Call to order by Speaker Steve Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to welcome you to the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate for the 2010-2011 academic year. I would like to remind the people present here that there will be no photos taken, no tape recording of the proceedings, other than that done by the administration.

“I would like everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phones and ask that anyone who speaks please rise and identify yourself by name and department or other administrative unit.

“At this point, we have no Good and Welfare speakers, so the seven minutes in addition to the proposed agenda will be allocated as needed to other items on the agenda. We will adjourn today at 5:30, which is one half hour earlier than the usual 6:00 adjournment time.

“At this point, I would like to call on associate dean of the faculty and chair of the Nominations and Election Committee to give the Nominations and Election Committee report. Professor Fred Gouldin."

1. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS

Associate Dean and Secretary, Fred Gouldin: “Thanks very much. From the length of this report, the number of names on it, you will know the Nominations and Elections Committee worked very hard over the summer. I would like to thank them all for their extremely hard work.

“So there are one, two, three, four, five, six different committees. The first one is Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty. Jerry Hass of the Business School has agreed to serve another term and he will be chairing the committee. And Carl Hopkins of CALS is joining the committee. On Academic Programs and Policies, Tom Cleland of Arts and Sciences will be chair. Jon Parmenter of Arts and Sciences will serve on the committee. Elliot Shapiro, Arts and Sciences. And finally, Qi Wang of CHE.

“Thanks. Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education, Brad Bell of ILR; Paul Bowser of that, and Andrea Simitch of Architecture and Planning.

“Thank you. The Financial Policies Committee, Joe Burns in Engineering, Tom DiCiccio of ILR, and Amy McCune of CALS. Moving on to the Library Board, Mark Constan, Chris Earls, Rebecca Harris-Warrick, John Hermanson and Nerissa Russell.

“On North Campus and Collegetown, Sandra Greene, Anthony Hay; my colleague in Mechanical Engineering, Michel Louge and Jack Muckstadt. So that completes the report. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, associate dean, for this report, which the senate receives. I would like to now call on Dean Fry to present the report of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.”

2. REPORT FROM CAPP COMMITTEE
Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “I am obviously not Tom Cleland. He is the new chair of Academic Programs and Policies, but I would like to say this committee has made an action already this year. They have approved the change of a field from Textiles to Fiber Science and Apparel Design. My purpose today was just to report that approval.”

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 2010 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call on you, senators, to approve the minutes of the University Faculty Senate meeting of May 12, 2010. Are there any objections? Hearing none, I presume that the minutes are approved as distributed. “We will now call on Professor Steve Morgan and his co-chair -- I trust you can tell us -- for a resolution concerning Cornell Childcare Center.”

4. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CORNELL CHILD CARE CENTER

"Professor Marinella Casasola, Department of Human Development, CHE.

“Thank you. I want to acknowledge my committee members, Steve Morgan, the co-chair from the Department of Sociology; Kim Weeden, also from Sociology and part of the CU Advance Team; Rachel E. Donovan, associate professor, Department of Policy Analysis and Management, who deals with childcare issues and policy; Peter Enns, Department of Government, who couldn't be here; Jennifer Thaler, Entomology; and myself, Department of Human Development. I have one of the infant labs on campus. And Steve Hamilton, also Department of Human Development.

"So we have three of the committee members who have currently or have children at the center as well, and I want to begin by thanking Human Resources and Mary Opperman for their help in gathering information and also acknowledging the hard work it took to put a childcare center on campus.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Dean of the Faculty appointed an ad hoc committee to analyze the challenges facing the Cornell Child Care Center, as set forth in the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on March 10, 2010,

WHEREAS a detailed report was prepared by the appointed ad hoc committee, shared in draft form with the University Faculty Committee on August 4, 2010, and then submitted in final form to the Dean of the Faculty on August 31, 2010,

WHEREAS a redacted version of the submitted report, omitting some confidential information, has been distributed to the Faculty Senate,

WHEREAS the report details management problems with the Cornell Child Care Center, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the President implement the primary recommendations of the ad hoc committee, which are to

- Give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract for service in August of 2011,
• Develop and release a new Request for Providers by January 1, 2011,
• Improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management costs and introducing a sliding scale for tuition,
• Appoint a seven-member Advisory Board, chaired by a senior administrator, and consisting of four faculty (two with expertise in child development and two with expertise in management) as well as three representatives of non-academic units of the university, and
• Enhance the University’s capacity to use the center for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff by increasing the quality of the center and by giving the Provost control over the allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the President indicate by November 1, 2010, through a letter to the University Faculty Committee, whether he will implement these recommendations.

“We have here the resolution. The first three points, the whereas are simply a summary of what led us to form the committee. What I would like to do is read point by point the resolutions. Be it resolved the Faculty Senate recommends that the president implement the primary recommendations of the ad hoc committee, which are: Improve the quality of care in budget-neutral manner, by reducing the management costs and introducing a sliding scale for tuition.

“Second, give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract for service in August of 2011; develop and release a new request for providers by January 1, 2011; appoint a seven-member advisory board, chaired by a senior administrator, consisting of four faculty, two with expertise in child development and two with expertise in management, as well as three representatives of non-academic units of the university.

“Finally, enhance the university’s capacity to use the center for recruitment of faculty and staff by increasing the quality of the center and giving the provost control over the allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center. Be it further resolved the Faculty Senate requests the president indicate by November 1st, 2010, through a letter to the University Faculty Committee, whether he will implement these recommendations.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. The resolution is now before us, and perhaps there are questions of fact before we debate the resolution, which eventually will be voted upon. Any questions of information at this point? “If not, then we'll entertain debate. First we'll hear from a speaker in favor of the several resolutions. Any speaker wish to speak in favor of these several resolutions? “Yes. Would you please wait for the microphone.”

Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology and Genetics, CALS: “I have a colleague and also a neighbor, two separate couples, who have had kids at the childcare center; and they made a point to seek me out and to encourage support of this resolution. So these are parents who withdrew their children from the center because of very serious concerns that they had, so I'm in support of it.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a senator or member of the faculty who wishes to
speak in opposition of the several resolutions? Gentleman in the far corner.” Professor Dan Magaziner, History Department, A&S.

“Hi, I am Dan Magaziner, from the History Department, and I would speak in opposition to the resolution. I find myself somewhat surprised to do so. I was involved in some of the original efforts to provide additional faculty oversight over the center. My daughter is there. She has been there over a year; but in the last many months, it has been my impression and experience that Bright Horizon has improved the way they do things there. The teachers are better trained; the staff, in general, at the place are happier. It is a better-run operation.

“I have no love for Bright Horizons. I am not in love with the idea we outsource our childcare to this massive corporate entity; but at the end of the day, my daughter is extremely happy there and she’s extremely happy with her teachers, and I would urge my senators and senators in general to vote against the resolution, unless we have some -- A, I would like to know what would happen to the teachers and if there is perhaps some way to vote for more oversight perhaps, but not actually to the step of giving notice to Bright Horizons that we will be terminating the contract. It seems to me they should be allowed to continue the progress and good work that I think they are doing.”

Speaker Beer: “Just a point of clarification; the resolutions that are presented to the senate are not subject to amendment on the floor. We will vote on the resolution after some time. The only possibility for alteration of the resolution is to refer it back to the committee who brought the resolution, and then it could be further considered at a future meeting.

“So now, is there a person who wishes to speak in favor? The lady in the front. And please wait for the microphone -- in the first row.” Professor Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology.

“Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology and member of CU Advance and also a member of this committee. I just wanted to address some of the issues the gentleman in the rear raised, which I think are actually very much consistent in some sense with what we outlined in the report.

“We do have data from parents that show that there has been a slight improvement in the parents who are remaining at the center’s view. When you dig further into the data, there’s a number of problems becoming quite clear and led us to this recommendation. Teacher turnover has been a major issue at the center throughout, and it is actually getting worse. It’s gotten higher in the last six months than it was in the prior twelve months and before that, so there’s no indication that Bright Horizons has been able to turn around in terms of teacher turnover.

“Another area we have objective data is in the number of records of licensing violations registered against the center. Those have actually not declined at all; so much so there are actually five additional violations we didn’t know about when we submitted the report three weeks ago to the UFC. The Bright Horizons accrued 61 licensing violations in a period of two years, whereas comparable centers of roughly the same size in Ithaca are more in the order of ten to twelve over that same period. So there doesn’t seem to be a decline in the licensing violations.
“I think the third fact that led us to this recommendation is that there’s been an increase, substantial increase in the investment Cornell has put into the center in response to problems that have been raised, and it is our view of the committee -- we unfortunately can’t release the confidential information about how much money we are talking about, but it is our view this is simply not a sustainable improvement, unless there’s a major, major shift in the budget model and a major increase in the amount of resources Cornell is willing to put into making Bright Horizons work. So that’s what led us to this recommendation.

“We do, however, acknowledge that Bright Horizons and, in particular, I think Human Resources has been trying to respond; but our view is that although it may be better than it was before, it’s still not up to the standards of care that Cornell faculty, staff and graduate students deserve for their children. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Speaker in opposition to the several resolutions? The gentleman rising.” Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE.

“I am not speaking in opposition -- but I would like to ask two questions. First question: If you give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that you are going to terminate the contract, is it correct that there’s nothing that restricts them from applying for the new contract under the new rules?

Professor Casasola: “Yes.”

Professor Burkhauser: “So that’s one answer to the point made before. The second one is - I’m mystified by this sentence: “Improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management cost and introducing a sliding scale for tuition.” What does it mean? Does it really imply you are looking for a budget-neutral solution in the sense that the consumers of this product will pay the full cost, or are you saying that you want to hold the share of the subsidy provided by Cornell to this enterprise constant, but somehow shift the way that consumers share the subsidy? If so, how exactly would that work?”

Speaker Beer: “Refer that question to the co-chair of the committee.”

Professor Casasola: “So more the latter. If we reduce the amount that we currently pay in management fees, we can, with just a, as you will see in the report, a modest, very modest tuition increase for only the upper portion of the families at the center would then defray whatever costs. So that is what we meant by a budget-neutral manner. Does that make sense?”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. Is there a person who wishes to speak in favor? Okay, would you like to speak in favor? Yes.”

Professor John Hausknecht, Human Resources Studies, ILR. “I want to thank the committee for all their hard work. I am a former parent of a 2-year-old at the center until last year. It was really the teacher turnover that pulled us out of there, and we saw no -- I guess hope would be the right word, for things to improve to the point where we’d want to continue him in care.
“So the points that have been raised here I think go a long way to improving the conditions, maybe in the future, down the road for other children; but it was sort of a disappointment, I think, as a new faculty member and new parent to go through the growing pains the center had.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in opposition? The gentleman in the rear.”

Professor Glenn Altschuler, American Studies and Dean, University Relations. “I have two strikes against me. I do not have any children and I’m a vice president at Cornell as well, and I’m not really here to address the substantive matters here; and I, too, commend the committee for the hard work that it did.

“I would just make two observations: One, whatever this body does, it’s very important that we make sure that this childcare center addresses the needs of everyone on this campus, and that means staff who have children, as well as faculty who have children, and there not be an academic-nonacademic divide here. That’s an important goal, and I hope everyone in this body will share it.

“To that end, if I may, I would like to make an observation about at least one of the resolutions. As a person who works closely with the provost, I would say it’s something akin to madness to ask that the provost be the person responsible for any number of slots in this. Do you really want the provost to be spending his time deciding whether Johnny Smith’s daughter is more appropriate than Susie Jones’ daughter?

“Surely, there are better ways to address this than to have administrators scrambling to be in the childcare business and to micromanage at that level. My own advice is that whatever this body does, micromanaging a childcare center is probably not the best way for this body to be spending its time. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there a point of information from the committee on this issue?”

Professor Casasola: “Please note that the request is that the spots be reserved for both faculty and staff, not simply faculty. So there was no bias towards faculty in that resolution. Also, another point of clarification.”

Speaker Beer: “We have another statement from the committee member.”

Professor Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology, A&S: “Just a point of clarification, it’s - - as the report outlines, it’s a madness that virtually all of our peers engage in already. So we did a lot of investigating of what our peer and competitor institutions are doing for faculty recruitment. The proposal we came up with is actually on the modest side, relative to what our peers are doing.

“Stanford, I believe, has four childcare centers; one is reserved exclusively for faculty. Brown University reserves all its spots in infant care for faculty, I believe. And the majority of our peer institutions already reserve some fraction of the slots in their childcare arrangement -- maybe not as many as Stanford and Brown -- for the express purposes of using them to recruit faculty.

“Of course, the justification for this, I think is quite obvious, we are reaching a period in which there’s going to be enormous hiring -- at least we are told -- the demography of the
faculty is changing. There are more young people, more dual-career people, and more women. Childcare is not exclusively a women's issue, but it seems to be tilted that way.

“The point of clarification I would like to make, it isn’t madness in the sense all the other institutions are doing this as well. So what we came up with is a proposal that will represent a small fraction of slots, less than 10%, 8% of the slots. Right at the moment, the center is undersubscribed, so there is almost universal care for people who want it, because there aren’t many people that want it right at the moment because of quality issues at the center. So I should say it’s a very small fraction of slots and it is also relatively small, compared to what our peers are already doing. Thank you.”

Professor Steve Morgan, Department of Sociology, A&S: “Steve Morgan, just clarifying as well. Co-chair of the committee, but – co-chair and also serves on the University Assemblies Committee for Childcare Services. I would like to say, we brought this recommendation to the University Assemblies Committee, which includes about a dozen non-faculty representatives and asked whether they thought reserving this very small number of slots would in any way pose a problem for the University Assembly Committee, which represents the full university community. And as stated in the report, they strongly backed the proposal and wanted us to say in the proposal they had backed the idea of such a system before the childcare center was itself created.

“So we don’t, as a committee, view this to be the least bit controversial from the perspective of what the University Assembly has said. So I refer you to what’s in the report. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We will now hear from someone in opposition to the resolutions. The woman on the aisle.”

Professor Tracy McNulty, Romance Studies, A&S. “I feel awkward speaking against the resolution. I am in favor of about 95% of what’s in here. I would support most of them. The committee has done an amazing job of researching and exposing some serious problems at the center. I have been in contact with them quite a bit in recent months. I should say I’m also a member of the Quarterly Business Review Committee, which was constituted following the work of this committee last spring and includes representatives from Cornell, from Human Resources, representatives from the Bright Horizons administration and four parent representatives, of which I am one. It is really because of the work that you have done that a lot of changes are beginning to be initiated there at the center.

“I feel a little like Dan Magaziner that spoke up first. My son has been at the center for a year and a half; is actually very happy there. Although I remain critical of certain important aspects of the administration, I worry what would happen to all the kids who are at the center now and all the teachers working there, if we were to terminate this contract with Bright Horizons now.

“I mean, first of all, there would be a lame duck period between January and when they would actually complete the running of the center, which I imagine the most hirable employees would begin looking for work elsewhere. I would have to assume they would be, in a certain sense, black listed by a new administration that would take over the
center; so this would result in an additional loss of continuity of care for the kids there.

“So I’m not a huge fan of Bright Horizons. I think it is sort of a toxic corporation in certain ways, but I have seen the administration really willing to make substantive change and interested in soliciting parents’ involvement.

“Finally, the last point I would like to say, I think we could be doing more to address the role of Cornell Human Resources in this oversight committee, because I have not at all been impressed by the two representatives of Human Resources who are involved in this committee. I don’t think they act like employers who are paying for a service. I don’t think they are pushing Bright Horizons to do as much as they could, so I think we could also be asking more on the Cornell side on the way of oversight. I will stop there.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolutions. The woman in the first aisle, in the pink.”

Professor Rachel Dunifon, Policy Analysis and Management, CHE. “Just to address those points, I think first of all, Bright Horizons, if there was a new request for providers, Bright Horizons could apply; so the goal would be to set the standards -- unlike what happened last time, set the standard at a level to create a childcare center we all would be proud of. And if Bright Horizons wanted to apply to run that center, they could do so; nothing to preclude them from trying to do that.

“And I think -- that was the main -- the main point sort of motivating all this is currently the center is a huge missed opportunity. It is a beautiful building out there on campus that unfortunately not so many people want to be a part of right now. Just trying to work to make that different.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Point of information; we’ll have five minutes more for debate and we’ll come to the vote. The gentleman on the -- my left side.”

Professor Kevin Attell, English Department, A&S: "My daughter goes to the center. She has been there since the beginning, basically, so I’ve sort of seen the progress from the opening to the current situation. I admire the work the committee has done. I was a signatory to the original proposal to form the committee, so I have long been aware of serious problems at the center and have long been interested in addressing them; but I also urge the senate to vote against the resolution, primarily because of the idea of terminating the contract at this point, without any sort of indication in the proposal, at least, that there has been consideration of what that would mean to the kids who are currently at the center.

“As Tracy said, there’s a sort of long lame duck period in which everyone there knows that their job is maybe not going to be there anymore. And nobody knows -- and the Bright Horizons administration, we don’t know what that would entail on their part, so that’s a sort of troubling possibility for those of us who still have our children there.

“To speak in favor of Bright Horizons -- and I, too, am not a huge fan; not a booster of Bright Horizons -- they have made improvements, and I think that does need to be acknowledged. Significant improvements. More improvements can be made. We could have gone elsewhere. And I see three or any of the other local places we had spots, and we
chose not to. This is just to say that not everybody who has remained at Bright Horizons has done so because they could not go anywhere else.

“I don’t think -- beyond what I just said, I think termination of the contract, without really thinking through what that would mean to the kids and the teachers who are currently there, and there’s no indication in the report -- I agree with much of what’s in the report. I disagree with parts of the report. I also have knowledge of, but have a different experience of -- the issue of violations I think is debatable, how serious the number of violations is.

“Anyway, I think I said my piece, and I think voting now to simply terminate the contract is precipitate and troubling to those of us that have kids there now.” Speaker Beer: “Perhaps a member of the committee could address that point.”

Professor Casasola: “One thing I want to point out is some of the short-term improvements are because Cornell has invested a significant amount in allotting more teachers. These, given the current budget, are not sustainable, so some of these improvements may not be long-lasting. Teacher turnover continues to be an issue.

“The idea was -- there was a lot of consideration. The idea of any change to a child’s life is very anxiety-producing to any parent, and so it was troubling to us that the contract raised the possibility that the teachers would not be able to continue; however -- can I say this? Or no. Okay. I’ll stop there, but yeah.

Professor Morgan: “The nature of the mandate or what information we can share with the senate is a bit more constrained than we would like it to be, so the longer version of the report contains a great deal more discussion of this transition period, how the teachers might well be able to -- we have specific recommendations there, but we can’t lay that out in the full public report, because we have been asked not to lay out particular features of the contract.

“So I understand we are all extremely concerned. We have talked a lot about how current families at the center would have been affected by the termination by next August by resolution, but I ask you to trust we think we have a way for getting to a resolution that you would be happy with. We can’t really say –”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Long-term positive outcome for the families and children and teachers, because I think, ultimately, all the parents expressed high satisfaction with their teachers. And our goal is to ensure the teachers are sufficiently supported so they don’t continue to leave.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “We believe there’s a mechanism for keeping teachers at the center.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. The period for debate on the committee’s resolution has come to an end, and so are you ready for the question?

“Okay. All those in favor of the resolution, as illustrated by Mr. Greene, please rise.

“Those in favor may sit. Those opposed, please stand.

“Only those senators may vote. I assume that those in favor who rose before are all
senators. Is that correct?

“Okay, those who are in opposition, please be seated. Any senators abstaining, please rise. Vote: 51 Yes; 8 No; 5 Abstain

“The resolutions clearly pass, so we will move on to the next issue on the agenda, which is Professor Carl Franck, for a discussion on academic integrity and admissions.”

5. DISCUSSION CONCERNING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ADMISSIONS

Professor Carl Franck, Physics Department, A&S. “Thank you. I would like to talk to you about the efforts of my colleagues, Terry Cool, Ephraim Garcia, Linda Nicholson. We sponsors wish to bring to your attention a revised resolution you see before you. This resolution seeks to increase academic integrity awareness among Cornell undergraduates.

“We are currently planning to vote on it at next month’s senate meeting. Our concern is while the vast majority of undergraduates are honest, cheating at Cornell saps our academic strength, dissipates faculty and graduate student teaching assistant time and energy that could be more productively and enjoyably spent in research and teaching; and most importantly, lowers our regard for students.

“We reflect at a happier time at Cornell when exams were not so tightly proctored as now and we didn’t have to work so hard to suppress cheating that is Internet-enabled.

“I am saying this, having been involved in many academic integrity cases in my department. I can only imagine the experience of students and faculty that serve on the academic integrity hearing boards that routinely deal with many saddening cases. This is not to mention all the effort other groups, such as our advising deans, put into these matters.

“So our weakened academic integrity culture is the problem. Our small step toward a solution of changing students’ attitudes is to diminish the willingness of students to cheat in the first place by increasing awareness of the Cornell Academic Integrity Code.

“In summary, the code says a Cornell student must not misrepresent the work of others as their own. The code goes on to detail the mechanisms by which faculty and students deal with code violations. We are concerned that for many students, real attention to code comes far too late, upon being charged with a violation.

“Our goal is to change a sense of academic integrity to strongly support the majority of students whose honesty we depend on. Also it would be even worse off than we are today. In the pursuit of a means of increasing academic integrity awareness, we had the good fortune of corroborating with the university-wide Committee of Admissions Deans that advises the associate provost for admissions and enrollment, Doris Davis.

“We proposed a question be added to all Cornell undergraduate applications as to whether the applicant would agree to abide by the code if they were admitted and entered Cornell.

“The dean’s advisory committee promptly responded with their conclusion by mid-day.
While they appreciated our efforts, they felt the appropriate place for such a question was not in the Cornell application, but rather in the next step of the matriculation process for a student who was accepted to Cornell; this response to what we call the case for Cornell.

“This is a stage where a student is asked if they accepted Cornell’s offer of admissions. The admissions dean’s committee was to pose the question of abiding by the code as a part of the acceptance to Cornell’s offer process. Those of us who were at our last meeting may recall that we sponsors hardly withdrew our original proposal in favor of the admission dean’s advisory committee plan.

“In the ensuing senate discussion, the concern was raised that while the proposal had merit, it was flawed in the sense that it posed a phony question; namely, we were asking a question for which there could only be one answer, whether or not a student would abide by the code. The same concern was raised in discussion in my department.

“Going back to our last senate meeting, we followed Stephen Pope’s suggestion for a solution of this concern. In a case for Cornell’s stage of the matriculation process, in order to accept Cornell’s offer, a student must affirm they will abide by the academic integrity code. One is not asking a question, but rather Cornell is requiring an affirmation of their acceptance of the code as a condition for entering Cornell.

“We feel this is the properly respectful position to take toward our potential students and appreciate the improvement over our original resolution. Here therefore, we have our current draft of the resolution that you see before you.

“It is a resolution to include an agreement to abide by the academic integrity code as requirement for matriculation to Cornell’s undergraduate degree programs, whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell’s proud of its academic integrity, but continues to suffer significantly from the violations of the code; therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the code and better establish it as a part of the Cornell identity, the senate resolves, following consultation with advisory committee of the associate provost of admissions and enrollment, that acceptance of the code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell’s various undergraduate degree programs.

“Specifically a student’s affirmation of acceptance of Cornell’s offer of admission should include language stating the student will abide by the code. Recently, in the runup to today’s meeting, we sought to get a current reading of the Associate Provost Davis’s position on our initiative. She explained while she regarded this as an important matter, since she was leaving Cornell shortly, she appointed Vice Provost Barbara Knuth and Director of Admissions Jason Locke to look after the issue.

“Vice Provost Knuth graciously responded today in time for our meeting as follows. Note she only had a week to consider our revised resolution. We first asked her for information about how other universities treat this matter. She explained while she regarded this as an important matter, since she was leaving Cornell shortly, she appointed Vice Provost Barbara Knuth and Director of Admissions Jason Locke to look after the issue.

“You may also be aware many efforts are underway regarding student knowledge of and adherence to Cornell’s academic integrity values. If you are interested in learning more about these efforts and have not consulted with Barbara Grumlar, I suggest you do so. She is a knowledgeable and valuable resource.
"If the faculty senate suggests requiring acceptance of the code is a matriculation requirement, many details will need to be worked out. These include such questions as how and when to communicate about the code with accepted students, how and when during the acceptance process they are required to certify they will adhere to the code, whether electronic or paper communications should be used; who would be responsible for ensuring each matriculated student has so certified. If a student signs a paper or online form, does it become part of the student’s permanent record and how and where does the form reside? What is the role of the college admissions office versus central admissions? Other questions would likely arise in the implementation process." “She says, "As you develop this idea further with your senate colleagues, it may be useful to discuss the feasibility of various proposals, the likely effect of student knowledge and understanding of and compliance with the code, relationship to other code initiatives and efforts underway for matriculated students, et cetera, with those who have expertise in this area, including central administration and college admissions, directors, associate deans and college advising staff.

"Thanks again for your efforts. Barb.

"In response to Vice Provost Knuth, I feel the resolution is properly vague on the matter of implementation. Rather, what we are calling for is a matter of principle. We should expect no less of our students than to abide by our academic integrity code.

"We look forward to your latest thoughts about the resolution, including any feedback you may receive from your departments. We strongly urge you to support it when it comes up for vote next month, since we feel while it might be a small step toward improvement of academic integrity culture, we believe it would be a vital one. Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "Just to clarify, the resolution is -- a formal resolution may be presented for consideration at a future senate meeting; but if there are any questions at this point, perhaps they could be posed to Professor Franck at this time. Any questions?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: “As my colleague, Professor Franck, surely knows, I'm no stranger to this particular issue and believe that the lack of academic integrity severely degrades this institution and that our enforcement of it is severely lacking.

“Having said that, I walked into this room about ten minutes late. And the reason I was ten minutes late is I was making a bid on Priceline for a hotel in New York City. And I got a little mixed up and it took a little longer than I thought it would, but the last step in that process was to say please initial here if you have read Priceline’s policies and you agree to them.

“And well, I must be truthful; I had not read Priceline’s policy, but I had no hesitation in initializing and clicking it and coming out the door. I think this is a common experience that people of my generation don't have as much experience with as people, incoming students, but they do that all the time.

“I just seriously ask you whether you have any reason to believe that students will take this compulsory -- it's the same thing, right? If I didn't initial that, I couldn't make my bid on Priceline, so I initialed it. Now, I perhaps demonstrate my lack of Priceline integrity,
but there you have it; but I just wonder whether or not you have any reason to believe that students doing this would take that any more seriously than I took initialing my -- putting my initials on that Priceline bid.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you care to respond briefly?”

Professor Franck: “We had a major slew of academic integrity violations in one of our service courses, and it is just a sad experience to alert students to the nature of the code when their careers -- academic careers are in jeopardy. It is a bow shot, it's a symbol. That's what we are trying to do here.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on to the next issue. Thank you very much, Professor Franck. The next issue is a resolution by Professor Lawless.”

9. RESOLUTION CONCERNING TIMELY RESPONSE TO FACULTY RESOLUTIONS

Professor Harry Lawless, Food Science, CALS: “Thank you. Do we have a slide of it? A brief bit of history; it was William Lesser from AEM who originally penned the first vision of this, which was a little simpler and passed by the CALS Faculty Senate last spring. We introduced another version of it to the faculty senate, which was discussed and tabled. The tabling had to do with the feeling that the scope of it was overreaching, that it was too broad and there might be sensitive or personal or tenured decisions that might not be the kind of thing that the university should be expected to respond to publicly.

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.

*The faculty realizes that some committee decisions may involve personal or sensitive information, such as tenure decisions, and thus are exceptions to this expectation for a public response and disclosure.

“And so we've added a rider at the bottom -- and I'll try to get my shadow out of the way -- by virtue of a footnote that tries to address that issue, saying the faculty realizes some committee decisions may involve personal or sensitive information, such as tenure decisions, and thus are exceptions to this expectation for a public response and disclosure.

“The other amendment we find over the previous version, Dean Fry communicated to me the administration would prefer 45 days to respond rather than 30; and seeing no objection to that and envisioning there might be complicated circumstances that would require careful deliberation in their response, I agreed to make that amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we have the opportunity for a short debate. Anyone wish to speak in opposition to the resolution offered on the screen? Anyone wish to speak in favor of the resolution? The lady near the front, in the third aisle.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government, A&S: “Wanted to speak in opposition. If the administration found 30 days too constraining -- this seemed like to me a reasonable amount of time and it's been used in other circumstances -- but if they found that too constraining, they could bring up the circumstances and request a delay that has gone on in the university’s negotiations with the City of Ithaca, for example. They have done things like that. I just don't see any reason to stretch it out. 30 days seems reasonable to me, so I would oppose the amendment.”

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

"Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

“Okay, all those in favor of the resolution as presented on the screen, which indicates 45-day reporting period from the administration, please indicate by raising your right hand or arm.

“All those senators opposed, please raise your right hand, right arm.

“All senators abstaining from the vote, please raise your right arm. Okay, the resolution clearly carries. Vote: 52 yes; 3 no; 5 abstain. Thank you. The next item on our agenda is a report from the University Faculty Committee.”

10. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department: “Part of this will be very brief and part will be a little longer. We have spent the last few months, from spring to the present moment,
in the first place discussing, acting in our advisory capacity to the childcare center debate. That debate's been resolved. I think everybody's been fully informed about what that's about, but the other item is still open.

“We have been discussing -- in 2009, the graduate student -- or student, graduate and undergraduate student support for childcare was reduced in September 2009, without notice to the students really. They found themselves with what had been an average grant of $2,700, some going up to $5,000 cap, which is the faculty staff cap, reduced to what is now a flat rate of $1,700 for childcare.

“That's a taxable -- always a taxable amount for the graduate students, where it is not for faculty and staff; so we approached the provost about restoring to those students who had come to Cornell with the expectation of a certain amount, had been promised that amount, restoring that amount to them, to that specific group.

“I will read you, then -- it won't take long -- an e-mail we sent to the provost, and it sums up the state of affairs. 'Dear Kent, as we discussed at the UFC meeting with you Tuesday, March 23rd, 2010, the UFC urges you to restore to its 2008-'09 levels the student childcare stipend for the students with children who were then enrolled at Cornell.

“As the student letter of concern of October 16, 2009, sent to President Skorton by students with children and other Cornell community members notes, quote, many students with children took the childcare grant into account when applying to or accepting an offer from Cornell, and many chose Cornell over other equally reputable universities. These students are disappointed not to have had prior indication that the grant might be altered," end of quote.

“The finish to our e-mail or the relevant part is, "In light of the precipitous reduction in the grant, as well as what appears to have been a level of support promised to students who entered before the current financial crisis erupted, the UFC feels the university has an obligation to maintain the level of childcare promised to students matriculated at Cornell expecting a specific level of support."

“The provost has so far not found a way to supply those funds and doesn't seem to feel there is a way to supply those funds, short of taking money from fellowships to other graduate students, which seemed to us not a good idea. That's an issue I think you folks could think about.

“It was mentioned here, but if I could make a brief aside, the childcare center also recruits graduate students to Cornell. Well, with a reduction in childcare support, I think one has to think about whether that recruitment is comparable to our peers' recruitment. That might be something the senate wants to look into."

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. We will next have remarks from Dean of the Faculty Bill Fry.”

**11. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY WILLIAM FRY**

Dean Fry: "Thank you, Steve. I have a very short report today, and it has to do with the calendar. I think you noticed that Monday was a holiday and there were no classes. I
enjoyed that time. I got two lectures ready on Monday, which was really nice, so some things can happen.

“That change was agreed upon two years ago and instituted this year. I promised that we would initiate an overview of the entire Cornell academic calendar. We put it off last year because there was so much going on; but this year, I started that process.

“You will see on this slide that the -- we are in the process of forming the calendar committee. Jeff Doyle agreed to chair the committee. Kent Hubbell, Michael Matier are members of it. There will be a representative from the SA, a representative from the GPSA, a staff representative and a few additional faculty. I will serve ex officio, and Laura Brown will also serve as ex officio.

“We would like to hear your comments about the calendar. We are developing and refining the charge to the committee. A current draft is that the committee will recommend a course of action concerning Cornell's calendar that will be academically appropriate, that will not exacerbate student stress, that will align more closely with the calendars of local schools and that will honor federal holidays, as is academically possible.

