the calendar. So Steve -- and the calendar is an issue that I had promised that we would investigate next year, and indeed we will. Next year is the first day in which Labor Day will be taken as a holiday, but also I would like us to take a very comprehensive look at the entire academic calendar, both fall and spring. In order to do this, it seems to me it needs to be largely faculty-driven. I am suggesting there should be four to six faculty members on a committee that would investigate the calendar; somebody from Student and Academic Services, at least one academic associate dean who deals with such things, representatives from the student assembly, the graduate student and professional student assembly, the university assembly, then we need to have liaison between Ithaca College and the local public schools.

“The provost and vice president for planning have promised we could have support in this endeavor. I think that’s really important, because this is not a trivial issue. It is going to be data-informed, it will be very important that we know what’s happening. “And so we have been promised support from Institutional Research and Planning to conduct this evaluation. So I think we can do a very credible job. That committee will be active in 2010 and 2011.

“The challenge to this committee is to create a calendar that’s cohesive, academically appropriate, that it has appropriate breaks, and hopefully -- and this is a significant challenge, Abby -- in synchrony with the area schools and avoids conflicts with IC. That’s a process that’s happening, and particularly on how we deal with the student experience, I would appreciate any suggestions that you might have. And Steve, I think that is my report. I would be happy to address any questions or to listen to comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Professor Cohn.”

Professor Cohn: “David mentions in the UFC report the audit budget corrections have now been made public. I have heard mention in passing of figures, but I haven’t seen anything sort of definitive, and I was wondering if you might be in a position to inform us
or update us about that process.”

Dean Fry: “I am in the position to ask Elmira Mangum, the Vice President for Budget and Planning. I think she can address that question very well. So Elmira—“

Elmira Mangum, Vice President for Budget and Planning: “Yes, the budget for fiscal year 2011, we are in the process of making the decisions and finalizing decisions. What we did at the beginning of this process was to try and restate what the Ithaca campus structural deficit is, and that is different from an operating, one-time expenditure reduction.

“Many of the actions that were taken this year, the 5% across the board was a permanent reduction, but there was also a drawdown from reserves. Those reserves clearly are one-time funds, and they were used to address long-term budget that the central university had for facilities and for buildings, et cetera; so what we are using those funds to do is pay down long-term debt to relieve the ongoing operating budget of 30 years worth of debt related to facility and other capital types of projects; but going forward in restating the deficit to begin fiscal year 2011, the campus budget for this fiscal year was budgeted to be almost $69 million in the red.

“And in order to address that, next fiscal year we have agreed with the Board of Trustees to take several actions. One was to reduce the endowment payout as an operating activity going forward, to try and reduce -- what we are going to try to do next year is reduce the ongoing expenditure budget, so that we can have a permanent corrective action and won't continue to have annual or create annual deficits over a period of time.

“Part of that -- so we'll address the entire $68.9 million, to try to take it down, but an action taken last year and this year as part of the budget reduction process included a staff retirement incentive. That staff retirement incentive was supposed to be implemented in a way that it would have a permanent impact on the budget. It didn't get implemented that way; so when I came, I found that it would reduce the expenditures for this year, so we had to load that back in next year as a permanent expenditure reduction.

“So the budget reduction for next year includes the $17 million that was supposed to come from the staff retirement incentive, it includes the $69 million that was coming from the budgeted annual deficit; but there are also a couple other things that are contributing to an ongoing operational deficit, which we are also going to address. And that includes -- we have a staff retirement -- a staff salary improvement program or salary improvement program that's been announced of 2%. When the budget estimates were made for next year, they were understated, so that's going to add an additional amount of permanent budget deficit that we need to cover.

“In addition to the fact that there are fees, tuition increases that were projected -- because we live on a projected budget -- and program fees, and they are not bringing in the resources that they had budgeted for and had expected for next year. So basically summarized, we are about $102 million structural deficit that we have to solve for, and the plan right now is to solve for about $72 million of it next year; and then the year following, we are hoping that some of the efficiency initiatives that we have gained -- that we should gain from the efficient work that's been done out of the Initiatives Coordination office, the Bains Consulting Group, to identify ways for us to save money
by delivering services more efficiently -- you hear about some of the actions the IT organization is going to try to take. There are procurement actions and contracts the campus is going to be involved in to create savings for everyone and structurally allow us to be able to reduce or spend over time.

“The one that's most important that's a part of next year's action that's been -- that you may have heard a lot about or -- I don't know if they have had a presentation on spans and layers, but the organizational one has to do with redefining the span of the organization of each one of the administrative layers and making them more -- deliver service more concisely and efficiently, and that's by contracting the number of employees designed to deliver different types of services. So this year’s budget will contribute about $20 million of these savings.

“The way we designed the budget reduction so far this year and where we are having hearings, we met with each of the deans to explain to them what the budget reduction would look like within their college. What we are doing is, rather than looking at the budget reduction as contract college, endowed college, in keeping with the theme that's going through Reimagining Cornell and trying to treat the university as one, what we are doing is looking at it in three different stratifications. We are looking at colleges and trying to treat academic instruction and research in the same manner and, in fact, for this particular strategy, we remove all of the sponsored program expenditures and activities, because they are variable and they vary across different faculty and schools.

“We said what's the base we have to deal with that's left and started to see how that would impact - how reducing that budget expenditure level would impact the colleges across the institution and try to make sure that they were treated and the impact would be similar across all the colleges. We provided for a little more of a budget reduction to academic support functions, because the idea here is to protect instruction. So the support functions such as career advising, the university libraries, career placement, campus life and some of the other activities that support the students and student experience on campus, we cut them just a little bit more; and then we took a look at administrative areas like the vice president's areas across the institution, facilities, the infrastructure, the plant and things like that. That is where the bulk of this reduction is going to come from.

“So the largest part of the reduction next year is going to come from the administration, administrative services, through trying to be more efficient in terms of delivery of services, and I think that's essentially the thing we are working with. Right now we are meeting with the vice presidents to talk to them about how this would impact their areas.

“The provost has provided an opportunity for each of the deans to come back to him, if they cannot absorb this reduction, or come back to him and explain the impacts of reduction on their particular part of the university. He is going to provide the same opportunity for the vice presidents and other administrative and support areas to come back and, during the next couple of weeks, we are hoping that we will be able to have a final budget that we can submit to the Board of Trustees in May, and we can have a budget going forward. So that's kind of where we are right now in the process.”

Speaker Beer: “Any further questions for Dean Fry? Gentleman on the aisle, on the left.”
Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Trivial question. You mentioned the e-mail election we are going to have. The last year was the first year I remember doing that. It didn’t say how many people we were voting for for each thing. It gave a list of names and said rank them. It didn’t say there’s two seats. So if you could fix it so it would do that, that would help.”

Dean Fry: “Thank you. We’ll fix it.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for one more question before we go to Good and Welfare. One more question?”

Professor Levitsky, Nutritional Sciences. “Going back to the suicide problem, two things: One is how does Cornell rate among other institutions? I have heard various rumors one way or the other on that. What are the data? And secondly, these suicide fences that have gone up, are they empirically derived, or are they promoted as a public display of Cornell doing something?”

Dean Fry: “My responses are from an ignorant person. I am clearly not an expert in this area, but from what I have heard is that physical barriers do make a difference, and there are -- I haven’t seen the data, but there are apparently credible data to support that. So yes, those physical barriers do prevent suicides, from what I have been told.

“And the first part of your question was, are we different from others. And suicides are really -- there’s a tremendous variance, but I heard Susan Murphy yesterday say that college is a tremendous mitigating factor in terms of suicides, so young people in college are less prone than those who are not in college. Cornell is apparently at about the national average for suicides. During the first part of this century, we were right at that national average. Then we had a period of about three years in which we had no suicides at all. And this year, we were clearly very different from that.

“They are always disturbing. I think what was particularly disturbing is this cluster of suicides just before bring break, and that really did concern people, that something had to happen to prevent or to break that sort of clustering; but from what I understand, we are probably about the average. Cornell suicides, if it’s off a bridge, are really spectacular, so that’s invisible.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. We will now move to the section of the agenda referred to as “Good and Welfare”. It’s a section under which any member of the faculty can address the senate on any area of concern. Our first speaker is Professor Harry Lawless, who will enlighten us on the matter of concern.”

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Harry Lawless: “Thank you. I am here to present or to inform you about a resolution from the CALS Faculty Senate which was passed unanimously last week. And do we have that on a PowerPoint slide?

“Okay, shall I read it? Thank you, Dean.

“This was penned by William Lesser from Applied Economics & Management, so I take no credit for this prose, but it was approved by all of us who are on the CALS Faculty
Senate. And it is in the spirit of transparency and engagement, and the basic idea is to have a mechanism by which the administration or the university will respond to recommendations from standing committees or other duly constituted bodies such as a faculty senate; there being no apparent mechanism for such response at the present time or at least no formal mechanism such as a web site or something like that.

“So it reads, “whereas all of Cornell University is undergoing a profound Reimagining process which requires the full informed commitment of all the university community” -- that’s the first whereas – “and whereas the organizational stewardship task force report emphasizes the importance of shared governance and collaborative decision-making with a commitment to open communication and transparency; recognizing that the feedback loop from faculty to the several levels of administration remain unclear to the extent that there is no evident mandate for an administration response to faculty standing committee resolutions and recommendations, nor is there a readily accessible source for follow up information on recommendations made and actions taken or not; and further recognizing that final decision-making authority at Cornell University reside with the Board of Trustees, the president and the deans and designees as delineated in the charter and other applicable documents; and moreover, recognizing that standing faculty committees decisions and recommendations are to be interpreted as recommendations to the university or college level administrators as indicated by the nature of the recommendations, then let it be -- here we go. Here’s the resolution -- resolved that when a standing committee, parentheses, such the CALS Faculty Senate, closed parentheses, makes a recommendation, the recipient individual or his, slash, her designee shall be required to send a formal response, in a timely manner, indicating whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part with a justification for the decision reached.

“The resolution continues in a second sentence, those explanations shall be added in a timely manner to a newly created web page for the university community to contain all committee recommendations submitted with the explanations of decisions made and justifications for those decisions.

“That is the original version from William Lesser that was approved unanimously by the CALS Faculty Senate on April 7. Since that time, Dean Fry pointed out to us the choice of verbs in the resolution were somewhat unfortunate, particularly the "shall be required to," insofar as the faculty cannot truly compel the administration to do anything, so Professor Howland suggested that the verb be changed to "should," so that "the recipient individual or his, slash, her, designee should send a formal response in a timely manner."

“And Dean Fry also pointed out the CALS Faculty Senate was not really a standing committee of the university, and so Professor Howland suggested a second change to when a representative faculty committee, parentheses, such as the faculty senate of the university or a college. And so that broadens that scope a bit, but I think captures the spirit of what was intended by the CALS senate.”

Speaker Beer: “Could you please describe what you intend with this resolution for the future.”
Professor Lawless: “We intend to present it then to the university faculty in its amended form for its first and second readings and hopefully its adoption.”

Speaker Beer: “At the May meeting?”

Professor Lawless: “At the May meeting. Thank you, Steve.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions? Senator Cohn.”

Professor Cohn: “As the Linguistic representative to this body, I feel it my responsibility to ask a semantic question, which is how to do you define “in a timely manner”? 

Professor Lawless: “Some of the CALS Faculty Senators also felt that that was vague, and I'm open to suggestions and amendments to that.”

Professor Walcott: “The University Assembly has the same provision in its charter and it requires that our recommendations go to the president and that he respond within 30 days. That’s just a suggestion.”

Professor Lawless: “Thank you, Professor Walcott.”

Speaker Beer: “Any further comments or questions on Professor Lawless’s concern? If not, thank you very much.

“We will now move to the second Good and Welfare issue, which will be presented by Professor Klaus Beyenbach. If you will hold that, please.”

Professor Klaus Beyenbach, Veterinary College: “Thank you, Dean Fry for the opportunity to speak in front of this group. I am Klaus Beyenbach, from the Department of Medical Sciences in the Veterinary College, and I want to talk to you about the suicides at Cornell.

“I am housed in the Veterinary College, and I'm a professor in the Veterinary College, but my teaching is exclusively to undergraduate students, and I have been teaching undergraduate students for 30 years. And with the students I have in my laboratory, I have about 20 undergraduate advisees; so with that experience, I believe to have a fairly good handle on what motivates and ails our undergraduate students.

“I am sure you must have given some thoughts why our students are compelled or driven to jump off bridges or to commit suicide in other fashions. And I wanted to share with you today my impressions of undergraduates, and my impressions are that many of them -- not all of them -- many of them are under too much pressure, and that this pressure is self-driven, self-imposed. I don't think it comes from us, but it appears to be peer pressure.

“I will give you some examples of the experiences I have collected during this semester. One student believes he should take and must take 22 credit hours, and I could not persuade him for taking less credits. I saw him two days ago, by accident, on campus, and he looked pale and gaunt and tired, and he had dropped down to 18 credits; but as an advisor, I had no power to prohibit the students from taking 22 credit hours.

“Another student in my class this semester is missing the 10:00 lecture. "Why," I ask her.
"I can't hear four alarm clocks."

"Why can't you hear four alarm clocks?"

"Well, I study until 5:00 every morning."

“Well, other students, next to their coursework, are taking undergraduate research, which is a major commitment; and for the first time -- that hasn't happened before -- they are also taking undergraduate teaching assistantships for four credits, five credits for research. And these are both major time commitments, on top of all the other responsibilities they are having. Why are some students now feeling compelled to do research and to be teaching assistants?

“And so often I get the impression that our undergraduate students, they are trying to be everything to everybody. Other students have a deep sense of social responsibility. They volunteer in the community, in the hospitals, in nursing homes, they work for Big Brothers, they go on fund drives, food fund drives, and they have that responsibility in addition to the primary purpose of really being here. Others, again, want to exhibit their leadership qualities and abilities, and they organize new interest groups, new clubs and so on, which again, is a big distraction from their education.

“Now, many of our students can handle multiple responsibilities; but coursework, research, scholarship, volunteering, athletics, and then not to forget many of our students are on work study, by themselves these may not be insurmountable pressure, but collectively, they may create a synergism that when a minor or benign problem comes up, that pushes them over the balance and to arrive at a catastrophic decision. “The suicide at Cornell is everybody's business, and I think it's primarily the faculty's business. I have great understanding for the University for putting up these awful fences at the bridges, because yes, we did have to do something quick, and immediately and visibly; but putting up the fences is only managing the problem. We must aim to cure the problem of suicide. I am not about to say that suicides can be cured, but I think we can do better than the national average.

“So on that note, I want to find out -- well, what is the faculty thinking about this? Do you agree with the experience that I have had? And what are we doing collectively as a faculty? What can we do in advising and in teaching to connect better with our students?

“I think we are all digitally connected, but personally isolated. And I think if we go back perhaps to some of these old-fashioned ways of taking your students in your office and sitting down for an hour or two and just talking and listening and hearing their concerns -- these students in this era, the students today, they are in an environment and atmosphere of political insecurity, of economic insecurity and physical insecurity. When we were students, we didn't have that. The United States was competent and generous -- [LAUGHTER]

“That is my experience -- competent, generous and confident. We are in a different era. These are the students we are getting, and the pressures they are now putting on themselves reflect some of these insecurities, and these insecurities turn into fears, and fears can turn into hopelessness. Thank you very much.”
Speaker Beer: “If you would like to hear some comment or --?”

Professor Beyenbach: “Definitely, yes.”

Speaker Beer: “We have several minutes for consideration of this very important issue that Professor van Beyenbach brings to us. Any comments or questions for him or on the issue? Gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor Clark: “So I guess I have had experiences similar to yours, where a student will decide, for whatever reason, that they have to do something, you know, that they have to take 22 credits or this is what's expected of them, and it's very difficult, as you said, to talk them out of that, to make them see that no, you don't have to do that. It isn't that way.

“So I think that's a real challenge. I am not sure how you get them to relax, how you get them to see that it's not all or nothing. There is something in between, and they will do just as well, if not better, by accepting that. That's the challenge that I have had.”

Professor Beyenbach: “I think it's a challenge that can be rather easily fixed, if the registrar doesn't allow students to take an excessive number of courses, but there may be also financial pressures for students to graduate in three and a half years rather than four; but I think moreover, it is part of a -- superhuman. Look at the resumes your undergraduates are sending to you. They seem so overstated of all the things they do and have done, and I think it's unrealistic.”

Speaker Beer: “The lady in the rear.”

Professor Rose Batt, ILR: “I think we can do things by having the kinds of conversations that you have suggested with our students. Obviously, we can't solve the problems of 15 to 20 years of students being pushed and pushed and pushed, to be the superstars, then they continue this kind of behavior, but we can certainly do whatever we can do.

“I have been really impressed by the mechanisms and the systems we have at the ILR School, whereby -- I don't know if it's every school has this or because Cornell is so decentralized we do things differently, but our office of student services, first of all, is very, very proactive.

“So the kinds of orientation, the kind of connections the students make with the Office of Student Services already is creating one body of people that they feel trust with, as well as trust with the faculty, and the Office of Student Services also asked the faculty to proactively, like in the mid-term, send them any names of students that we are worried about, and I have had -- I routinely have interactions where I catch some student who seems to be falling behind. I talk individually, and then the Student Services follows up. I think that kind of teamwork of having several points at which students can be caught and -- in a safety net is really the way to go; but I really think ILR does a fabulous job on that score.”

Professor Beyenbach: “Glad to hear it. Yes, we must be proactive about this. When we come to the point where we have to send students to counselors, I think it's already too late, and -- or counselors. I am not saying that that’s what you are doing, but we get encouraged to send students to counselors; but when I talk to the undergraduates, they
don't want to admit weaknesses, and that's how they look at it, if they seek counseling.

“So what you are doing, proactive from the very beginning, taking a personal interest in your students, that's what I hear you saying; I think, yes, we have to connect personally.”

Speaker Beer: “Former Dean of the Faculty Walcott.”

Professor Walcott: “Brief comment. I have found that in general, many of them are very busy and they don't come seeking my advice; whereas when we had the pin numbers that were required, it was a motivation, it was something that they had to come and see me to collect, and that at least gave me a contact once a semester where you could talk to a student.

“And now I have those that want to talk, and that's fine; but there are a substantial number that are too busy, don't get around to it and interact by e-mail. I think, again, by instituting some kind of system to encourage students to have contact with advisers might help very much.”

Professor Beyenbach: “Exactly. When we have gone over to this digital advising, I don't see the students anymore. I only see them when they graduate, and I have to sign off on having them fulfill the requirements. And then the students might feel that if I have to see my faculty advisor, well, they may not be comfortable with this. Perhaps it is a sign of weakness or so.”

Speaker Beer: “Final comment or question by Senator Vicki Meyers-Wallen.”

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Biomedical Sciences. “All the things you are saying are very good. We teach veterinary students, who are also under stress and financial difficulty. All the things you are saying are great; but if you are worried about suicide, then I think we have to look at suicide and ask the question, if we are going to treat this disease or prevent it, then we need to know what's causing it.

“Right now I don't know anybody in this room who really knows what's causing it, and I think the university is in a position, now that this is a problem, to use their professionals to talk to their families or whomever and find out really what is the background of the students, what are the things that might be causative. Certainly someone has an idea.

“With that kind of information, which is of course private, at least the university could give us some clues, some professional clues from professionals who know what they are doing, and say this is what we can do, as faculty, to treat that disease. So I would hope that the university is doing something like that.”

Professor Beyenbach: “Very well said, Vicki, and I think we, as a faculty -- we can do better in alleviating anxieties in our teaching, we can do better in our advising and in our encouraging and nurturing and enabling the careers of our students. And I think -- and I have no experience in that -- I think we may also do some improvements in admissions.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. We have reached the hour of our adjournment. Motion to adjourn is in order.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”
Speaker Beer: “All in favor, aye. (Ayes). Thank you very much.”
Meeting adjourned: 6:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
UPDATE ON COMPUTER
“DESKTOP” SUPPORT

Steve Schuster & Charlie Walcott

April 14, 2010
Discussion Topics

• Why is this activity important and what is the scope?
• Quick overview of Reimagining IT activities
• A slightly deeper dive into a couple of the activities
Importance and Scope

- Cornell has over 800 IT staff at an annual cost of around $78M with little planning or coordination of activities
  - Our processes are inconsistent
  - We invest in duplicative efforts that are not necessarily strategic
  - Community needs are often not being met
  - The community is generally unhappy with IT support or systems

- Scope
  - Limited to staff time and expenses not directly associated with sponsored funds
Significant Activities

• IT governance and decision making
  – Align IT investment with institutional direction and need
  – Creation of the IT Governance Council
    • Provost, CFO, CIO, Dean of CIS
• End user and desktop support
  – More later
• Academic computing
  – More later
• Application and service development
  – More later
• Data center needs
End User and Desktop Support

• Challenge
  – Can we optimize the ways we support Cornell users and maintain our computer systems while not being overly constraining?

• Emerging recommendations
  – Standardize on a smaller set of computers, operating systems and configurations
    • 1 -3 types of desktop, laptop and operating system
  – Update our technology and processes
    • Managed desktops – NOT controlling the desktop
    • Remote troubleshooting rather than IT staff dispatch
  – Cluster IT resources to preserve local efficiency and focus while ensuring sufficient talent and consistent process
  – Some faculty will have special IT needs that need to be supported
    • Sponsored research may need to pay for a higher level of service
Academic Computing

• Challenge
  – How do we build a strategy to better support the academic mission of the institution by identifying strategic investments and critical IT support for our faculty and students?