“I have no prediction at this point as to whether we'll do anything; but as near I can tell, we will consider a lot of stuff, and hopefully we'll be able to make some improvements on the calendar. It's a hope. And with that, I will conclude my comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. Are you willing to take questions on other matters, since we still have a few minutes?”

Dean Fry: “I bet everybody would just love to leave.” (LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: “Any questions for the dean of the faculty? Seeing none, motion to adjourn would be in order. We are adjourned. Thank you.”

Meeting adjourned: 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
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• A solid majority of CAPP was in favor of the field name change proposed by Textiles, and there was no opposition.

• CAPP approves the field name change.
Resolution on Recommendations for the Cornell Child Care Center for consideration at the
September 8th Meeting of the Faculty Senate

WHEREAS the Dean of the Faculty appointed an ad hoc committee to analyze the challenges facing
the Cornell Child Care Center, as set forth in the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on March
10, 2010,

WHEREAS a detailed report was prepared by the appointed ad hoc committee, shared in draft form
with the University Faculty Committee on August 4, 2010, and then submitted in final form to the
Dean of the Faculty on August 31, 2010,

WHEREAS a redacted version of the submitted report, omitting some confidential information, has
been distributed to the Faculty Senate,

WHEREAS the report details management problems with the Cornell Child Care Center, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the President implement the primary
recommendations of the ad hoc committee, which are to

- Give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract
  for service in August of 2011,
- Develop and release a new Request for Providers by January 1, 2011,
- Improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management costs and
  introducing a sliding scale for tuition,
- Appoint a seven-member Advisory Board, chaired by a senior administrator, and consisting of
  four faculty (two with expertise in child development and two with expertise in management)
  as well as three representatives of non-academic units of the university, and
- Enhance the University’s capacity to use the center for recruitment and retention of faculty
  and staff by increasing the quality of the center and by giving the Provost control over the
  allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the President indicate by
November 1, 2010, through a letter to the University Faculty Committee, whether he will implement
these recommendations.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The opening of the Cornell Child Care Center marked an important milestone in Cornell University’s efforts to become a leading family friendly employer. Despite good intentions on all sides, the center has been plagued with many challenges, as this report documents, including a problematic budget model, a weak management team that has been insufficiently responsive to parent concerns, unsatisfactory levels of compliance with New York State regulations, and high annual turnover in its teaching staff. These challenges have resulted in many parents deciding to leave the center, a current enrollment at well below capacity, and a declining reputation in the community.

Since April of 2010, significant investment by Cornell and responses by the provider, Bright Horizons Family Solutions, have helped to mitigate some of these problems. Unfortunately, these changes have been insufficient and, in many cases, are unsustainable. More substantial changes are necessary for the center to reach its potential. Nevertheless, this committee believes that the center can and will become the model of excellence it was intended to be.

As detailed in the full report that follows, the committee has developed a series of recommendations based on answers to the questions in its charge. The five primary recommendations are to: (1) improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management costs and introducing a sliding scale for tuition, (2) give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract for service in August of 2011, (3) develop and release a new Request for Providers by January 1, 2011, (4) adopt a new oversight model by establishing a seven member Advisory Board, and (5) enhance the University’s capacity to use the center for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff by increasing the quality of the center and by giving the Provost control over the allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center.

PREAMBLE

Following the adoption of a resolution by the Faculty Senate on March 10, 2010 (reprinted as an addendum to this report), the Dean of the Faculty appointed a committee on March 29, 2010 comprised of seven members:

Marianella Casasola, Associate Professor, Department of Human Development (co-Chair)
Rachel E. Dunifon, Associate Professor, Department of Policy Analysis and Management
Peter K. Enns, Assistant Professor, Department of Government
Stephen F. Hamilton, Professor, Department of Human Development
Stephen L. Morgan, Professor, Department of Sociology (co-Chair)
Jennifer S. Thaler, Associate Professor, Department of Entomology
Kim A. Weeden, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology

The committee then gathered information and/or sought feedback from:

- the research literature on child development and indicators of quality in child care centers
- the Human Resource offices and/or Vice Provosts for faculty development of Cornell’s peer institutions
- current and former parents with children at the Cornell Child Care Center
- current and former teachers and administrators at the center
- employees in the Division of Human Resources, including Mary G. Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources
- two attorneys in the Office of the University Counsel
- the Chair of the University Assembly’s Childcare Services Subcommittee
- the Executive Director of CU-Advance
- the Dean of the Faculty and the University Faculty Committee
- additional faculty members with relevant expertise.

Structure of the Report

The resolution (see Addendum) states:

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.

In the remainder of the report, we answer the six questions above from the resolution, each in its own section, offering detailed recommendations that follow each response. The committee has also raised a seventh and relevant question for the center’s direction, which is answered first.

§1. What should be the standard for quality of care at the Cornell Child Care Center?

Cornell University is a world class educational institution, admired by its peers, and devoted to its community, faculty, staff, and students. To meet a widely recognized need and enhance its ability to attract world-class faculty, staff and students, the university opened the Cornell Child Care Center in August of 2008. Located on the northern edge of campus, the center was designed to provide full-time care for 48 infants, 50 toddlers, and 56 preschoolers in 15 separate classrooms.

In a celebration two months after the center opened, the Cornell Chronicle ran a short article with hopeful quotations from President Skorton that expressed Cornell’s widely shared enthusiasm and great expectations for the center:

“The opening of this center is a great milestone in Cornell’s efforts to be the best employer we possibly can be. ... It offers a safe, exciting and innovative environment in which children can learn, explore, develop social skills and grow.” (President David J. Skorton, Cornell Chronicle, 10/16/2008)

Given these high hopes, the quality of care at the Cornell Child Care Center should be no less than excellent. The center should be a source of pride that is marshaled without hesitation in the recruitment of talented faculty, staff, and students to the university. The center should serve as a model for other communities who wish to treat their constituents as well as Cornell aspires to treat its own.

Accordingly, the Cornell Child Care Center should meet the following minimum standards. The center should

1. maintain high levels of compliance with New York State regulations,
2. provide high levels of continuity of care by maintaining low turnover of its teaching staff,
3. achieve accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), and
4. receive strong positive reviews from parents when they are given the opportunity to provide anonymous ratings of care.

The center should have an administrative team that can effectively

5. develop and sustain a positive working environment that can attract and retain the best available teachers to the center,
6. manage staffing and hours of operation in accordance with the varied work schedules of university faculty, staff, and students, without sacrificing the quality of care, and
7. adapt child care delivery to the unique culture of the university and the local community.

The center should acquire a reputation in the community as

8. equal to the best child care centers in Tompkins county and
9. equal to the best child care centers at Cornell’s peer institutions.

The center should operate in a physical space that is

10. optimized to promote cognitive, social, emotional and physical development and
11. convenient to campus.

It is this committee’s unanimous judgment that the Cornell Child Care Center should meet all of these minimum standards by a clear and wide margin. But, for the reasons detailed throughout this report, and after nearly two years of operation, the Cornell Child Care Center does not meet enough of these standards. One area of strength is the center’s extended hours of operation, which are longer than those of other centers in the area and which many parents have indicated they appreciate. This benefit, however, has come at the cost of consistent care, as described below.

In order to achieve consistently excellent care, fundamental and sustainable changes are needed. We outline these changes in response to the six questions that formed the charge of this committee (see the Faculty Senate resolution adopted on March 10, 2010 and reprinted in full as an addendum).

§2. Can the center budget model deliver the quality of care that is demanded by the Cornell faculty?

In its initial vision of the center, Cornell did not anticipate that its budget model would constrain the quality of care. The current model overemphasizes management and is too lean in its staffing in three critical respects:

1. The current budget for the center provides an infant to teacher ratio of 8 infants to 2 teachers, in line with the minimum standard set by New York State. However, this ratio falls below the best standard in the community (6 infants to 2 teachers) and does not meet the 6:2 ratio for infant care recommended by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Public Health Association. Research shows that infants fare best in classrooms with small ratios, where they can obtain the individualized, responsive care.

2. Additionally, the center lacks adequate numbers of teachers’ assistants, which creates a significant strain on teachers, and has resulted in discontinuity of care for the children. The current system leads to inconsistency in terms of who provides care in any given room when a teacher is absent or on break. The key concern is that children are too often
placed in the care of individuals who are likely to be much less familiar with them than their own regular teachers. A staffing solution, consistent with the best quality of care in the area, would be to assign two regular teachers and one teacher’s assistant to each classroom. Having three teachers assigned to each classroom ensures consistency in caregivers when a teacher is absent or on break.

3. The center is open for longer hours than any center in the area, a feature which many parents appreciated and for which they expressed strong support. However, the center does not have a budget that matches these longer hours of service.

The problems associated with staffing shortages were clear soon after the center opened. These staffing shortages resulted in overworked teachers with inadequate break time and teaching support. Many teachers have chosen to quit because the workload was too heavy (see Table 2 on teacher turnover that is presented below).

Bright Horizons and Cornell’s Division of Human Resources are largely in agreement that these staffing shortages must be addressed and have worked to mitigate them since April of 2010. In part, however, the staffing shortage has been resolved by under-enrollment. In contrast to other local centers, the Cornell Child Care Center has been operating at less than 80% capacity, especially in the infant rooms. Presumably, many parents became sufficiently dissatisfied to seek child care elsewhere in the community, and the resulting decline in enrollment led to the closure of one infant room, even though infant care is in the shortest supply in the community.

Recognizing the need to provide more teacher support and training, Bright Horizons has brought in more experienced teachers from other Bright Horizons centers to serve as mentors and to help guide the NAEYC accreditation process. However, these mentors are present only on a short-term basis. Most recently, Cornell, through the Division of Human Resources, has hired three additional teachers on a temporary basis from July through September 2010 to help the center pursue NAEYC accreditation. The addition of these teachers has resulted in improvements, which parents and staff greatly appreciate.

In sum, there are now more teachers and fewer children at the center than originally planned. Yet, there is no budgetary commitment to maintaining these staffing levels into the future. Because the center is now operating in a substantial financial deficit, this committee believes that a new budget needs to be adopted.

**Recommendation:**

*To increase its teaching staff and thus improve the quality of care, the center needs a larger budget. A sliding scale for tuition should be adopted so that higher-income families pay a modest increase in tuition rates. In addition, the university should reallocate its subsidy away from the large management fees and overhead charges that it currently pays to Bright Horizons Family Solutions.*

By our calculations, a modest tuition increase for half of the families at the center with the highest family incomes, coupled with lower management costs (see next section),
would allow the center to permanently maintain the summer 2010 staffing levels in the
toddler and preschool rooms while also enabling additional improvement in the ratios in
the infant rooms (see above). This would also entail a lower number of infant slots at the
center, reducing them from 48 to 36. Since, as best we can tell, the center has never had
more than 36 infants under its care, this reduction is not a sacrifice relative to present
arrangements for care.

Would parents with the ability to pay higher tuition do so? In our discussions with
faculty, the answer is clearly yes (although many of these same parents would only do so
if quality improved significantly). The increased rates would be comparable to, but still
lower than, some other area child care centers. We believe that the views of parents are
shaped by the norms set by the university itself. Cornell, in pursuit of excellence of its
programs, charges very high tuition to its students. It ensures accessibility by offering
generous financial aid to families who cannot afford to pay the high tuition that
excellence of programming requires.

We recommend that the Cornell Child Care Center pursue excellence of care in the same
manner. Cornell offers a Childcare Grant Subsidy Program to its faculty and staff, which
allocates approximately $1.3 million per year. The maximum award is $5000 per year per
family. In results presented in the fall of 2009 to the University Assembly’s Childcare
Services Subcommittee, the University documented how this subsidy is disbursed. For
2010, families with incomes less than $50,000 per year were scheduled to receive grants
that equaled $2,861 on average. Amounts then declined steadily to an average of $633
for families with incomes between $95,000 and 115,000, to $511 to families with
incomes between $115,000 and $150,000, and to zero for families with incomes greater
than $150,000.

We have recommended a sliding tuition scale for the center as a narrowly targeted
solution that is consistent with an “ability to pay” norm in the community and that would
increase the budget for the center. We would not be opposed to an alternative
recommendation, which we assume is more costly to the university: across-the-board
tuition increases at the center coupled with larger Child Care Grants for all lower-income
faculty and staff that can be used at any child care center. Regardless of the accessibility
strategy chosen, our position is that accessibility goals should not be pursued by holding
tuition levels lower than is necessary to provide excellent quality of care.

§3. Should the management contract with Bright Horizons be renegotiated or terminated?

Cornell is currently approaching the end of the second year of its contract with Bright Horizons
Family Solutions, a for-profit company acquired by Bain Capital for $1.3 billion in January
2008. Over these two years, the center has failed to deliver the quality of care expected by the
Cornell community. It has failed to meet the minimum standards outlined in the first section of
this report. It has also, by our reading, failed to meet the performance standards in the contract it
signed with Cornell.
Bright Horizons bears primary responsibility for the weak performance of the center for the following reasons:

**Licensing Violations.** As detailed in the Faculty Senate resolution (see Addendum), the center had the largest number of violations of any child care center in the area, at 38 between opening day in August 2008 through the end of January 2010. Since the resolution was drafted, the center has accumulated 18 additional violations for a total of 56 through June 2010. Of these violations, the New York State Office of Child and Family Service deemed 20 of these as “serious”. Table 1 places these numbers in context relative to other child care centers in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Capacity (in children)</th>
<th>Non-Serious Violations</th>
<th>Serious Violations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Community Child Care Center (IC3)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Montessori School (IMS)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop In Children’s Center (Drop In Center)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Child Care Center (CCCC)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Cornell Child Care Center (CCCC) has a similar mix of infants, toddlers, and preschool children as does IC3. Over this time period, the CCCC has not run at full capacity and therefore on a per-child basis has an even worse regulatory record compared to IC3 than this table implies. Comparisons to IMS and the Drop In Center are more complex because both are smaller centers, the former does not provide infant care, and the latter follows a mixed mission of full-time and back-up care.

The explanation offered by Bright Horizons for this poor relative performance on regulatory compliance is that the higher rate of violations at the Cornell Child Care Center reflects Bright Horizons’ vigorous self-reporting policy. This explanation is not convincing. These violations are listed on a publicly available website maintained by the New York State Office of Child and Family Services, and any member of the community may request additional information on them.

After reviewing the descriptions of these violations, this committee does not regard these violations as indicators of widespread imminent harm to children. However, these violations do reflect the weak performance of Bright Horizons in meeting Cornell’s minimum standards for quality of care. If striving to provide the best quality of care in town, the Cornell Child Care Center should hold one of the strongest records on regulatory compliance in the area, not the weakest.

**Teacher Turnover and Discontinuous Care.** One of the essential characteristics of an excellent child care center is continuity of care. Research indicates that the same teaching staff should care for children for at least one year at a time. Staff continuity establishes healthy and secure attachments, particularly for infants but also for all young children. Discontinuity in teaching staff is associated with increased behavior problems among children in child care.1

---

Bright Horizons provided this committee with data that allowed us to calculate rates and trends in teacher turnover. Table 2 presents teacher turnover in three categories of full-time equivalent teaching positions: “Lead teacher,” “Teacher,” and “Assistant teacher.” For these categories alone, teacher turnover has been an astounding 105 percent in less than 2 years. Turnover does not include administrative staff or substitute teachers, but our data collected from parents (as we describe below) show similar cumulative rates of turnover in these positions.

| Table 2. Teacher Turnover at the Cornell Child Care Center, August 2008-June 2010 |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                         | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  | Cumulative       |
| Number of Departures                    | 3     | 19    | 12    | 34 since opening |
| Months of Operation                     | 4     | 12    | 6     |                  |
| Departures Per Month                    | .75 per month | 1.58 per month | 2 per month |                  |
| Average Annual Size of Workforce        | 24    | 35    | 31    |                  |
| Departures Per Month as Percentage of Annual Size of Workforce | 3.1% per month | 4.5% per month | 6.5% per month | 105% since opening |

Note: Calculations per month assume homogeneity of months throughout each year.

A cumulative turnover rate of 105% for 22 months is equal to a 56% annual rate of teacher turnover. As a point of comparison, the Ithaca Community Child Care Center, which cares for a similar number of children of the same age as the Cornell Child Care Center, had a 3.5% teacher turnover rate in 2009 and a 7% teacher turnover rate in 2010. In the past year, the teacher turnover rate at the Ithaca Drop In Center was 15% (2 out of 13 teachers) and at the Ithaca Montessori School was 29% (6 out of 21 teachers). It is reasonable to assume that a new center will have a higher rate of teacher turnover than an established center, but the differences between other area centers and the Cornell Child Care Center are too large to be attributable to newness and continue to increase.

To obtain more-detailed information on turnover within classrooms, rather than just at the level of the center, committee members contacted parents whose children are or were at the center. These parent-generated data largely match the data supplied by Bright Horizons. However, these data suggest slightly higher teacher turnover rates because parents counted transfers between rooms, and departures from rooms because of promotions to administrative postings, as turnover within rooms. This turnover is not reflected in the numbers provided by Bright Horizons, which only include departures from the center. Based on the information that we gathered from parents, over the first 22 months of operation across all fifteen rooms at the center,

1. the typical room has had six separate full-time teachers (i.e., a median of 6 teachers with a mean of 5.5 teachers, a minimum of 3, and a maximum of 9).
2. none of the 15 classrooms will end its first two years of operations with the same two teachers they had at the center’s opening.
3. three classrooms will have had 8 or more teachers, representing an annual turnover rate of greater than 200% per year.

These statements are true even though (1) some infant rooms have come in and out of service as demand has fluctuated and (2) we believe that we have undercounted the number of teachers at the center because of incomplete parent recall and lack of full data from Human Resources and Bright Horizons.

These turnover problems are not new.

1. The results of the October 2009 parent survey, as cited in the resolution (see Addendum), showed that 41% of parents reported that their children had “5 or more” teachers since joining the center, even though 25% of respondents had had children at the center for less than 6 months as of October 2009. When asked whether “Teaching staff turnover” met their expectations, 70% of parents indicated that the turnover rate was higher than they expected and in the most recent parent survey in the spring of 2010, many parents still expressed concern over the teacher turnover rate.

2. When the Bright Horizons CEO spoke to parents at the center in January of 2010, many parents remember him stating that the turnover rate at the Cornell center had been more than twice as high as Bright Horizons typically experiences when opening a center.

In spite of Cornell and Bright Horizons’ awareness of these problems, this issue has not been effectively addressed. Teacher turnover has not declined in 2010. Rather, as the bottom row of Table 2 shows, the turnover rate increased steadily from 2008 through 2009 and has continued to increase in 2010.

Beyond these basic turnover rates, many parents have stressed additional factors that have made the consequences of turnover even more serious: departures have been very abrupt and new hiring has been slow. Thus, the turnover experienced by children in classrooms is even higher than reported rates indicate because of the many substitute teachers who have been called in to serve between the appointments of regular teachers. And, because these changes arrive abruptly, often with little explanation, parents are unable to effectively help in the transitions by cushioning the impacts on their children.

On daily continuity of care, many former and current parents at the center have complained to this committee that, especially during the first 15 months of the center’s operation, children were far too frequently shuffled between rooms to balance child-teacher ratios. In most cases, parents were not even informed that such shuffling was occurring. Our understanding is that the frequency of such movement has declined in 2010 because of the temporary increase in staffing. Again, we are not convinced that this change is sustainable without significantly altering the budget model.
Weak Administrative Team. From the beginning, the administrative team hired by Bright Horizons has performed well below Cornell’s reasonable expectations. The Regional Manager assigned by Bright Horizons had never overseen the opening of a center before she was assigned to oversee the launch of the Cornell Child Care Center. This was a factor in the chaotic opening days of the center. Human Resources has indicated that the initial enrollment lottery was poorly handled. Only one month after the center was opened, the first Director was fired for undisclosed reasons. By the end of the first year of operation, the next two highest-ranking administrators (the Assistant Director and the Program Coordinator) had also left the center.

The second Director, brought in with a temporary contract, had experience working at the Bright Horizons corporation but, apparently, had insufficient training on New York State’s licensing regulations. She also failed to slow the rising teacher turnover rate and, according to some parents, did not adequately respond to parent concerns.

The third, and current, Director, who has been in her job for more than one year, was hired without any experience as a Director of a child care center. Former teachers as well as former and current parents have shared many critical comments about her performance. It is clear that teacher turnover has increased since she entered her position. This history of ineffective directors raises great concern about Bright Horizons’ ability to hire and train an effective leader for the Cornell Child Care Center.

Many teachers have complained about the mismatch between the corporate culture and child-focused care at the Cornell Child Care Center. For example, they have indicated that (1) the center is top heavy administratively, with too many layers between classroom teachers and the Director; (2) the teachers are required to spend substantial time completing paperwork, and consequently have too little time to develop and implement the Bright Horizons educational program; and (3) the corporate model has a rigid, cookie-cutter feel, which gives teachers too few opportunities to develop unique identities for their rooms and provides them with little autonomy in how they approach their teaching. Overall, many teachers seem to feel that the administrative team is committed primarily to implementing the Bright Horizons corporate blueprint for how to run a center, giving insufficient support and too few opportunities to develop and exercise their professional competence.

Accreditation Problems. This committee believes that Cornell’s minimum standard of quality child care should be accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Achieving NAEYC accreditation is difficult and time-consuming, but doing so indicates a commitment to the quality of care that is associated with optimal child development. Cornell’s Division of Human Resources indicated in June 2010 that Bright Horizons was on track to achieve NAEYC accreditation and intends to submit its full application in September 2010, as required in its original contract with Cornell.
However, Human Resources also reported troubling details about the accreditation process. In June 2010, this committee was asked if Cornell might recommend that Bright Horizons delay its application for NAEYC accreditation. The concern was that teachers were being asked to work on the weekends, putting in as much as 50 hours per week of paid work, in order to prepare materials for the accreditation application. When this committee asked how this could be, Human Resources indicated that the teachers had been so overworked over the past year and a half, and had experienced so much turnover, that they had not been able to document the care they were providing to the children. Teachers were being asked to work overtime to make up for the missed work that is necessary to achieve NAEYC accreditation (e.g., comprehensive binders of the care provided to each child).

After some communication with this committee, Cornell decided to hire three additional, teachers for July 2010 through September 2010 to help give teachers more break time from their classrooms to prepare the NAEYC materials. Such help from Cornell is a direct financial transfer from Cornell to Bright Horizons. Although the additional teachers reduce contact time between children and their regular teachers, we are hopeful that they will provide the support necessary to prevent additional teacher resignations in the short term while aiding progress toward achieving NAEYC accreditation. At the same time, these additional teachers do not represent a long-term solution to the problem of teacher overwork or turnover, or maintaining accreditation: first, the supplementary teachers are temporary; and second, they further harm the financial position of the center by increasing the university’s costs.

Failure to Meet the Standards of the Ithaca City School District’s Universal Pre-Kindergarten Program (UPK). Child care centers can derive numerous benefits by taking part in the UPK program. When a child care center participates in UPK, they receive $1500 for every child who is part of the program (this amount may increase to $2500 per child next year). The center may choose to pass some of these funds back to the parents, but the rest can be used to purchase items to enhance a given classroom or the entire center (e.g., computers, software for assessments and curriculum, or in-service training materials). Additionally, each teacher taking part in UPK attends monthly meetings with other early childhood teachers to gain ongoing training and information on child development, resulting in up to 15 or more hours per year in additional teacher training. UPK teachers are eligible to take part in a host of other trainings that the school district offers. Finally, the teachers are given access to a special online tool that allows them to assess the needs and strengths of the children in their classroom and develop activities designed to address these. Thus, participating in the UPK program provides important opportunities for the teachers directly involved in the program while at the same time benefitting a center financially.

Despite interest in participating in the UPK program, the Cornell Child Care Center has been unable to manage the UPK enrollment process. The center could not consistently provide the necessary attendance records for pre-K students to the school district, or offer the minimum staff development and training required for the program, as set by the school district.
Discouraged Teachers. The weak performance of the center is not attributable to members of the teaching staff, who work by choice in a field with pay levels that are far lower than they should be and who strive to do the best that they can in tough working conditions. In the recent spring 2010 parent survey, parents expressed strong and enthusiastic appreciation for their children’s teachers. Although many of the teachers have violated regulations, these violations reflect the weak and non-supportive administrative team more than individual teachers’ abilities. It is particularly troubling to this committee that so many of the talented and caring individuals who have taught at the center are no longer there. Those who have remained deserve heartfelt thanks from the community. Those who have left, especially those who worked to change the center but who left because of the stress induced by their efforts, deserve thanks just as much. It would be a strong benefit to the center to find a way to bring these talented teachers back into the child care community at Cornell.

The teachers at the center deserve a supportive environment with the best training possible to ensure that they can provide the best possible care. They should be given the opportunity to conceive of their positions at the center as part of a larger professional development trajectory.

Unresponsiveness to Parents. During the first 16 months of its contract, Bright Horizons was unresponsive to the concerns of parents, failing to adequately address their requests for change or to discuss candidly the center’s challenges. Since January of 2010, Bright Horizons has improved its communication with parents, but only after substantial pressure from Cornell’s Division of Human Resources and the adoption of the resolution by the University Assembly that suggested many immediate changes.

As quoted at length in the resolution (see Addendum), parents who responded to the parent survey of fall of 2009 (a full 14 months after the center opened) were exceedingly dissatisfied. When asked whether Bright Horizons was responsive to parent feedback and concerns, 62% of parents indicated that Bright Horizons had performed below their expectations. Over half (55%) of parents indicated that they did not receive enough information about changes at the center, and 41% indicated that they did not trust the Bright Horizons administration. Similarly, over half (51%) of parents felt that the Director was performing below expectations, and 54% felt that the Bright Horizons administration was performing below expectations.

Parents complained that they were not informed of teacher departures until days before they occurred; nor were they given sufficient information on the reasons for the departures. A key indicator of quality child care is having children placed in a single room, with a consistent group of peers and a consistent group of teachers. However, parents at the center complained that their children were moved to other rooms without their knowledge or consent in order to balance ratios. When parents, either individually or through the Parent Advisory Committee, asked for explanations of regulatory violations and the rumored incidents occurring at the center, parents received explanations that they found insufficient.
Because of the problems at the center, many parents left in the winter/spring of 2010. Human Resources reports that the parents at the center now (those in the summer of 2010) are happier. Based on feedback we have received from current parents, we agree that some improvements have occurred. However, it is difficult to disentangle how much of this change is the result of the unhappiest parents leaving and how much is the result of significant improvements at the center. As evidence for the selective attrition explanation, we note that: (1) a high percentage of parents in Human Resource’s 2009 survey indicated their intent to leave; (2) enrollment rates have been declining at the Cornell center yet enrollment has not declined at other local centers; and (3) a substantially higher percentage of the parents who were surveyed in 2010 receive child care grants than the parents surveyed in 2009, suggesting that dissatisfied faculty, staff, and students who can afford other more expensive care have disproportionately “voted with their feet.”

The most recent parent survey (conducted in spring of 2010) still expresses substantial dissatisfaction with the management of the center, while providing strong support for the teachers. Forty percent of parents believed that the competence level of the current director did not meet expectations. Similarly, 50% believed that the management of the Bright Horizons staff did not meet expectations. Nearly one third of the parents reported that they did not trust the Bright Horizons administrative staff and that the management was not open to parent opinions. Perhaps most alarming, only about half of the current parents would recommend the Center to a close friend seeking child care, and 41% of parents would opt for a different child care center if they could find a center with the same availability of hours and days. Thus, while the spring 2010 survey shows higher levels of parent satisfaction in some areas, the results still indicate substantial concern with Bright Horizons’ management and the overall quality of care at the center.

**A Declining Reputation in the Community.** Because of these problems, the Cornell Child Care Center has a poor reputation in the community. This harms the University’s overall reputation to a non-trivial degree (as in the April 7th *Ithaca Journal* story on the licensing violations, above, and the April 13th *Cornell Sun* story on the same). More importantly, the poor recent record of the center is a barrier to faculty recruitment and retention. This is a particularly important factor because the university will soon resume faculty hiring at its normal or even accelerated pace in anticipation of the pending wave of retirements.

Since the center’s opening, many families have left (and continue to leave) for other centers in the area, primarily the Ithaca Community Child Care Center and the Ithaca Montessori School. This committee knows of no families who have returned to the Cornell Child Care Center after moving their children to these local alternatives. Instead, this committee has received feedback from some of these parents, in each case praising their new child care providers while making direct comparisons to their past experiences at the Cornell Child Care Center.

The declining reputation of the center also exacerbates the consequences of high rates of teacher turnover. The center’s current reputation dissuades potentially excellent new
teachers from considering the Cornell Child Care Center as a desirable place of employment.

For these reasons, Cornell has sufficient grounds to terminate the contract with Bright Horizons. The case for termination is stronger still because of the very high financial costs of retaining Bright Horizons, which include high management fees (beyond operating costs) paid directly to Bright Horizons as well as a contractual obligation for Cornell to pay any operating deficits. These costs make it harder to achieve the staffing increases recommended by this committee in the budget model section.

At the same time, Cornell must accept some of the responsibility for the failures of the center as well. Cornell opened the center with a budget model that could not deliver the quality of care expected by the community and without sufficient input from faculty and others on campus with expertise in child care and child development. And, as we detail in §5 below, Cornell did not respond quickly and effectively when problems arose.

**Recommendation**

Because the center needs a fresh start under new management and with a new budget model, Cornell should inform Bright Horizons that it is terminating its contract for service.

Because Bright Horizons is not solely at fault for the problems outlined above, Cornell should avail itself of the opportunity to declare “termination without default,” giving 180 days notice, and paying the stipulated termination fees in the contract that it signed. The termination fees are less than the annual operating deficit under which the center is now running, and which the university must pay. Thus, in this committee’s judgment, the termination fees are a fair price to pay for a series of business decisions that now appear to have been unwise. The termination fees could prove to be a bargain in comparison to operating a center that is running in financial deficit and that cannot attract enough tuition revenue to cover its escalating costs.

To allow time to find a new provider, Cornell should move quickly by issuing a new request for providers by January 1, 2011. Cornell should undertake a full competitive bidding process, following University Policy 3.25. Consistent with Cornell’s current standards, full bids from alternative providers should be solicited and then evaluated. Given the situation that the university now finds itself in, careful attention should be paid to termination clauses in the contracts proposed by alternative providers. Thus, bidders should be required to submit sample contracts, and these contracts should be evaluated by the Office of the University Counsel.

§4. Can the facility built by Cornell be modified in cost-effective ways to rectify some of the serious deficiencies in design?

No. Increased staffing at the center will mitigate some of the problems of the design of the building, such as the separation of the diaper changing areas (and bathrooms) from the main
classrooms. However, the lack of an indoor communal play space for gross motor activity is a significant problem for which there is no clear, cost-effective solution. The same is true of the playgrounds, which have attractive stylistic features but are so small that they must be used on an overly restrictive rotating schedule.

**Recommendations**

*Human Resources should continue to pursue some creative ideas for enhancing the outdoor play spaces, including additional fenced play space to the west of the center.*

As a long-term solution, Cornell should consider converting the center into one that serves only infants and toddlers, and then opening a preschool in another location. Alternatively, the center could enroll fewer children at its current site while having a second center in another, nearby location.

If the university chooses to maintain the current site as a center for infants through preschoolers, plans should be made to build a sufficiently large indoor space for gross motor play in a new wing to the west or north of the center, comparable in size to those maintained by other area daycare centers. Plans should also be made to extend the playground to the west of the center. We are aware that such an expansion might pose problems with neighbors and current users of the space, but the same is true of any university expansion plan.

§5. **Does the oversight model of the center give sufficient influence to parents and to faculty at Cornell with relevant expertise?**

At no point in the conceptualization, planning, or oversight of the Cornell Child Care Center have parents and faculty with relevant expertise and experience in child care and child development been given sufficient influence over the design or direction of the center. This committee believes that many of the problems that have plagued the center would have been avoided if (a) faculty with relevant expertise had been given a real decision-making role in setting ratios and selecting the provider for the center, and (b) parents at the center had been given a substantial formal role in the center’s operation.

The committee’s charge does not suggest that we attempt to discern who made the decision to hire Bright Horizons or how the selection process was managed. It is, however, relevant to the question of future oversight that the decision to hire Bright Horizons had by all accounts been made before Cornell faculty who had relevant expertise were asked to give input on the center. Indeed, the faculty members who sat on the University’s ad hoc child care committee in 2006 said that their involvement felt purely symbolic.

After the center opened, Cornell failed to intervene quickly enough to prevent the present crisis from developing. Information about the large number of licensing violations at the center was available to Cornell quite early in the center’s operations, but did not trigger a visible or effective response. Other events suggest that Cornell failed to address needs arising in the center. For example, in the spring of 2009, parents at the center submitted a petition to the university asking
Cornell to extend free parking benefits to teachers at the center, in response to their on-the-ground observations of teacher dissatisfaction and turnover. Although the center is located next to the A-lot, the teachers at the center could not park in the lot for free, like Cornell employees. As Bright Horizons’ employees, they were asked to pay $650 annually to Cornell (i.e., 3.25% of a pre-tax salary of $20,000), which many chose to do because convenient direct bus routes did not exist for them. The petition was rejected by the Office of Transportation Services. It took 6 months for Cornell to work out a solution, which occurred only after the parents mobilized a second, more vigorous campaign to eliminate the fees.

During the fall of 2009, when the problems at the center were deepening, some parents reached out to the University Assembly’s Childcare Services Subcommittee. In response, the chair of the UA subcommittee indicated that Human Resources had already requested that her subcommittee focus on other broad child care issues, leaving oversight of the Cornell Child Care Center to Human Resources, which would deal directly with parents at the center. This same request was then repeated orally by a representative of Human Resources during a UA Childcare Services Subcommittee meeting later in the fall of 2009.

During this same time period, Bright Horizons rebuffed efforts of the center’s Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) to become more active. Throughout 2009, the PAC was advised by Bright Horizons to focus its attention on teacher appreciation activities and was discouraged from meeting without representatives of Cornell and the Bright Horizons administration in attendance. The PAC was also discouraged from developing into a parent-teacher organization, which some parents felt could help address the concerns of teachers. The PAC relationship with Human Resources was also already strained, in part because of the parking issue, and in part because the position of the Cornell liaison to the center was filled by three different Human Resources employees during the first 16 months of center’s operations.

When it became clear to the UA Childcare Services Subcommittee in December 2009 and January 2010 that the problems at the center were very substantial, and members began to believe the subcommittee would be shirking its obligation to the university community by not considering what it could do to help, the UA subcommittee asked to see the contract signed with Bright Horizons. A representative from Human Resources reported to the committee that the Office of the University Counsel had decided that the contract could not be shared with the committee. Thus, during the crucial period when the center’s problems were deepening and parent dissatisfaction became widespread, important stakeholders had no effective means to press for change.

When Human Resources came under intense pressure to make changes following their own survey of parent satisfaction, they arranged for a visit from the CEO of Bright Horizons. During a January 2010 meeting with approximately 40 parents at the center, the CEO, who was accompanied by three other senior administrators, declined to answer questions or gave vague responses to the questions submitted to him by the Parent Advisory Committee. Instead, he repeatedly indicated that he was aware that Bright Horizons “owned the problems” and that Bright Horizons needed to fix them.
Bright Horizons then developed an action plan. This committee has not seen the action plan, but one member was told by Human Resources that the original plan was insufficient to address the problems at the center. Only after additional pressure from Human Resources in 2010, pressure that was not independent of the adoption of resolutions by the Faculty Senate and the University Assembly, did genuine improvements begin to unfold. These improvements did not, however, raise the level of care up to the quality that Cornell parents expect, and they are financially unsustainable barring a permanent change in the budget model.

In sum, this committee found evidence that Cornell’s oversight has contributed to the problems at the center. Our review of how peer institutions oversee their child care centers suggests that part of Cornell’s difficulty in oversight are related to its decision to eliminate the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. In many of our peer institutions, the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity (or equivalent) works in partnership with Human Resources to ensure that their child care center(s) meet the fundamental missions of their organizations.

To ensure the future success of the center, this committee recommends a new oversight model. The responsibility for selecting a provider and then continually monitoring and evaluating the center should be distributed more broadly across the university, while also taking better advantage of the very substantial local expertise in both child development and organizational management.

**Recommendation**

*The President should establish an Advisory Board for the Cornell Child Care Center.*

A seven-member Advisory Board should be established that includes four faculty members, two with expertise in child development and two with expertise or experience in management. The three additional members of the committee should be appointed from non-academic units at the university, such as the Division of Financial Affairs, Risk Management, the Counsel’s Office, and the Division of Human Resources.

The Board should meet at least twice per year and should conduct annual reviews of performance at the center, assisted by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. To ensure that its perspective is informed by relevant stakeholders, the Advisory Board should cultivate direct channels of communication with parents of children at the center as well as teachers. The Advisory Board should also consult with the University Assembly’s Childcare Services Subcommittee when considering issues that may impact the teaching philosophy, curriculum, and accessibility of the center. The University Assembly’s committee represents the full university community, and its members should no longer be discouraged from engaging issues of concern at the center.

In cooperation with other relevant units and committees, the Advisory Board should select the vendor in response to the new RFP recommended by this committee. The Advisory Board should evaluate alternative providers on their willingness to (1) allow parents at the center to be involved in operational decisions to an appropriate extent and
(2) allow the Advisory Board to conduct anonymous parent and staff surveys on a yearly basis.

The Advisory Board should not be charged with overseeing day-to-day operations of the center. If the President chooses to again direct the Division of Human Resources to manage the business relationship with the child care provider, then representatives of the Division of Human Resources should monitor day-to-day operations at the center. Under this cooperative arrangement, the Division of Human Resources and the Advisory Board would work together as partners with a common goal of ensuring that the Cornell Child Care Center reaches the level of excellence that Cornell deserves.

Finally, we recommend that the Advisory Board be chaired by a senior academic administrator. The University Faculty Committee has recommended instead that it be chaired by a senior administrator, not necessarily from the academic side of the university. We see advantages to both recommendations, and we have adopted the less-specific recommendation of the University Faculty Committee for the resolution that will be brought forward for deliberation by the Faculty Senate.

§6. Are the priorities of the center aligned with the core mission of the university?

The university’s core mission has recently been defined in the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan through a series of Umbrella Goals.

1. Enroll, educate, and graduate the most deserving, promising, and diverse student body possible. Provide all students (undergraduate, graduate, professional) with an education that is innovative, distinctive, and of the highest quality, and that inspires in them a zest for learning.

2. Maintain and enhance world leadership in research, scholarship, and creativity.

3. Maintain and enhance efforts to recruit, nurture, and retain a diverse faculty who are outstanding scholars and teachers and an excellent, diverse staff who provide outstanding support to faculty and students.

4. Strengthen the public engagement of the university's education, research, and clinical programs with local, national, and international communities, consonant with its stature as an academically distinguished private university with a public mission.

5. Establish and maintain organizational structures and processes that promote and support academic excellence.

With reference to these umbrella goals, the center is not sufficiently aligned with the core mission of the university. Most importantly, as noted in the first section of this report, it is not a sufficiently high quality center to attract faculty, staff, and students to the university. As noted
earlier, the center should be a source of pride for the university, and it should be used actively to recruit talented faculty, staff, and students to the university.

Moreover, from the perspective of the university faculty, the center is not sufficiently aligned with an important strategic goal of the university: to redress gender imbalance in the faculty ranks as the faculty is renewed over the next twenty years, and more specifically to bring the percentage of women in each department or unit to 20% or the PhD pipeline, whichever is greater. Meeting this goal will require that Cornell be at least as good as, if not better than, our peers in supporting women faculty. Although child care is by no means solely a “woman’s issue,” it is nonetheless still the case that women are more likely to have primary responsibility for child care and more likely to give weight to the availability of high-quality child care in assessing whether to accept an employment offer or counteroffer at Cornell.

A survey of peer institutions conducted by CU-ADVANCE suggests that the majority of our peers reserve a modest number of child care slots to aid in the recruitment and retention of faculty and, less commonly, senior staff. These slots are typically assigned by the Provost or Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. In addition to the Provosts’ slots, a few peer institutions (e.g., MIT, Brown, Stanford) have tiered wait lists that give priority to faculty for particular child care slots (e.g., all infant slots, all slots in one of the on-campus centers). We note, however, that the latter institutions offer more on-campus slots and/or are located in cities where external child care slots are more plentiful.

**Recommendation**

Mindful that Cornell has a strong tradition of extending benefits broadly to all members of the university, and recognizing that all members of the community very likely want to send their children to a center with children from diverse families, the university should develop the capacity to use the center for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff in pursuit of its strategic goals.

Although alternative models exist at our peer institutions, this committee favors a modest program, similar to the one in operation at MIT. Under this model, the Provost would have control over the allocation of 12 slots per year at the center, a number this committee found to be roughly comparable to our peers in terms of both absolute numbers of slots and the percentage of the total number of slots. The University Assembly’s Childcare Services Subcommittee has reviewed this recommendation and has expressed its support, noting further that it supported such a plan when it was proposed before the center opened.

These slots would be set aside each year for assignment by the Provost no later than May for a guaranteed summer start date. If late-fall openings are projected, a department may pay to hold one of the Provost’s slots during the fall term for a faculty member who has a January 1 start date. In order to ensure that this system is cost-effective, we recommend that the Advisory Board (a) conduct further inquiries about how peer institutions manage Provost’s spots and (b) evaluate potential providers in part on their willingness to allow Provost’s slots to stay open over the typically under-subscribed summer months with
minimal or no additional charge. The Board should also consult with the University Assembly’s Childcare Services Subcommittee while developing an implementation plan in order to discuss how to ensure that the center remains balanced across types of families at the center.

We note that 12 slots represent only 8% of the total number of slots at the center (and, moreover, that the child care center is currently below capacity). The remaining 92% of slots (or 134 slots) would be allocated in a random lottery across faculty, staff, and students. Our recommendation thus represents a balance between the goal of leveraging Cornell’s investment in the child care center to help with recruitment and retention, as our peers do, and the goals of ensuring a diverse child care center accessible to all members of the Cornell community.

§7. How should the Cornell Child Care Center fit into the broad university strategy for supporting faculty work life balance?

This question was added to the committee’s charge at the request of the Division of Human Resources in comments it provided on a draft of the March 10th Faculty Senate Resolution.

This question is best addressed by the standing University Assembly Childcare Services Subcommittee. Nonetheless, this committee agrees with prior committees that the Cornell community’s child care needs cannot be met by only one child care center. Cornell should continue to support other child care providers in the area, and Cornell should develop a strategic plan for opening additional child care centers after the university’s financial position improves. If Cornell wants to keep pace with its peers on work/life balance, it has no choice but to meet this challenge. We have confidence that the university will do so.
ADDENDUM

Resolution Adopted at the March 10, 2010 Meeting of the Faculty Senate

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,

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 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 child care, with five percent indicating that they anticipated needing child care in the next year or so, most likely for an infant ….”]

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 child care, 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?

23
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
Sofia 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. Garcia-Garcia, 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
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
decisions made and justifications for those decisions.

*The faculty realizes that some committee decisions may involve personal or sensitive
information, such as tenure decisions, and thus are exceptions to this expectation for a public
response and disclosure.
DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

BILL FRY

September 8, 2010
Calendar Committee

Jeff Doyle (Plant Biology) (chair)
Kent Hubbell (Dean of Students)
Michael Matier (IRP)
SA representative
GPSA representative
Staff representative
2-3 additional faculty

Brown (VP, ex oficio)
Bill Fry (DoF, ex oficio)

Draft Charge: “Recommend a course of action concerning Cornell’s calendar that will be academically appropriate, that will not exacerbate student stress, that will align more closely with the calendars of local schools, and that will honor federal holidays as is academically possible.”
Minutes from the October 13, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Speaker Steve Beer: “When you speak, please rise. Wait for the microphone to get to you, and then identify yourself as to name and department or other administrative affiliation. There are no Good and Welfare speakers today, so we will proceed with the agenda as is on your screen.

“At this point, we are going to have a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee, and Dean Fry will give that report.”

1. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “Fred Gouldin is the chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, but Fred is sick this afternoon and asked that I present the report. So Steve, next slide. Next slide. And the next one.

“The Nominations and Elections Committee has been working really hard. It’s been a challenge to fulfill the membership of the various senate committees, but I have these appointments to announce: To the Educational Policy Committee is Andrea Parrot and Charles McCormick; Faculty Advisory Board for Information Technologies, Carlton Gillespie, Monica Geber, and Paul Velleman, who has accepted the position of chair of that committee.

“For the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments, Sanjay Mohanty, David Lee, Steve Robertson and Tim Hinkin.

“For the Faculty Committee on Program Review, John Abowd and Raymond Craib. The Lectures Committee, Chris Anderson, Joyce Morgenroth. Library Board is Jeremy Braddock, and the Local Advisory Committee is Angela Douglas.

“And I think that completes the report from the Nominations and Elections -- oh, there is another one. Sorry. For Sexual Harassment Co-investigators, Mary McCulloch; University Assembly, Howard Howland have agreed. And for the University Relationships Committee, Steve DeGloria and Sarah Kreps. That then concludes the report from the Nominations and Elections Committee.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. So the Senate is going to accept the report. And to give us some practice, we are going to use the high tech voting procedure which you received when you came in. So the idea for this high tech voting procedure is, if you look at your iclicker, you will see there are letters next to each click position. A signifies yes, B signifies no. So let’s practice now.

(LAUGHTER)

Those senators wishing to approve the report -- seems to be a procedural question. “Oh, yes, it is necessary to turn on the iclicker. Very good.

(LAUGHTER)

“Thank you very much for that point of information. So again, you first turn it on by hitting the button at the bottom, the on/off button. And then you click A if you approve
the report and B if you don’t approve the report, okay? So now it’s time to click away.

You have a comment?”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “Just a question, information question. So how does one abstain?”

Speaker Beer: “I think probably we could click C, for those who wish to abstain. Okay, so have you had a chance to click for one hour -- sorry. One minute. There had been several clicks, so let’s give you another ten seconds to get your click in. Remember, A for approve, B for not approve, C to abstain. Another question.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “How do we know our votes recorded? Is there a paper trail?”

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: “This is strictly high tech, and we are saving on paper to preserve the greenness of the campus, even in light of the fall colors.”

Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management: “When you click, if the green light goes on, that means you have successfully voted. You can click as many times as you want.

“So now you see the results of the vote for approving, and – (LAUGHTER)

“So maybe I should ask President Skorton to please interpret the –“

President David Skorton: “There’s 48 votes for ayes, 1 vote for nay, two abstentions, one person’s offended that I am here.“

(LAUGHTER)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 2010 MEETING

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We will go to the next item on the agenda. The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes for the September 8th, 2010 meeting that were distributed in advance of the meeting to senators. Of course, I needn’t remind you that only senators are authorized to vote. All members of the faculty are authorized to speak at a senate meeting, but only senator’s vote.

“Shall we try to click again, or should we do this by voice vote? Any objection to approval of the minutes of the September 8th meeting?

“Hearing none, we’ll declare the minutes of the September 8th, 2010 meeting approved by unanimous consent.

“Now we are going to call on Dean Fry to introduce our featured speaker of the afternoon.”

3. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT DAVID SKORTON

Dean Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I had requested the pleasure of introducing President Skorton this afternoon, because it really is a pleasure to do that. He has agreed to address
the community at least once a year. It is just a really fun thing to do. I think we are -- I feel quite proud that David Skorton as our president, for a person who can get on the stage with Wynton Marsalis in September and be appointed to the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies in October, I think we are really covered. I think the jazz can help us elevate our moods. If that doesn’t work, he can work on our hearts physically to take care of us.

“So I’m really proud that, David, you are our president. The appointment to the Institute of Medicine is the highest honor a physician can get, and its wonderful David is both a physician and also a scientist. Last spring, when we were in the midst of the financial deliberations and such, I was called by a reporter from New York. I don’t know the media outlet; and this reporter kept asking questions. Frequently my answer to that question, "I’m really happy that David Skorton is our president."

“During this time, and still does have a wonderful view of the University, he has taken responsibility for correcting the financial issues that were facing us, but has done that with a heart, and I think that we’ve all benefited from that. So with that announcement, David, if you would be willing to address us.”

President David Skorton: “Bill, thanks a lot. That is a very generous introduction. I have heard a story that Samuel Johnson was at a dinner party, and the party featured dancing dogs. At the end of the evening, leaving the party, he said to the person who was hosting it, "Thank you for the wonderful evening and the hospitality, and I hope to see you soon."

“She said, "Dr. Johnson, you thanked me for the hospitality and the dinner, but you haven’t commented on the dancing dogs. Did they dance well?"

“He said, "Madam, it’s not that they danced well. It’s that they danced at all." “That is a comment on my performance with Wynton Marsalis, but it was quite an experience. Once I got done hyperventilating, I had a pretty good time.

“So I give three major “state of the university” talks a year: One is for reunion weekend, oriented to the alumni who come back; one is at the Trustee Council Weekend, and it’s oriented toward the alumni and University Council and current and former trustees; and one I take most seriously in terms of preparation is this one to the university faculty. I think that Kent and others in my office will attest that this is a very important report and update on the university.

“The difference between this and the other two, in addition to the fact I’m reporting to the faculty, the core of the university, is that I do this one in response to what the Dean of Faculty asks me to speak about. So that’s the tradition I learned from Charlie Walcott and I have continued it.

“Bill sent me a note and asked me to cover anything I thought was relevant in terms of an update to the faculty; but in particular, to be sure to cover these five items: The current financial situation, including predictions for the future; the current status of the master plan for the Ithaca campus; predictions concerning the $100-million faculty hiring initiative; the status of capital construction on the campus; and the status of implementing recommendations from the various planning processes we have been going
through. So I'll do my best to answer those questions in 15 to 20 minutes' time and allow as much time as Bill likes for question/answer.

“When I first came to Cornell after 27 years in public higher education, I needed to get around and meet the faculty and understand the different culture. In the first three years I made well over 100 visits to individual faculty offices, studios and departments and some colleges; and then the fourth year I was here, I became overwhelmed by the financial situation, and sort of dropped away from meeting the faculty at the pace I wished. I have returned to meeting faculty again this year, focusing more specifically on undergraduate teaching.

“In addition Bill has organized and I have greatly appreciated lunches at the office, where he will pick out four faculty members -- and sometimes he knows them all, sometimes he doesn’t know them all. Sometimes they know each other -- and we get to know each other a little bit. That has been very helpful. Today is an important chance for me to get more feedback from you, so I will start working down those questions.

“The first is the financial position. We are definitely on a new, more positive trajectory. This is largely because of the fact that the faculty, the deans, the staff themselves, the students and the vice presidents and vice provosts have all pitched in and interacted in ways that would lead us toward balancing the budget, not on the revenue side by raising tuition exclusively, which is the usual gambit in higher education, both public and private, but to do a lot on the expenditure reduction side, starting with the central administration of the University.

“For those of you who haven't watched this carefully -- and you probably had better things to do than worry about these details -- I eliminated two vice presidencies of the University. They won't come back, at least while I am president; made the staff in my office smaller by about 25%. Kent reduced the size of the provost's office, and many things of that type rippled through the administration of the University.

“The staff work force of the University is about 8% smaller now than it was two years ago. So know that your staff colleagues have borne the brunt of the personnel actions, virtually all the personnel actions related to reducing the University’s budget.

“We finished last fiscal year, the year that ended June 30, in the black, with a $1.9-million positive balance. Now, that doesn't mean the budget is balanced going forward. It means that last year we managed not to spend all the available resources. Some of that was due to delayed hiring. Some was due to one-time revenues that the deans especially were able to bring to bear.

“We finished with a $68-million annual operating or structural budget, $68 million of predictable expenses for which we did not have -- do not have-- a predictably recurring revenue source. And the changes that the Provost has instituted for the year we are in now, all of which have already been instituted, will bring that structural deficit down to $39 million by the end of the year. And in a couple years, we'll have a balanced budget very, very predominantly done by reducing expenditures, and those expenditures predominantly done on the administrative side of the house.
“One of the areas that several of you in this room asked me about has been longer term views on expenditure reductions related to conservation measures in the capital and construction program. I wanted to report to the faculty about that. We have approved $4.9 million so far in expenditures toward energy conservation projects -- that's building renovations -- and another $10 million will be brought forward by the end of this fiscal year. These projects will cover the entire campus, both the contract colleges and endowed colleges.

“As you understand, the benefit to the environment, of course, is immediate when the project is over. The financial benefit of these nonrecurring expenditures will accrue over years as we save money on energy costs. It will be three or four years until the savings will begin to accrue significantly. By nine years, we will have recouped the money we put out in a nonrecurring fashion. We'll be doing the right things in terms of the environment, and saving money going forward.

“We are still recovering, of course, as a nation and as a university from the market downturn. To remind you, our endowment lost 26% of its value during the first year of the recession. Last year, the investment returns were positive, 12.6%, third highest in the Ivy League, making up some of what was lost in the recession, but the endowment distributions for fiscal '12, for next year, a year from now, will remain at the fiscal '11 level, since the payout from the endowment, the monies put into the University budget, is about $300 million, which is offset against the investment returns.

“One of the areas of financial challenge to the University is dealing with the financial need of the students and families at the University, and you well understand the effects of unemployment and underemployment on family incomes; and to a great extent, that permeates this community as well. In spite of the recent financial challenges, the Provost has kept the commitment to need-blind admissions and need-based financial aid. Cornell is the seventh most economically diverse university of our caliber in the United States, based on percentage of students here with Pell grants. About 13% of the undergraduates on campus have Pell grants. A few years ago, each year the number of Pell grants on this campus was decreasing. And because of the change in financial aid that Biddy Martin, David Harris and others put into place, and it was amplified by Kent Fuchs and his administration, we continue to be even more economically diverse, which I think is very important and in the tradition of Cornell.

“As many of you have read about recently, we now have an even more aggressive student financial aid program, in which we will match the need-based parental contribution level and the need-based loan level of any other Ivy school for students accepted to that Ivy school. In other words, if a student has a documented offer from another school with a certain financial aid package, we will match the need-based parental contribution level and also match the level of need-based loans.

“We will also strive to match the same levels for students accepted at Stanford, Duke or MIT. I use the word strive there, as opposed to the more definite verb in the case of the Ivies. Philanthropy is very important to these efforts, as you will understand, and I have tremendous good news about philanthropy in the last year. Many of you have heard this
already, but I want to go over it again for you.

“We have set a goal for $350 million for additional money for undergraduate scholarships. We have raised $191 million of that already. We completed a strong year in fundraising after a recession-caused weaker year in fundraising, with new gifts and commitments up 77% last year over the year prior, for a total of $466 million. That is university-wide, including the medical college.

“Last year, Cornell had the top results in the Ivy League for new gifts and commitments. The most astounding statistic is the Cornell Annual Fund, which is money used by the department heads and deans for current year expenses -- that is, not money that goes in the endowment, but cash for use that year -- the annual fund went up every year during the recession and reached its record year last year, up 12% in one year, with $27.3 million given by 32,000 donors. So the results of philanthropy are, to me, astonishingly positive, given the fact the economy was still volatile and rocky, and probably still is.

“Once again, the credit for that goes to you and to the department heads and deans and to Provost Fuchs and to the Alumni Affairs and Development organization. The reason I say you get the credit is that what these people are investing in is either their positive recollections and connections to the university based on faculty who taught them years or decades prior; or the fact if they are Cornell parents, that their students have come here to study with you; or that the taxpayers are spending money here that you have won by competitive processes in most areas. And so you should feel good about that. It was a very, very positive year.

“In terms of the report, Bill, on campus construction, we have in excess of 200 open capital projects. Most of these are renovation projects, as opposed to new construction projects. This represents a decrease of 27% this year from the high water mark we had in '07-'08 before the recession. During the peak of the construction pause, we had over a 50% decrease in overall construction activity. A five-year capital plan is being implemented, and the difference from past practices is that all projects have all sources of funding identified in advance and, for the foreseeable future, we are not going to go out for more long-term external debt.

“The long-term external debt for the university quadrupled in the last decade, and that includes expenditures at the Medical College; and the assets against which those debts are accrued, of course, went down with the endowment decreasing during the beginning of the recession. I believe we will be able to carry forth without any interruption on the projects I will tell you about, because the Provost's office and the Office of the VP for Facilities Services, Kyu Whang, have identified sources of funding that are in-hand or lined up to be in-hand. We don't have to wonder where they will come from. They don't involve external debt.

“The only caveat we need to make in everything I tell you about revenue is the condition of the State of New York. In general, the State of New York has been absolutely reliable on following through on capital development promises when they are made, but I feel it's my duty to tell you, as you already know, the State's financial situation is difficult, and
there's going to be a change in administration; but I believe what I'm going to tell you,
including the state-funded projects will go forward as I'm mentioning, but that's a caveat.

“The major construction to be scheduled to be completed within the year, with an
estimated total cost of $373 million, includes -- those are total project costs -- the Physical
Science building, which is partially occupied and should be complete in about a month’s
time; Human Ecology building and parking garage should be completed by Spring of '11. The New York State Veterinary Diagnostic Lab was dedicated a couple weeks ago
and is an outstanding facility, the best facility of its type in the Northeast -- for those of
you who know about life science research, there are seven Biosafety Level 3 facilities in
that building. That alone is astounding.

“Paul Milstein Hall for Architecture, Art and Planning, scheduled to be completed in
about a year’s time. The Johnson Museum construction; the museum should be
completed approximately the end of the academic year, by May. The Plantations
Welcome Center is on schedule for completion this year. There is a rowing center
scheduled for completion in about a year, with the site work underway, and major
renovation projects, which many of you are living through, including Martha Van,
Barton Hall Roof and Masonry, and the Olin Library Fire Safety Project that will be
ongoing.

“Major projects planned to start this academic year, as opposed to finishing in the next
year, include Food Science in Stocking Hall. This is one of those SUCF or state-funded
projects. We are going to seek authorization this month at the Board of Trustees meeting
and hope to begin work next month, with an August 2014 completion date. This is a very
important project from any perspective that’s been in the queue for a long time. The
design projects for Warren Hall Phase 1, for Fernow Hall renovations and for
construction of the Teaching Dairy Bar, which hopefully brings back Banana Berry
Skorton, will be seeking construction authorization late this year or early 2011.

“Looking ahead -- the projects that are currently in design, but we don't know exactly
when they will start -- one is a long-term approach to suicide means restriction on
bridges, and we are still in the process of looking at alternatives, and there will be a lot of
chance for community and faculty input - and there are already faculty involved in
looking at some of the options. Gates Hall for Computing and Information Sciences is to
be built at the southeast corner of Campus Road and Hoy Road, across from Hoy Field,
and the construction is targeted to start in March 2012.

“The provost, Dean Huttenlocher and Vice President Phlegar developed a very innovative
and compelling mechanism of funding Gates Hall that is a combination of the generous
grant we got from The Gates Foundation some time ago, along with the reallocation of
some funds from CIS and Engineering and philanthropy. It is almost all finished
now. So I’m confident about that project.

“Then there's Phase 1 of a project for the Law School to renovate a portion of Hughes
Hall and construct a link between Hughes and Myron Taylor, a three-story link. It has
been authorized for design, and the construction for this aspect of this phase of a
multiphase project will be targeted for June of 2012.
“Next you’ve asked me to talk about the Master Plan for the Ithaca campus in the context of construction. As many of you remember, the master plan was conceived as a long-term development approach for the campus, not a blueprint for everything that would be built. It was designed and developed in different times, in times where the use of debt was something that was at our hands. We were using it too.

“And probably the pace of development and some details would be probably different if we were developing the plan now, but the principles upon which the plan was developed I don’t think would have changed. It had to do with supporting academic success and growth; providing open, collaborative and adaptable environments for teaching, research, and outreach; promoting exchange of ideas and the nurturing of innovation; and, of course, maintaining the beauty of the campus and the openness and pedestrian nature of campus. I mean pedestrian in the sense of walking around, not being plain.

“Once again, we are going to follow the plan, as projects come up and we can afford to build them, without external long-term debt. We will do it following the principles of the master plan, and we look at the plan each time a project comes up.

“In terms of the strategic plan, I hope many of you have had a chance to look at the plan. It is an aspirational-level plan. It has quite a bit of detail for a plan at that level. I want to tell you again how proud I am of the fact that plan was written, finalized entirely by faculty; Kent and I had serious input into it. The trustees had serious input, many of you had input into it, but the bureaucrats didn’t write this plan and put it to bed. It was done by a faculty committee chaired by Ed Lawler, and Kent and I are following this plan in going forward with the priorities of the University.

“Every academic department and college should expect to have a plan of some form that is aligned with the University’s strategic plan, and the Provost has asked Senior Vice Provost Ron Seeber, who I’m sure many of you know, to be responsible for overall implementation, coordination and monitoring of the plan. Ron is assigning vice presidents and vice provosts to each section of the plan to work with the individual units in developing what some call a line of sight between the overall plan and the plans of individual units.

“Much of the plan’s implementation, obviously, will depend on individual colleges and schools; and therefore, faculty input will be critical. The academic deans and department chairs will have responsibility for the planning in their own units, which is the only way it could work. We are now in the process of finalizing responsibility, prioritizing the different objectives and developing detailed strategy for execution of the various parts of the plan.

“The first goal of the plan is faculty excellence, and so Kent and I have taken on faculty renewal as the #1 initiative based on the plan. The strategic plan says “faculty renewal in the context of academic priorities and substantial retirements.” That is a quote from the plan. We are committed to raising $50 million from external sources and matching that with $50 million from internal sources over a period of five years, $10 million a year from internal sources, matched with $10 million a year from philanthropy, and I’m confident that we’ll get this done.
“I know that the provost and deans have identified the internal matching money, and we are in the process and already having success in identifying external funds. This resonates, of course, with alumni—recent and distant—and I’m confident we’ll be able to succeed with this plan. The objective is to hire faculty in advance of retirements. Some have called this pre-filling. Whatever you want to call it, the idea is to hire faculty in advance of the funds freeing up from retirements. And the question, of course, is will we be able to count on retirements for use of those funds at some time in the future, and we are convinced over a five-year period, ten-year period, 15-year period, many of us will in fact retire, regardless of the recession.

“We have the oldest faculty now in the history of the University. 47% of us are over 55. That doesn’t sound that old to me, honestly, but 47% of us are over 55. In the early ’80s, that number was 25%. That is quite a difference over my professional lifetime. My first faculty appointment was in ’79–’80. Many of us will retire in the next decade.

“During the recession, in addition to reducing the staff workforce by the retirement incentive and many layoffs, we suspended or canceled many faculty searches, and the hiring dropped to 43 faculty hires in ’09–’10, the second-lowest number of faculty hires in the last three decades. Obviously, a non-sustainable situation for any university, especially a university of this caliber; so Kent and I agree we need to begin hiring assertively right now to renew the faculty and take advantage of the huge wealth of talent that you and other faculty around the country are currently supervising.

“Every Cornell college and school has already been assigned a portion of the $50 million goal, to which all have agreed. And the funds each college or school raises in current use funds -- I’m talking about funds to be spent that year, as opposed to funds put in the endowment -- will be matched by the school from its internal resources. If college X has an assignment of $5 million of philanthropy, they will be expected to come up with $5 million of matching funds, which the deans have all said is eminently doable.

“The Provost asked the academic deans to develop their best estimates of the five-year hiring rates, including hiring using funds from this initiative, in addition to hiring that would have gone on without the initiative. 15% of $100 million or $15 million is targeted for the Provost’s discretion based on academic priorities across the University and, to some extent of course, by donor wishes.

“We aim to get out in front on faculty hiring. We have a better liquidity situation, if I could use that term, in this University now than many of our peer institutions because of a whole variety of factors we can talk about in the Q&A, if you wish, or any time you want to talk about them. So I think we have a chance to go out and hire some very, very impressive and promising people at various levels of academic seniority; and the Provost has a good plan, the deans are on board, and we’ll start doing it right away.