• Emerging recommendations
  – CUL, CTE, CIT and local units must more clearly define roles and responsibilities to eliminate duplication and confusion
    • Example: CUL takes more direct responsibility for frontend faculty support while CIT provides the infrastructure
  – Build an academic computing strategic plan to identify needs, goals, roles, investment and direction
Application and Service Development

• Challenge
  – How do we ensure our development investment is strategically aligned, optimally performed and sufficiently maintainable?

• Emerging recommendations
  – Move from a build-here-first approach to one of outsourcing or purchase
  – Cluster IT resources to preserve local efficiency and focus while ensuring sufficient talent and consistent process
  – Define consistent QA and requirements processes, architecture, release management, outsource management and etc.
Timeline

• Consideration by President and Provost in May
• Initial changes in place for 2010-11 academic year
  – Focus more on application development, while develop standards for end-user support
• Multi-year process, with goal of most changes completed in two years
NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS REPORT

Nominations & Elections Committee
  • Nicolas van de Walle (3 year term)

Fabit Committee
  • Steve Sangren (3 year term)

Emergency Grant Fund Committee
  • Mike Walter

North Campus/Collegetown Council Committee
  • Michel Louge (3 year term)
University Hearing Board (2 year term)

- David Galton
- Dale Grossman
- Jim Jenkins
- Michel Louge
- Porus Olpadwala
- Deb Turnbull
- Ralph Obendorf
Minutes from the May 12, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to call to order the University Faculty Senate meeting for May 2010. I would like to note that the clock on the wall may look beautiful, but it’s nonfunctional, but I will try to keep track of time with my atomic watch. I would like to remind the people present to please turn off their cell phones or silence them, and there will be no recording, graphically or with tape recorders, of the proceedings here. We ask that people who speak, please stand and identify yourself as to department or other administrative unit.”

“Since our parliamentarian Peter Stein is away this week, I have asked Mary Beth Norton to act as parliamentarian for the purposes of this meeting, and she’s graciously agreed to do so. So first item of business is a report from the Nomination and Elections Committee, being given by the associate dean of the faculty, Fred Gouldin. Fred?”

1. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary: “Good afternoon. My report is relatively short. First I want to report on the results of the faculty elections. So for faculty trustee, Nelson Hairston of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology has won that election. For Nominations and Elections Committee, S.K. Obendorf of Fiber Science and Apparel Design and John Sipple of Education. For the University Faculty Committee, Clare Fewtrell of Molecular Medicine; David Delchamps of Electrical and Computer Engineering; Don Hartill of Physics and Kent Goetz, Theater, Film and Dance.”

"Then the following are appointed by nominations and elections: Maria Fernandez is appointed an A.D. White professor at large; David Feldshuh of Theater, Film and Dance is also appointed an A.D. professor at large; and finally, Natalie Mahowald of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences.

“Finally, for the Library Board Committee, Mary Beth Norton has been appointed for -- my notes say here one more year; and Ileen DeVault has been appointed to replace Clete Daniel. That completes my report. “Any questions -- yes. The dean. I have been corrected. So these are not A.D. White professors, but rather faculty members that have been appointed to serve on that committee as members at large. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there a motion to accept the report? Thank you. All those in favor of accepting the report from the Nominations and Election Committee, signify by saying "aye."

(AYES)

Speaker Beer: Opposed, "nay"?

The report is accepted without question.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “Thank you. Without objection. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Next I would like to call on Professor Mary Beth Norton for a report on the Library Board.”
2. LIBRARY BOARD REPORT

Professor Norton: “Thanks. Just the explanation of my appointment for one more year to the Library Board, it was basically decided that since the unit library reviews have started and I have been chair, it would be easiest if I continued as chair for one more year, so that’s why I am being appointed for one more year. “

“On the Entomology Library issues, I’d say that in the last meeting of Library Board, we considered a report recommending the closing of the Entomology Library in Comstock Hall and moving of the books to Mann Library. I should say the initial report from the CALS administration and from the librarians was to close the library immediately or more or less immediately, sooner rather than later.

“There was a good deal of response from the faculty, input from students and faculty, and so we did not actually receive the report that called for it to be immediately closed. The report we received had been modified and amended after that report, and it called for the closing of the library after a one to two-year period of implementation.

“Basically, the problem is that to maintain the library in Comstock Hall would require a very large capital expenditure, which the CALS administration was unwilling to put out and which the Entomology Department could not fund on its own. So we agreed with the report, and there were many valuable possible things in it; for example, the much greater access to the Entomology collection, which currently is available for consultation only 40 hours a week, but movement to Mann Library means it can be consulted 104 hours a week. That is all the hours the Mann Library is open. The board unanimously accepted the recommendation that the Entomology library be closed as a separate unit and we recommended that to the librarian. She accepted our report, she recommended it to the provost, and the provost has already decided to implement that. So that is actually in place.

“I will say that one of the results of the input was that there will be digitization of the major reference works so that members of the Entomology faculty and graduate students and undergraduates can still consult the kinds of images that they need next to, shall we say insect specimens that were brought in, which was one of their major concerns, that those images that are now in reference books in the library would be moved over to Mann and would be separated from the insect collection itself. This seems to be able to be resolved by the use of extensive digitization. That is going to happen over the next one to two years, and this task force will be deciding what books need to be digitized. That can be done for about the same amount of money that it would cost to have a library staffed for that period of time.

“We have already received a preliminary report on the Engineering library. It is a unanimous report. We haven’t had a chance to talk about it yet, so I would prefer not to go into the details. We will be doing that. We will have two more meetings with the Library Board before everyone disperses for the summer. That’s the end of my report, but I’d be happy to answer questions. Should I say that Jeff Scott, the Chair of Entomology, and I and Anne Kenney all came to the UFC meeting to talk about the library situation.”

Speaker Beer: “We have a couple minutes, if there are questions for Professor
Norton. Could you wait for the microphone to arrive and then please stand, identify yourself as to name and department.”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology Department. “I have a question about the library’s policy on archiving. So when all this is moved over to Mann, do volumes have to be accessed on a -- with a certain frequency and, if not, are they then moved to some other distant storage?”

Professor Norton: “No. We were assured the Entomology volumes moved to Mann would stay in Mann; would not go to the annex, for example. I know there was a concern a lot of them would go to the annex. That is not true. We were told repeatedly there’s plenty of room in Mann Library to integrate the Entomology collection. And there’s no rule. The library doesn’t have a rule as to how many times things have to circulate or they have to go to the annex. That’s not part of the decision about what goes to the annex.”

Professor Calderone: “Thank you very much.”

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: “Thank you. I just had a question about the Engineering library. I am sorry you’re not at a position to tell us what happened.”

Professor Norton: “I guess I can tell you what the recommendation was.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “That would be nice.”

Professor Norton: “To close it. To keep it as a study space, but to move the books somewhere else.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “So then my question, it was a unanimous report and I would like to know, was it like the Entomology report that was first decided and then presented to the faculty, or was it a more.”

Professor Norton: “No. It was done unified from the beginning. The paperwork that we got, undergraduate, graduate students, faculty, librarians, everybody was involved in making the decision from the beginning.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “Thank you.”

Professor Norton: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Norton. I think we’ve been advised there’s a representative from the "Cornell Chronicle" here who would like to record the proceedings. This is a change in our rules, and it would require a two-thirds vote, affirmative vote by senators of the body in order to allow that, since one of our standing rules is there should be no recording. And photography. Just photography. Okay. Visual recording, shall we say. Okay. Okay, the photographer states he wants to take just a couple shots. I presume that would be especially of the dean of the faculty. That being said --”

(LAUGHTER)

“Is there any discussion on this issue? Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of suspending the rules to allow for visual recording of some of the proceedings of today’s
senate meeting, please signify by saying aye."

(AYES)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed, "nay"? Abstentions?"

“You are unanimously granted permission to photograph the proceeding. I now call on Professor at Large Abby Cohn to present a resolution on advising.”

3. RESOLUTION ON ADVISING

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “Hello. So at the very end of our last Senate meeting, Klaus Beyenback from Biomedical Sciences shared some concerns during Good and Welfare, and we then had a brief discussion about concerns. And the resolution that I’m presenting is something that I originally -- Kathy Gleason and I drafted and circulated to a number of bodies and got input; and then in its final form, we are happy to present this resolution, which has also been endorsed by a number of members of this body, as well as Klaus and a couple other people. So I wanted to give a little background how that discussion evolved, and then present what we think is just a very kind of simple resolution.

“Both Kathy and I were struck by the fact that in many ways, Klaus’s remarks, I think, resonated with us. And there are many, many issues that were raised in Klaus’s remarks, but one thing that came up was how we do undergraduate advising and whether we do or don’t have sufficiently effective tools to do that; and how we set those goals and expectations.

“And since that time -- Kathy is a member of the Student Mental Health Committee; is that correct? Council, okay -- consulted with some of the people in the administration who are very directly involved in these matters, and both Kathy and I consulted with associate deans in our respective colleges and we also met with Laura Brown, who is currently the voice provost for undergraduate education.

“And based on the ideas we had and the input we got, we’ve come up with this resolution. And let me go through the resolution and touch upon a couple points and then open it for discussion. So whereas the faculty are deeply concerned about recent events, both as events in and of themselves and as indications of how we are functioning as an educational community; whereas a critical part of the undergraduate experience is academic advising and the most effective advising takes place in face-to-face meetings at least once a semester; whereas recent changes resulted in faculty advisers not having a mechanism to compel advisees to visit them before pre-enrolling and before making other changes to their schedules, such as taking over-hours.

“Be it resolved the senate asks the vice provost for undergraduate education, working together with the university registrar and the associate deans for undergraduate education of each college, to establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising, including face-to-face meetings.

“So I would like to make a couple of brief comments. One is that it’s very clear to us -- and we hope this is reflected in the language -- that we don't anticipate there being a one-
size-fits-all solution that will work in every college. The idea is that we're hoping to bring both the administrators who are most centrally involved with these issues, the associate deans of the respective colleges, and faculty who are concerned to think about how do we establish or reestablish shared expectations with the porousness and flexibility for the specific solutions to be college-specific.

“In terms of mechanisms, one of the things that came up, and some of us bemoan and some of us think is great, is the fact we no longer have pin numbers. Some of us think, well, back in the good old days, I was able to see my advisees. Other people think, phew, I don’t have to use this antiquated program that wasn’t working.

“It is true that in PeopleSoft, there’s a mechanism where you can basically block your students out from pre-enrolling, but there are a couple issues here: One is, at least in Arts and Sciences, there are no set expectations now about how to use that tool. So it may be that we have tools available that we are not effectively using; but the other thing is my understanding is that that blocks students out completely. They can’t go in and play around with their schedule and kind of have something like a mocked up schedule to discuss with their advisor when they come in for a meeting.