“Once again, I’m always honored to be your colleague in every way, very honored to have a chance to answer these questions for the Dean of Faculty, and I’m very pleased to stay as long as you want and answer questions about these items or anything you want to talk about. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much.”
President Skorton: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Assuming that members of the body have questions, I would remind you to please raise your hand and wait for a microphone to be delivered to you, and then rise and state your name and affiliation, and then pose your question. Gentleman in the second row.”

Emeritus Professor Dick Durst, CAPE. “In addition to the money for these new faculty that will be hired, what about space and office space, laboratory space? Has some consideration been given to that, as far as can we accommodate them?”

President Skorton: “Yes. So let me repeat the question. The question was, to paraphrase, in addition to the money for the people’s salaries and start-up packages, where are we going to put them to do their work. And you asked it in a more polite way than that, which is very unusual for Faculty Senate, but I appreciate it. It is a big issue. And unfortunately, I need to be fairly rigid about not acquiring more debt for the University because of the very high level of debt service we are paying all the time now and the fact that we are going to be paying it for decades. And so we have to find a way to utilize the space very carefully.

“That is an easy thing to say; a very hard thing to do, but there are 200 capital projects — in excess of 200 going on now. So in many areas of the campus, I would submit that we have had enormous increases, needed increases and justifiable increases; but in the physical and life sciences, we have done a lot better in the last few years than we had opportunity in years prior to that.

“I am worried about space in other parts of the faculty. In the humanities, I’m concerned about space. I know faculty are sharing offices in some areas. I am concerned also about common space, about auditoria. The Law School, for example -- I believe this is correct. I hope this is not incorrect, but I believe it's correct to this day, that the Law School cannot put the entire first-year law class in any room operated by the Law School. Is anyone here from the Law School who might know that's correct? I am pretty sure that's right.

“There are areas on campus where this is a more acute issue. So we’ll do the best we can, but I do think the urgency of returning to a healthy pace of faculty hiring, even though there will continue to be a crush while these projects are being completed, many of them have completion dates that are one or two years out.

“The possibility of increasing the human capacity of the University right now while there are so many people who need jobs in the academic community in many, many fields and while we have liquidity to hire them and the deans have identified and the Provost has a plan, I think we should push ahead and do it. Would you agree, Dick?”

Emeritus Professor Dick Durst: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer: “Senator Cohn.”

Professor Cohn: “I wanted to commend two aspects of the strategic plan; both the faculty
renewal and the explicit commitment to diversity. And I wanted to pursue that second point just a moment to ask, in the face of this very aggressive hiring, which I think is absolutely terrific, how are we going to really explicitly ensure our diversity goals? I have a specific concern in that regard.

“One of the positions in the provost’s office that hasn’t been filled is a vice provost for faculty development or diversity. I am very concerned that, without that position, we are not going to do as effective a job as we should be in meeting these two aspects of our strategic plan.”

President Skorton: “Yeah. So Abby, you have been eloquent. I agree and I believe Kent agrees 100% with what you said. It is a chance to do better on diversity. I would even take one step backward and say that whatever losses we had that made the diversity situation worse in the last couple years were especially acute because the rate of hiring was lower.

“So if you lose someone that adds diversity in any dimension, the chance of doing better in that regard was much worse when we weren’t hiring. So it’s critically important. Kent has an interim plan to deal with a position in his office. Kent, do you want to mention something about it? After Kent tells you about this, I have one more thing to add.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “So we will be announcing probably Friday -- I just read the draft for this -- that Zellman Warhaft, a faculty member in Aerospace Engineering, will be working quarter time in the provost’s office as what we are calling a provost fellow. So I can’t appoint a new vice provosts now, but I can create new titles. So he’s a provost fellow. His whole objective is to help us think about achieving this goal.

“So it’s just focused on faculty diversity, recruiting, retention, and climate. He is going to spend a year helping us do that, and you are the first group to hear that. He is starting immediately. He is teaching 170 undergrads now, but he’ll be working more in the spring. And it is acknowledgment of that issue.”

President Skorton: “And one thing I would like to add: the combination of expertise of a faculty member, the expertise in Human Resources and the discipline in the hiring units to not hire without a diverse pool, I believe it’s going to take all three of those things.

“And so what you are saying is extremely important, necessary, but not sufficient in and of itself to get this done. So we'll have to all pull together, and the rank and file faculty can have a big role in identifying individuals, sources of individuals, ways of making the opportunities apparent. And one of the things that Kent and I struggled with is how much to talk about the faculty renewal initiative outside of campus. Sort of don’t want to get peer institutions bidding against us, so to speak, for faculty hiring, recruiting diversity, to know too much about it.

“By the same token, we want our alumni and friends who are helping us fill up this fund to know about it; so we are erring on the side of being open about it. That diversity -- I know it goes beyond the faculty; the staff diversity and student diversity as well. The student diversity has been helped by the financial aid enhancement, although there’s not a one-to-one correspondence between those two items; I think in the hierarchy of things
that Kent and I talk about and realize we don't have all the answers, that's either number one or number two, so I appreciate you brought it up. And help keep our feet to the fire as you see what we end up doing. Kent and I still co-chair the University Diversity Council, but we know we need help and someone who will dedicate a serious portion of his or her time to doing this.

"Questions?"

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman on the side.”

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics. “The question I have is about the faculty club, a topic that bothers me a lot. I know it's on the plan to have a real faculty club just in the future. I understand it will not be done soon, but the one we have now is about to be closed. The question - what do you feel about it?”

President Skorton: “Well, it's a terrible situation. Peter Stein and I have had multiple conversations about this. And can you remind me, was it two years ago that we agreed to put it on the list? Or three years ago?”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics” “Two years.”

President Skorton: “The next day after Peter beat me down on that, the whole recession started. I think the very next day. I don’t think it was cause and effect. So it’s true that new construction for it is not the top priority, because there hadn’t been a source of funds. It is also true with the other area closing, many faculty have contacted me and I’m sure many have contacted Bill and -- I know Bill has, because he brought it up last time we met to comment that we lack the space. I don’t have a simple answer to this. We know it’s a problem.

“As recently as last week, when Bill and I met, we were scratching our heads and wanting to make it happen. If you have ideas in that regard of mechanisms -- everybody agrees it is important to do it, but we need mechanisms to do it--please send them directly to me, and I will share them with my colleagues. It is very important to have common space, and we don’t have much. The Physical Science building has nice common space for that part of campus. It is not the same as the faculty club, but at least there’s new common space in that regard, so I’m with you on the objective.

“Unlike the question about diversity, where we have an immediate blueprint of what to do, to at least make progress, we don’t have this one figured out. We did not put the club on the list just to get Peter off my back. He did it because we all agreed it was a need, but we are just not borrowing money right now to build things and it is not obvious where the funds would come from to do something that you will recognize as worthwhile. Questions?”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the light blue shirt.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: “In terms of hiring and renewing the faculty, are there any incentives that come from the administration for hiring junior faculty as opposed to senior faculty? At least -- I know in the hard sciences, there’s often an attraction to hiring established investigators because they are funded already, they
have a track record and so on.

“On the other hand, it kind of defeats the whole purpose of renewing the faculty, because they are coming in at a totally different level, and it's not really showing support for junior faculty hires. I am just wondering whether the administration can offer any incentives for hiring junior faculty.”

President Skorton: “I will say what I think is the case. I believe this is one of those functions that has to be decentralized, and people have to make the decision closer to the unit. There will be times when the people in the unit will want to hire someone at a mid-career level or senior level. Other times you need skills that are best met by hiring someone close to his or her training. I don't know of any direct programs from the top that incentivized junior hiring, but a very interesting question.”

Provost Fuchs: “I would recommend we don't want the provost making that decision; but on the other hand, I should say that both in my group and individual meetings with the deans in which we are thinking very deeply about this, almost always they are allocating budgets that would be appropriate for junior hires.

“So they are assuming, in many of their planning exercises, that the exiting faculty will have a higher salary than the junior faculty. I think there's a built-in economic incentive, the best way to describe it, but I don't think you want the provost making call. That is my recommendation.

“But I think there's an acknowledgment of that. We believe junior faculty are the heart of the institution in the future-- and I think we above 55 acknowledge that.”

President Skorton: “Why did you look at me when you said that?”

(LAUGHTER)

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English and the American Indian Program: “I want to follow up on diversity. CALS has a diversity requirement now. Raising consciousness on campus is one way to deal with this issue. I am wondering why the University doesn't have a diversity requirement, curricular.

“Second question, someone should explain to me -- it remains pretty mysterious -- what the relationship between the diversity council and the ethnic studies programs are on campus. It seems the ethnic studies programs are on the ground working with our diverse population, our underrepresented minority population, American Indian population, but we don't seem to have any contact with the Diversity Council. So I don't know what's going on particularly in that specific area.”

President Skorton: “Well, in the second question -- thank you for the questions -- the second question, I need to do a better job of having the Diversity Council's work visible to these areas that are close to where the action's really happening. The idea of the Diversity Council is as a policy-level group that would do things, for example, like Abby brought up, about having a certain position, understanding where the responsibility would be for planning at a policy level, what happens in the university; things not only like ethnic studies, the area you excel in and many other areas, I believe should not be dictated by
anything at the top.

“You should know what’s going on, you should have input to policies. There is a group -- I know that's what you are talking about -- group below that level, the diversity working group, that's much closer to the level of people who would be involved in that.

“Kent, do you want to say anything about working group? Not too much; but I'll tell you what we ought to do. Based on these questions and obviously on our concern about it, we should develop some communication -- so it is clearer to people. Maybe one of the things that Zellman can work with us on, if it's okay with you, Kent, is to help us get word out about it and think about ways to connect in a bidirectional sense of also getting input from these faculty-level on-the-ground working areas, about what to do.

“In terms of a requirement, did you mean a curricular requirement? That is up to you all. That is up to you all. You really don't want me dictating curriculum. I took the swim test, so I did my part in meeting a common Cornell requirement; but the tradition of this place is -- I think it's the only way to do it -- to leave the curriculum entirely in the hands of the faculty; but this is the Senate and you have the bully pulpit, and so I think it's good. Glad to be here to facilitate that.

Questions?”

Speaker Beer:  “Gentleman in the red shirt, on the aisle.”

Professor Wojciech Pawlowski, Plant Breeding and Genetics: “After several years, faculty hires were at the low level, I think many units will have a push to hire people ASAP. I wonder if you are projecting any university-wide mechanism to ensure the best people are really hired. So some kind of encouragement to the unit to not to hire the first person who comes around, but maybe the second or third round of searches would be necessary.”

President Skorton:  “Sort of a quality control mechanism. I think it's a very good point. The deans and provost will be involved in all these appointments, and I heard you. I think it's a very good idea. I think once again, you don’t want some rigid superstructure put on the local hiring decision, but we both heard you. I think it's very smart.

“Kent, You want to add a comment? Why don't you keep the microphone?”

Provost Fuchs: “Best estimates are that as many -- we have about 1,600 faculty, roughly, and the best estimates are that about 800 of us will not be here ten years from now; retirements and other departures. So if the State doesn't treat us too badly -- we'll have to hire almost 800 faculty.

“I would encourage all of us to view this as an amazing opportunity to hire people better than us. I think that should be our standard, that we want faculty here ten years from now that are better than those of us that will be retiring. You are right. There's this risk that we'll grab those that are available and we won't hire the very, very best, and I think that's critically important. You raise a good point.”

President Skorton:  “It is upwards of 800, maybe more faculty over ten years. It is a fabulously rapid rate. So I think that it's a very important point that you make, but at the
same time, it’s this amazing opportunity, and when -- I’m giving one of the other state of
the university addresses in a few days. In two weeks we will talk about this and try to get
people motivated for this process, but it is an astonishing number. It’s twice the rate of
hiring we are doing now. Twice the rate. So it is an opportunity, but it is a challenge for
that reason and for other reasons too, and the space is not an insignificant part of the
challenge.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the brown jacket.”

Professor Burkhauser: “The reports came out the last couple weeks. I would like to get
your view on how accurate validation of what we are trying to do is reflected in those
records. If you think it is a fair view of what’s going on at Cornell, how can we improve
and what will you do in the next five years to make sure we do?”

President Skorton: “This is a tough one. Most of my career was in graduate education. I
was waiting anxiously for this to come out, then I was -- let me think carefully the words I
choose -- I was baffled by the complexity of the output. At least to me, it was baffling. It
was hard for me to compare it to prior NRC rankings because the metrics used were
different, the methods used to develop the metrics are different.

“I will tell you, I’m still working through our data, trying to really understand it and I
don’t have that done yet. At first blush, as Barb Knuth I think expertly described it,
working with her staff, most of our programs I believe would be fair to say are ranked in
the top 20. Even then I have to be tentative, because it’s not clear what metric you would
use; the mid-point of the range or upper end of the range or -- you can imagine it’s
tempting to just use the upper end of the range.

“So I think at first blush, it is hard to be anything but happy with the results, but it’s a
point in time -- the last point in time was 14 or 15 years ago, and I found it very difficult,
if not impossible to compare. The last time this came out I was VP for research, working
for Hunter Rawlings at the University of Iowa; a way different time. It was easy to
compare those rankings with prior ones.

"I will tell you three things I have noticed: One is the comprehensiveness of excellence
that I perceive in the university, even before I became a cheerleader for the university, is
reflected in that. Life Science, Agricultural Science, Physical Sciences, Engineering, Math,
Humanities are all represented in that upper crust group, which is very reassuring,
because over such a long time, a decade and a half, you could wonder, especially with the
government’s disinvestment in the humanities and the arts, is that affecting quality. It is
an obvious concern. So one thing, I was reassured by the breadth of fields that looked to
me like they were in the upper echelon, if I’m interpreting it correctly.

“So secondly, the fact that within those disciplinary areas, there was a fairly broad range
suggested that there’s not just a couple points of light, but that the reputation of the place
for having faculty excellence within those disciplinary areas, as well as interdisciplinary
areas is very much intact. I think it is important to focus on the fact that interdisciplinary
studies, which was my field, can only succeed if the disciplines are grounded in very
strong faculty presence. So I feel secure saying that.
“The third is that linking our actions in hiring, in space development, in decisions about prioritization of the 15% of the faculty renewal initiative that the provost will have personal discretion for, I believe should in part be based on the more thorough drilling down into those data. I hope I’m not overstating to say Barb Knuth and her people are doing that in a big way now. Are you here, Barb? Am I overstating how baffling it is?

“Yeah, so I’m sure Barb would agree, if you have observations about the data, any of you, and you want to share them with Barb and me and Kent, we’d love to have them. It’s the first time we are looking at something that has this unusual methodology.

“Talking about rankings, I want to tell you three rankings I’m going to cite at the state of the university address in a couple weeks that I think are very indicative of what a good job you all are doing. I mean that very sincerely. One is the "Times Higher Education" ranking; puts us at 14th in the world. Even if it’s off by several places, it is amazing. There are 4,200 higher education institutions in the U.S. alone, so 14th in the world is a pretty good number.

“Secondly, the seventh most economically diverse school of our caliber nationally shows there’s been a positive effect of maintaining and enhancing diversity based on financial means through this period. And the third, very interesting to me, was a ranking about a month ago in the "Wall Street Journal" that some of you may have seen; nearly 500 companies who recruit heavily on college campuses ranked the top 25 schools they like to recruit students from. The only Ivy on the list was Cornell, and it was Number 14, just coincidentally.

“It shows that what you are doing is developing knowledge in our students in what I called in my speech last year classical inquiry as well as skills in our students that are “practical”, and we are doing it in the mode of keeping the doors open, regardless of financial means, at least better than we were.

“And the other thing interesting, by the way, is Barb’s summary. I would like to say it’s apparently accurate. I wish I understood the rankings better, but it looks good to me what she has done. Her statements in that interview, where she says the best use of these rankings will be to help inform how we’ll make things better I think is the point. That is a work in progress. Again, I ask; if you have thoughts about the results in your own graduate field, please let us know.

“One last item Barb mentioned in her interview that I’m sure you noticed was we had the most fields ranked of any private school in the U.S., which is a challenge. It also shows across that many fields to have that much excellence is a good thing. How to use it to get better is a major question.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman on the aisle --.”

Professor Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: “You still have a $39 million deficit and you want to expand all this faculty hiring. Can we see or expect more reductions in certain areas of the University? And if so, where’s that money going to come from?”

President Skorton: “Okay, the question was how we’ll get rid of that last $39 million
structural deficit. I told you all these positive things about the Provost. The provost has a plan to further get to the bottom of that. It’s based mainly on continuing expenditure reductions, but we don’t believe there will be any across-the-board reductions in force; no more major series of layoffs after the ones being worked through the system now. Doesn’t say there won’t be any layoffs, but I don’t think you will see major dislocations.

“There will be things that will be different on campus that will be a challenge for all of us to live with. We are changing the procurement system. E-shop, for example, is widely considered a challenging system. We spent two hours today with the deans, the vice presidents and the vice provosts going over all the administrative streamlining initiatives and looking at a timeline. And Kent and I both come from public university backgrounds. We have decided to make the information about cost-cutting transparent.

“So within a week, there will be a web site that, as long as you have a Cornell net ID, you can get on. Every student, every faculty, every staff can look at the details of how we are going to get to a balanced budget. Shows every initiative, every year, every dollar. It doesn’t show the details of every mechanism, but those were described in releases we had earlier in the year, so you can look at procurement -- these are all administrative areas -- information technology, human resources, finance, communications and others. There is also something called spans and layers, like my having two fewer VPs and so on.

“When you see the web site, which we previewed today, I think you will be happy about the transparency and you may wonder, how are you going to take $30 million out of the procurement system over years? We will have to all work together to be in the situation where there’s a little less choice here and there in the interest of redirecting money to other uses, for example, hiring faculty, eventually having more space of all kinds and increasing diversity in the university.

“I am proud of the fact that the Provost and others -- many others who have worked on this -- have done this budget reduction without touching the curricular side of the house; but look at the web site. By the end of the month, if not earlier, this will be up. There will be an announcement when it goes “live”. As long as you have a net ID, you can look. It has every initiative. The whole timeline for each aspect of each initiative is broken down into sub-actions. And it’s all laid out there, so take a look. It is all going to be transparent.”

Speaker Beer: “We have six or seven minutes left of questions for the president. The gentleman in the stripes.”

President Skorton: “They both have stripes sort of. All right.”

Professor Phil Nicholson, Astronomy: “I have a question that ties together the two topics of the faculty hiring you anticipate in the next ten years and the graduate rankings. In our department, we had a discussion recently, because we realized the same thing; we were faced with at least 50% of our faculty, if not more, retiring in the next ten years, because we were mostly created in the 1960s, so we have a particularly perverse histogram. And one of the conclusions we came to, I think the only one we came to, is instead of trying to replace us on a one-by-one basis, we should take this as an
opportunity to rethink within our department what are the strong parts, what are the
parts we really want to bolster 20 years from now, and which parts make a bit less sense
than they did in the ’60s, when the basic structure was developed.

"I am not sure if this makes sense. It is how to do at a university level, involves the
thought of shrinking departments and expanding others that look like they are where the
future lie, but maybe it’s a positive way to look at this. There is a tremendous number of
spots.”

President Skorton: “Gosh, it's eloquently put. I don't know how many of you have taken
time to read the summary of the strategic plan, but if you had time to read it, you will
notice similar sentiments expressed in different words in the plan. Once again, obviously,
it has to be a decentralized piece of work, although if you look back, I believe it was
December of last year, Kent, you put your decisions on the web for those 19 academic
task forces. You will see summaries of that on the web site. I know Kent agrees. The
question will be, will the local units take up the opportunity, seize the moment to actually
make some changes.

“We ought not to make change just for the sake of saying we made a change, but it is an
opportunity. 50%, 40% retirements, these are the numbers we are hearing in many
communications across the campus. It is a big opportunity or, to put it a different way, if
we don’t think about the situation strategically now, it’s not predictable as to how the
situation will turn out if we don’t take a chance to think about specific vision of the
faculty in each unit; how do they see the future of the unit and at the same time have a
campus-wide overviews. So I think it’s a very important effort to undertake.

“It is also important to foster the dialogue between those who have been here for 20, 30,
40 years and have the perspective of time with us, as Kent says, and the future of the
institution in the sense of the people who will be here after we have retired. And so how
to make sure that all the faculty have a chance for input, senior and junior, I think is very,
very important in all those areas.

“In the departments that I am associated with and appointed, two in New York City and
one here, it varies according to the unit. Biomedical Engineering, for example, is a
relatively new department. It has a different kind of history than your department does,
but I think in every department there will be retirements and in every department there
will be opportunities of one kind or another, and so I think it’s very important to do. It
has got to be done locally.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the blue and gray shirt, please.”

Professor Harry Kaiser, Applied Economics & Management: “I should say. Would you
care to give us a brief update on the State budget situation and what that's going to imply
for contract colleges this year? Being in one of the contract colleges, I’m very interested in
what might be in store for us.”

President Skorton: “Good to see you, Harry. Thanks for asking the question. Well, what
can I say about the State budget situation. I guess if you read the political ads, it depends
on who becomes governor as to exactly what's going to happen. I don't say that to be
facetious. There are very clearly stated goals for how to do things at the state level. I am very concerned about every state that I know about in the country. I spend a fair amount of time following the economics of higher education.

“Last year, last calendar year, I spent six months chairing a task force for Governor Paterson to try to diversify the New York State economy by getting businesses and higher education together in areas where that makes sense. A lot of it had to do with entrepreneurship and technology transfer; some had to do with utilizing the strengths of different kinds of higher education institutions to achieve different goals. Some had to do with bringing the venture community together with faculty in a more direct way and so on.

“In the process of doing that, I had a chance to really understand the State’s economy better than I otherwise would have. Higher education and health care are two of the major drivers of the New York state economy. Of the ten largest non-government employers in the State of New York right now, ten largest non-government employers, three of them are Cornell University, University of Rochester, New York Presbyterian Hospital. And that tells you two things: It tells you we are a big, robust organization and there are other organizations in the state not as robust as they used to be.

“So I think not necessarily you personally, but you collectively as faculty ought to be looked at by the new administration as public policy experts in different areas, whether the department you are in is called policy, like PAM, or not, there are areas in which the state will need us to step forward and offer expertise in certain areas.

“I know I’m dodging the question, because I have no idea how to predict, depending who gets elected governor what will happen, but whoever gets elected will face big deficits. So far, the two years that Kent has been responsible for the university budget, he’s found ways to buffer the effect on the contract colleges of these downturns, very creative ways to do that. We have taken up a lot of slack by these administrative reductions that absolutely needed to occur. As long as I’m president, Kent is provost, we won’t let those structures grow back; but there will be more challenges for all state institutions in this state.

“One thing I try to do each fall is meet with the school superintendents in our area, just to know more about their challenges. A lot of our faculty and grad students' kids are in those schools. The area schools are facing unbelievable challenges without alternative revenue sources. Similarly, although as a collective organization, I believe we are on a positive trajectory now, those parts of the university that will depend on state funding will still be challenged, and we have to work through that together. I mean together, not just in a rhetorical sense. We have to figure out what to do about that.

“The last thing I will say, again, every indication that Kent and I have is that the space development, both renovation and new construction, the state has traditionally supported, they are continuing to support. I think it’s very important; because in CALS, for example, as you know, Warren Hall and Stocking Hall and so on have been in need of fixes or replacement, whatever, depending on the structure for decades, can I say? At least a decade.
“And so I’m positive about most aspects, but I think it would be naive not to expect more problems at the state level. Just to remind you quickly where the money comes to run the university, 26% comes from tuition. About 20% comes from the Physician Practice Plan in New York, which is a closed feedback loop, so to speak. That is about half of it. About 10% at the high water mark came from the state, give or take. Ten percent, 11% at the high water mark came from endowment earnings, much less than our peer institutions. About 5%, 6% comes from outright gifts. And then most of the rest, a very substantial amount, you earn through grants and contracts.

“And so the state money is very, very important, but if the capital expenditures keep flowing and the provost continues to be as creative as he is, I’m very confident we’ll get past it; but I’m sure we have another challenging year coming up. I want to end on where I started answering your question, Harry. When the new governor is elected, I’m going to be on the person’s door step, again, saying the faculty of these universities in the state should be looked at as a resource to help solve some of these problems. We talked to both parties persistently throughout to make sure they know there’s a lot of expertise resident in the 300-plus colleges in the state.”

Speaker Beer: “I would like to, on behalf of the Senate and the Faculty, President Skorton, thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

“And a special thank you to Provost Fuchs for chiming in at the appropriate times. So now we’d like to call on Senator Carl Franck for resolution on academic integrity and-

4. CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND CU MATRICULATION

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Thank you. I would like to quickly report on discussions we had on an online forum over the past week that included administrators and faculty, beyond the faculty senate on the issue of this resolution we posed to you. There was an important concern that was raised by Professor Andrew Galloway that somehow the resolution might alter the nature of the academic integrity code itself, not just support it.

“He raised the following scenario: Suppose the student, under the proposal, has affirmed his acceptance of the academic integrity code and then enters Cornell and is found to violate it. Would that student be automatically expelled?

“I raised explicitly this question with the university counsel, Nelson Roth, and he replied: "You have asked whether the proposed faculty senate resolution on academic integrity at Cornell University matriculation would place a new or different legal burden on the University. Provided the actual language of the affirmation to be signed by incoming students is carefully drafted so as not to create arguable contractual rights, we see no problem with the proposed resolution.

"Thus a statement characterized as an acknowledgement and affirmation or pledge, wherein students acknowledge awareness of the code and state they will abide by it, as
opposed to an agreement to abide by it wouldn’t be problematic. Requiring students to sign such a statement as a condition of matriculation would not change the current structure.

"We do not presently need a student's agreement to adhere to the code of academic integrity in order to enforce the code. As a matter of University policy and New York State law, students are bound to adhere to it and sanctions for violations may be imposed, regardless of whether they provide such an acknowledgment."

“Thus Andrew's concern is diffused. However, Nelson Roth suggested we change the resolution's language from "agreement" to "affirmation." And Vice Provost Knuth has also drawn our attention to this. She's in charge of implementing the resolution, assuming it goes ahead. So we have a concern over language, and hence the amendments that you see in the handout and in front of us here.

“In the title, we replace the phrase "agreement" with the expression "acknowledgment of a Cornell student's responsibility to abide by the academic integrity code." In the text, we replace "acceptance of the code" with the phrase "acknowledgment of the student's responsibility under the code."

“And then to sum up, in the course of our discussions over the provost's resolution on our online forum, the concern was raised by Professor Daniel Aneshansley, Biological and Environmental Engineering, that it was too aggressive. However, generally the responses have been positive, overwhelmingly positive from faculty and administrators who have written in and we have been in touch with, as demonstrated in what you'll see in this forum online.

“We are appreciative of the support we received from current and past academic integrity hearing board chairs. I would like to move the resolution.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. The resolution on the screen, the amended resolution is before us for discussion. After some discussion, the senators will vote on the amended resolution. Any questions or comments? Senator Cohn. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Cohn: “I was just wondering about the fact that the graduate -- those graduate schools that abide by the code are not included in this. I was just wondering if there was consideration of that. Not all the graduate -- some of the professional schools have their own codes, but the graduate school, I believe, and some of the professional schools do follow the code. So just wondering about that.”

Speaker Beer: “Perhaps -- can speak to it. Please await the microphone.”

Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School Barb Knuth: “Thank you. My response is based on the beauty of Kent Fuchs' design here, where I'm not only Dean of the Graduate School, but also a Vice Provost in charge of admissions. So it's useful that I'm in this role for this question. While this resolution does deal with undergraduates, because I'm Dean of the Graduate School also, it stimulated our own thinking in the gradual school.

“So what we are doing in the Graduate School is examining the mechanism by which
graduate students accept the offer of admission to the Cornell Graduate School and identifying if we could have a similar kind of process. So what we are thinking about at the graduate school level, because the admission acceptance there is done online, that we’d have a link to the code and then, in the agreement to matriculate at Cornell in the Graduate School, there would be some sort of affirmation; but the details haven’t been worked out, but at least it stimulated our thinking on that.

Speaker Beer: “Any other comments or questions? Are we ready for the question?

“So you had your practice session with the clicker. Now it’s a real clicking experience, if I can get the clicking to go. So I would remind you, make sure your clicker is turned on and press the A button if you vote affirmatively for the amended resolution. Press the B button if you are opposed. Press the C button if you abstain. Please don’t press D or E.

(LAUGHTER)

Resolution to Include Acknowledgment of a Cornell Student’s Responsibility to Abide by the Academic Integrity Code as a Requirement for Matriculation into Cornell’s Undergraduate Degree Programs.

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity, (http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html) but continues to suffer significantly from violations of the Code.

Therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the Code, and better establish it as a part of Cornell identity, the Senate resolves, following consultation with members of the Administration responsible for admissions and enrollment and the office of the University Counsel, that acknowledgment of a student’s responsibility under the Code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell’s various undergraduate degree programs. Specifically, a student’s affirmation of acceptance of Cornell’s offer of admission should include language stating that the student will abide by the Code.


“And we’ll give you up until 60 seconds to do your clicking.

“Ten seconds. Well, the results are before you. 91% of the clickers voted for the amended resolution. 9% voted against. No abstentions. So the amended resolution is adopted.

“We will now go to the next item on the agenda. The next item is a report from Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry.”

5. REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean of Faculty Bill Fry: “So I hope there are no "Sun" reporters that say it took the faculty three minutes to make their first vote using clickers, but we need to thank Rich Burkhauser and Rosemary Avery for berating us into getting the iclickers, so congratulations to you; and David Kingsley for actually doing it. Thank you very much
for enabling that to happen.

“I have just a few comments today, since I stand between you and adjournment. I wanted to say first of all that the UFC and the faculty-elected trustees are going to meet with members of the Board of Trustees in two weeks. If you have issues that you would like us to bring to the Board of Trustees, would you please send them to me, if that would work; because we’ll bring up issues of concern to the faculty to the members of the Board of Trustees.

“In April of this year, President Skorton charged Susan Murphy, Kent Fuchs and Bill Fry with coordinating the examination of the student experience, and several processes are in place at this point to deal with that. There was a resolution at the Senate last spring in which we encouraged an analysis of advising.

“Laura Brown, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, has done several steps on that. There are activities underway, and just seems to me it would be appropriate for the Senate to hear from Laura in the not too distant future about what some of those steps are and what progress has been made. So I would like to put that on the agenda for a future Senate meeting, unless I hear objections to that.

“I reported last time that there is in process a calendar committee. It is almost completely formed -- not quite -- and that group should be meeting in the very near future. As near as I can tell, just about everything is on the table.

“That committee may refine its charge, but I think they will consider all aspects of the calendar. That is the weekly calendar, the days of instruction, and also the times of instruction during the day. I know several of you have very passionate opinions about those. I would like to hear those, and the calendar committee should hear those opinions. Jeff Doyle is chairing that committee, and do please send your suggestions to Jeff. You can copy me, if you wish.

“I received comments from other people about other pedagogical issues that we should consider. Many of those I think will go to the Educational Policy Committee for at least initial discussion. I would like to hear from you, if you have other issues that you haven’t sent that we really should take to the Educational Policy Committee.

“Some of them that I have heard about are the workload of students, whether there should be cross-college consistency in credit hours, cross-college curriculum development; but please do send me your suggestions, and I’d be happy to receive those. I’m wef1@cornell.edu. I think that’s it. So are there any questions or comments for me?”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. And there are no Good and Welfare speakers; so at this point, a motion to adjourn is appropriate.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “So moved. Any opposed? The Senate is now adjourned. And please don’t take the iclickers with you. Leave them on the table in the front of the room. And you might click them off at the same time.”
Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

October 13, 2010
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Resolution to Include Agreement to Abide by the Academic Integrity Code as a Requirement for Matriculation into Cornell’s Undergraduate Degree Programs

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity, ([http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html](http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html)) but continues to suffer significantly from violations of the Code.

Therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the Code, and better establish it as a part of Cornell identity, the Senate resolves, following consultation with the Advisory Committee of the Associate Provost of Admissions and Enrollment, that acceptance of the Code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell's various undergraduate degree programs. Specifically, a student’s affirmation of acceptance of Cornell’s offer of admission should include language stating that the student will abide by the Code.