“So what we are able to do with the current technology may or may not be exactly what we need, but the bottom line is much, much more basic: We do not want the technology to be driving how we decide and how we do advising. So what we want to do is foster a more substantive discussion about what our goals are collectively and how best to realize them.

“And I was very pleased in our meeting with Laura Brown to find out that she feels that she, in her monthly meetings with the associate deans, has already established a very effective conversation and put on the agenda for the fall the question of advising; so she’s very open to thinking about how do we draw more faculty input into that conversation.

“And she also made a very specific invitation. She would very much welcome specific suggestions from any of us about how to make advising more effective and also, for example, how to foster greater accessibility between the faculty and the students. So she would welcome e-mails starting now on any of those questions. So I think I’ll stop here.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Cohn. The resolution is now open for discussion. And following discussion, we’ll vote on the resolution as presented by Professor Cohn. Is there anyone who has a comment or would like to voice an opinion on the resolution as presented by the several people named at the bottom of the slide? “

WHEREAS the faculty are deeply concerned about recent events, both as events in and of themselves and as indications of how we are functioning as an educational community

WHEREAS a critical part of the undergraduate experience is academic advising and the most effective advising takes place in face to face meetings at least once a semester

WHEREAS recent changes have resulted in faculty advisors not having mechanisms to compel advisees to visit them before pre-enrolling and before making other changes to their schedules (such as takeover-hours)
BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Senate ask the vice provost for undergraduate education working together with the university registrar and the associate deans for undergraduate education of each college to establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising including face to face meetings. Submitted by: Klaus Werner Eric Cheyfitz Abby Cohn Jane Fajans Clare Fewtrell Kathy Gleason Ellis Loew Marilyn Migiel Satya Mohanty Elizabeth Sanders Michael Tomlan Shawkat Toorawa Charles Van Loan

Speaker Beer: “Are you ready for the vote? Okay. We'll vote on the resolution, which is on the screen before you. All those in favor, please signify by standing. Now, only senators may stand in this situation. We should have a count, yes, please. “Okay, those who stood for the resolution, please be seated. And those in opposition to the resolution, please stand. One gentleman -- are you a senator, sir? (LAUGHTER) “Only senators may stand to signify non-approval. “Any abstentions, please stand. One abstention. So the vote passes overwhelmingly by 60, 0, 1.”

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2010 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer. “So now we'll move on to consider the minutes of the April 2010 University Faculty Senate meeting. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes as distributed?

“Very good. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the April meeting, signify by saying "aye." (AYES). In opposition, "nay"? Abstentions?

“Unanimously approved.

“We'll now proceed to a discussion or presentation of student climate by Professor Murphy and Janet Corson-Rikert.”

5. REPORT FROM SUSAN MURPHY AND JANET CORSON-RIKERT REGARDING STUDENT CLIMATE

Vice President Susan Murphy: “Thank you very much, and I thank Dean Fry for the invitation for us come have a conversation with you today. Obviously, this year has been an extraordinary year for Cornell and an extraordinarily sad and difficult year with a total of ten student deaths since our opening weekend, six of which were by suicide; this following three-and-a-half years of no suicides among our undergraduate student body. And I will also say there were three nonstudent, students on leave who also died, who affected our community, because many of them still had close contacts with students here on the campus.

“So we have faced an extraordinary challenge. And you could imagine, as difficult as it was for any of us, quote, adults, for students of an age group who think they are invincible, it was particularly difficult. So I am delighted that Bill's given us a chance to come talk with you a bit about our whole approach and issues with the mental health and/or illness of our students, because suicide, frankly, is but the tip of the iceberg.

“What Dr. Corson-Rikert will do today, I hope, is give you a sense of what's happening at
Cornell, what's happening in the national scene, why this feels different than it did 20 or 30 years ago, it is indeed different, and then to invite conversation with you very much akin to the resolution that you just passed. President Skorton has asked Provost Fuchs and Dean Fry and me to lead a conversation with the campus around the student experience, and we are obviously looking at issues around student life. There are issues around the clinical services we provide students and issues related to the broader experience that our students have. And this is not a one-time conversation, but rather the beginning of a discussion.

“So with that, I would like to invite Janet Corson-Rikert forward. Janet serves as the Executive Director of the University Health Services, otherwise known as Gannett, for her to talk about our student mental health. Janet? Janet Corson-Rikert, Executive Director of University Health Services:

“Good afternoon. I am pleased to have been invited to talk with you today. As Susan says, this has been a very difficult year for Gannett and for the campus. Needless to say, at Gannett, we feel it particularly strongly, since our business is trying to take care of students, starting with H1N1 in the fall, through this crisis this spring. It has been extremely difficult, and each of these ten losses of our students has been absolutely devastating, so I’m pleased to be here and hope this will be part of an ongoing partnership with you as we all think together about what we can do to address, from a campus-wide point of view, the mental health of our students.

“So this graph you see here really depicts what’s happened in terms of our visits for counseling services since 1996, for the people who can’t see that from where you are, up to the current time. What that really shows is that we’ve seen almost a tripling of our demand for mental health services over that period of time. During that same period, we have also seen an increase in the acuity and complexity of the mental health problems we are seeing, so this has been an extremely challenging phenomenon for us to keep on top of.

“We have worked very hard with lots of support in the university administration to try to keep up with this. I think we’ve done pretty well in terms of emergency and urgent needs, where we are constantly challenged as in what we call routine concerns that are anything but for many of our students.

“We have overhauled our systems, our operations, we’ve added staff, we’ve done all kinds of things to try to get the students in who need to be seen; but by about mid-semester, we always start running into problems, no matter how many people we’ve added to our staff, where the number of intake appointments that we have to have doubles or triples, and the number of people that we need to refer into the community increases significantly, beyond those who are happy to do so to those who would much rather stay on campus.

“So why is this a concern? Our access here, as we know, is extremely important. We have data that suggests that risk of suicide decreases about six fold for students who are actually seen in counseling services. What I should add is this experience that you see here is not unique to Cornell. This is a trend that my colleagues are seeing all over the country. In fact, if you move to the next slide, we’ve seen now about 14% of the student
body in a given year in our mental health services. Some of our peers are seeing considerably more, just to flip those up. Doesn't mean they are all doing that, but what this just shows you is, I think, an idea of what the demand is for services, if you have the resources available.

“So this is something, frankly, that we have been aware of for a number of years. Harvard and MIT did major evaluations of mental health on campus after they had major crises several years ago and identified a target of about 18% penetration; we call it percentage of students using services. So we know we have probably a way to go in reaching the students who need to be seen.

“In fact, if you look at that graph, it shows the increase in demand. What that registers as much as anything is the increase in our staffing and the capacity of our staffing to see, so that if you added staff faster, that would be an even steeper slope.

“So we also know a little bit about, as Susan said, what's beneath the tip of the iceberg here for us, which is mental health functioning. Through survey, showing you some data here from the unrolled student survey of 2005, we can see that about 40% of students have really quite significant strugglings that they believe impact their academic functioning during the course of a year. We know from other data that about half of those probably have some kind of diagnosable mental health condition and, as you can see here, underrepresented minority. And I would add international students as well have an even higher burden of concern related to both societal and cultural issues and their adjustment to this place. This data is also replicated very closely by the National College Health Association data. Again, very consistent across different universities, across the country.

“So obviously, the most devastating end of the spectrum is suicide. What we know from surveys also, in this case the National College Health Assessment, is that about one in ten students seriously considered suicide over the course of the year, and about 1.3%, a little over 1%, actually attempt suicide. Again, that data is very consistent between schools, so we are not an outlier in that.

“As you are all aware, Cornell has a particular reputation relative to suicide. For many decades, students have referred to “gorging out”; the administration’s office dealt with questions regularly about a reputation for suicide that Cornell has. In fact, that reputation has not been founded in the data, if you look back over a decade or two of our statistics. We run about like the national average for higher education, which is about 7.5 to 8 suicides per 100,000 students per year. We would expect one to two suicides per year. We had been getting that.

“In fact, the three-and-a-half years leading up to this year were, in fact, very good years for us. We had no suicides, which was, I’m sure, the best stretch there’s been in a very long time; but unfortunately for us, our beautiful gorges provide a public mechanism for suicide, and the public suicides add a big challenge for us. Not only do they bring notoriety amongst our student body and amongst the students applying to colleges all over the country, they also add risk for contagion, which is the phenomenon of one person’s suicide being influenced by awareness of another suicide. If suicides are in the
privacy of home, overdoses or whatever, often we will not even hear they are suicides in
the general public. In this environment, everybody knows.

“And unfortunately, as you know, this spring, with a cluster we had with three suicides in
one month off bridges and gorge edges. We had what is called a cluster, which is three or
more suicides in a very short period of time. And a combination of the close cluster there
and the rapidly increasing communications technology, we had media, national media
coverage around this that we have never experienced as an institution before; and what
expert consultants tell us is we will never be the same really as a result of that, at least not
for a very long number of years, that the national reputation will follow us. If we have
another suicide, we'll have national attention to that again. So what that means is that our
student body, our community remain at higher risk for suicide as a result of that. “So
what are we doing about it? You are aware of barriers. I am not going to focus on that
one today -- and immediate means restriction -- but to talk about clinical services a little
bit. This is something, as you could see from that graph, we worked on very hard over
the last number of years. We have significantly increased our staff, we have worked hard
on the integration of medical and mental health services, because much higher
percentages of students seek help through medical services through a given year; so we
want to catch students wherever we can. ”

We do screening in all our medical visits for depression, so we have done a lot there; but
we also felt that was not sufficient, that we really need to think about the entire
community, including those students who are not coming to see us. ”

So what we started doing back about 2000, 2001, was we identified a couple of counseling
staff which we devoted full-time to actually working on a consultative basis, with advising
offices and with faculty and staff who were worried on the front lines about students that
aren't necessarily seeing us. ”

We also in 2004 started up the Council on Mental Health and Welfare that was just
mentioned here, which was an attempt to get together student leaders, student services
professionals and faculty to think together about sources of risk, how we might mitigate
that risk and increase support for vulnerable students on campus. And that work has
really led to some changes in collaboration with members of this group, undoubtedly,
around best practices for faculty in academic areas for identifying students in at-risk
times or demonstrating evidence of risk.”