Submitted by:

Carl Franck, Senator, Physics
Terrill Cool, Senator, Applied & Engineering Physics
Ephraim Garcia, Senator, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Linda Nicholson, Senator, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Shawkat Toorawa, Senator, Near Eastern Studies

August 31, 2010
Resolution to Include Acknowledgement of a Cornell Student’s Responsibility Agreement to Abide by the Academic Integrity Code as a Requirement for Matriculation into Cornell’s Undergraduate Degree Programs

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity, (http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html) but continues to suffer significantly from violations of the Code.

Therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the Code, and better establish it as a part of Cornell identity, the Senate resolves, following consultation with members of the Administration responsible for admissions and enrollment and the office of the University Counsel, that acknowledgment of a student’s responsibility under acceptance of the Code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell’s various undergraduate degree programs. Specifically, a student's affirmation of acceptance of Cornell's offer of admission should include language stating that the student will abide by the Code.

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

October 10, 2010
Resolution to Include Acknowledgment of a Cornell Student’s Responsibility to Abide by the Academic Integrity Code as a Requirement for Matriculation into Cornell's Undergraduate Degree Programs

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity, (http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html) but continues to suffer significantly from violations of the Code.

Therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the Code, and better establish it as a part of Cornell identity, the Senate resolves, following consultation with members of the Administration responsible for admissions and enrollment and the office of the University Counsel, that acknowledgment of a student’s responsibility under the Code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell's various undergraduate degree programs. Specifically, a student's affirmation of acceptance of Cornell's offer of admission should include language stating that the student will abide by the Code.

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

October 10, 2010
April 2010: President Skorton challenged the community to examine “the student experience”.

Coordination: Susan Murphy, Kent Fuchs, Bill Fry
April 2010: President Skorton challenged the community to examine “the student experience”.

Coordination: Susan Murphy, Kent Fuchs, Bill Fry
advising (Laura Brown)
calendar (in process)
   (please send me your suggestions)
other pedagogical issues (EPC)
   (work load of students, cross-college consistency in credit hours, etc.)
   (please send your suggestions)
Dear Senate Colleagues,

In order to facilitate discussion in advance of our next meeting’s vote on the resolution to require an affirmation of the Academic Integrity Code as part of the Cornell undergraduate matriculation process, we have established an online forum on the topic for Cornell administration and faculty members. It is available to all such members of the Cornell community with academic appointments. You can access the forum in order to read the resolution and post and read comments about it by going to:

https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/AIDISC/Home

This tool is very user-friendly and you should be able to use it straight away. You can find detailed instructions at


If you have questions about how to use the forum, please contact me at cpf1@cornell.edu or call 5-5215 or 257-6969 (home) or administrative assistant Ms. Becky Jantz at raj8@cornell.edu, 5-5351. We are indebted to Ms. Barbara Friedman at CIT for setting up this forum.

I hope you’ll pass along this invitation to all your department’s faculty.

Sincerely,
Carl

--
Carl Franck
Director of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Professor, Physics
Minutes from the November 10, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steve Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to order the University Faculty Senate meeting for November 10, 2010. I would like to first remind people present that no photos or tape recordings are allowed during the meeting and ask everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phone.

“When members of the body wish to speak, we ask that you rise and identify yourself as to name and administrative unit, and kindly await for the microphone to arrive before speaking. And I would remind you that we have a high-tech voting system. Every senator should get a clicker. There are clickers in the box at the left and, if you see a senator coming in who bypasses the clicker, please ask him to get a clicker, because he'll need it for the important votes that the Senate will take this afternoon.

“So at this point, I’d like to call on Associate Dean of the Faculty Fred Gouldin for a report on the Nominations and Elections Committee.”

1. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS

Associate Dean and Secretary, Fred Gouldin: “Thank you, Steve. It’s my pleasure to be reporting for the Nominations and Elections Committee, which as usual, has been working very hard. The information that I’m going to tell you is also shown on the screen, so let me begin.

“The Childcare Services Subcommittee, Stephen Morgan of the College of Arts and Sciences has agreed to serve.

“For the Educational Policy Committee, Bruce Levitt, who is chair, College of Arts and Sciences, and John Muckstadt, College of Engineering have agreed to serve.

“For the Faculty Committee on Program Review, Professor Jane Mount Pleasant, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, will be joining that committee. For the Lectures Committee, Jonathan Ochshorn of the College of Architecture, Art and Planning, is chairing that committee. For Nominations and Elections, Susan Suarez of the College of Veterinary Medicine will be joining that committee.

“The North Campus and Collegetown Council has three new members: John Belina of the College of Engineering, Jennifer Gerner of the College of Human Ecology, Joe Regenstein of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Professors-at-Large Selection Committee, Graeme Bailey, the College of Engineering; University Benefits Committee, Michel Louge, my colleague from Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; and the University Sustainability Committee, Tony Ingraffea of the College of Engineering.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Fred. The body may accept the report. All in favor say aye. (Ayes.)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed, nay? Abstentions?

“Your report is accepted.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “Thank you very much.”
Speaker Beer: “Now I’d like to call on Associate Dean of the College of Human Ecology, Carole Bisogni to give a report on advising. And I can equip you with a microphone.”

2. REPORT ON ADVISING

Associate Dean Carole Bisogni: “Thank you. I appreciate being invited. I am here to read a report from Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Laura Brown, and this has to do with the advising study being undertaken by the Associate Deans Working Group.

“This report is being a followup to actually a request from the Faculty Senate that we investigate and consider issues related to faculty advising, which in my experience is being expressed around the campus at this time. I have a brief progress report.

“The associate deans for undergraduate education are convened monthly by Vice Provost Laura Brown, and the group consists of the associate deans of all the undergraduate colleges, among others, and I can tell you those others later, if you wish. Our study of advising across the undergraduate colleges has four particular aims: One is to provide a description of current advising practices ongoing in each college. We believe this information will suggest effective models and also generate useful comparisons across how things work in different colleges and how people feel about them.

“A second aim of our study this semester is to generate a statement of advising goals for the undergraduate colleges, a statement of what we’d like to achieve, and also to address the current challenges toward these shared goals and the current assets we have as a campus.

“A third aim is to address the impact of the PeopleSoft software on the advising relationship -- the relationship between faculty-students and other advising staff on campus -- and make recommendations related to this relationship. Finally, our aim is to introduce -- consider new activities, projects and directions for undergraduate advising on campus. These would include best practices in the colleges, new programs that colleges are trying, as well as possible collaborations, adjustments, new priorities and university-wide activities.

”For example, it may be possible to really strengthen undergraduate advising through initiatives in resident life, the first-year experience for students, new student programs, undergraduate research, and also through career services.

“This is our progress report of what we are up to. We plan to have the report completed by the end of the semester and to provide the report to college deans, the provost, the president, the faculty senate, the dean of students and others who wish it.

“I know at this time, if you have comments or concerns, we welcome them, either now, if there's time, or perhaps directly to Laura Brown or through your college associate dean for academic affairs.”

Speaker Beer: “We have several minutes available for questions and answers. Senator Cohn. Please wait for the microphone.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “Okay, one is whether there’s any faculty representation on the working group; and the second is whether you could share any
more specific responses vis-a-vis the resolution we put forward with some specific concerns and recommendations last spring.”

Associate Dean Bisogni: “The working group doesn’t have representatives on it. All the associate deans are faculty members. We also have in the group the associate deans from the graduate colleges, the dean of students, associate dean for continuing education summer session, university registrar, the associate dean for new student programs, vice president for student academic services and the director of the office of undergraduate biology; but in terms of at-large faculty members, in this group, no.

“You raise a good question. I don’t have specific comments in response to the Faculty Senate resolution at this time.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other questions or comments on the matter of advising? Thanks for the report.”

Associate Dean Bisogni: “I will pass it on to Laura Brown. Thanks for inviting me.”

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 2010 MEETING

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call for consideration of the minutes of the October meeting of the university faculty. Are there any comments or questions on the minutes?

“And before we take a vote on this, I would like to remind the members, the senator members that we are now high-tech and vote by clicking. And just to refresh you, there are a bunch of buttons. The button at the bottom turns the apparatus on or off; and to vote affirmatively, you push the A button. To vote negatively, you push the B button. To abstain from voting, you push the C button. Please don’t finger the D and E buttons.

(LAUGHTER)

“Associate Dean Gouldin informs me we are short of a quorum. That means we cannot take a formal vote at this time. We will pass over this issue and go to the next issue on the agenda, which is the presentation of a resolution on faculty lunch by Professor Grossman. And we’ll have a discussion -- the resolution will be presented, and then we’ll have a discussion on it; however, until a quorum appears, we will not be able to vote on the resolution.”

4. RESOLUTION ON A FACULTY LUNCH

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics Department, Arts & Sciences: “Okay. Actually, I was here nine months ago, kind of feel like -- nice time schedule, right? And I was talking to you about the resolution, the situation with the lunch. And what I want to do today, if you don’t remember, I want to, again, briefly review what I know the situation was, where we are now and why I want to have this resolution.

“Can we have the resolution up here? Okay. Here’s the resolution.”

Motion for the Cornell Senate: "Status of faculty center"

WHEREAS most major universities in the world have a “faculty club” or a “faculty center”, and
WHEREAS Cornell University has had a faculty club and/or luncheon facility for over 50 years, which has important benefits to the university such as increasing professional and social interactions amongst faculty members, thereby improving faculty productivity, and assisting and enhancing recruitment and retention of faculty,

WHEREAS the existing faculty luncheon facility is to be closed at the end of the Fall 2010 semester, and

WHEREAS the Cornell Dean of Faculty conducted a survey of faculty members about the need for a faculty luncheon facility and the results indicated that a significant number of faculty members felt that keeping the facility is important, and

WHEREAS the 2010-2015 Cornell University Strategic Plan calls for "develop a revamped faculty club on campus,"

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT The Senate strongly urges the Cornell Administration, and in particular, the Provost, to reverse the decision to close the current faculty luncheon facility and keep it open until a suitable replacement is found, and recommends that a serious planning effort be undertaken, with Administration support and involvement, to ensure a sustainable faculty center that includes a luncheon facility.

Senators supporting: Elizabeth Earle, Don Hartill, Harry Kaiser, Michael Nussbaum, Tim Mount

Speaker Beer: “You can advance the slides yourself.”

Professor Grossman: “Oh, yeah, that’s okay. I have learned a lot. I have learnt how to write resolutions. Some friends help me, so you do get good things. Anyway, so as far as I know, the history is that we have something called a Statler Club, a faculty center. For many years, I think before I was born -- not 100% sure -- but there’s a place that was there, and it was at the Statler Hotel.

“Last year and through the years, it was shrinked, and last year it was shrinked a little bit more, the beginning of 2010. And now the situation that, unless something will come out, the plan is that it will be closed, okay. There’s not any specific plan for this to stay open.

“And then the Provost, I think, in January, he appointed the Dean of Faculty to try to find a solution. I have been talking alot with the Dean of Faculty. I talked alot with the Provost, and we tried to find a solution. Then the Dean of Faculty appointed a committee to try to find a solution. I was the chair of this committee, and we have tried hard to find an alternative.

“I really spent a lot of time trying to look for places. I have sent a lot of e-mails to people around campus, and it was a very frustrating experience, because people just don’t answer you -- I don’t know; they don’t know you, or just because it’s frustrating, you know. You talk to students and they say, ”We don’t have time.”

“I say maybe we give them less homework, they can answer my e-mails; but practically, basically, and I think I understand the reason. Nobody wants to give up space. Space is very, very important. Every space that’s freed up, there’s like I don’t know how many people want this space, so people naturally don’t come and come back to us. So basically,
we had this committee, we produced a report of -- this committee basically, the bottom line is nothing comes out of it. So what I'm trying to gain by bringing this resolution is to try to make it why it is important for us and why we don't want it to be closed. That is the basic idea.

“So let me again try to explain why this is so important and why it’s important for me and why it is important for anybody. Let me start by saying that -- maybe not a good argument. Whenever my kids bring up this argument, I said it's not an argument, but everybody has it, so I want it; but it's true.

“Basically, if you just look out -- basically all universities that we want to be like them, they have a faculty club, and they have a place. I have a friend, you know, a colleague of mine, he said I’ve been to the Dominican Republic, and they have much better than what we have. So yeah, there is something about what we are -- we consider ourself -- and I’m really happy to be part of a very first-class university and we want to be top ten university, everybody says, and we want to be like everybody else.

“The other thing, within the university, many other sectors have their own place. Every day I walk by the Big Red Barn, and this basically the University gave to graduate student something, that I don’t know how much money it was, but it was given to them, and nothing had been given to us. So it’s not only the University decided no sector get nothing. And I know that there’s a lot of history coming, but that’s what the current situation.

“The undergrads have their own place. We were talking to the football team. The football team even has their own place, and we don’t.

( LAUGHTER )

“No, I know. That is what it is. That is just a matter of fact. There is some frustration about it. Now, the other thing I want to say is that in a way, I don’t have to even prove -- try to tell it to the University, because the University themself have it -- how it say not black and white, but white on screen, on the resolution -- on what’s called strategic plan.

“The strategic plan, it says clearly the university club as a whole is a very important thing. One of the actions is to not only to keep it, but actually improve it. It says the action objective C -- objective 6, item C, develop a revamped faculty club on campus that ensure there are conversation space for faculty, graduate professional student across campus, so people actually -- we don’t have to really, in a way, to kind of explain why it is important. Everybody kind of agreed it is important, then we kind of fall between the cracks.

“There was a survey done over the summer. All faculty members were asked how important it is for them. I don’t have the summary with me, but basically, everybody can read what they read. It is very clear that there’s significant amount of people that see it as very important.

“So let me say -- I think this is where the point is, and that’s what I try to convey, is for us, this is like really very, very important for the way we do work, and kind of try to explain it is when I try to set a doctor appointment, I will say, you know, I cannot do it over lunch. I can do it at 11:00 or 2:00. Lunch is the time we do things; we go together and sit and discuss physics and teaching and discuss post-doc hiring, whatever you want. That’s the
time. Everybody in our group knows that’s what it is.

“And the point that I think is very important to understand is that we do research, everybody of his own needs. The University provides us with needs; so University provide, for example, libraries. Some people, it’s very important for them. That’s why the University provides it for us. People have different need. For our group, basically, the fact that we have a place we can go and discuss quietly in a nice atmosphere, it’s extremely important for our work, okay. It is not just hey, let’s have lunch. That’s really, really the point.

“And I would like to have a little quote, so I asked some friends -- so that’s for us, from my group at physics, but I asked friends from -- don’t matter who she is, but a young faculty member, female faculty member that’s important, and she said, and I quote, "I can safely say that most of the mentoring I received as an assistant" -- [AUDIO DIFFICULTIES] -- we come together and find a solution.

“I know from the past that when someone -- when these things were -- if the University will decide, this is really, really important, we will find a solution. And that’s basically the aim of this resolution. So this is basically all the fact, and this is what I was -- came about it. I was hoping that we can get, and basically to keep it open and to work really with a lot of goodwill to find a solution. And I think if we do it, we will find a solution. That is it.”

Speaker Beer: “So the resolution is now on the floor, open for discussion. Gentleman in the blue shirt. Please wait for the microphone.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Can you tell us the exact numbers of people that supported it in the survey as a fraction of the total number of faculty?”

Professor Grossman: “Yeah, so the numbers you ask for, it was from 1 to 4. Four was extremely important, very important, kind of important and not important. The number was 9% said extremely important, another 18% said it’s important, and 40-something percent said it’s not important. More than 50% said it’s important to some degree.

“And my point, as always, there’s nothing that is important for everybody. There’s many things that I couldn’t care less if the university would close it, but it’s important for -- so that’s the numbers.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the second row, please.”

Emeritus Professor Dick Durst, CAPE: “Have alternate locations been sought for the faculty club?”

Professor Grossman: “Yeah, so we looked for many alternate locations, and many of those, we tried to contact the people that are responsible. As I said, some didn’t answer, some answered for the first or second e-mail, and I can tell you a list of places that we tried. And basically, it’s extremely hard to come as myself and say, you know, we are doing this, as head of committee, so we look at -- we didn’t get an answer yet. We looked at Anabel Taylor. They said they may be able to give us for one day a week.

“We are still looking -- Dean Fry is looking; there’s still no answer. I don’t know. It doesn’t look so good. We tried to look at several places in Physics building, in particular,
since we have a new building; we'll be moving. There's some big space that used to be the library down there. When we came, it's already -- I don't know how many other people are wanting this thing. We tried the A.D. White House. The answer was it was tried already ten times. Don't bother.

“So I still went out and I ask and I got the answer there's -- we look at the Sage, and nothing come up, and we look at the Memorial Hall for the football. Actually, they said they might be able to give it to us for like one day a week. So if we were able to get five places that will tell us one day a week, we might be able to do something, but we are down maybe for two. So yeah, we tried. We tried, okay. I don't know if there's other ideas on the market. I'd be happy to try.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the third row, please.”

Professor Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. “I don't get a lot of e-mails from faculty about resolutions, but I got e-mails on this, and there was a lot of strong support among engineering faculty, at least from my department, Mechanical and Aerospace. It could be that engineers are socially challenged, and any chance we get to socialize we want to take advantage of it. It might also be that engineers, like physicists, like to work in teams and discuss problems and discuss technology over lunch. Maybe that's it -- I'm not sure -- but there was a lot of support among engineers.

“I think having the lunch club thing is really lame and a first-rate university should have a genuine faculty club in a traditional sense, its own building, somewhere on campus. I am afraid of this era where we have to come up with the money to pay for the building before we can break ground, or God forbid find a little spot where to put the building, this is going to be a long way off, probably beyond 2015. I would invite a comment from the Provost, if he'd dare, but --.”

Speaker Beer: “Senator Lisa Earle, who is also one of the senators bringing us this resolution. Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics. It is true that the survey showed that many faculty are unfamiliar, completely unfamiliar with this facility or don't consider it highly important. I think one reason for that is that the reduction in size of the facility, particularly the recent shrinkage down to the Regent Lounge has made it unrealistic to advertise the facility, to make people aware of it, to invite new faculty coming to Cornell to come to it; because if that kind of advertisement were successful, the place would be overrun.

“So just holding steady at the numbers we currently have is the best we could do, given the facility, but that's not to say that a larger or better facility would not be an important thing to more faculty members.”

Speaker Beer: “Lady near the rear.”

Professor Rose Batt, ILR. “We have a group at ILR that regularly goes over to the Statler at noon, and it’s a very inclusive thing, so that whoever wants to participate on a daily basis can. There is always a group of four or five or six or ten. It is a great integration mechanism, because when visiting faculty come, or when you want to kind of engage graduate students, there's always an inclusive group, and we find it's a great way of
integrating people who come for a month or two and want to learn more and get to know the faculty, so it's been a really positive thing to have for faculty generally. And I would just echo what Elizabeth Earl said. I happened to be an undergrad here in the '70s, and I waitressed at the faculty club, and it was just always full. Then I came back 20 years later, and it was this kind of skunky thing in the bottom of the terrace. Then it became even skunkier; went to a tiny room in -- a room in Statler, and I think that it's really a shame. I think people really need it.

"And the other thing is, facility. I don't know how people feel about lunch, but you go over to the Statler or, you know, The Red Barn at noon, I mean, you wait in these lines and you grab something, you go back to your -- it is so un-social. And we need spaces to have quiet conversations and build a sense of community."

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman in the center."

Professor Peter Hinkle, Molecular Biology and Genetics. "We have had a couple discussion about this issue now. I don't think I heard anyone speak against it. Maybe I have forgotten, but by own feeling is times have changed, and there are lots of facilities on campus that aren't as formal as the old faculty club, and probably in some cases they have cooks and some cases there's simply rooms with microwaves.

"We have lunch rooms in our building. There's no difficulty for groups of faculty to say let's meet and discuss a certain problem at a certain time, and there are plenty of places to do that. In fact, you could even do it in someone's office, if it's not too large a group.

"The other factor is, my own feeling is that faculty frequently wish or desire to have a subsidized lunch, and I don't think that that's the modern way to do it. Also, I know I've met many Europeans over the years who would never consider bringing a lunch from home, but I don't think that's such an unusual thing, even for faculty to do nowadays.

“So I would say what we are experiencing here is the change in the times in which people didn't utilize it as much because there were alternatives and there were changes in lifestyle. We dress differently also now. Anyway, I don't think we need a faculty club."

Professor Grossman: "If I can answer these three points. The first point, as I said, that's I think the main point: We work differently. I don't know how you work. We work differently. If it was up to me, truly, we'd close all libraries. I do not need a library. My point. (LAUGHTER)

"Why, if they come -- of course, others need it. So the fact that I need it and you don't, doesn't mean. And the fact that I don't find it nice to bring lunch from home, the point is that we, as faculty, should support the fact that we are diverse and we are diverse in the real meaning of the -- we work differently. And since I was a student, in all high-energy groups, high-energy physics groups in the nation is same. At Stanford, it was the same; that's what it is. We always do this, okay.

“So the fact -- I think what I really ask here is the understanding we do things differently, and the fact about when we did this survey, actually you find that the number of assistant professor that need the club is actually more than full professors; so just an interesting fact."
Speaker Beer: “Gentlewoman in the yellow, please.”

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Veterinary Medicine, Biomedical Sciences. “I don't know if you are aware of it, but there was a considerable body of knowledge on this subject of a faculty club, because there was a committee that was sponsored by Provost Martin, and there was a considerable amount of investigation that was done on this. And there was also a faculty survey that was done by Peter Stein, so it was done very specifically.

“I don't know how many people responded, but it was a significant response, and that over 80% of the faculty who responded said they wanted a faculty club and they wanted one that was -- that they could spend money at lunch; they didn’t expect to have a subsidized lunch. And we also had looked at it to see what was needed to make it financially sustainable, without intervention or supplementation from Cornell. And so all of that is available to you. I just want to say that none of the faculty were looking for a free lunch or even a subsidized lunch. It was very clear from the survey that what they were looking for was a place to work, and a different kind of place to work than what they already have. That’s different for different people.

“Clearly, it was also a place to bring people from other places and impress them with the Cornell environment so that we could recruit people here, and also mentor the people that we have in a very friendly and collegial environment. And I don’t feel that we have that now.

“Certainly, there are places to go and cook your lunch, but that's not what we are talking about. We are talking about working, recruiting, keeping the people that we have that are good in a collegial environment, where everyone is welcome. And it was not only for faculty. It was also for other people who are not faculty, per se, could come. So I think it’s important we go back and look at that. The siting was very important and the financial issues were very important, and you should see that.”

Professor Grossman: “Didn't know about this.”

Speaker Beer: “I am informed by Associate Dean Gouldin that we had achieved a quorum, so after another question or two, we will put the resolution to a vote.

“The gentleman in the second aisle.”

Emeritus Professor Jerry Hass, JGSM: “First I want to point out, I think the faculty club is a little narrow definition. At least in my mind, faculty -- also, talking about university club, where friends of the university and others could enjoy the opportunity to get together in something other than a 3-by-5 lunch room or a place that's so noisy, where maybe you can't even get a table, except if you went very early or very late.

“And the second point I would make is that over three days, I took the opportunity to just pass this resolution about the faculty club. How many people signed -- did you count the number?”

Professor Grossman: “No, but I can show you.” Professor Hass: “Someone came to me and said subsidized lunch for 25 people.”

Professor Grossman: “No. We have --.”
Professor Hass: “That’s just people in the last three days that were at that club, that we -- and I saw people come in at one time, look and walk out because there was not a table available. I think there are more than 100 signatures.”

Professor Grossman: “Not 100, but close to 100, I think. 10 to the 2.” Professor Hass: “That is a lot of people.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. I think we are going to have to consider whether this resolution should be voted upon or not, because time for its discussion has passed. So are you ready for the question?”

Professor Hass: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer: “So as I indicated, we are going to vote by clicking, so all those in favor of the resolution on the lower part of the screen, please indicate such by pressing the A -- first turn on your clicker, the bottom button, and then press the A button if you are in favor of the resolution, the B button if you are opposed to the resolution, the C button if you wish to abstain from voting.

“As far as I can tell, I’ve done what I should with this master clicker. So I think alternatively, we’ll have to vote by -- (LAUGHTER) - by show of hands. So I would ask Dean Fry and Dean Gouldin to please count. All those in favor, please raise your right hand. “All those opposed, please raise your right hand.

“All those senators who wish to abstain, please raise your right hand. “Without seeing the count, just seeing the hands, the resolution passes. 46 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention.

“So quickly, can we dispose of the minutes of the October meeting? All those in favor of the approving the minutes, raise your right hand. Those opposed, please raise your right hand.

“Those abstaining, please raise your right hand. “The minutes are approved unanimously.

“Okay, so now we have a report from the University Faculty Committee by a mystery reporter to me.”

5. UFC REPORT

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “Actually didn’t know I was going to do this until I arrived today. Thank you once again. UFC met with the executive committee of the Board of Trustees two weeks ago today. It was really interesting. That is about the only thing I want to talk to you about, and I’m going to be brief.

“Who was there from the UFC, well, Bill was there, of course. He was sitting at the head of the table with Peter Meinig, who’s the chair of the Board of Trustees. From the UFC, we had Eric Cheyfitz, we had Don Hartill, we had David Lipsky, Tim Mount, I believe -- no? Kent Goetz, and I. The whole executive committee, the Board of Trustees, those in town were there. That was unusual. Apparently, this meeting has only been with a subset of that group in the past, but Peter Meinig invited everybody.

“The UFC met and talked a little ahead of time about what we wanted to ask the trustees
about. One thing was a really general question, and that was reimagining Cornell -- that’s a weighty phrase -- and you, trustees, is the reimagining that you are seeing the kind of reimagining you imagined? And sort of gave them that open question.

“And the responses were telling, in a certain sense. I mean, the trustees were not of all one voice. And for example, the woman who was in charge of the big $4 billion capital campaign was saying -- sorry? Yeah, I don’t know their names. I am really sorry. She said how great it was that we even had a strategic plan, that the universities don’t usually have things like this the way we have it, and this is a great selling point when we’re raising money. That was one piece of response.

“Another piece of response was we are totally on board. It is all up to you guys, all up to the President and the faculty and the administrators, like the Provost and company, and we are all on board with that. Then there were the few who were sort of like well, yes, we like, but we’d like to see a little more speed with certain things, you know.

“For example, they were saying if economics is taught in 50 different places in the University, how can that possibly be efficient and all that sort of thing. And that opened up an interesting discussion. David Lipsky made a really solid speech, I would call it, supporting the way we do things at Cornell, in some sense autonomously; that it’s different having economics in the ILR School from having economics in the Johnson School, labor economists working together, sitting together, do important things together that they wouldn’t do if we just threw all the economists -- or even had all the economics courses kind of uniformly shared across.

“There were some positive feedback from the Trustees on that. They said yes, you’re right. Some of them did. Some of them still thought there’s got to be a better way. Okay, another thing was -- another point one of the UFC members brought up was the fact he didn’t feel the University was doing such a great central administrative job on diversity stuff, and even though they are talking a lot about it.

“And more broadly, he commented that often the central administration wants to do something that everybody agrees is a good thing and they kind of ignore the fact we have all kinds of scholarship across the University dealing with whatever they are trying to do. They don’t ask those people. They go hire administrators to do the job without asking faculty, who happen to be experts in the area. And the trustees said that’s something very important you take up with your President. That was one thing.

“Now, the one shocking comment I heard -- maybe I’ll close with this -- the one sitting right across from me. He said, and I almost quote -- this isn’t funny, actually -- he said given that only 20% of our recent graduates are employed, do you think we should be giving them a more relevant education?

“Now, first of all, the stat in the first clause does not apply to the Engineering College, certainly not. And I can’t imagine that everybody else is so down in the dumps that it averages out to be 20%. When you take the Engineering College into account, it can’t be true; that’s thing number one.

“Thing number two -- and I think I said this -- that relevant was a word that was hot
when I was in high school in ’72 or so, but everything had to be relevant, but I don’t think it really fits in the image of the university, in my head. And I think the other UFC members were sort of taken aback by this as well. Everyone kind of mumbled responses to that, but I think we all sort of thought about it for a while. I don’t know what your impression was on that, but it was a really interesting meeting, and I think they are listening to us.

“And also, they were wondering why are we asking this general question about the strategic plan? Are you suspicious? Do you think we have an agenda we are not telling you? I think we were just curious, because we look at the strategic plan, and we don’t think of it as a huge, dramatic shift. It talks about doing the things we have been trying to do anyway - be great at research, be great at teaching, all that stuff. I mean, and it doesn’t seem to us to be such a huge departure. Okay.”

Speaker Beer: “You still have a few minutes, if you would like to entertain some questions or comments. The woman on the left.”

Professor David Delchamps: “And I forgot to mention our faculty trustees were at this meeting as well, Nelson Hairston and Rosemary Avery.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “I am curious how you would respond if someone from outside said, well, I hear you have been reimaging Cornell. How is it different now; because I would have to say, well, we have a lot of new buildings and parking lots, but we have fewer faculty, fewer graduate students, we are closing libraries like mad, selling books to China. How’s it better? How have we reimagined it better? Does anyone have a good answer for people on the outside who ask us that?”

Professor Delchamps: “I don’t. I mean, my library is getting closed, but the way that was broached to the Engineering College was sort of an exuberant e-mail from the Dean saying we are improving the Engineering library by getting rid of all the books.

(LAUGHTER)

“That’s what it said. We are going to make it into study space, and people don’t use the books anymore. They just use the online, so we’ll move the books out of the way and have all this room for students to hang out.”

Professor Sanders: “And I forgot to say we are closing the faculty club. That’s another part of the reimaginaion. Is there anything good to say about this?”

Professor Delchamps: “Well, I think it’s early. It’s early in the process. That is the way I’m looking at it personally, but it’s just me.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentleman in the orange jacket.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. “Did anyone at the meeting or does anyone here actually know what the figure is, as far as how many students are unemployed of the recent graduates?”

Professor Delchamps: “I could tell you in my department, it’s a very small percentage of students who, say, graduated last year or the year before who reported, when we surveyed them, as seeking employment and not obtaining it, still unemployed and still looking.
“Some of the people probably sought for part of a year, didn't find anything they wanted, then decided to go for a master's; something like that. I don't know, but it's a very small percentage, single digits in ECE, Electrical and Computer Engineering, but I don't know what it is in English or Philosophy or anything.”

Speaker Beer: “On the aisle.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Can you hear me?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “I can hear you.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “You mentioned diversity. Did it mention ethnic or racial diversity? Can you elaborate on that, please?”

Professor Delchamps: “I think the UFC member who brought that up was thinking mostly in terms of ethnic and racial diversity when he raised the question. He did it in a very general way; that he thought diversity is front and center in a lot of the sort of policy that we read -- the administration puts out, what we are trying to do. And the administration has not done a good job into tapping into the available scholarship in the ethnic studies programs who can help them with reimagining our approach to diversity. That was the point he was trying to raise; but also trying to raise a more general point, that this happens often, there's scholarship available to help with a noble mission and the scholarship doesn't get asked to help.

“We didn't talk numbers. It was an hour and a half meeting. There wasn't time for that really, I don't think.”

Speaker Beer: “Questions or comments?”

Professor Carl Franck, Physics. “The subtext of this whole thing was a financial crisis. The fact that many of us are here is a good sign. I mean, I think that's -- that was a major issue, and reimagining was restructuring, finding financial solvency.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, thank you very much. Appreciate the report. Now we'll have a report from the Vice Provost for Research”.

6. REPORT FROM SR. VICE PROVOST ROBERT BUHRMAN

Senior Vice Provost for Research, Robert Buhrman: “Okay, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I have a number of slides I would like to go through, but if you would prefer to ask questions, stick up your hands and we'll do that for the next 15 minutes. It is really up to you folks, but -- they have changed the form of my slides, not to my favor.

“What I'll talk about is a little about the goals and directions of Cornell research, administration. This is the support side, and then focus on what's going on in reorganizing the office of sponsored programs, where our grants go through. The vision that we have for research administration at Cornell is we'll be as good as the Cornell research is, which is dang good, so that's a good goal to have.

“Secondly, how we are going to do that is support and facilitate the advancement of research while upholding institutional principles, which we have not always done
consistently, but we are trying to do that; and to adhering to external regulations, which are getting more onerous, no question of that.