We have also been working toward developing a really educated and caring community
here. And there are two different initiatives mentioned here: The notice and respond
effort, as we have developed with donor money, a DVD that runs through a scenario of
faculty dealing with a student evidently in distress, which we facilitate. “

Tim Marchell is one of our facilitators, and Greg Eells, so try to run through with faculty
members what some issues that come up and what some of the resources are that are
available to them, which has been very well-received. I think Tim has been to almost all
of the departments in Engineering now with very positive feedback. ”

Spear-headed by the student dean's office was developed a faculty handbook, which had
significant contributions from Gannett, from other student services professionals and
from many faculty talking about the best practices they have devised during their time teaching. And we have a copy of that here, if anybody would like to look at it later. ”

So we have been asked along the way what role do academic practices have in stress and in suicide in particular, and the answer, of course, is certainly they relate to stress; however, they are only one factor. The influence is really exerted in the context of internal and external factors, including individual make-up of a student, their mental health situation, their personality, the expectations they themselves have, their families have, the support that’s available to them, either personally or on campus. And those interacting factors can produce a varying level of stress here, but what is really relevant for all of you to remember is that when you are looking at those internal, environmental, external, contextual factors, at any given time in any of your classes, there are a significant percentage of students who are at that moment or chronically operating at a level of stress and vulnerability that requires very little to tip them into a more difficult condition. ”

So your opportunities really are in the areas of thinking about where does the stress need to be, where is it part of academic rigor and where is it really not adding value, but adding risk. And also, down in this lower area, we are focused on mental health support, and I hope we’ll be able to work a little more on the resilience issue, but the support area is very much a shared opportunity amongst us and you, and we hope we will have opportunities to continue to think about these issues. ”

We would welcome any comments or questions. We are involved in an ongoing conversation in response to the crisis of the spring. We took a number of immediate measures. We’ve also been looking at things to do up through June 4th, as we end this semester, and now we are on to some of the longer-term strategy. The advising resolution you passed is a partnership that’s a part of that.”

Speaker Beer: “We have about eight or ten minutes for questions and discussion following the presentation. Please wait for a microphone carried by Cindy or Karen.”

Professor John Weiss, History Department. “I am reaching a little to a presentation made to our department several years ago about this problem, and one of the things that was mentioned there was a connection between the alcoholism problem and the use of alcohol. And I recently have been involved and, in fact, looking at some solutions that have been proposed, including the one called the social norms approach, which apparently has not been really fully experimented with or attempted at Cornell yet; although, as far as I know, briefly. That is about it. ”

So I’m interested in knowing how the problem is being studied in the sense of the connection with alcoholism and alcohol use, which is a more general problem than one of mental health and suicide, and so are they in separate committees or are they regularly associated together? How does that work?”

Vice President Murphy: “Let me talk about the structure, John, then I would like Janet to talk about the medical aspect, or Tim Marchell. We do have a President’s Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs as well as the Council on Mental Health and Welfare. Both of those report to a group called the Executive Committee of Campus Health and Safety. So we try in that committee to pull together the issues. They are clearly related, and there
are a number of us that sit on both councils."

We, in fact, did use a social norms approach here, and I'll let Tim talk a little more about it. We know that alcohol can create impulsivity and we know suicide is related to impulsivity. So there continue to be a number of strategies coming this year."

Together, with the leadership of Tim and Kent Hubbell, we'll be looking in particular at trying to identify students who are in our first year residence halls presenting signs of dependence on alcohol in a more assertive way than we have done in the past. We are in partnership, conversations with the Greek system and changes we are asking them to make. We have changed our policies about notifying families related to alcohol and partnering with the judicial administrator, because that we know to make a difference; but perhaps Janet or Tim could say a word about how these are connected.”

Janet Corson-Rikert: “Let me say a quick word. I will pass this to Tim Marchell. Tim is our Director of Mental Health Initiatives, and we do include alcohol and other drugs under mental health; very much related and interactive, so I appreciate that question.”

Tim Marchell, Director of Mental Health, Gannett: “Our approach to alcohol problems, as part of our comprehensive approach to mental health, includes strategies that target individuals that are at high risk of both substance abuse problems and/or mental health problems. The social norms strategy, in a nutshell, is based on the finding that students often overestimate the amount of drinking that is done by their peers and that they may tend to conform to an imaginary peer group or peer norm. So correcting those misperceptions can be an effective strategy in reducing student drinking.”

What we have found is the most effective application of that is to use it in the context of our brief alcohol screening and intervention program with students that have been found in violation of the campus alcohol policy. So approximately 400 to 500 students a year go through that program called Basics. In that, we correct misperceptions, using data that we have collected, and that intervention overall has been shown to be effective in reducing high-risk drinking and negative consequence.”

And the social norms dimension of that is an important part of it; but we are also concerned about the students unable to moderate their drinking, so we are trying to identify students who have developed alcoholism or dependency on alcohol, depending on how you would term that, and those are students that we provide more intensive engagement with referrals to community resources and oftentimes leaves of absence because they are unable to enter into recovery while they are still students actively on campus. So they'll often get treatment and come back after a period of absence.”

Then we are also looking broadly at the overall climate on campus around alcohol, trying to examine access issues. The more access there is to alcohol, the more consumption and harm there. So we are looking at that, as well as working with our Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other questions for the experts on mental health? Lady near the front. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Mary Tabacchi, Hotel School. “I don't know if it's a question for you or a
question for my colleagues. I find that some of my students that struggle the most with what appears to be mental health issues are people who can’t seem to plan, so that at exam time or close to the end of the semester or mid-term, these tendencies to be really emotionally upset happen then. ”

And I don’t know if there’s something we could do as a faculty or some suggestion you have for us to help students -- I mean, you can’t make them plan. I mean, but planning and time management is a big issue here, and I don’t know how to address it. Maybe someone else does.”

Vice President Murphy: “I would just support some of what you are saying, Mary. I think we do know the time management aspect of students, students who don’t succeed here are those -- not because they are uncapable, unless we have an illness that sets in, but because they frankly haven’t learned how to study or don’t know how to plan their time. So this is a good reminder for us, as we partner with our colleagues in learning strategy centers and the TADCON center, what we may do to enhance our time.”

Janet Corson-Rickert: “I might just add to that, we really don’t know all the answers to why we are seeing so many more students really requesting mental health services. Part of it is clearly the decrease in stigma associated with getting mental health care and part of it is related, I think, to the better medications that now allow students who never would have made it here before to be here. ”

So we’ve got a much more diverse student body relative to health now than we have had before, just like we have more diversity in race and ethnicity. So that has implications; but I also wanted to add that technology and what part that has in the stress of our students, and probably you too -- it affects me -- the pace at which we communicate with each other, the turn-around that’s expected, the amount of time these students spend communicating with each other and being distracted by communication is something that really needs more research done on, I believe, in relation to what we are seeing on college campuses. So if any of you are interested in that topic, we’d love to partner with you.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on. Thank you very much for your presentation and the response. I would like to now call on David Delchamps for a report from the Educational College Policy Committee on Academic Integrity.”

6. REPORT FROM EPC (ACADEMIC INTEGRITY)

Professor David Delchamps: “Okay. I’m reporting for the Educational Policy Committee. We had a great group this year and had some really good discussions about academic integrity. And what I want to talk about today is just the very edge of the iceberg, not maybe the tip, but the edge, one facet of it. ”

There are all kinds of different academic integrity issues. There is the code, there’s students’ knowledge of the code, faculty knowledge of the code, reluctance to proceed, all that sort of thing. I want to talk about one thing. I want to talk about plagiarism and specifically about plagiarism detection software. And what I’m trying to do by bringing this up is to get reactions from you folks, get buy-in or for you to bring up things we
haven't thought about, before we decide whether to move forward.

So let me give you background. Obviously, plagiarism is a huge problem. Last year in one department, in the Arts College, for example, 15% of their honors graduates lost their departmental honors because they were found guilty of plagiarism. Fifteen percent in a very large arts department. Now, that's pretty disturbing, and lots of other places, where people write papers. I'm not talking about problem sets and stuff in engineering, but papers, plagiarism is a problem.

So there exists plagiarism detection software out there. There's one particular package, one particular company who are essentially the elephant in the room, and they are called Turnitin. I believe the Johnson School uses it now. Last fall, EPC had some preliminary information that people had talked on FABIT, the Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology, about Turnitin. There were lingering legal issues of various kinds about copyright on student papers submitted to Turnitin, to see if they plagiarized about personally identifying information.

Apparently, these issues have been resolved to the satisfaction of University Counsel, so the question arises as to whether Cornell should proceed with making Turnitin more widely available to faculty to use. No one's talking about forcing you to use it. So the EPC invited Evan Cooch from Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology, who happens to be here today, to our April meeting, and he gave what I thought was a very convincing presentation about Turnitin; convincing in the sense it convinced me and other members of EPC it was probably a good idea to move ahead on this.

What move ahead means is essentially get an ad hoc group together to scope it out, figure out the devilish details we have to resolve; for example, students signing waiver forms, et cetera, and does everyone have to sign the waiver. It's going to cost a lot of money to the University; and therefore, we want to make sure there's faculty buy-in on this; people are actually going to use it -- it does dovetail seamlessly with Blackboard, at least that's my understanding -- and whether faculty are going to use it, whether faculty favor going ahead with this and, I think, a strong statement from the faculty, they probably think it is a good idea to have it in place is what we'll need to enable this project not to be reimagined preemptively, if you know what I mean. Is that a good phrase, Susan?

(LAUGHTER)

Okay. Now, Turnitin -- plagiarism is not a laughing matter. Turnitin is an enforcement tool, but not just an enforcement tool and it is not just a deterrent tool. We think there's possibly a learning side to this. Students could actually learn a little more about what plagiarism is. What is plagiarism in the 21st Century? A lot of students don't really know.

I read an article in “The Sun” where a student participating in a project called The Art Collider referred to “this digital age where there's no authorship to anything.”

Okay, now, whether students think that, really think it in a rational way, I don't know. I would bet that fairly few do, but they have grown up in an atmosphere where that's the case, authors are dead, we are text flow free. And I think having them learn that
authorship is not dead is something we could get out of this. ”

Evan is here to answer your technical questions. He is the, as he puts it, the computer wienie in the audience. So what do you think about this? Do people have comments or “over my dead body,” or “yes, we should go ahead”?

Speaker Beer: “We have four or five minutes to deal with this matter. Karen, could you come to Professor Cohn?”

Professor Cohn: “Briefly, Cornell had subscribed to Turnitin when Isaac Kramnick was Vice Provost. Lynne Abel and I were involved in the conversation. He said, ”Oh, let’s sign up.” And it got canceled because university counsel objected. ”

So I’m glad to hear those objections are no longer there, but if I’m remembering correctly, the way -- it sort of does two things that we can’t do with just a Google search. Everything that gets submitted to it becomes part of the database that we then have access to, and I assume the confidentiality issues and copyright issues have to do with how those mechanisms were done; but I am assuming that’s still the case and I think it’s important for people to realize that. We are asking our students to submit their work and make it become part of this collective database that we also then benefit from. ”

The other thing that I think it was supposed to be able to do was that it accessed the deep web in a way that we can’t, by having access to various paper mills and so on that we don’t have access to. So if you wanted to comment on those points.”

Professor Delchamps: “I believe both the things you said are correct. Evan? Is that -- was Abby stating things accurately?”

Professor Evan Cooch, Natural Resources: “Yeah, I mean, both those points have been addressed. I mean, everybody in this room appreciates the speed with which technology is developing, so even experiences a few years ago with Turnitin probably doesn’t entirely condition our thinking about it right now. The technology in terms of that system, plus also the ability of students to do things is changing extremely rapidly. ”

So to deal with the two points you raised, my understanding in the conversations that we have had -- and we, being the FABIT, the Faculty Advisory Board on IT, with counsel’s office -- that most of the issues that were of concern with Turnitin and equivalent kind of companies have either been dealt with or are likely to be surmountable. And I don’t pretend to understand all the nuances of legalese that counsel’s office has to delve into, but their basic view is that it’s all workable; we can make this happen at Cornell and we wouldn’t get in any trouble and that, by and large, any specific nuances for certain kinds of courses like what do you do for required courses if a student refuses and so on could be dealt with. ”

The technical thing you mentioned in your second point is really the value added with Turnitin. There’s no way that we, as individual faculty, are going to be able to take individual papers, even if they are electronic, and we’re able to cut and paste and search and do what Turnitin or equivalent companies can do. They can do the Google search, but they can also access the repository of all these paper mills that are out there. ”
And the challenge with Turnitin -- and I think David alluded to this -- you have to decide as a faculty, if you choose for your course to implement it, what do you mean by plagiarism? How many words in a sentence have to match before you want the red flag to be ticked? I mean, this is a complex conceptual and pedagogical issue. There are technological solutions, but by tuning the software one way or another, I could catch everyone or catch nobody. So how this gets implemented for individual courses or departments or whatever granular level you want to get to is really what would need to be evaluated in some kind of scoping. 

I think the issue David is addressing in principle; is this something the University should pursue, before we get down to the weeds and how do you implement it and some of the subtleties that are important, but maybe something that are better left until the scoping phase.”

Speaker Beer: “We have time for a brief question from Professor Walcott. “

Emeritus Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior. “There are two ways of using this system. One way, as a faculty member, you simply run all the paper you get through it, and that becomes kind of the professor making the judgment. Another way to use it, which I learned about from a high school teacher who was here for a conference a while back, is to ask your students to submit their papers to Turnitin and give them to you, already labeled by Turnitin and marked as to whether there’s any plagiarism there. That has the great virtue of being an educational experience, rather than just a punitive experience. So there are these two possibilities, and I think it’s a very powerful tool which should be explored.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I think we have to move on.”

Professor Delchamps: “Can I say one more thing? If you want to weigh in on this one way or the other and you didn't have a chance to speak, please feel free to e-mail me at dfd1@cornell.edu.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. So we'll move on to Professor Carl Franck, to present a resolution on academic integrity.”

7. **RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (STATEMENT ON CORNELL APPLICATION FORMS)**

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Thank you very much. I would like to preface my remarks by explaining that the action of bringing this resolution to you in the senate has been in coordination with parallel activity in the Cornell Office of Undergraduate Admissions. This morning, Assistant Dean Arthur Smith raised the proposal we are considering with the representatives of the administrative offices of the various colleges, as well as Jason Locke, who has overall responsibility for Cornell applications, and Doris Davis, Associate Provost for Admissions and Enrollment. “They returned with support for a modified version of our proposal. At least two of our resolution sponsors and I regard their modification as a significant improvement of our proposal. The modification is as follows: rather than propose that the question our resolution poses be placed in Cornell applications, it be posed to students who have been accepted to
Cornell. “Before moving the resolution be so amended, I first introduce the resolution as it currently stands. We sponsoring senators from across the university propose Cornell should include the following question as part of applications to its undergraduate colleges: If you attend Cornell, do you agree to abide by Cornell’s code of academic integrity? ”

What is the AI code? The code says students are expected to never misrepresent the work of others as their own and not to assist another student in doing so. What is the problem with academic integrity at Cornell? Aside from the damage that is done in the form of dishonesty and intellectual theft, the suspicion that students can be cheaters promotes distrust and disrespect in student-teacher relationships, and instructors are deflected from what they came to Cornell to do in order to foil cheating and prosecute academic integrity violation cases. ”

Why do we have such problems? I believe this is partly due to a lack of awareness of AI. In my college, Arts and Sciences, students are introduced to the code in their weekend of orientation in a whirlwind of competing information. We have students that are missed who, at their core, are dishonest. ”

How does the resolution address the issue? By asking students in their applications whether they would follow the AI code, we are alerting them to the code itself. We are saying it helps define what it means to be a student at Cornell. So suppose an applicant doesn’t support the code, but checks the box indicating they do? I’m hoping they will ask the question, do I really want to attend a school that puts this much emphasis on academic integrity. On the other hand, the question might well encourage many more students to think more positively of Cornell. ”

This is our core idea, an effort to re-brand Cornell; however, some of you might object, as a faculty member in my department, David Mermin, did strenuously, that to ask such a question would treat the students like children and potentially chase away top students we wish to recruit. I think that our code is excellent and one worthy of respect by our students. ”

I wish we didn’t have to ask this question, but our circumstances demand it. A petition drive in support of such a question on applications has had very strong support in my department. 13 faculty and 17 graduate students signed it. A number mentioned the pride they feel over the AI system they experienced as students in contrast to their frustration over AI as teachers here. ”

We, the sponsors of this resolution, feel it is an important issue for us to consider in this university-wide body. We do it in parallel with Arts and Sciences Dean Arthur Smith’s effort within the Committee of Admission Deans from across the university to introduce such a question as part of the matriculation process for the 2011-2012 academic year. ”

We heartily look forward to your insights into this matter, especially those that result from the reactions that you receive from your various departments.”

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity.
Whereas, violations of the Code reduce the intellectual vitality of the University by deflecting instructors away from teaching and sow distrust in teacher-student relationships. (For example, Robert Lieberman, a Senior Lecturer in Physics, recalls that as an undergraduate here in 1958, exams were not necessarily proctored—that is, a proctor was free to step out of the exam room. By contrast, instructors now need to watch students take exams after checking their identity.)

Whereas, in an effort to strengthen academic integrity at Cornell, the following proposed resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider has emerged from discussions with the office of advising and admissions of the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty and graduate students of the Physics Department.

Therefore, The Senate resolves that the following question should be added to the application forms for Cornell’s various undergraduate degree programs:

If you attend Cornell do you agree to abide by Cornell’s Code of Academic Integrity as given at: http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html?

Submitted by:


Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much for introducing the resolution, which is now open for discussion. The gentleman close to the middle. One moment for the microphone, please.”

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. “While I agree with the sentiments of motion, I don’t think the wording is appropriate in that you are setting up a phony question; you are going to have to give the students an answer yes or no. It is obvious that no one will answer no. I think it’s so disingenuous to ask the question. I know that proposing amendments is not in order, but let me say that the people who are going to implement this, if it is passed, I hope they would use alternative wording such as “in submitting this application, I agree to abide by the code of academic integrity.”

Professor Franck: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman near the front.”

Professor Dick Durst, CAPE: “Dick Durst, CAPE. I think it’s unrealistic to think that a student who does not have integrity is going to be bothered by this kind of a statement. (LAUGHTER)”

So I mean, they are quite willing to say oh, I will abide by it, but knowing in the back of their mind if there’s a way I can get around it, I will.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other -- would the mover like --.”

Professor Franck: “Just to respond, the effort here is to distinguish Cornell from other schools in that respect.”
Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any other points to be made? Are we ready to consider the question? Professor Cohn, in the front.”

Professor Cohn: “I guess I’m still sort of confused. I’m confused by what the next steps would be. And you also alluded to the fact there had been a proposed revision to this, so I’m not quite sure what I’m voting on, not knowing what’s coming next.”

Professor Franck: “It is my hope that we’ll be able to do, as I have done in physics, and canvass our department, find their opinion on this. In the way of amendment that would reflect this very strong encouragement we have just gotten from the various representatives of admissions departments, I would argue that we’ll come back with a revised, amended resolution that would reflect their opinion as to what would be practical. Mainly, this would be something to be asked as a question to be asked before matriculation at Cornell. You have been accepted to Cornell. Do you agree to this. Goes in with do you agree to pay your bills.”

Speaker Beer: “The speaker wishes to clarify the situation a bit. I don’t think the senate has the power to compel a change on the application. We might recommend to those in charge of writing the applications to include the question that the movers suggest.”

Professor Cohn: “So I’m really having trouble figuring out what it means for me to vote yes or no or abstain.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Department of Communication. “This is a very quick one. So part of benefit of this is that the link is in there in the application and it might encourage people to read it. I just wonder if the application has that somewhere, where there’s sort of encouragement to read. I like the statement version, but I could see value in having a special place to say there’s a value to looking at this; but I don’t know if it has that somewhere already, here’s our code, if you want to read it, click on this link.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: In the American Indian program. I would like to make a motion we table this until the fall. Speaker Beer: “So the motion has been made to essentially postpone consideration of this motion until the first meeting in the fall semester. This is a non-debatable motion; and therefore, we will now vote. In order to pass, this vote requires a majority of the senators voting to vote affirmatively and then the motion will be tabled.”

Professor Norton: “I believe a motion like this would require a second.”

Speaker Beer: “One moment, please. A question on parliamentary procedure from the associate dean.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Second the motion.”

Speaker Beer: “Motion has been seconded. You still have a question? Parliamentarian, would you --.”

Professor Norton: “Motion to postpone is debatable.”

Speaker Beer: “As the speaker understood the motion, it’s to postpone to the next meeting, which will be in September.”
Professor Norton: “Postpone to a certain time. What’s undebatable is if you are laying it on the table.”

Speaker Beer: “So considering the ruling of the parliamentarian, we can debate this for a few moments. We don’t have many moments.”

Professor Norton: “The chair interpreted it as a motion to postpone indefinitely.”

Speaker Beer: “I believe the mover suggested to postpone it until the fall. Is that incorrect?”

Professor Cohn: “He said table it.”

Speaker Beer: “So is your intention to kill the motion? For the purpose of killing it?

Unidentified Speaker: “No. For the purpose of putting it on the table –”

Speaker Beer: “If the motion is tabled, it can come off the table at the next meeting. Okay. So all those in favor -- parliamentarian, may I call for a vote on tabling the motion?”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor of tabling the motion, please stand. Senators only. Okay, those wishing not to table the motion, please stand. Those abstaining from the vote to table? So the vote is overwhelmingly to table.”

Dean Fry: “43 to table, 4 no’s and 4 abstentions.”

Speaker Beer: “42, 4, 4. The motion is tabled. We will now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a resolution to be presented by Professor Lawless.”