"Just give you a little background of where we are as a research institution, the Ithaca campus I’m speaking of, we are approaching $500 million a year in annual research expenditures, 26% of the total budget on the campus. There are 1,800 or 1,900 graduate students, GRAs each year; about 4,000 personnel supported on sponsored funds, a large part of our staff; approaching 2,000 proposals are processed every year and going out.

“We are doing that in a very 20th Century, or 19th Century approach; that is paper, form 10s, bad tracking, lots of bad systems. We have incomplete and poor verification that we are in compliance across the board. We currently have 3,700 active awards. This is the last count; a little out of date, a few months. 600 active subcontracts to other institutions, mainly universities, but not only; 1,100 PIs with active works currently, 225 departmental and college research administrators we have to interact with and have to understand what’s going on and all be on the same page, which is a difficult challenge.

“Approaching 2,500 research protocols submitted each year to the animal care and the human participant protocols, institutional biosafety for chemical work. All this is done with paper web forms. We have a stand-alone animal protocol system, which irritates many faculty deeply, I am told.

“So let me say a few words; where our focus has been in my office and my staff -- I'm supported by Cathy Long, the Associate Vice President for Research Administration. We really have been focusing on enhancing -- on an internal focus largely, enhancing the staff, enhancing training and improving the consistency and the organization.

“We have been trying to develop, and successfully, I think, but still work a progress, the culture service and quality, and we also have been developing the idea that we take a risk-based approach to what we do, which means as Cornell is going to incur a risk in what we do, it has to be acceptable risk. Risk when we sign agreements -- this is risk on how we implement compliance regulations, but we cannot have unacceptable risk. It could be very expensive.

“Our sister campus in the med school has paid almost $10 million in fines over the last ten years for bad performance in effort reporting. That is a risk that’s not affordable for Ithaca, or for them. Basically, what we are setting up with the way of majoring and benchmarking performance, we want to be able to easily get key performance indicators and compare ourselves to other peer institutions in the Ivy plus research-intensive universities. We are conducting program assessments.

“Some of you are aware of the fact there’s an ongoing examination of how we deliver animal care for our researchers in dealing with some of the issues; heavily communications, but there are other things going on. And we are also having a research communications study of how my office talks about -- brags about Cornell research, which is a great story to tell.

“And we are addressing internal compliance issues that I have to worry about; you don’t, I hope. What we are trying to do now is start focusing on external out to the campus. First
thing is we are reorganizing the Office of Sponsored Programs, which I'll speak about in a few moments.

“There are other steps pending over the next several years, including putting in an integrated research administration system, which when the end happens, which will be a number of years from now, we'll have one seamless web-based program delivered to the desktop, proposal development, proposal submission, proposal acceptance, compliance, all be integrated together. I think it will be a very good development, if we could do it successfully.

“As you all know and remember, we have not always implemented systems well at Cornell. We have to get this one right. We are going to do it in a very staged and systematic process, and we are doing it in a way which is in partnership with leading research universities around the country, including now MIT, where the basic template is coming from.

“Office of Sponsored Programs. Last year, after a year-long search, we were able to recruit JoAnne Williams. She joined us December of last year as director. She came from Clemson. Before that, she had been working in industry. She has a law degree, but mainly she's a really skilled negotiator and a very good manager, in our assessment.

“She is now -- after getting a good look at the institution, the office is looking at realignment, reorganization. I'm talking about the current state, why we are changing and where we expect to be going forward. So right now, there's lots of dissatisfaction with OSP. There is a lot of people who say good things about OSP. I don't hear that enough, but that's the nature of the human enterprise. We complain a lot. That's why we get better.

“We have various levels of quality of OSP support to the PIs in the departments, and the skills and understanding of the spectrum of sponsors are not standardized amongst the GCOs. That's the grant contract officers that work with the PIs. And the PIs and departments have an incomplete understanding of the scope of the role. And the perception is, if some people say they help a lot, but another perception is OSP provides minimal added value to the process. They get in the way; they don't facilitate the process. There is -- I'll come back to that.

“Particularly, sponsors and PIs say why did you accept this grant or contract -- not so much the NIH or NSF, but it's the industrial funding or foundation funding or things of that nature. You accepted it here. Why don't, won't you accept it here? That's a different GCO.

“That is not a way to run a professional half-a-billion operation. We'll address that. We have minimal feedback between the sponsored program on the formal way and the customers, both internal faculty and external sponsors. We get phone calls, but that's not a formal feedback mechanism. We get rumors. "So the other thing we need to do is change perception from being a barrier to success to being a partner in success. We need to provide consistent high level of administrative sponsored program support. We need to standardize the personnel, training and ability to deliver services, we need to improve the low morale and sense of contribution.
“The grant contract officers work very hard for Cornell, they think they’re protecting the institution. They are. They think they are enabling research; they are. They are not heavily thanked and supported. That's true of the staff across this whole university. The faculty are the key. The students are the key. You will not succeed without good staff.

“We need to implement the Cornell strategic plan, which says we are going to strategically focus cost-effective enhancements and infrastructure support of research scholarship and creativity. That's my task in our office.

“So externally, we have an increased and more and more burdens in federal and state compliance regulations. It is not going to get better. There are over 40 sets of separate federal regulations that we have to know about and implement every -- all the time. They added four over the last two years. There are 216 federal acquisition regulation clauses, and our grants and contract officers have to be able to read, understand and know whether or not it should apply. There are 79 defense federal accusation regulations, then there are all the ones the other agencies can add in at their pleasure and leisure.

“Increase complexity of sponsor-driven requirements, contracts and other transactions' funding mechanisms; and of course, particularly looking forward, there's going to be more and more competition for research dollars. There's not going to be growing volume of dollars.

“If Cornell is to excel, as we can and should, we have to be very competitive. We cannot be an obstacle for a PI to write a grant. We have to be the way to help that grant get in and get funded.

“So I'm not sure you can see this, given to the innovative blue background, but we are going to change how we organize the office. Rather than having a GCO assigned per department, we are going to have teams of GCOs assigned to centers of expertise. There will be one center of expertise in federal government. There will be one center of expertise for state government and foundations, and other states and local governments -- there aren't too much of that, but there's some. There will be one that will address a real issue we have in Engineering and some of the contract colleges particularly, which is dealing with industry.

“It is that problem of having consistent terms, having people who are knowledgeable of what we are going to be addressing by doing this division. You will not have one GCO. You will have one for your federal fund -- which many cases, that's all you really do -- but if you also have corporate funding, you will go to a different one, who is an expert in corporate -- serves enough critical mass and will be enough expertise in these centers so if one is out for sick leave or child care issues or vacation, you will have someone else who has electronic access to the files, to the data and can immediately respond to your phone call and questions.

“That is what we are doing. And then we'll have a center of expertise in operations, which will provide enhanced support we'll have in the system. So this is just quickly -- you can just read this. These will be posted on the faculty web site.

“So you can read them, in the interest of time, in taking questions. So where we think
we'll end up is we'll have improved support to researchers and departments, better quality, more consistency and speed. We think we'll have much better relationships with sponsors. That has to happen. They can't come back to us and say you did not accept -- you accepted something last year; you need to accept it this year. We'll say Cornell policies are this, and this is how we are going to implement it.

“Increase levels of skills of the sponsored program resources. We have been hiring some very excellent GCOs the last couple -- over the last two years. They need to be trained and brought up to speed, but that's happening. It is not easy to find practiced and skilled grants and contracts officers in the middle of nowhere -- that's what they say we are -- so we have to train them, but they are excellent people.

“And we are going to have a better teamwork, in my opinion. So finally -- I'll leave this up here, in case there's questions -- we are implementing our current research administration system, which is called Ezra. What does Ezra stand for? I haven't a clue. Cornell, of course. It stands for Easy Research Administration. That's -- okay. (LAUGHTER)

“Pretty bad. It is not that good, but it is easy, because some guy wrote it about a weekend and he put it up. But we will be tracking -- up until now, until JoAnne came on board, we haven't been insisting that everything be tracked electronically. So when a proposal comes in, it's on there. When it's updated, it will be there; so we can have a much better tracking of our operations.

“When we go to the new system, it will be much more automatic, but that's where we are. So we'll be able to get response times, be able to understand how much work a particular GCO is doing; we'll be able to do better training, better consistency, better management.

“That is all I have to say. I would be happy to take questions in the minus two seconds I have.”

Speaker Beer: “You have more than that. You have seven or eight minutes.”

Sr. Vice Provost Buhrman: “Seven or eight minutes. So thank you. Sorry. I shouldn’t do that.”

Professor Wojciech Pawlowski, Senator-at-Large, Plant Breeding and Genetics: “So some of the responsibilities in terms of sponsored research also in the department, and I wonder how you envision making the system more efficient with more specialized GCOs, if I still will have to go through the same and only person in my department that will have to deal with all kinds of grants.”

Sr. Vice Provost Buhrman: “That is an excellent question and an excellent challenge for Cornell. Research administration is a distributed task. It's done centrally, and it's done in departments. I'm quite concerned both about the staffing reductions in the departments and the level of training.

“Some departments have very good research support administrators. They are typically the ones that have a high volume. The smaller units or the ones that perhaps have had a bad staff history or whatever, are not so much. We have to work together. We view it --
my office views it very much that it has to be a campus collaborative effort, and we just have to deal with it and work with the deans if there are particular cases where this is not being addressed, or we are not going to excel in research.

“This is the challenge. We have to do it cost-effectively because, as we know, I heard comments about the faculty headcount has shrunk. Well, count the staff, and you’ll really see a head count shrink. That was fine and that’s probably the right choice, but we are going to have to make sure the staff we have are well trained, well supported and well integrated across the campus. So I think it’s an excellent point; one we are well aware of, but solution is a lot harder than knowledge in this case.”

Speaker Beer: “Time flies. I think we can take one more question. Gentlewoman in the rear.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Yes, just a couple questions on that staffing reduction. What was it, and what is your staff now? And also, in terms of this reorganization, how long -- what’s your time projection and who put it together? Is there an outside consulting firm that's helping you? How are you going about it?”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “Thank you. First, I have to be honest. I ment staffing reduction that's mainly out in the units. OSP reduced one. Our volume certainly was up with the recovery act. We got $100 million of additional money, but we have all these extra reporting requirements, including monitoring subcontracts.

“Used to be we could just send the money out. Now we have to make sure they are in compliance. It’s tremendously burdensome, but it’s the way it is. Now, what was your other -- oh, what is it?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “What’s the number?”

Vice Provost Buhrman: “I don’t know. 30 in OSP. I have it, and I’ll be happy to give it to you; but now, the time frame of the reorganization that JoAnne is putting in place with a lot of consultation with other people; so I’m responsible for it, but it was her idea. First, it was an idea -- this is how they do it at MIT, at Michigan. It’s not su generas, from us, but it’s been very thoughtful.

“We didn't bring in an outside consultant, but there’s enough information out there. With her experience, both with working at Clemson and working in industry, that you should have expertise. I had to go to a dentist specialist today. I didn’t go to a GP for that. You want to go to experts. We need to have experts, because this is no longer a mom and pop research organization.

“So I think we are on the right track. I’m convinced of that. Making it all work is not a trivial task. It’s a human enterprise.”

Speaker Beer: “I am sorry. We are going to have to cut that -- due to an error in the schedule. Thank you very much, senior vice provost.

“Now I would like to call on the Dean of the College of Human Ecology, Alan Mathios, for a report on reaccreditation.”
7. UPDATE ON REACCREDITATION

Dean Alan Mathios: “So we hit our milestone. I have in my hand the draft copy of the self-study that we put together. We have three months now and it will get -- to get comments from the community, so this is largely what I will be talking about.

“So we're due for -- every ten years, we go through this process. It was actually in November of 2008 I received an e-mail from the central administration that started with very glowing language about how wonderful I am, and I knew this was going to be trouble, because about the second paragraph was would you be willing to cochair this steering committee that puts together this self-study.

“So actually, we have been working on this for two years, so it's quite -- we are quite happy to be at this stage now. So basically, the requirements are we put together an in-depth self-study, a three-day visit by an external review team that will occur later in the spring. The self-study has to address 14 standards of excellence for accreditation; very different from the last ten years.

“In some sense, going back, looking at what we did last time was totally useless to us, because Middle States changed the whole way they actually do accreditation and what they require in a self-study. It covers everything from Weill Medical College to Cutter to Singapore, we have programs; so we have to address virtually every place that Cornell touches. And while this is a voluntary process, it's really not voluntary, because you must be accredited to have access to federal financial aid.

“The 14 standards, we broke this up into working groups, into conceptual categories of institutional stewardship with the standards under that listed there: Student admissions and support, the faculty had its own working group, integrity governance, administration, educational offerings and assessment. And I'll just say on standard 14, assessment student learning, this is one of the major changes that was barely addressed in the past. Now Middle States is almost obsessed with how we report on how we measure student learning, that we have to articulate learning goals at the university level, at the college level, at the department level, at the course level, and assess against our stated learning goals what students learn. So I'll talk more about that later.

“So the organization was breaking it into these working groups around these standards. We also have a trustee task force that works with us, so there they are. The chairs of the working groups are there. It's a nice array from the university.

“Then in addition -- so the steering committee was me and Kent Hubbell, the cochairs. Marin Clarkberg is now the director of institutional research and planning, and actually, she's done a truly, truly amazing job in getting this sort of organized and up and operational. Seriously, I cannot say enough positive things about Marin.

“And then in addition to the chairs of each working group, this is the rest of the steering committee. You can see the talent that is represented. Each working group in of itself had a typical number of people, about eight to ten folks working on each working group; so this really touched many, many individuals, many in this room.

“So the timing is -- we started in earnest in March 2009, and we promised actually
originally we’d have a working draft in November, and so we met that deadline, November 2010. And this is the draft we will share with the campus. In December, we have a preliminary visit from the chair of our evaluation group. I’ll show you who the group is in a second. That’s just a one -- half a day visit, just to get acquainted with the University and the team.

“Then we have to submit our final self-study -- every page on the web and in the print has draft on it. Once we get comments and edit and resubmit, we must have this by February 1 to Middle States. The evaluation team is visiting March 27 to March 30 in the spring; then that will be followed with an actual report from them to us, giving us our status.

“The primary audience -- they keep saying this, we have to do this, but they say this is for your benefit -- the primary audience is the institution’s own community, and the secondary audience includes the external constituencies. We tried to take that approach. We tried to really reflect on what we are doing well as a university and where improvement can occur, at least from sort of this steering committee’s perspective.

“The report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement. It’s most useful not when it’s a defensive document that just talks about the praise of your institution and defends what you have done, but takes an analytical look at what you are doing. This is all going to be on the web, so you can look more carefully at this presentation.

“So we had a weird confluence of events that we started before the strategic plan activities were going on, then the strategic plan activities were created and completed and we are still going. So we’ve worked back and forth with that group and with the strategic plan, shaping how we started doing our work. It influencing us, we believe it influenced them, because we had overlap and we discussed quite often.

“In the end, our recommendations in our self-study are trying to be, at least in some areas, word for word with the strategic plan recommendations, and certainly not putting recommendations out that we have to carry through; because if you put a recommendation in to Middle States, they are expecting you to follow through. So given the number of activities the strategic plan is requiring the University to focus on, we made sure we were consistent with the strategic plan in posing recommendations in the document that’s on the web.

“So we have a web page that’s been up for quite a while now. This document is on there, so if you go to the web on Middle States at Cornell.edu and you go to Documents, you will see the self-study design plan that was approved originally, how we were going to do this that was submitted to Middle States, and you will see the draft of the self-study.

“I do encourage you, maybe at a faculty club in the future, during lunch, to take this and go through it. It’s actually -- in my view, I learned a lot about the University, a lot of things going on that you would not know about otherwise; so it’s actually an interesting read, I think, and we’re really anxious to get feedback on it.

“Just to give you a sense of the table of contents, it’s about 227 pages long. We were encouraged by Middle States to keep it around this length. Some self-studies get into 300,
400, 500 pages. We really wanted to make this a read that’s doable for the evaluation committee; so we were very, very careful about length. So you see, the length’s there.

“This is by far the most challenging change for the University with respect to the self-study and what we have to do. Essentially, we have to, according to them, to get accredited, we have to have clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels and a document organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning.

“So when I accepted this committee assignment, one of the first things I did was meet with Kent and say, if we don’t actually start figuring out how to document and organize around this, we are going to be in deep, deep trouble two years from now. So Laura Brown -- first it was Michele Moody-Adams, then Laura Brown took responsibility for creating a decentralized approach to assessing student learning.

“And so basically, there’s a core assessment committee with representation of every college on that core assessment committee. They bring the issues, the central issues, so they get pushed to the dean, the associate dean largely, who’s responsible for assessment in your colleges; and then they are working with departments to develop department learning goals, get that into faculty, syllabi learning goals, then strategies for assessing against those learning goals.

“We have a ways to go, but the actual progress we have made is quite remarkable. There are stated university learning goals now. Every college has learning goals that are on the web. As a dean, I have developed Human Ecology’s learning goals. I have actually found it very helpful to me, when I discuss the college to external audiences. Here’s what we expect our students to learn. Then I think about how our program does or does not sometimes support those particular learning goals. So I have actually found at first, this was just bureaucratic, this is what we have to do; and I’m slowing becoming a converted person in terms of thinking this actually has significant value in thinking about our curriculums and how to have them evolve.

“The recommendations, the -- here’s the learning outcomes for Cornell. In case you haven’t seen these, just to give you a sense of what we have down over the -- this is not the steering committee. This is evolved from your colleges coming up with your learning goals, us looking at those learning goals and raising the common ones to the university learning goals. So there they are. This is all on the web. You can take a careful look at another time.

“Again, the recommendations, the primary purpose of the self-study is to advance our self-understanding improvement, so we have recommendations at the end of every chapter in this self-study. They are stated recommendations of what we are committing ourselves to do. This is a quick way to get a sense of the document, if you wanted to.

“A typical chapter is organized like this: So Chapter 4, Integrity Governance and Administration. Here are the sort of table of contents of that chapter. Part 1 is leadership and administration. There are all the subcategories within that chapter under 1, under 2, integrity, ethical conduct policies and enforcement efforts; and 3, the end is recommendations.
“The site visit is March 27 to March 30. The chair is Rebecca Bushnell. We were able to make recommendations, based on lists they provided, as to who might be a good person to chair this. We strategically suggested Rebecca, because some of the most challenging issues in assessing student learning are in the humanities; how do you measure student learning in very abstract-type material, so we wanted a chair who has a sense of the difficulty of accomplishing this. So a dean of Arts and Sciences at Penn seemed like actually someone very good.

“Laura Brown knows this person, thinks she's quite, quite intelligent, quite balanced in the way she thinks about things, so we were very pleased with that. The rest of the team has just been provided to us. It was actually quite late in us knowing this. I think it's actually a reasonably good team. It has some of the -- our competitors we like to think we compete with, it has some land grant representation there, so I think we are doing quite well with this composition of a team.

“A typical visit that will occur is in the morning; they will show up on Sunday. They will have a reception for them. They will work as a team, and then on Monday morning, they will meet with the chair and the president of -- the chair of the evaluation committee and president meet, interviews and visit. Lots of interviews with campus people from all -- from students, staff, faculty, interviews and visits again. A team dinner for them.

“Next morning, same thing. They start off with the chair and the President meeting, and sort of typical day. At the end, they will present an oral summary to the President and the steering committee, which will be followed up later with an actual report. They can do several things to us. They can make suggestions, which then it's our prerogative whether we want to act on their suggestions. They can make recommendations to us that requires us to take action and report within either five years, which is a good thing. That's a typical -- if you have recommendations, that's the least offensive approach is we'll visit in five years to see you are making progress.

“If there is a concern on whether the university meets a standard of excellence, they will want to see progress earlier than five years, so there's different levels. Requirements are signals that accreditation is in jeopardy. There's no one on our committee that feels we are going to be in that category. Where we feel we are likely to be is on assessment of student learning, given we just started really having a documented, organized approach to the way Middle States wants this done, that we suggest that we're going to have probably a revisit, you know, maybe not in five years, but they are going to want to see sort of progress reports in a couple years, because we are so still in the process.

“Any comments you have can be sent to either myself, Kent Hubbell, and it's been a great team -- working with Kent and Marin has been a great honor to work so collaboratively with them -- Kent, myself, Marin, any comments. We'll take them, we'll share them with the steering committee, so the steering committee will be responsible for editing the final document as a group. Questions?”

Speaker Beer: “Sorry, but the time is very short, and the Dean of the Faculty has a significant report.

Speaker Beer: “Thank you so much. A report from the Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry.”
Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “Kent Fuchs would like to say a word.”

Speaker Beer: “Before Dean Fry reports, the Provost – “

Dean Fry: “No. After.”

Speaker Beer: “Oh, afterwards.”

Dean Fry: “Yeah. So I had four topics that I wanted to discuss today. The first one is that Bob Cooke has digitized all of the memorial statements for the faculty, and I think that’s a really fantastic item. They will be available online. You can download them. We are printing these books still, but we are printing fewer of them. Primarily the families of the faculty who are really appreciative of these books, but that’s a wonderful thing.

“Bob, would you like to just say a word about the whole project? This was at Bob’s nickel, by the way, and his effort.”

Emeritus Professor Robert Cooke: “When Bill says what we have done -- put the memorial statements, the little stubby books online, he didn’t say we run it all the way back to the founding of the University in 1868, and the faculty minutes, it started with a resolution. In 1939, they switched and went to the booklets. “Anyway, it’s all online. It’s in eight volumes, and I urge you to read it or dip into the parts that are of interest, because you will be astonished with the breadth and depth of Ezra Cornell’s dream, as you see what’s happen over the years. It is really inspiring. Copies can be made available, but they are very expensive. We are putting it online, so there's essentially zero incremental cost. It's about $100 a set, if an office really needs the paper.”

Dean Fry: ”Thank you, Bob. I think it’s a really nice gesture on his part. I wanted to say a few comments about some issues that the EPC is currently addressing. Actually, the EPC expected to bring a resolution to the Senate about adopting Turnitin that turns out to be not a premature resolution. EPC is looking at the whole issue of academic integrity. Turnitin, which is a plagiarism detection device, will be a small part.

“The EPC is also looking at the issue of having assignments and exams over fall break. I received 250 e-mail messages just after fall break from students who wanted no assignments -- or longer fall break and no assignments. The issue that Dave Delchamps raised concerning diversity in the campus is also in front of the EPC. What will happen, I think it’s a bit early to say.

“The Calendar Committee is also meeting. They had their first meeting. They meet again at the end of this week. I wanted to let you know that group is in operation. Then I wanted to say a few words about the resolution concerning the Cornell Childcare Center, a bit about it, the response and reaction to that.

“The President’s response was made public on Monday afternoon. He sent to Charlie Walcott and me about Monday noon his response, and I sent it out to the senate and also to the Childcare Committee. And what his response was, that there was considerable time and effort, and he spent looking at the ad hoc report, the Senate resolution report from Human Resources, correspondence with diverse constituent groups and also the resolution from the University Assembly.
“I asked Steve if I could share his message to the childcare committee, and I would just like the read it. It says -- he sent this Tuesday morning --

"As you may be aware, most parents and teaches at the center indicated they are now very pleased with current conditions at the center, and I’m certain everyone can agree this is a very positive development for Cornell.

"President Skorton has appealed to the community that we go forward in a spirit of collegiality and civility. I am sure you will all join me in hoping for the best at the Cornell Child Care Center honoring the President’s request that the campus come together support in sport of center.

“I want to echo those comments. These are a few of my observations about this entire process. First of all, this has been the most emotive issue I have ever seen at Cornell. I have dealt with faculty around salary, around space, lab space, office space and all kind of issues; but when it's your kid, you really are -- you really get into it, so this is a really tough issue.

“There has been a lot of angst, much anger on a lot of people's side; the communication has been awkward at times or wanting at times. I think it's clear there have been improvements at the child care center. I think we'd all agree with that.

“I would also say, I think the heading in "The Sun" yesterday morning was -- was it yesterday morning? Was sort of in -- today, okay. Time flies -- saying the President disregarded the Senate's resolution I think is not at all accurate. Certainly not all of the recommendations were adopted by the President, but there were certainly changes that he said he would do that followed the Senate resolution.

“My interpretation, personally speaking, is that this resolution and this activity has had a very major change, and I think it’s for the benefit of the childcare center. So I would just urge that, again, we move forward with civility and mutual respect for all persons involved, graduate student, staff and faculty.

“And I went on to adopt Steve’s goal and the President’s goal that the Cornell Child Care Center needs to become an excellent facility, and it is really best if we all work together. I just wanted to put that on the table. With that, Steve, I will stop and --.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we are good. We could take a couple minutes for some remarks by the Provost.”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “I will be brief. I wanted to first thank everyone that's been involved in the accreditation process. We are not done yet; but when you finish your self-study, that’s a big, big step. The institution has never been through an accreditation process like this one, that is all outcomes-focused, and not only Marin, Kent Hubbell and Dean Mathios, but everyone else involved in this, thank you very much.

“One of our other favorite topics, the faculty club, the faculty lunch, the University has been subsidizing that -- I provide $60,000 a year to that. I received an e-mail this morning from the chief financial officer, who didn't know about this resolution, saying the deficit that’s been accumulated over ten years is a little over $700,000. She wanted to know what
I was going to do about it. I told her to erase it. She said that's not possible. What has to happen is actually cash has to go into that account at some point, so I have to fix that problem.

“I informed the Hotel Dean it was his problem. He said we should split the cost. I cannot contribute more than $60,000 a year. What I have done is I'm turning that money over to Dean Fry to use as he sees fit. If it is important to you all, I would encourage you to have your department chairs and deans contribute. I think probably another $100,000 per year, so about something like $100 per faculty, this could become a viable option.

“I have cut from your departments and your colleges $100 million per year out of your budgets. I'm just not willing to do that anymore. We are now hiring faculty, we are investing in that. Any spare change I have, I put into faculty recruiting. That is my top three priorities. I would have voted for this resolution, but that's not the solution.

“So I'm giving Dean Fry the money, and he can spend it as he wants. There are about 100 faculty that use it. There's $60,000 there. I think there is a solution, but the solution really does depend on money. It really does. The full cost -- it's an expensive lunch, because you have to set up, take down, you have to staff it. It is quite a different venue than going to a restaurant. But I will respond to the resolution, but that's a sense of where we are. Thank you all very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Provost Fuchs. We have reached the hour of adjournment.”

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
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Motion for the Cornell Senate: "Status of faculty center"

WHEREAS most major universities in the world have a “faculty club” or a “faculty center,” and

WHEREAS Cornell University has had a faculty club and/or luncheon facility for over 50 years, which has important benefits to the university such as increasing professional and social interactions amongst faculty members, thereby improving faculty productivity, and assisting and enhancing recruitment and retention of faculty,

WHEREAS the existing faculty luncheon facility is to be closed at the end of the Fall 2010 semester, and

WHEREAS the Cornell Dean of Faculty conducted a survey of faculty members about the need for a faculty luncheon facility and the results indicated that a significant number of faculty members felt that keeping the facility is important, and

WHEREAS the 2010-2015 Cornell University Strategic Plan calls for "develop a revamped faculty club on campus,"

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT

The Senate strongly urges the Cornell Administration, and in particular, the Provost, to reverse the decision to close the current faculty luncheon facility and keep it open until a suitable replacement is found, and recommends that a serious planning effort be undertaken, with Administration support and involvement, to ensure a sustainable faculty center that includes a luncheon facility.

Senators supporting:

Elizabeth Earle, Don Hartill, Harry Kaiser, Michael Nussbaum, Tim Mount
Cornell Research Administration

The goals and direction of Cornell research administration

Reorganization of the Office of Sponsored Programs

Faculty Senate
November 10, 2010
Research Administration

Vision and Mission

• Vision
  – Cornell’s research administration will achieve a level of effectiveness that is as superb as our faculty and the research results that they produce

• Mission
  – Support and facilitate the advancement of Cornell’s research while upholding institutional principles and adhering to external regulations
Cornell Research Scale and Scope

- $480M research expenditures (26% of Ithaca campus budget)
- 1,871 graduate students (GRAs only) and 3,940 personnel supported with sponsored funds (current)
- 1,906 new proposals last year
  - paper, dept. systems, Grants.gov, Fastlane; PI/RA mgmt of agency forms/rules, institution rates
  - manual routing, verification of compliance regulations
- 3,700 active awards; 608 active subcontracts
- 1,109 principal investigators with active awards (current)
- >225 department and college research administrators (RAs)
- 2,490 research protocols submitted for review
  - paper, web forms, eSirius
  - manual tracking, verification, reporting
Tactics

• Internal focus primarily to date
  • Enhance staff leadership and expertise
    – Leadership changes, reorganization, position and qualification redefinition, training, mentoring
  • Develop culture of service and quality; utilize risk-based decision making
    – Customer surveys, response standards, risk assessment, cost/benefit analyses
  • Obtain and act upon stakeholder input
    – Faculty/staff involvement in hiring, engage assoc. deans, faculty user groups, researcher participation in improvement projects
  • Measure and benchmark performance
    – Key performance indicators, peer comparisons
  • Conduct program assessments
    – Animal care program review, communications study
  • Address internal compliance issues
Tactics, continued

• **Moving to external focus**
  
  • **First step:** Reorganize OSP to better serve internal customers (PIs) and external customers (sponsors)
  
  • Other steps pending – *possible subjects of future reports*
Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)

JoAnne Williams – Director (as of Dec. 2009)

Realignment and Reorganization

- Current State
- Reasons for Change
  - Internal
  - External
- View to the Future
- Expected Outcomes
- Metrics
- Next Steps
• Customer dissatisfaction with services provided by Office of Sponsored Programs

... Why?

– Varying levels and quality of OSP support to Cornell PI’s and departments/units

– OSP Grant & Contract Officer (GCO) research administration skills and understanding of spectrum of sponsors are not “standardized” among GCOs

– PI’s and departments have incomplete understanding of scope of GCO role

  perception is that OSP provides minimum added value to process

– Sponsors and PIs experience inconsistent terms and conditions in similar agreements

– Minimal feedback mechanisms between OSP and its customers - researchers and department administrators
Internal Reasons for Change

• Need to change perception of OSP from being a barrier to being a partner

• Need to provide a consistent high quality level of administrative sponsored program support

• Need to “standardize” OSP personnel core skills and knowledge and required continuing education

• Need to improve low morale and sense of contribution among GCOs

• Need to define, document, and disseminate sponsored program administrative processes and/or process improvements

• Need to help implement the Cornell Strategic Plan

  – Strategic Initiative #5: Implement strategically focused, cost-effective enhancements to the infrastructure in support of research, scholarship, and creativity.
External Reasons for Change

• Increased, administratively burdensome federal and state regulatory compliance requirements
  – Over 40 sets of separate federal regulations that apply to OSP activities
  – At least 216 FAR clauses and 79 DFAR clauses (in addition to numerous agency specific clauses) that can be included in a contract.

• Increased complexity of:
  – Sponsor-driven requirements
  – Contracts and other transactions
  – Funding mechanisms

• Competition for research funds demands quality OSP administrative performance, and skilled negotiators to compete for the funds while consistently following Cornell policies
View to the Future: OSP Centers of Expertise

Federal Government
Center of Expertise: Federal Government
Universities
Weill Cornell

State & Foundations
Center of Expertise: NYS & Foundations
Other States & Local Gov’ts

Industry
Center of Expertise: Industry
International Gov’ts
Subcontract/Subaward

Contract Support/Oversight
Administrative Operations & Support

Customer Support
Research & System Support
Audit

SOP & Policies
Training/Event Coordination
Metrics/Dashboard/Reporting

Website
Outreach
Infrastructure Support

OSP Realignment 10
Center of Expertise
Functional Responsibilities

Federal Government

State & Foundations

Industry

Proposal & Pre-Proposal Review & Submission

Award, Sub-award and Out-year Action Negotiation; Subcontracts, & Other

Outreach & Education

Contract Support/Oversight

Administrative Operations & Support

Operations

Infrastructure & Office Management

Proposal Services & Award Services
Outcomes of Change

• Improved support to researchers and Cornell departments/units – *quality and speed*
• Improved relationships with Sponsors
• Increased level of skills and quality of OSP resources
• Business process improvements
• Improved team work within OSP
• Research system (EZRA) modifications will allow measurement of:
  – Cycle time for (examples only):
    • Proposal receipt to proposal submission
    • Award receipt to award acceptance
    • Other document receipt to conclusion
• Response time to customer calls
• Number of proposals/awards received and successfully processed
• Research funds processed per GCO
• Customer satisfaction survey
• Establishment of OSP points of contact (liaisons) for each college
  – Attendance at department administrator meetings
  – Response time to departmental requests
• Continuing professional education requirements
Cornell’s 2011 Reaccreditation

Process and Progress
November 2010
Accreditation thru Middle States

- Renewal in 2011
- Decennial process involves
  - In-depth institutional self study
  - Three day visit by external review team
- 14 standards for accreditation
- Covers the entire institution: Weill, programs with professional accreditation, etc.
- Requisite for federal financial aid
Fourteen Standards

Institutional Stewardship
1. Mission and Goals
2. Planning, Resource Allocation & Institutional Renewal
3. Institutional Resources
4. Leadership & Governance
5. Administration
6. Integrity

Student Admissions & Supports
7. Institutional Assessment
8. Student Admissions and Retention
9. Student Support Services

Educational Offerings
10. The Faculty
11. Educational Offerings
12. General Education
13. Related Educational Activities

Assessment
14. Assessment of Student Learning
Steering Committee
Mathios & Hubbell, co-chairs

Trustee Task Force on Accreditation:
Elizabeth Altman
Ronnie Chernoff
Ezra Cornell
Asa Craig
Stephen Ettinger
John Noble

Institutional Stewardship
(Standards 1, 2, 3 & 7)
Kathleen Rasmussen, chair

Integrity, Governance & Administration
(Standards 4, 5 & 6)
Charlie Walcott, chair

The Faculty
(Standard 10)
Amy Villarejo, chair

Student Admissions & Supports
(Standards 8 & 9)
Kraig Adler, chair

Assessment of Student Learning
(Standard 14)
David Gries, chair

Educational Offerings
(Standards 11, 12, 13)
Laura Brown, chair
Steering Committee

Alan Mathios and Kent Hubbell, co-chairs

**Working Group Chairs +**

Marin Clarkberg, Director, Institutional Research & Planning
William Fry, Dean of the Faculty
Barbara Knuth, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Susan Murphy, Vice President for Student & Academic Services
Elmira Mangum, Vice President for Planning & Budget
Kristin Walker, Institutional Research & Planning
Gina Ryan, graduate student, Microbiology
Nikhil Kumar (until May 2010), undergraduate student, ILR
Vincent Andrews (after May 2010), undergraduate student, ILR
## Timeline overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee first convenes</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States approves Cornell’s self-study design</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Working Groups research, analyze, evaluate</td>
<td>AY 2009 - 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group reports due</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee drafts comprehensive report</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft shared with campus constituencies</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary visit from team chair</td>
<td>December 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final self study submitted to Middle States</td>
<td>February 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team visits Cornell</td>
<td>March 27-30, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The primary audience is the institution’s own community, and the secondary audience includes external (or public) constituencies.”

— *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, The Middle States Commission on Higher Education
“The primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement. The self study is most useful when it is analytical and forward-looking rather than descriptive or defensive, when it is used both to identify problems and to develop solutions to them, and when it identifies opportunities for growth and development.”

— Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
Relationship to Strategic Plan

- Self study activities were initiated before strategic planning began
- The work of the self study has informed, facilitated, and complemented strategic planning efforts at every stage
  - Overlapping participant lists
  - Overlap in the questions that were asked
- Strategic Plan, in turn, became a basis for developing recommendations that have been incorporated in self study
2011 Self-Study for Accreditation through Middle States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Overview</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process and Timeline</td>
<td><strong>Self-Study Design Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>The Middle States Commission on Higher Education formally approved Cornell's Design Plan on July 15, 2009 in a letter from Debra Klinman, Vice President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td><strong>Draft of Cornell’s Self Study</strong> (October 29, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>A first draft of Cornell’s Self Study. The final draft will be submitted to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in February 2011. Comments welcome before December 18. (See left for contact information.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For More Information Contact: 
middlestates@cornell.edu
Marin Clarkberg
mec30@cornell.edu
607-255-9101
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cornell University: An Overview</td>
<td>21 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach to Self Study</td>
<td>6 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional Stewardship</td>
<td>26 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integrity, Governance and Administration</td>
<td>18 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Admissions and Supports</td>
<td>39 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Faculty</td>
<td>28 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educational Offerings</td>
<td>40 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment of Student Learning</td>
<td>28 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>14 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conclusion</td>
<td>7 pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 227 pages
Standard 14

Assessment of Student Learning

• Clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, college, major, course)

• Documented, organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning
Learning Outcomes for Cornell

**Disciplinary Knowledge:** demonstrate a systematic or coherent understanding of an academic field of study

**Critical Thinking:** apply analytic thought to a body of knowledge

**Communication Skills:** write and speak articulately

**Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning:** understand cause and effect relationships; use symbolic thought

**Self-Directed Learning:** work independently; take initiative

**Information Literacy:** access and evaluate information sources

**Engagement in the Process of Discovery or Creation**

In addition, Cornell graduates should develop a deeper understanding of:

**Multi-Cultural Competence:** engage in a multicultural society

**Moral and Ethical Awareness:** embrace moral/ethical values

**Self-management:** demonstrate awareness of one's self in relation to others

**Community Engagement:** demonstrate responsible behavior
“The primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement. The self study is most useful when it identifies opportunities for growth and development.”

— Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
The chapters makes recommendations for which we be held accountable at the periodic review five years hence. These fall at the ends of the chapters. For example:

**Chapter 4. Integrity, Governance, and Administration**

1. **Leadership and Administration**
   
   Board of Trustees; University Assemblies; The Assemblies and Shared Decision Making; Administration; Policy Development; Selection and Evaluation of Leadership; Communication

2. **Integrity**
   
   Ethical Conduct Policies; Enforcement Efforts

3. **Recommendations**
   
   Leadership and Administration; Integrity
Spring 2011 Site Visit

• Chair: Rebecca Bushnell
  – Dean of Arts & Sciences at University of Pennsylvania (2005-present)
  – Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, Princeton

• Dates: March 27-30, 2011
  – Sunday afternoon session through Wednesday afternoon exit interview
Evaluation Team

Rebecca Bushnell, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Penn
Susan Boswell, Dean of Student Life, Johns Hopkins
Ann Dodd, Assistant Dean for Strategic Initiatives and Graduate Education and Associate Professor of Agricultural Leadership, Penn State
Thomas Elzey, Senior VP of Finance, Drexel
Daryl Nardick, Director of Strategic Projects Integration/Senior Project Consultant, Georgetown
Glenn Starkman, Professor of Physics, Case Western
Karin Trainer, University Librarian, Princeton
Donna Waechter, Associate Dean for Medical Education, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
## Outline of visit agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday (27)</th>
<th>Monday (28)</th>
<th>Tuesday (29)</th>
<th>Wednesday (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair &amp; President meet &amp; Interviews &amp; visits</td>
<td>• Chair &amp; President meet &amp; Interviews &amp; visits</td>
<td>• Finish report writing &amp; Chair prepares oral report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus people</td>
<td>• Campus people</td>
<td>• Team only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon</strong></td>
<td>• Reception &amp; First working session of the team</td>
<td>• Interviews &amp; visits &amp; Team dinner</td>
<td>• Interviews &amp; visits &amp; Team Dinner</td>
<td>• Oral summary for President, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td>• Team meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Report writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final report may make...

- **Suggestions**: action optional
- **Recommendations**: requires the institution take action and report in:
  - Next periodic review report (5 years)
  - Progress letter (6-24 months later)
  - Monitoring report (6-24 months later)
- **Requirements**:
  - Signals that accreditation is in jeopardy
middlestates@cornell.edu

• Kent Hubbell, Dean of Students, klh4@cornell.edu

• Alan Mathios, Dean of the College of Human Ecology, adm5@cornell.edu

• Marin Clarkberg, Director, Institutional Research & Planning, mec30@cornell.edu
• Memorial Statements now on line
  • (Thanks to Bob Cooke)
• Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Calendar Committee
• CCCC Resolution
  • Response
  • Reaction
The Memorial Statements are on eCommons.

The University Faculty Archive (lists both the volumes (collections) and Individuals)  
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17811

Two subsets:

The Memorial Statement *Collections* (books containing a decade of statements)  
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17838

The Memorial Statements *Individually*  
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17813

Thanks to Bob Cooke!!
• Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Calendar Committee
• CCCC Resolution
  • Response
  • Reaction
President’s response on Monday noon ➔ Charlie Walcott, Bill Fry
(previous request for extension of the response time)
➔ public on Monday afternoon

Previous conversations ➔ considerable time and effort
(report from ad hoc committee, Senate Resolution, report from HR, correspondence with diverse constituent groups, Resolution from UA.)
Dear faculty endorsers of the March 2010 resolution of the Faculty Senate (cc William Fry, Dean of the Faculty),

As you may be aware, most parents and teachers at the center have indicated that they are now very pleased with current conditions at the center, and I am certain that everyone can agree that this is a very positive development for Cornell. President Skorton has appealed to the community that “we go forward in a spirit of collegiality and civility.” I am sure you will all join me in hoping for the best at the Cornell Child Care Center, honoring the President’s request that the campus now come together in support of the center.

Best,

Steve
Observations (WEF):

- The most emotive issue that I’ve seen
- Much angst, much anger.
- Communication awkward/wanting
- There have been improvements
- There will be changes
- Some (not all) recommendations adopted
- Senate Resolution/ad hoc committee
  → big impact

Move forward with civility and mutual respect for all involved
CCCC needs to become an excellent facility
best if we work together
Minutes from the December 8, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Speaker Charles Walcott: “Call the meeting to order. I have the usual kinds of announcements to begin with. First off, I’d remind the body no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and would everyone please turn off their cell phones, so that that won’t disturb matters. Then, if you have comments and remarks, please not only identify yourselves and the department, but wait until you get the microphone, so that everybody can hear you and so that we get a recording of what it is you have to say. “As far as I know, there are no Good and Welfare speakers today, so we have an extra five minutes, which I think we will add simply to the Africana discussion probably. And finally, a most important reminder, please drop off your Clickers, either up front here in a box that’s available or one in back. Please do not take them home. (LAUGHTER)

“Well, they don’t do you very much good at home anyway. So I would like to call on Fred. Where did Fred disappear to? He is on the phone. Poor guy.”

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 10 NOVEMBER 2010 MEETING

“Well, why don’t we do the minutes. I am not going to ask the question how many people here have read the minutes, but I am going to ask if people are willing to have the minutes approved. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? Seeing none, I’m going to accept them as written.

“And now, Associate Dean & Secretary Fred Gouldin, you are on for Nominations and Elections.”

2. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Associate Dean & Secretary Fred Gouldin: “Thank you very much, Charlie. My report is very brief. There are just two new appointments that were made, Angela Gonzales for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences has accepted her term on the Institutional Review Board for Human Participants. And second, Professor Castillo of the College of Arts and Sciences will be on the Committee of Professors-At-Large Selection Committee.

“I am sorry. Do I need to make that report again? Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “So we need a motion to accept that report. So moved.

Second? Any discussion? Yes, point of view of order, sure. Excuse Me.”

“Do we have a quorum?”

Associate Dean Fred Gouldin: “Yes.”

Speaker Walcott: “We do have a quorum. So I’m going to simply ask all in favor, please signify by raising your hand. All opposed? Unanimous -- abstentions, I suppose I should ask for. No abstentions, so that’s unanimous.

“We will now proceed to the resolution from the Educational Policy Committee. And Bruce, would you come and present it, please.”
3. RESOLUTION FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Professor Bruce Levitt, Theatre, Film & Dance: “Thanks, Charlie. The first resolution from the Educational Policy Committee -- there are copies up here, if you need the hard copies they are up front.”

"WHEREAS there is a consensus among national experts in the field of academic integrity that cheating is pervasive at American colleges and universities,"

"WHEREAS there are numerous factors that contribute to this crisis of academic dishonesty at the college level, including: the predominance of cheating in secondary schools; a lack of preparedness and familiarity with requirements of academic integrity, particularly regarding plagiarism; increased access to electronic materials and the corresponding difficulty of detecting inappropriate use of such materials; increased stress, including pressure to excel; student perceptions of unfairness in grading and academic requirements; and inconsistent handling of academic integrity violations;

WHEREAS colleges and universities that have responded to this crisis invariably determine it necessary to develop a comprehensive educational approach, addressing the multiple causal factors and involving both the faculty/administration and students to create both formal and informal cultures of academic honesty,

WHEREAS to create a formal culture of academic honesty it is crucial to make academic integrity an educational component of the first-year curriculum, in the classroom and/or through academic co-curricular offerings;

WHEREAS as part of an educational response to inadvertent academic dishonesty, innovative educational responses (e.g., small, group, interactive classes) might be utilized;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost in collaboration with the University Faculty create an initiative to draw upon internal and external expertise to explore approaches to creating a climate of academic integrity on campus and to propose the steps and resources necessary to accomplish such a goal.

“Discussion?”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “This seems appropriate and reasonable, but I was wondering if we could have a little more context as to why this is coming up now, why it’s being put forward and, more specifically, what kinds of conversations or what thoughts there are about the kinds of steps that might be taken.”

Professor Levitt: “The EPC has discussed this for at least a year, and that discussion came to a culmination when Carol Grumbach came to present to us a report from a week-long conference that she had attended that involved a number of universities, and there was a large report, a lengthy report from Carol, who herself is in Student Services and is an attorney.

“And that report involved an overview of the problem, a number of the ways that this is addressed at various universities, and the notion is that there didn’t seem to be anything readily adaptable necessarily to Cornell and that we need to come up with a unique and
clear solution, given the diversity of colleges. And every day, there seems to be another article in the "New York Times" about a site that students can go to and purchase essays, even now admissions essays, which was the latest one that I read in the "New York Times."

“So that’s the context, that it seems to be overwhelming, that the second resolution, which I’ll bring up in a moment, which has to do with Turnitin, in a survey that FABIT did in 2009, 90% of the faculty at Cornell felt -- that were surveyed. Four hundred people returned the survey -- felt they needed some help with this issue, some software program that would assist; but the larger issue is that I think the EPC feels this should not be punitive necessarily, that there needs to be education about academic integrity and how to accomplish that, what’s the best venue, what’s the best program. There may be different programs in each colleges that necessitate different approaches.”

Professor Cohn: “I would just, as a comment, say it’s very, very important to work closely at the college level. I served as the chair of Academic Integrity Hearing in Arts and Sciences a number of years ago, and we worked quite systematically at that time to put together and to keep going a working group among the chairs, and I’ve also been involved in a number of specific initiatives that have been taken in Arts and Sciences over the years; so I think to be sure that there’s a cross-college conversation that provides the underpinnings and foundation for any such discussions.”

Professor Levitt: “I think that’s the point of trying to raise this to the provost level, to pull together all that expertise that exists in the various colleges on those committees, because we did look at reports from several of those committees over the last year.”

Speaker Walcott: “Yes, in back.”

Professor Harry Kaiser, Applied Economics and Management. “I am just curious -- my first meeting of the year as I’ve come back onto the senate we passed a resolution that dealt with academic integrity. How does that resolution fit into this? What’s the relationship between this and that resolution?”

Professor Levitt: “I am unfamiliar with that resolution. David?”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. “That resolution is completely decoupled from this one. That came from a faculty member, and it involves putting a statement on the matriculation agreement saying I have read and understand and I agree to abide by the Cornell Code of Academic Integrity.”

Professor Kaiser: “You are calling for ways to help prevent cheating, and that is one way, isn’t it?”

Professor Delchamps: “Well, certainly, it’s a cultural thing. There are so many elements to this. I preceded Bruce as chair of the EPC, and we have been -- a good three years now, and there’s not just technology. There are a lot of different ways to cheat, not just plagiarism, not just Wikipedia, it’s Course Hero; but then there’s culture, student culture that sees a little cheating is not such a bad thing. Carl Franck’s resolution addresses the culture issue, and I think that’s a huge -- I’m hoping that whatever we come up with, whatever approach this leads to is going to involve that as well.”
Professor Kaiser: “I would just add to that, too, it’s one thing to say on a document that the student signs that they will abide by the academic integrity policies. It’s another to make sure they know what those policies are, and there’s some sense, some, I think, widespread sense that the students do not know or understand those policies. And so part of this would be to disseminate those in such a way that that statement has meaning.”

Speaker Walcott: “Professor Stein. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Stein: “I walked in the middle of Bruce’s presentation, and when I sat down, the last word I heard was something about nonpunitive. Does that mean that the notion of punishment will have no part in this regime?”

Professor Levitt: “No. What it means is there has to be -- (Audio difficulties.)

Professor Peter Katzenstein. Government: “Two students fully unaware what they were doing. The reading list had a two-paragraph statement about academic integrity. I spent ten minutes in the first lecture on this, talking with great intensity about it. When it came to paper time, I took five minutes at the beginning of the lecture. The TA’s reaffirmed this in each of the 20 sections. Three students plagiarized.

“And it’s not that they do it with a bad feeling in their stomach -- one of them did -- the other two were utterly clueless, totally clueless. And I don’t think it’s a culture which is unique to the electronic age. When I came 30, 40 years ago, there was a deep corrupt culture of plagiarism at Cornell. It was the old network of the fraternities, and the established faculty and everybody was laughing about the recycling of term papers. I don’t think this is -- this is a culture corruption issue, and I’m very happy that this is moving in this direction.”

Speaker Walcott: “Other comments? Are you ready for the question? All right. Now, we’re going to do high-tech. And we are going to use these clickers. Now, the thing that is important to remember is A means yes, B means no and C means I abstain. Okay, got it?

“I will turn it on. You got to turn on your clicker first. I have got to turn on this thing here, and then we'll see if we can make it work.

“Okay, you are ready to vote. We’re still gathering votes. We’re up to 50. Do I have 51? 54. 55.

“Okay. Has everybody voted? All right, now the exciting part; we will see what the outcome is. Oh, my gosh. Look at that. 98% in favor and 2% opposed, and no abstentions. So I would declare the motion has passed.” (LAUGHTER)

"I call on Professor Levitt to proceed with the next –“

4. RESOLUTION FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON TURNITIN

Professor Bruce Levitt: “The second resolution,

WHEREAS there’s a consensus among many at Cornell that academic dishonesty is prevalent on our campus, increasing faculty frustration, renewing a demand that the
university purchase a university-wide license for Turnitin;

WHEREAS to the extent that Turnitin is employed, it is imperative that it be one component of a comprehensive educational approach, otherwise students are merely punished and deterred temporarily, but not educated, and the University fails in its mission to educate our students to become ethical citizens and professionals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that as one component of this comprehensive approach, the University purchase a University-wide license for Turnitin for use at faculty discretion;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that faculty are strongly urged to make certain that students understand course academic integrity requirements and know how to meet them; text in a course syllabus, without elaboration, may be insufficient for these purposes; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that faculty who use Turnitin are strongly urged to use it as an educational tool as well as a detection tool.

“And there are three resolutions. Be it resolved that as one component of this comprehensive approach, the university purchase a university-wide license for Turnitin for use at faculty discretion. Be it further resolved that faculty are strongly urged to make certain that students understand course academic integrity requirements and know how to meet them. Text in a course syllabus without elaboration may be insufficient for these purposes. And be it finally resolved that faculty who use Turnitin are strongly urged to use it as an educational tool, as well as a detection tool.”

Speaker Walcott: “You have the motion before you. Is there any discussion? Abby Cohn.”

Professor Cohn: “We actually had an earlier go-around a number of years ago, when the then vice provost signed us up for Turnitin at that time. In fact at that time, the university counsel determined that we couldn’t use it; and since that time, I understand that the university counsel has made a different determination, but I’m curious to know -- at that time, one of the significant features was that any paper that was run through Turnitin became the property of Turnitin, and thus, we either -- we have to expect our students then to give up those rights to their paper. And is that still the case? And what does the committee think about that?”

Professor Levitt: “That is the issue that’s been resolved with counsel, that the students still retain rights to that paper, as far as we understand, yes.”

Professor Cohn: “Retains right is not the issue. The issue is does it become part of Turnitin’s database and do they use it for further fact-checking.”

Professor Levitt: “It does.”

Professor Cohn: “And is it the case that the student then no longer has control over what might happen to their paper, where it goes, who has it? What kinds of assurances are we in a position to give to students relative to --.”

Professor Levitt: “My understanding is Turnitin does not sell or distribute the papers. They only keep it in their database. I know there are some units in the college that are
using Turnitin already, and seem to be happy with it. I remember when Isaac Kramnick did purchase that as a site license for us to use, and that was the issue; whether the student did retain their rights to that paper.”

Professor Cohn: “I understand here it’s just to make it available, it’s not a requirement; but I would like to share a concern of one of my colleagues who just feels that the idea that this material would then become Turnitin’s to use is completely dissonant with all the other principles we espouse relative to copyright, our own information and how we treat confidentiality with respect to information.”

Emeritus Professor Dick Durst, CAPE: “I would just like to add support to this, saying whether or not faculty uses this, just the knowledge of a student that we have this available and it could be used is going to be a deterrent in itself.”

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Could you give a good example how it could be used in an educational way?”

Professor Levitt: “One of the suggestions that was discussed at the conference that Carol Grumbach attended was to have the students literally go online and plagiarize a paragraph and put it through Turnitin, or paraphrase, which Turnitin picks up to a certain degree and put it through Turnitin, so they can actually see the various kinds of things that are caught with this technology, and also for their own information. There are some students who don’t know that paraphrasing is plagiarism, without citing the source, without giving some reference to it. So those are the kind of things that were talked about in the EPC meeting, of how one might use this as an instruction tool.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- “One of the things I tried to work out with the students was to take a writing course on professional writing. One student came back to me and said there’s no such course offered on the Cornell campus next semester. This course would be useful.”

Professor Claire Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine. “I understand Abby’s concern, but the reason why Turnitin wants to keep it is to determine whether some fraternity person at Cornell has sold a paper; not given the paper to somebody else.”

Professor Jane Fajans, Anthropology” “Some years ago we were told to put a text in our syllabi that suggested that plagiarism -- what plagiarism was and why it wasn’t allowed. I don’t understand why text is not sufficient in a university where everybody is supposed to be literate and a little bit responsible to the syllabus you hand out to them.

“It may be that it needs further elaboration, but I would not put -- I would like, I guess move to strike that from this resolution, because I think that’s giving students all the ways out of abiding by what we’re trying to instill here, to say, "Oh, but the professor didn’t elaborate on it, so how could I possibly be responsible for it.”

Professor Wojciech Pawlowski, Senator at Large, Plant Breeding and Genetics: “I am wondering if you made an assessment about the economics of purchasing a university site license, how many people would use them and if it would just make an economic sense.”

Professor Levitt: “What I can tell you, the Faculty Advisory Board on Technology did a
survey. They had 400 responses. 90% of those 400 people said that they would use such a tool, if it were available. Were asking for it, in fact.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communication. “I just wanted to push on the question of copyright. I want to make sure the EPC thought about the implications of a required course. So we’re still in this position where asking a student or obliging a student to turn in through this mechanism, does then hand this paper over to Turnitin, which the courts have said is fair use and acceptable; but if there’s no way for a student to opt out of that for the course and a course is a required course, then we really are putting them in a dilemma, where we’re sort of tacitly obliging them to participate. If that’s still a question about whether they have the right to opt out or if we are basically handing off that right. I want to make sure, especially as a required course, as a special case for this.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: “I want to emphasize this is an ethical issue. Plagiarism is an ethical issue, but this kind of surveillance is also an ethical issue. As we think about it and vote on it, just want to make sure that’s on everybody’s mind.”

Professor Levitt: “I would just remind everybody that the participation on the part of the faculty member is voluntary. Not on the part of the student. That’s true.”

Speaker Walcott: “Other comments? Yes, sir.”

Professor George Hudler, Plant Pathology: “I wonder whether the committee has done enough homework to know that Turnitin is the best product for the money.”

Professor Levitt: “Actually, our sense is from the FABIT report and from those using it on campus already that it probably is right now.”

Speaker Walcott: “Other comments? Yes. Wait a second for the microphone.”

Professor Paul Feeney: College of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology. “I just wonder, if we have this kind of system that’s sort of built in and we have a license we can all use, it would become a prop we’d rely on and perhaps allow us to be less diligent about employing other ways of deterring cheating. I can think of many other ways, some of which were referred to earlier.

“In my class, for example, I would announce that the top 20 essays as judged by the teaching assistants would come to me, and we would bind them and put them in a folder in the library, because there would be a special topic that is not known to be in any fraternity files. We don’t know what’s been set in previous years, keep a track of that, so then that would deter people from having something memorialized, if it were, in Madden Library, there for everyone to read in the future and find them out.

“Another one is actually to have the students pay particular attention to sudden increases in the quality of the writing, unbecoming to the typical undergraduate, which is not difficult in our field, and then to type those in on Google and see what comes up. And in fact, one of my recent students, about four or five years ago actually found that a student - - she noticed there was some text that looked familiar. It was actually taken out of a paper of hers that had been published in the National Academy of Sciences two years previously, of her own work. So needless to say, we had something to sort out there.
“Another time, when I gathered papers from different sections, I found two identical papers. Now, they may have got through on Turnitin, but clearly one had plagiarized the other, and I found out who those two people were and took appropriate action. So there are -- just getting more involved with what the students are doing, and just trying to play -- just understand what their motives are, looking for signs that you can detect quite easily, if you get to know the students or have TAs who can do that, can go a long way to mitigate having to depend upon a prop like this that might then excuse us from putting in other effort.”

Speaker Walcott: “Okay, I think the time for discussion is over, and I would now call for a vote. Once again, let me arm this great machine here.

“Okay, remember A means you're in favor of it. B means you're opposed to it, and C means you abstain. Is everybody done? 58. Do I hear 59? (LAUGHTER)

“Okay. Come on, computer. You can do it. Well, there are the results, and it looks to me as if the motion passes, 66% to 26%, with 9% abstentions. Okay. We now proceed to Bruce Levitt.”

5. RESOLUTION ON “WORK NECESSITATED OVER BREAKS” FROM THE EPC (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

Professor Levitt: “This is an advisory resolution only. We are seeking your advice. The EPC is seeking your advice. There has been a lot of conversation lately amongst us about the amount of homework given over short breaks, and so there's a draft resolution in front of you:

"Whereas student workloads have become an increasing cause of concern in relation to student mental health and whereas short breaks in academic requirements are generally regarded as healthy, be it resolved that framing assignments in such a way that necessitates academic work for students over fall break, Thanksgiving break and spring bring is strongly discouraged."

WHEREAS student workloads have become an increasing cause of concern in relation to student mental health; and

WHEREAS short breaks from academic requirements are generally regarded as healthy,

BE IT RESOLVED that framing assignments in such a way that necessitates academic work for students over Fall Break, Thanksgiving Break, and Spring Break is strongly discouraged.

“The reason we are bringing this to you is that it's a difficult issue to phrase. We're not trying to discourage students from reading a book that has been assigned since the beginning of the semester and that book’s completion may be after fall break. What we're trying to get at is the notion of someone giving an essay to be written on Wednesday before fall break, having it due the Wednesday after fall break, or a take-home exam over fall break. Those are the kinds of things we're trying to get at, not the long-term assignments that students can anticipate and hopefully schedule their time for.
“This is of grave concern to a lot of faculty, a lot of parents, a lot of students; and also in just informal conversations with the mental health people at Gannett, they feel this is crucial to reducing the amount of stress on students, if there is some ability to get away from the increasingly heavy loads of work over these short breaks. So we’re looking for your advice.”

Professor Andre Kessler, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: “Is there evidence the workload increased over the past few years? Because I kind of have the feeling it’s actually not. It is just that the students have to do other things in addition to learning at the university.”

Professor Levitt: “The anecdotal evidence that we have are hundreds of e-mails to the Dean of Faculty’s office and the conversations with students, and actually, this conversation came from faculty members who wanted it discussed.”

Speaker Walcott: “In the back, please.”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “Has the EPC given consideration to an issue I think I may have raised with them, which is the other very short break in which it’s not healthy to have work, which is overnight? I live in a freshman dorm, and have done so for the last -- this is my fourth year there, so I can attest to this. I suppose it’s anecdotal but that’s about 1,000 different students.

“One of the things that has become remarkably unpleasant and clear to me is that there are members of faculty who assign things that are due at 2:00am in the morning or 11:00pm at night or 6:00am in the morning, problem sets -- it tends not to be humanists. I tend not to exonerate the humanists -- but completely interfere with the sleep schedule of the students, so it seems to me there’s a large question about how we assign work.

“I think technology, which has helped so many of us, is also proving to be sort of a contributor on this, because we know we can time stamp things on Blackboard and time stamp things through e-mail. So is that part of this discussion?”

Professor Levitt: “It is on the agenda as a separate issue for the December meeting, December 15th.”

Professor Toorawa: “So don’t we want to think about these things globally? It would change the way we write our syllabi, it would change the way we assign readings. I may be wrong, but I think it perhaps will be doing things in a very haphazard way, if we discuss whether or not we’re going to assign work over a break, and wait a minute, whether or not we’ll assign things overnight. Seems to be an important discussion that needs to take place across the colleges. And thank you for addressing this. I am one of the faculty members who brought this to the EPC’s attention.”

Professor Cohn: “Two comments. I appreciate the spirit of this, but I feel the way it’s currently worded doesn’t quite get the reading that you want, and I might suggest that we would say something like necessitate significant academic work or -- the thing is, it’s only going to be advisory anyway, so there may be some fear if we start adding adjectives, it will water it down; but I think we want to separate the sort of ongoing work that really should potentially be happening during those times versus the -- sort of the more major
assignments.

“The other comment that I might share, which is something brought up by a colleague, but it ties into a discussion we had last spring when we passed the resolution about advising was significant concern about what seems to be a significant increase -- I just used "significant" many times -- a significant increase in the number of students taking overloads. And the fact that we have no advisory mechanism, none of those students are getting guidance from anyone who is saying you should not be doing this.

“And we had a report last meeting from a member of the committee that's -- working committee that's working on that, but we have no feedback on that. And each and every semester that goes by where we have no mechanism to see our advisees face-to-face and particularly have the discussion about what a reasonable number of credit hours are, I think continues to exacerbate and feed very directly into this problem.”

Speaker Walcott: “Professor Stein.”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “I find the language so vague that it's hard to know quite what it means, but I'm inspired by the freshman to my right -- that was supposed to be funny. I'm sorry. (LAUGHTER)

“And it seems to me there's a wording that I can't quite get exactly right at the moment that would incorporate this problem, the problem that he raises, and perhaps one might think about whether weekends is a time that should be used. I mean, I rather think it should be, but that's obviously something to think about.

“And you could put them all together in one language by saying something like that the time that is allowed -- that a reasonable time be allowed to complete an assignment, and that time should not include fall break, midnight to 8:00 am in the morning and weekends, if you feel that way. I mean, if the writers feel that's an appropriate thing to exclude.”

Speaker Walcott: “Right behind Professor Stein.”

Professor Kaiser: “I support this motion. I have a logical question. How is this information going to be relayed to the faculty every year? Is it coming from the provost, the president? If I'm a new faculty member, how am I going to know about this?”

Professor Fajans: “I just want to endorse what Abby Cohn said about students taking too many credits. I certainly know -- and I know this informally from all my colleagues that over the last 15 or 20 years, every one of us has had to water down our syllabi in order to keep students in our class because students are taking so many more courses. It has gone from 125 to 150 pages of reading a week, Social Science or Humanities course, to 75 being too much.

“So there's a broader issue about what students expect to be able -- expect of themselves and expect of their college education that's shifted over time, and I think the discussion has to include that.”

Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “The EPC addressed this in a variety of ways. The major reason for bringing this today is to get your input, so if you have suggestions you would like to
make in terms of wording, the EPC would like to hear that. It is not up for a vote today, but to get your input. And that’s a serious request, that you send your input to Bruce Levitt."

Professor Levitt: “ba15@cornell.edu.”

Speaker Walcott: “Back corner.”