8. RESOLUTION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS

Professor Harry Lawless, Food Science: Thank you. This is a updated version of a resolution that was passed by the CALS Faculty Senate two months ago and was penned originally by Professor William Lesser from AEM, and it was written in the spirit of encouraging communication and transparency, which is like home, mom and apple pie -- we all like those -- and perhaps to discourage this administration or future administrations from using what might be termed a pocket veto or what my lawyer likes to refer to as letting something whither on the vine, and also to encourage a public response. Resolution:

WHEREAS all of Cornell University is undergoing a profound reimagining process which requires the full informed commitment of all the University community, and

WHEREAS the Organizational Stewardship Task Force report emphasizes the importance of shared governance and collaborative decision making with a commitment to open communication and transparency, and

RECOGNIZING that the feedback loop from faculty to the several levels of administration remain unclear to the extent that there is no evident mandate for an administration response to faculty standing committee resolutions and recommendations nor is there a readily accessible source for follow-up information on recommendations made and actions
taken or not, and further

RECOGNIZING that final decision making authority at Cornell University resides with the Board of Trustees, the President, the Provost and the deans and their designees as delineated in the University charter and other applicable documents, and moreover

RECOGNIZING that standing faculty committees’ decisions and recommendations are to be interpreted as recommendations to University or college level administrators as indicated by the nature of the recommendation, then let it be

RESOLVED that when a representative faculty committee (such as the Faculty Senate of the University or a College) makes a recommendation they will identify the recipient who is expected to respond (such as the official who constituted a committee). The recipient individual or his/her designee should send a formal response within 30 days indicating whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part, with a justification for the decision reached. The recommendations, responses and explanations should be posted within 30 days to a newly-created web page accessible by the university community to contain all committee recommendations submitted, together with the decisions made and justifications for those decisions. Sponsors: Harry Lawless, Elizabeth Earle, Tim Mount, Robert Masson, Greg Poe

“And so I’m not going to bother to read this, since you are all literate, but I will read the resolved, that when a representative faculty committee such as the faculty senate of the university or college makes a recommendation, they will identify the recipient -- now, that’s kind of a new addition, under the suggestion of the president and provost as communicated to me by the dean of the faculty; is that correct? And they felt that was important for good communication -- who is expected to respond, such as the official constituted committee, the recipient individual or his/her designee should send a formal response within 30 days -- that was the second suggestion made at the last faculty senate meeting to make a specific time period -- indicating whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part, with a justification for the decision.”

“The recommendations, responses and explanation should be posted within 30 days to a newly created web page accessible by the unit community to contain all recommendations submitted together with justifications for those decisions. And so without further commentary, I will entertain questions or discussion.”

Speaker Beer: “Resolution is now open for discussion. Any comments for support or non-support? The gentleman --.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “I support the motion, and I think the president and provost support the motion. I think there’s great agreement on this, that when the university is contacted and when it’s contacted specifically not in vague terms, that the university administration should respond, and this is a well-thought-out motion that will get us that.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Just to be fair, is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition to the resolution? Yes, there's --.

Professor Michael Todd, Operations Research and Information Engineering. “Not really in opposition. I am just sort of wondering how we define what the representative faculty committee is. Presumably, this does not include tenured committees and so forth, so I'm not sure how to make it clear that this is sort of policy-type decisions or recommendations to the administration, rather than internal things.”

Professor Lawless: “We have, in fact, struggled with that definition, and the current wording has been something of a modification from the original, which identified the faculty senate as a standing committee, which it really isn't. I suppose that we could have further clarification of that, if someone is a better wordsmith than the current contributors.”

The idea was that if someone constitutes a committee, like ad hoc committee to look into drilling of the Marcellus Shale on Cornell property, that such committee would make recommendations that would then engender a response. And this is merely communicating to the administration that the faculty, as a body, has an expectation that they will respond and do so publicly with some degree of justification for their decisions.

Speaker Beer: “Any comments? The gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “I think this is excellent, and I realize and recognize the climate that's generated this kind of recommendation, but I think the previous speaker’s comment is important.

“Representative faculty committee” is just too vague. I serve on a confidential faculty committee, and there's no way -- the language as stated would compel that committee to -- compel the provost to disclose his decisions and that just would not work, so I don't think it's a question of wordsmith. I think it's a question of coming up with language that describes the committee that you mean and excludes the committees that couldn't be included, such as tenure and other confidential committees; but I support it completely, except that it needs to be stated more clearly.”

Professor Lawless: “I would just like to perhaps argue with the verb "compel." We did change the wording from the verb "must" to "should," indicating that we recognize that the faculty cannot compel the administration to do anything. Professor Lesser is in the rear; and would you care to comment, sir?”

Professor Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management. “Thank you, Harry, for presenting this. The intent of using the word "representative" in this instance was to refer to committees in which the bodies present there represent a larger identified group around the university, whether it be your departments as you are formally elected; others are appointed by departments or schools or groups of that nature.”

I think if we are talking about ad hoc tenure committees and so on, I think the individuals, although they may represent the broader university community, don't necessarily respond to represent any particular group within the university, and that's the intent. However, if we wish to modify it by saying something to the effect that as long as
it doesn’t deal with confidentiality issues, perhaps that would help clarify the matter. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on. Are you ready for the vote?”

Professor Lesser: “One more question.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department. “You could put in when a representative faculty committee not bound by rules of confidentiality, for example, the gentleman in the back suggested, and that would seem so cover the issue.”

I also wanted to add this was a recommendation made by the governance committee, to have specific responses from the university administration to resolutions. Specifically we were talking about faculty senate; but obviously, it could extend itself to college, certain college bodies, but I think it’s that proviso about confidentiality were added, that would do the thick.”

Speaker Beer: “The last speaker suggests an amendment, which would be substantive, and that is not in order; so in order to include such an amendment, it would be appropriate to send a resolution to a committee for reconfiguration for consideration later. So I think at this point.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Since there seems to be some problem with the language, can we move to table this, and then.”

Speaker Beer: “Yes.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “That seems to be my job today, doesn’t it?”

(LAUGHTER)

“If there’s anything else that wants to be tabled, I’m here to handle it.”

Speaker Beer: “You are moving to table?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Yeah, then we can modify it appropriately.”

Speaker Beer: “The resolution has been tabled and seconded? Okay, all those in favor of tabling this resolution, please signify by saying "aye." (AYES) Opposed, "nay"? Abstentions? Aye?”

The motion to table clearly carries. So we now have two tabled motions to consider next year. Now we’ll move on to the report of the Committee On Academic Programs and Policy, being given by Thomas Cleland.”

9. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Professor Thomas Cleland, Psychology: “Thank you. So I’m here representing -- representing the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies of this body. We were asked last December to review the procedures of the Biology Curriculum Transition Committee, which was charged with implementing large-scale changes in the curriculum within the major and extending out into the services and coursework provided by biology
to other colleges and departments. Because it is inherently cross-college, its falls within our committee's purview, so our committee in response to this charge, we interviewed the chairs of these committees and also the authors of the original resolution which requested a degree of transparency in this transition committee, which that claimant had considered insufficient.

In our findings, we also interviewed the two task forces' chairs. These task forces were the actual sources of the recommended policy changes that guided the changes in the curriculum, which the transition committee was implementing. I'll refer to those -- I probably won't refer to them, but they are the Biology Task Force, which inherited, to a certain degree, some of the resolutions of a predecessor, a CALS task force limited to that college.

Our findings in brief are that while it would have been appropriate for the Biology Task Force to send this by CAPP during their deliberations which were published in February 2008, we have reviewed the proposal and find there's no negative impact on the academic programs of any of the colleges that rely upon services of the biology programs.

In reviewing in detail, including the interviews with students and faculty department heads, open meetings and town halls, we found the actual proceedings of that committee to be exemplary in terms of their openness and integration into the community.

Our second finding is that the Biology Curriculum Transition Committee is largely an implementation committee simply implementing these resolutions as published in February 2008, and has been doing so without imposing any substantial changes that might require or compel a review by us or the faculty senate in general. I'd be happy to take any questions or detailed clarifications.

Speaker Beer: "Take a minute or two for questions. Seeing none, we'll move on."

Professor Cleland: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Now call on Professor Dennis Miller for a report on behalf of the University Faculty Committee."

10. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Dennis Miller, Food Science: "Thank you. I think as you all know, one of the main functions of the University Faculty Committee is to set the agenda for the faculty in the meetings, so you have already seen what we discussed in our last two meetings. I'll mention we met two times since the last faculty senate meeting; first on April 22nd, and second on May 4th."

At our April 22nd meeting, President Skorton and Provost Fuchs joined us, and the main topic for the discussion at that meeting with the president and the provost was the undergraduate climate at Cornell and recent student suicides, and we've already heard a good deal about that this afternoon. I just point out that the president really thanked us for expressing our concern about this issue and he said that it really is an appropriate and important issue for the faculty to be involved with.

Couple of things that were discussed during that meeting that we haven't discussed today
was, one, the reasons for putting up the fences, and the president mentioned that there is evidence that if you take away the means for committing suicide, that can be an effective means of preventing suicides; and therefore, that was one of the rationales for putting up the fences, and also the contagion issue. The fact we already had some suicides this year made it particularly appropriate, in the president’s view, to make that decision, even though it was somewhat controversial.

We talked a little bit about how we can reduce student stress, and we’ve already heard some of that this afternoon relating to advising, and that was discussed. A couple other points that were brought up were eliminating evening exams. There’s some anecdotal evidence that evening exams are particularly stressful for students. That’s an idea that came up.

Another one would be making it easier for students to transfer from one department to another. Apparently it is somewhat difficult for students to transfer to another department, particularly if it’s in a different college; so one idea would be to make that a little bit easier.

Another thing the president emphasized that I think was emphasized today was that it’s becoming increasingly more difficult to get admitted to Cornell, and so we are admitting students that have already been under a lot of stress in high school, just getting themselves here, so they come in with a certain level of stress. So we discussed these issues. I think it was a very fruitful discussion; however, the UFC really did not come up with any recommendations on the issue at this time.

For the May 4th meeting, Anne Kenney, the university librarian, Mary Beth Norton, the Chair of the Library Board, and Jeff Scott, Chair of Entomology joined us, and we discussed many of the issues that Mary Beth Norton brought up earlier in the meeting today. So I don’t really need to go over those. I just might mention that Jeff Scott, the Chair of Entomology did point out that there was some disagreement among the Entomology faculty with the closing of the Entomology Library, and he mentioned that approximately half of the faculty was opposed to that decision, and so I just thought I should mention that; but again, the UFC decided not to make a recommendation regarding this issue at this time.

So basically, that’s the report. I would be happy to answer any questions, if anyone has any.

Speaker Beer: “We have time for half-a-minute question and answer. Seeing none, we’ll turn to the Dean of the Faculty Bill Fry for remarks.”

11. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY

William Fry, Dean of Faculty: “Thank you, Steve. The first thing I’d like to do is thank the senate for, I think, a very effective and substantive year. I think the senate is an important body within the university. It’s looked to for advice and response from the university administration, as well as our colleagues. And I think we’ve done a fine job. We have dealt with substantive issues, and I appreciate that very much. Thank you very much.”
“What I’d like to do next is just to say a few things. Many of you read the editorial in “The Sun” last Thursday. David Delchamps sent it to me so I could see it. The title was "Teach Your Students Well," and it called on the faculty to deal with the issue of student suicides.

“I attempted to respond to that editorial. I have not seen my response in "The Sun," so I guess it’s not there, but what I said was that in fact some faculty had reached out to their students via e-mail or personally in class, as I have had responses from both faculty and students who appreciated that very much. I’ve also seen comment from faculty and students who did not and who missed -- thought that they should have done it.

“The article called for advising to be reviewed, and I mentioned that in fact the senate was going to be dealing with an issue resolution on advising in that response, and I’m glad that we did that today. Then it also said that the academic calendar needs to be reviewed. And that process, I’m happy to say, is started. A committee is being formed. We have some members who have agreed to be on the committee. It’s going to be a huge task, and I hope it will be somewhat successful.

“Next I am asked to write an annual report. It goes into the May meeting of the trustees, and I just wanted to just review some of the things I put into this report this year. We taught at least 4,472 courses, at least 437,000 credit hours. We contributed more than 7,000 articles. We don’t know exactly how many more. I don’t know how many books you all wrote. I would love to learn that. We have spent at least $480 million in FY 09 on research. Our new sponsored awards, as of the end of April, are more than $280 million, and there are several awards pending. The university welcomed eight new members to the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, or the American Philosophical Society. And congratulations to those eight new members.

“Also pointed out that the faculty are heavily involved in a lot of things in addition to teaching, research and outreach. There are 105 senators. At least 60 are here today, because I counted you. We have 26 committees involving 320 faculty, and some of those committees have been really busy this year. You heard David Delchamps, EPC has been very busy; the Financial Policies Committee has been busy; UFC meets two or three times a month. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty’s been busy. Mary Beth and the Library Board has been busy, the Local Advisory Council, the Institutional Review Board, the Institutional Biosafety Committee and FACTA have all had tremendous jobs this year, and there are others as well.

“Not only that, but at least 29 faculty were involved in the strategic planning led by Ed Lawler, the reimagining task forces, the cross-university reimagining task forces have involved 140 faculty. And the reaccreditation process, which we will hear more about next year, has involved at least 29 faculty.

“And then finally, I wanted to say that I think the response to the suicides is a really important topic for us, and I’m glad that we are looking at the academic climate within
the University. Finally, in relation to the issue that Tom Cleland identified, I did meet with the academic deans last Tuesday, I guess it was, and I pointed out to the deans that one of the functions of the university faculty, according to the bylaws, is to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit and to not forget about the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies. So I did that. I hope that made some impact. If there are any questions, I’d be happy to take one or two. Comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Seeing no questions, I think it’s appropriate to thank Dean Fry and his staff and the University Faculty Committee for putting together these many, many issues for consideration by the senate. And I believe our time for adjournment has arrived, so motion to adjourn is appropriate.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor? (AYES) Meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM

Respectfully submitted

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
FACULTY ELECTION RESULTS:
Faculty Trustee – Nelson Hairston, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Nominations & Elections Committee – S. Kay Obendorf, Fiber Science & Apparel Design & John Sipple, Education
University Faculty Committee – Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine, David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Donald Hartill, Physics & Kent Goetz, Theatre, Film & Dance

AD White Professors at Large Members:
Maria Fernandez, History of Art
David Feldshuh, Theater, Film and Dance
Natalie Mahowald, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences

Library Board Committee:
Mary Beth Norton appointed for one more year
Ileen Devault (replace Clete Daniel)
Resolution on effective advising:

Whereas the faculty are deeply concerned about recent events, both as events in and of themselves and as indications of how we are functioning as an educational community

Whereas a critical part of the undergraduate experience is academic advising and the most effective advising takes place in face to face meetings at least once a semester

Whereas recent changes have resulted in faculty advisors not having mechanisms to compel advisees to visit them before pre-enrolling and before making other changes to their schedules (such as taking over-hours)

Be it resolved that: The senate ask the vice provost for undergraduate education working together with the university registrar and the associate deans for undergraduate education of each college to establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising including face to face meetings.

Klaus Werner Beyenbach, Biomedical Sciences
Eric Cheyfitz, Senator, UFC member, English
Abby Cohn, Senator, Linguistics
Jane Fajans, Senator, Anthropology
Clare Fewtrell, Senator, Molecular Medicine
Kathy Gleason, Senator, UFC member, Landscape Architecture
Ellis Loew, Senator, Biomedical Sciences
Marilyn Migiel, Senator, Romance Studies
Satya Mohanty, Senator, English
Elizabeth Sanders, Senator, Government
Michael Tomlan, Senator, City & Regional Planning
Shawkat Toorawa, Senator, Near Eastern Studies
Charles Van Loan, Alternate, Computer Science
Cornell University’s Campus-Wide Approach to Student Mental Health

Cornell University Faculty Senate
May 12, 2010
Annual percentage of students utilizing counseling services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>’08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>’08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>’07-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>’07-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>’07-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental health & academic functioning

Was unable to function academically (e.g., missing classes, unable to study or complete homework) for at least a week due to depression, stress or anxiety

- 39% overall
- 54% of URM

- Enrolled Students Survey, 2005
- (n=4,790 undergraduate responses; response rate 37%)
Suicide

• 1 in 10 seriously considered suicide in past year*
• Cornell reputation vs. data
• Current: cluster & contagion

* National College Health Assessment, Cornell 2006
N = 1,906, RR = 38%
Public Health Approach to MH

- Clinical services (vital but not sufficient)
- Campus-wide network of support
- An educated, caring community
  - Notice and Respond
  - Faculty Handbook
Academic practices
(e.g., grading, scheduling, instruction, advising)

+ 

Resulting Stress

Low  Moderate  High
Academic practices
(e.g., grading, scheduling, instruction, advising)

+ Internal & external contextual factors
(e.g., expectations, resilience, mental health, support)

Resulting Stress

Low Moderate High
Resolution to Modify Cornell Application Forms by Adding a Question on the Academic Integrity Code

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its *Code of Academic Integrity*.

Whereas, violations of the *Code* reduce the intellectual vitality of the University by deflecting instructors away from teaching and sow distrust in teacher-student relationships. (For example, Robert Lieberman, a Senior Lecturer in Physics, recalls that as an undergraduate here in 1958, exams were not necessarily proctored— that is, a proctor was free to step out of the exam room. By contrast, instructors now need to watch students take exams after checking their identity.)

Whereas, in an effort to strengthen academic integrity at Cornell, the following proposed resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider has emerged from discussions with the office of advising and admissions of the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty and graduate students of the Physics Department.

Therefore, The Senate resolves that the following question should be added to the application forms for Cornell's various undergraduate degree programs:

If you attend Cornell do you agree to abide by Cornell's Code of Academic Integrity as given at: http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html ?

Submitted by:

Carl Franck, Senator, Physics
Terrill Cool, Senator, Applied & Engineering Physics
Ephrahim Garcia, Senator, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Linda Nicholson, Senator, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Shawkat Toorawa, Senator, Near Eastern Studies

May 5, 2010
MOTION TO REQUEST FORMAL RESPONSE TO FACULTY STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

CALS Faculty Senate

WHEREAS all of Cornell University is undergoing a profound reimagining process which requires the full informed commitment of all the University community, and

WHEREAS the Organizational Stewardship Task Force report emphasizes the importance of shared governance and collaborative decision making with a commitment to open communication and transparency, and

RECOGNIZING that the feedback loop from faculty to the several levels of administration remain unclear to the extent that there is no evident mandate for an administration response to faculty standing committee resolutions and recommendations nor is there a readily accessible source for follow-up information on recommendations made and actions taken or not, and further

RECOGNIZING that final decision making authority at Cornell University resides with the Board of Trustees, the President, the Provost and the deans and their designees as delineated in the University charter and other applicable documents, and moreover

RECOGNIZING that standing faculty committees’ decisions and recommendations are to be interpreted as recommendations to University or college level administrators as indicated by the nature of the recommendation, then let it be

RESOLVED that when a representative faculty committee (such as the Faculty Senate of the University or a College) makes a recommendation they will identify the recipient who is expected to respond (such as the official who constituted a committee). The recipient individual or his/her designee should send a formal response within 30 days indicating whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part, with a justification for the decision reached. The recommendations, responses and explanations should be posted within 30 days to a newly-created web page accessible by the university community to contain all committee recommendations submitted, together with the ade and justifications for those decisions.

Sponsors: Harry Lawless, Elizabeth Earle, Tim Mount, Robert Masson, Greg Poe
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

BILL FRY

May 12, 2010
Response to Sun Editorial: 6 May “Teach Your Students Well”
→ the faculty need to respond to suicides

➢ ‘reach out via e-mail, class discussion’
  • some did, (some did not)
  • Dept mtgs with Gannett (lots of interest)

➢ ‘advising needs to be reviewed’
  • see comments of 14 April and 12 May mtg

➢ ‘academic calendar needs to be reviewed’
  • the committee is being formed and the charge clarified.
Annual Report  (University Faculty)

Teaching: 4472 courses, 437,000 cr hrs.
Scholarship:
• >7000 articles
• $480,000,000 research expenditure (09)
• new sponsored (30 April): >$280,000,000
• 8 new members (NAS, AAA&S, NAE, or APS)

Faculty Governance:
• Senate (105 Senators)
• Committees (320, 26 committees)
  (esp EPC, FPC, UFC, AFPS, LB, LAC, IRB, IBC, FACTA, …….)

Strategic Planning – 29 faculty
Reimagining - 140 faculty
Reaccreditation - 29 faculty

Response to suicides
ByLaws (Article XIII.1.)
“The functions of the University Faculty shall be to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit, or are general in nature; and to recommend to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification or discontinuance of degrees.”

CAPP:
“1. Concern itself with academic programs and policies which are independent of or extend beyond the single or joint jurisdiction of a school or college faculty except those delegated to other committees by the University Faculty or the Faculty Senate
2. Conduct an initial screening of formal proposals for new academic programs or policies including proposals for substantial modification or discontinuance of existing programs or policies. If, after an initial screening of a policy or program, the Committee concludes that further study is desirable, it shall so report to the Faculty Senate. It shall proceed further only after authorization from the Faculty Senate.
3. Examine policies governing the use of, and plans for, University-wide academic facilities and services, such as libraries, classrooms and computers.
4. Provide an initial review of proposals from all sources for new degrees and for the combination, modification or abandonment of old degrees.”