Professor Ron Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior: “I guess my concern is related to the last comment, and we really don’t have a critical analysis of what’s going on. I mean, we all know, and I believe Arts and Sciences is aware of the fact the number of students that are doing double, triple majors has increased dramatically.

“Students are reporting the stress, and the stress may be self-induced. To give this message, it actually may be driving the over commitment on the part of the students. You would think that actually a better way to maybe go about this at this point is actually do an analysis to make sure that this is the best approach to solving the problem.

“There are a number of campuses that have made it very, very difficult to do double majors. The idea is that when you start doing double majors, instead of taking four courses or five courses during the semester as a normal load, you try to do six or even seven. And that certainly will increase the number of calls from students and faculty, because the students are trying to juggle all that additional work.

“So just by doing that, you actually could potentially make the problem worse, because we don’t necessarily understand what the problem is. We don’t know why they are complaining or what the root cause of this development is at this point.”

Professor Levitt: “I think there’s a clear difference between a semester-long syllabus in which students can anticipate assignments and an essay that’s not on that syllabus that’s assigned, say, Wednesday or Friday before fall break that’s due the Wednesday after fall break. So I do think the issue of student loads is absolutely true. I mean, I see that with my own students; but I also think this one issue can be addressed.

“It may be that we need to address the whole notion of student loads -- true -- additionally, but I think there’s been less than -- I think in some cases, there’s -- there have been assignments by faculty that seem to be egregious in this way, where they are -- where the faculty postpones or waits or gives an exam, a take-home exam over fall break. I think that’s what we are trying to address with this, but I do take the point that we should probably discuss the student load issue too.”

Professor Booker: “It seems more generic.”

Professor Kim Weeden, Sociology: “I want to point out another unintended consequence, and that is that alcohol is a depressant. And I say this, actually, as somebody who lives quite next to Ithaca (Foaming) Falls, which is unfortunate, in a number of respects, mainly that I do hear the helicopters and panic every time, because I know exactly what helicopters mean in my neighborhood. They aren’t traffic helicopters; but I think a motion like this, while well meaning, can have unintended consequences in encouraging more partying, especially this thing about the weekends. Do we really not want students
to be working over the weekend? What are they going to be doing instead? And I think that might be quite counter-productive for what we are trying to alleviate here.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Microbiology and Immunology. “I strongly support the motion, I support the language of the motion, because I think it addresses exactly the situations that you are trying to prevent, and I think by putting additional language in there like "significant" leaves it up to the faculty to decide what is significant. The students should not be subjected to that. I think it’s a power issue. And as far as the students partying, I think it’s up to them what they want to do, really.”

Speaker Walcott: “Right behind you.”

Professor Graeme Bailey, Computer Science. “Just a quick observation to the EPC to think also about the provision of prelims the week after Thanksgiving break, immediately proximal to final exams, which is a tradition in some departments.”

Professor Levitt. “That is on the December schedule as well.”

Professor Toorawa: “What all this is demonstrating is something that I think many of us know, which is that first of all, students don’t necessarily know how to manage their time very well; and second of all, in many cases our syllabi are extremely demanding. And what I do, for example, I front-load, because I expect my colleagues not to front-load, so the students have less to do for me than other classes. I think we all probably need to be educated a little more about how to do our syllabi.

“I think many of us went through these things at a time when things were a little bit different. The kinds of distractions we had were different. Alcohol was always there, but Facebook, technology, the way students interact. Again, I speak from living in a dorm. Things are quite different even than five years ago.

“There is a lot of things we could do. I leave open slots in the syllabus and tell the students, like you, I sometimes can’t keep up, so I keep things open. And so I model that as well for them, so they understand it’s okay if I slip a little behind. I can catch up; but it’s a whole culture of time management, and so that’s why I, too, support this and endorse it, but I think it’s a much bigger issue and we need to address the bigger issue. This simply shows we are aware of the problem. We need to somehow address the real problems.”

Speaker Walcott: “Okay, that’s it for our time for that item, and -- Eric Cheyfitz to present something. I don’t have my cheat sheet. Eric, let me wire you up. It hurts a lot.”

6. RESOLUTION ON TAKING BACK THE TAP – FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

Professor Cheyfitz: “Thanks. This is a proposal from a student group, as you can see, that came to the UFC. I don’t have a dog in this fight, so to speak, nor does the UFC. We didn’t have anyone on the UFC who could do the science, as you can see a lot of whereas proposals that present statistics. We have no reason to doubt the statistics.

“They are probably completely accurate, but it needs faculty sponsorship or UFC sponsorship or Senate sponsorship, so we thought we’d present it to the Senate because it is an environmental issue that is important, and it’s by way of saying it’s a resolution -- a
proposal for resolution, seeking a resolution. I have no expertise in this matter whatsoever, but we did -- the UFC did want to present it for consideration. So I'm going to sit down and let the discussion proceed.

“We do want discussion. We have ten minutes for discussion. We would like to see -- I think what we'd like to do is just test the waters here and see if faculty is interested in this kind of proposal, in supporting this kind of proposal. I could say, as someone who writes a lot, that it could use trimming down, I think, and focusing for sure; but beyond that, is this something that the Faculty Senate wants to address, which is the issue of bottled water on campus, as part of a sustainability initiative, which is clearly on the agenda of Cornell University.

“So yes, we'd like to hear from people. I dare say, there are probably people in the room who do environmental science who can perhaps add to whatever is here.”

Speaker Walcott: “Comments? Questions?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “This is one of the issues with the resolution. There are too many whereases, no doubt, and too many resolveds, but the resolveds are both educational on the part of the administration -- it's asking for the administration to educate the campus on the hazards of bottled water in terms of the bottles themselves, the plastics; but it's also asking the administration to somehow lead a movement to reduce the sale of bottled water on campus, which is a material consideration clearly and has to do with economics. So that in a nutshell I think synthesizes what all those resolveds are about.”

Speaker Walcott: “Any comments? Yes.”

Professor David Levitsky, Division of Nutritional Sciences: “You could also add -- an educational component that drinking the extra water will not do a damn thing for their health, which is well-known; secondly, the quality of the water they get from their plastic bottles is no better than what they are going to get from the tap.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “That is in the resolution already. So I think that's covered.”

Speaker Walcott: “Abby Cohn.”

Professor Cohn: “I guess the question I have reading this resolution is whether we, as a body, would be writing the resolution or rather endorsing a position taken by the students, but particularly if the student assembly has already passed this and there's wide support for it, I could imagine us taking a position more of endorsement or a much -- a more specific set of actions in endorsing and sharing with the students the communicating to the administration the desires to do this, rather than sort of putting forward the same sort of resolution that the students have put forward.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “I think that's clearly what they're looking for. I think they want the Faculty Senate to support the resolution. They've got a list of supporters already, and I guess ideally, if I could speak for them -- and I haven't spoken to them actually, nor has the UFC, as far as I know -- but if they could add the Faculty Senate to that list, that probably would satisfy.”

Speaker Walcott: “May I just add a remark, that as chair of the University Assembly, I
happen to know this resolution was passed by the students and forwarded on to the president, and so I think were the faculty to say they agreed with it, that would be something that the students would value.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Yes.”

Speaker Walcott: “If there’s no more comment, I think we should proceed to .”

” Professor Cheyfitz: “I guess the only question would be is it worthwhile to put this as a resolution of support for this particular resolution, just have a vote on it. Okay, so we can do that.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you.”

WHEREAS, Cornell University has signed the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, which pledges “Cornell University to a path toward climate neutrality enhancing our land-grant mission in support of a socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable society”; and

WHEREAS, the Cornell Climate Action Plan, which seeks to “achieve climate neutrality on campus by the year 2050, and provide a model for solutions that will engage, educate, and inspire our state, our nation, and our world,” identifies energy conservation as one of the five recommended action areas and promotes “active leadership” and “campus engagement from faculty, staff, students, and alumni”; and

WHEREAS, bottled water wastes 2,000 times as much energy as tap water, and 85 percent of bottles are not recycled; and

WHEREAS, Cornell Dining sold 148,543 total Aquafina single-use water bottles in the latest fiscal year, a decrease of 33,575 units from the previous fiscal year, thus indicating declining consumer demand for bottled water on campus consistent with nationwide trends; and

WHEREAS, U.S. plastic water bottle production requires approximately 32 to 54 million gallons of oil, and three out of every four of those bottles end up in landfills, as roadside litter, or in an incinerator; and

WHEREAS, a 20-ounce bottle of water requires about one-third its volume in oil for manufacture, transportation, and disposal; and

WHEREAS, almost 50% of bottled water comes from the same source as tap water but is sold back to consumers at hundreds of times the cost; and

WHEREAS, bottled water, regulated by the FDA, is less stringently regulated than municipal tap water, regulated by the EPA; and,

WHEREAS, Fall Creek the source of Cornell’s tap water, consistently exceeds EPA standards; and

WHEREAS, public tap water is safe and is significantly more affordable, accessible, and environmentally sustainable than bottled water; and

WHEREAS, bottled water undermines communities’ faith in their public water systems;
WHEREAS, 68 universities and colleges around the country including Brown University, Harvard University, Dartmouth College, Yale University, University of Pennsylvania, University of California-Berkeley, Belmont University, Oberlin College, New York University, Vassar College, Washington University, Oregon State University, Seattle University and many others have already made campus-wide efforts to curb their bottled water use; and

WHEREAS, The Cornell Student Assembly passed a similar resolution on the 4th of November, 2010 demonstrating their support for the following actions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that President Skorton issue a directive to all departments, facilities and functions discouraging the purchase of bottled water.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University invest in drinking fountain infrastructure by increasing the number of and, where possible, retrofitting drinking fountains on campus with spigots for refilling reusable bottles.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University encourage the use of and, where possible, sell refillable bottles at dining facilities, department offices and functions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University authorize, endorse, and facilitate efforts to educate, via various media, the university community regarding the value and benefits of using the local water system for all of its water needs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University will take gradual but concrete steps to end the purchase, sales, and distribution of bottled water on campus and at Cornell-hosted events, which will include:

Gradually replacing bottled water with tap water and/or filtered water whenever possible;
Specifically refusing to sell bottled water through Cornell Dining when future beverage contracts are negotiated; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the President’s Sustainable Campus Committee (PSCC) include a timeline of specific measures pertaining to decreasing the consumption of bottled water into its “annual progress report on Cornell’s campus sustainability initiatives and commitments” as part of the Climate Action Plan.

Resolution Presented By:
Take Back The Tap at Cornell
Kristen Loria ’11, President

Organizations Supporting the Resolution:
Cornell Student Assembly (Resolution Passed) Environmental Law Society KyotoNow! Sustainability Hub Society for Natural Resources Conservation Roots and Shoots Cornell
7. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “Thank you, Charlie. My comments are going to be in four categories. I just want to indicate there’s a committee working on the Cornell academic calendar. That committee is meeting about every two weeks. It is learning a lot. It is learning that some simple solutions seem to be unavailable, but it is in action. Just want to let you know they are acting.

“Last month we also passed a resolution on a faculty lunch. There is continued activity concerning the continuation of a faculty lunch. There will be a meeting next Monday that I will have with representatives from the Hotel School, and we’ll see what happens. At the present time, the current faculty lunch is destined to have ended last Friday at the Statler Hotel, so we’re investigating what can happen for next semester.

“Can I have the next one, Charlie? I just wanted to share with you; I received this e-mail today from the family of a deceased faculty member indicating that they do really appreciate the memorial statements, and I wanted to say that very soon, all of the memorial statements that we talked about last time, Bob Cooke is -- those have been scanned, they will become available back to the very beginning, when those memorial statements were made.

“And then finally, I want to say a few words about Africana. Can I have the next slide, Charlie? First of all, I want to disclose that I was informed confidentially about what the provost was intending to do, and I have to say that my personal view is that units do better in colleges. That was -- it’s been my view for a long time. I think it’s true for Nutritional Sciences, I think it’s true for the Isles of Shoals, and I think that it is also true for Africana. So just wanted to disclose the very personal view. “And it’s also my view that the university needs to provide stronger support to the Africana center. The provost sent everyone a message this afternoon, in which he indicated that is also his approach. I happen to believe that, that there will be that stronger support. He is planning to spend more money, but he plans to do it only through the College of Arts and Sciences. And then finally, this action, whether it’s a closing of a department, merging of a department or adjusting the reporting structure of a unit, from my reading of the bylaws, it’s completely legal. We went through this with Theoretical Applied Mechanics, the Department of Education and with Africana, so the bylaws give the administration that power. I just wanted to provide that for discussion for later on. So with that, I would be happy to take any questions or to sit down.

“Sit down”. “I was informed, yes.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “Can you clarify that a little bit more? Was it a meeting --?”

Dean Fry: “It was a one-on-one discussion. I met with the provost, he said this is what he was planning to do and that it was confidential.”

Professor Sanders: “My question -- sorry about that -- to ask him what was the nature of
the meeting. He said he was informed confidentially, so I wanted a bit more clarification on that meeting in which he was informed.

Director Robert Harris, Africana Studies: “Well, this is from the Dean of Faculty’s report, and if -- my name’s Bob Harris, Africana Studies, and I’ll be talking more later -- could you let us know when you were informed of this?”

Dean Fry: “Between 10 and 14 days ago.”

Speaker Walcott: “There is a comment in the back.”

Professor Steve Morgan, Sociology Department: “Was the UFC informed confidentially?”

Dean Fry: “No.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: “I realize there’s going to be a longer discussion and it’s going to be important, but I want to say that I think this reveals something that’s come up over and over again, which is this sharing of so-called confidential information to somebody who represents the faculty, and I think it puts the Dean of Faculty and the UFC -- sometimes it’s a case of the UFC -- in an impossible situation, and I don’t think we should agree to keep things confidential that affect the faculty and that we have the right to know about. So I’m sure we’ll have more to say about this.”

Professor Stein: “I only know what I read in the newspaper, but it was stated in the newspaper that no one in Africana was informed, except for being told about it five years ago. I don’t know if that’s correct, but that does seem to me peculiar, and I think it raises a lot of questions. I hope I can hear it’s not true, but that’s what was in the newspaper.”

8. DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE ACADEMIC HOME FOR AFRICANA CENTER

Professor Carole Boyce Davies, Africana Studies: “Good afternoon. I’m Carole Boyce Davies, Professor of Africana Studies, with a joint appointment in the English Department. First of all, I’m a faculty senator and it is in this context I address you this afternoon. I want to thank the Dean of the Faculty for including this as a formal agenda item. Initially it was at the end of the agenda, but we are pleased that you have made it a formal item and given us time to really develop it properly in this context.

“There is a written statement, which you should have picked up in the front, but I’m going to read from some of it -- not the entire thing, since you have it, but highlight some of the critical items we want to bring forward this afternoon. And then my colleague, Professor Bob Harris, who is the director of Africana Center -- Africana Studies and Research Center, will join me and also provide more context and also respond to questions that you may have.

“The first -- I’m going to hit some of the key paragraphs. One of the points that Dean [Fry] made that really startled us was that this had been discussed informally with a number of people and we [Africana faculty] were not informed at all, so I want to highlight that; that we actually had a meeting but after the fact. First the provost scheduled a meeting, but did not tell us what the agendawould be. We had to solicit it
from him through the chair, and then he indicated that it was the future of Africana Studies.

"When he came to meet with the faculty, he just announced that this was a decision that was already made. This took place on December 1, 2010, as the statement says.

“And then we had a subsequent meeting with President Skorton, 12/6/10, in which he endorsed this decision. So it was announced as a fait accompli i.e. the Africana Studies and Research Center was going to be moved to Arts and Sciences. So the part I want to highlight: this decision, we feel, violates the fundamental recommendation of the Faculty Senate Committee to review faculty governance March 6, 2007, which stressed faculty participation as an essential of shared governance.

“The second point is that the provost indicated he had consulted with individuals, but in that consultation with other individuals, we [Africana] were totally left out. We had no prior discussion with him about this, and we felt the same courtesy and opportunity to deliberate which he had, for example, with Dean Fry was not accorded to our faculty at all prior to his announcement of its implementation.

“The provost essentially announced the change in Africana’s structure in a way which denied the faculty’s expertise and participation in his decision. This begins a process of undermining the Africana Center. This is a slippery slope, we believe, for faculty engagement at Cornell University.

“Thirdly, the provost has since, in several communications, including the ones in the newspaper that was mentioned, including the one circulated today, indicated that he cites a 2005 Africana program review as basis for his decision; however, this review, which I have read carefully, contains four recommendations, none of which mention transferring the Africana Center to the College of Arts and Sciences.

“He also -- we should say as well, there was a long response from the director and faculty, which challenged a number of factual errors in that program, and a response from former Provost Biddy Martin, which engaged a number of questions -- items raised and recommendations raised in that review. He also indicated in the "Cornell Chronicle" of December 3rd, 2010, that he also used the reimaging Cornell initiatives, which creates a leaner and more distinguished University. This record as well did not address any structural rearrangement of the Africana Center.

“While we welcome support on the Ph.D., we want to say we have already started a process which was instituted by the hiring of new faculty -- I’m one of them -- and a series of meetings, retreats. We have brought in consultants from Harvard, Berkeley, Northwest and U. Mass. over the year to consult with us. This culminated in a Ph.D. proposal, which we is waiting implementation. So the idea of announcing the Ph.D. as kind of a treat or carrot does not work for us, because we have been in that process for a while and there's a document which has outlined the way which we envisioned this Ph.D. to look.

“I am going read the last paragraph, "We are especially concerned about the timing of a change of such proportions. It has negatively impacted our students at a time when
Cornell is marketing itself as a caring community. This decision brings additional negative attention to Cornell University as it relates to the treatment of minority" -- quote, unquote minority -- "issues and undermines trust and confidence in the institution.

“The lack of prior consultation with Africana faculty and transparency inevitably raises suspicions about the real intentions of the administration for the future of Africana Studies. We are not irrevocably opposed to change. This is one of the ways we have been presented, but we cannot accept proposals that will weaken our institutional vision and integrity.

“The provost’s approach to governance sets another unfortunate precedent for Cornell University. We request this decision be put on hold until the Africana’s faculty is appropriately consulted on this matter and has input in considering possible models that will enhance its own future.”

“This is the formal presentation of the statement. My colleague, Professor Bob Harris, will now join me [in this presentation]."

Professor Robert Harris, Africana Studies: “My name is Bob Harris, and I have been at Cornell University now for some 35 years. I think I know many of you that I’ve worked with here, as I served as special assistant to the provost for six years, I served as Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development for eight years. I am a member of the graduate field of history. My primary appointment is in the Africana Studies and Research Center. I’m also a member of the Field of American Studies, I’m a core faculty member of the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs, or CIPA.

“And why do I mention this? I mention this because the canard is often brought out that the Africana Studies and Research Center is intellectually isolated from the rest of the university, and I think that’s one of the things that a number of people have in the back of their minds, that if the Africana Studies and Research Center joins the College of Arts and Sciences, that somehow or another it will be more intellectually involved in the university as a whole.

“Our faculty, our members of graduate fields across the university, we have a graduate field that right now exceeds the number of core faculty in the Africana Studies and Research Center. We did this as a result of the external review that was conducted on the Africana Center, and I just have to respond to the portion of the provost’s letter to the faculty, and I hope that we can have the same privilege of communicating with the faculty at large as the provost did.

“We asked for an opportunity to speak to the Faculty Senate, and that’s what we thought we would be speaking to, as opposed to the faculty at large, so maybe we’ll be granted that same privilege; but anyway, it says that the review urged that the structure of the Africana Center be revisited because of its negative impact on Africana. Now, the Africana Studies and Research Centers existed here for 41 years. We have reported to the provost for those 41 years. Yes, like any department, there are ways in which -- things we can do that will be improved, but I’m not sure that the review committee talked about the structure as having a negative impact on the Africana Center, because we’ve been functioning quite well under that structure.
“The president and the provost point to African-American studies departments, programs at other institutions and they, in a way, say they want us to be like Harvard, Yale, Princeton. We're different. We have to acknowledge that. I think if we had an opportunity to sit down and to discuss this with the provost, he may have understood that the comparability is not there. At Yale, it’s African-American studies. It does not include African studies, does not include Caribbean studies. At Harvard, it’s African and African-American studies. At Princeton, I don’t know what it is. I mean, they are trying to develop a strong African-American studies program there, I gather. “So the question of comparability is one that we really should look at. Our work goes across colleges. Many of our faculty are currently members of graduate fields that are not just in the College of Arts and Sciences and have been members of graduate fields in other colleges. There are some other models that could be applied here. Many of us have served on external review committees for different colleges and universities in looking at their black studies, Africana studies, African-American studies departments and programs, but that expertise that resides with us who knows the field better than we do was not called upon in considering what type of arrangement there would be. The provost mentions that he’s pleased that I have agreed to continue serving as director with full support of the Africana faculty. Like Dean Fry, the provost indicated to me what he planned to do a week before he came over and spoke with our faculty and asked that I not let the faculty know what he was planning to say. I gave him my word I would not let the faculty know. We did ask him for an agenda. It was a very vague agenda that he gave us, because once I let the faculty know that the provost was coming to speak with us as opposed to us, they wanted to know what's the agenda?

“So as an administrator, I -- you know, supposedly the head of the unit, I asked him to supply an agenda. He gave two sentences, I think, very vague, about what he wanted to discuss with the Africana Center. So I had some idea our faculty was totally in the dark about this and had no idea of what the provost was coming to say. And let me just -- couple of points. We want to make sure you have time to ask us questions -- I have agreed to continue serving as director, because I tendered my resignation when the provost said he was going to make this announcements to the faculty. I tendered my resignation to him, told him I could not in good conscience serve as director of the Africana Center if it was going to be absorbed into the College of Arts and Sciences.

“When he asked me to serve as director of the Africana Center, we spoke about the reporting relationship, and he said to me I would report to him with a day-to-day report to Alice Pell. That was the agreement under which I said yes, I will serve as director of the Africana Center. He violated our agreement. That is why I had to resign. Only because the faculty have asked me to stay on have I agreed to do so.

“One last point; and this, to me, is really the great disappointment that I had. As I mentioned, I have been here 35 years. I think I’ve been a hell of a good citizen of this university. And when the provost came and when he laid this out for us, I said, “Kent, you’ve put a lot on the plate before us. Could you give us two days to digest this and come back and to talk with you? ”No.”

“That’s the reward you get.”
Speaker Charlie Walcott: “I would like to ask Senior Vice Provost John Siliciano to come and talk. Then we’ll have open discussion. John?”

Vice Provost John Siliciano: “Hello, everybody. I appreciate this opportunity to come speak on behalf of the trustees -- I’m sorry. On behalf of the provost. Freudian slip is right. The provost is not here because he’s speaking with the trustees. He’s in New York and wanted me to come here and be able to discuss this with you and respond to our colleagues here.

“We don’t all agree on exactly what happened here. I think what we do agree on, or at least I can assert is true that what we believe in the provost’s office is the importance of making sure Africana receives the support necessary to ensure its excellence and national prominence. The provost reached this decision after considerable thought, and he’s decided this goal can only be fulfilled by moving -- changing the reporting structure of Africana and removing that report from the provost’s office to the dean of the colleges of -- College of Arts and Sciences. “The reasons underlying this conclusion are set out in the letter that all faculty received today. The provost sent that letter because this was put on the agenda for the Faculty Senate, and he was not able to be here and wanted to make sure his voice was able to be heard. He did not want to rely on me to accurately represent his views.

“I won’t go through the letter or repeat the points in it, but I want to emphasize a few things; one is what’s already been mentioned, that the current arrangement is an anomaly and this change has been under consideration for a long time. Virtually all the top programs at all of our peers have Africana studies in whatever variant it is -- and I accept Bob’s view that they are different configurations at different colleges, but the basic unit is always within the central liberal arts college and it’s always reported -- or always does now in the top units, report to the dean of that college. At none of these does it report to the provost’s office.

“Our arrangement was a source of concern in the 2005 very extensive external review. The committee was so concerned about the arrangement that they urged the provost to reconsider it on the ground that it was detrimental to Africana. Provost Martin, my former boss, delayed doing this and instead focused on another recommendation of that committee, which was to increase the number of Africana faculty significantly and engaged in multiple hires over those years.

“Provost Martin left, and Provost Fuchs came in. He considered it carefully. He discussed this with others, including both the past and current directors of Africana. Those discussions obviously did not represent unanimous points of view, but they did occur. So that’s in terms of the arrangement. In terms of how -- I’m speaking for myself, but also the provost shares this view, how we view this issue. This is really, in my view, an issue of our own assessment of what we are capable of handling within the provost’s office and doing responsibly in terms of the academic units. The provost has the authority and indeed the responsibility to determine what our office is good at and what we are not good at. What we are not good at, we have the responsibility for finding the right arrangement.
“The Africana reports -- I'll go into that, but unlike almost all other units, reports directly to the provost’s office. This has in practice meant reporting to a vice provost. In my six years there, Africana has reported to three different vice provosts. I have had other units reporting to me, two other units; the program in real estate, which has 50 graduate students and the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs, which has 200 graduate students. Those were the other two academic units that reported directly to the provost’s office for historical reasons. So I had the task of administering or being the quasi-dean for those units.

“It is very clear to us that we lack the tools to be in the supervisory role of a frontline academic unit. By that I mean a unit engaged correctly in the teaching of our students and the production of research. That is not what we are good at, and it has resulted in a form of benign neglect for those units. And in fact, it’s something that I don’t -- I view as having non-benign consequences. It creates all sorts of problems of things we are not structurally set up to do that dean’s offices are.

“An example is the tenure process. That requires, under the rules, that the review occur at the department level, the dean level and provost level. This multiple layer of review ensures not only we’re protecting faculty excellence, but that faculty candidates have different independent assessors of their work. In terms of Africana, that middle stage is missing. It goes directly from the center to the provost. In order to build in that protection, we have created a fictional quasi-dean, meaning one of the vice provosts to serve as the dean. You can imagine the difficulty of ensuring the integrity of that decision when it is essentially all within the provost’s office. This seriously impairs the rights of appeal available under the faculty handbook.

“So there are a number of these anomalies that are quite significant. As a result of these, the provost -- one more thing, this issue of our capacity to do things, not only in terms of our substantive ability, but our sheer capacity has changed dramatically in the last two years ago. We have gone through a very significant down-sizing. We have eliminated multiple positions. We no longer have a deputy provost, a provost for the Life Sciences, for the Social Sciences, for land grant, for outreach and for other positions. So we have shrunk considerably as a part of the restructuring, and the remainder of our efforts -- and we are working full-time -- is to get through this crisis and to deal with university-wide planning and operations.

“As a result of this, we have moved all of the units that were under this prior arrangement, and prior provosts moved others, the Nutritional Science, Lab of Ornithology and others, with colleges that are more closely affiliated with their subject matter. We have now moved the other remaining ones, the Program of Real Estate and CIPA, out of the provost’s office in terms of a direct report.

“So that is how this is -- I can see this is really an effort to assess what we are good at, what we are not good at. This is something we are not good at. It is something that Colleges of Arts and Sciences across the country excel at in terms of supporting their centers and units dedicated to these areas of study. So that’s the substantive issue of the change.
“In terms of these issues of respect and commitment to the future of Africana, all I can say is that we are trying to demonstrate an enduring commitment, respect for Africana by placing it in a place we believe it will thrive. This includes a commitment of additional resources for the future of Africana, to allow hiring of new faculty and to create a first-rate Ph.D. program.

“The bottom line for me is we really have a choice in this era of very scarce resources; we could add more bureaucrats like me to Day Hall to do this job and do it poorly or we can spend our money on faculty hiring. This is the battle we are in right now. Every cent we can save on administrative overhead, that’s people like me, and put into the colleges in terms of faculty hiring is money well-spent. We have down the hall an excellent dean’s office in a first-rate College of Arts and Sciences that has this capacity. I understand this is not a decision that has support in all corners, but this is the gist of my understanding of the provost’s decision. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Okay, we have -- minutes for questions. Locksley needs a microphone.”

Professor Locksley Edmondson: “Locksley Edmondson, Professor, Africana Studies, former director 1991 to 1996. I was a senator here years ago. I miss not now being called senator. I loved the title. It made me feel good. I am coming here today to see iClickers. I have never heard of them before. I know you are moving on; but I’m glad you told the audience not to take them home, because we deal with academic integrity and it is an important statement you made, Walcott.

“I remember years ago as a senator coming here with a very incredible infamous humanities report -- (Audio difficulties.) “I teach a course on Africa, I teach a course on the Caribbean, and I had to say to them, if you incorporate the study of Africa and the Caribbean, we have -- from Brazil under America, I cannot believe academics are wanting to follow the American imperialist mission that the entire world must be subsumed under American -- the American umbrella. They backed off. They backed off, but they brought it back through the back door.

“I regret to say -- the previous speaker said it’s respect for Africana. Can you respect a department by deciding if the provost -- what is good for us and not having the courtesy, simple courtesy, decency, to liaise with us; because we feel, frankly, we may know a little more about the field than they do. They are telling us that they know more about it than we do. It’s unacceptable in a total way. It is insulting, it is degrading, and I don’t think any department here would like to be treated in that way.

“We are academics. We are -- we have differences, we are transdisciplinary departments. Let me tell you, by definition, I’m a political scientist, but we have to liaise with other departments. We don’t want to keep away, we relate to other departments.

“I want to say one other thing. I’m going to shut up now. I made the point that you come to Africana, and you see perhaps proportionately a larger percentage of black people than you would expect on Cornell campus. People will look twice or -- I have said it before; per capita, I defy anybody to dismiss it. We are the most international department at Cornell. We have other departments with faculty from the Sudan, from Ethiopia, until two months ago, from Kenya, from Tanzania, from Swaziland, from Nigeria, one Jamaican
thrown in for good measure; and recently, from Trinidad. We have international people
too, from Chicago and from Manhattan. (LAUGHTER)

“I hope you understand the point I’m getting at. We have no right to be treated in this
way. And the president yesterday actually almost told us as much, that he agreed with us,
but this is not the point. We resent it, and I hope the scholars, academics with units, there
are ways and means of treating people in a decent, respectable, intellectual way. Thank
you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Walcott: “Time for just one more comment in the back.”

Professor Margaret Washington, History Department. My name is Margaret Washington.
I am in the History department. I am on the graduate field in Africana. I support
Africana's position 100%, but they can represent that better than I can. I just want to
make a comment about Vice Provost Siliciano’s statements about the tenure process in
Africana.

“I have been at this university for -- since 1988. I have served under four provosts. The
first one was Mal Nesheim. The first time I served on an ad hoc committee as the chair
was an Africana tenure decision. So the idea that Africana faculty do not go through the
same tenure process that the rest of us do, it just -- it's not true.

“I have sat on three ad hoc committees, I have chaired three ad hoc committees for
Africana faculty, so they go through the same process that the rest of us go through. They
have their department vote, an ad hoc committee is formed, then they go to FACTA, and
then to the provost. So I don't know where this idea came from that somehow Africana
skips over the process that the rest of us go through, but it may be just an example of the
kind of misinformation that takes place about the Africana Center.”

“Professor Toorawa: ‘I realize time is short, so I want to point something out. Whatever
the merits or not of the argument as laid out by the provost or by John -- and I thought
the arguments presented here were administrative and therefore potentially acceptable to
faculty -- it's clear from reading this letter that what's really gotten everyone upset is what;
is unilateral decision, no consultation, fait accompli, consulted with others, but not with
us, blah, blah, blah.

“Obviously, we can't argue that it's not legal, if it's legal. And we might disagree on
whether Africana legitimately belongs in Arts and Sciences or not, but I am frankly
embarrassed that our provost did not consult with members of that department. It
absolutely makes no sense to me. Even if it was to show, have a meeting, a public meeting,
lay it out, take everyone's objections, then say I'm going to do what I think is right, at least
everyone would have felt they have been consulted and it was public. This is not the way
to govern.” (APPLAUSE)

Speaker Walcott: “It is exactly 6:00, and our tradition calls for adjournment at 6:00. It
being 6:00, I declare unilaterally and arbitrarily that this meeting is adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED)
Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
RESOLUTION: Taking Back the Tap

Whereas, Cornell University has signed the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, which pledges “Cornell University to a path toward climate neutrality enhancing our land-grant mission in support of a socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable society”; and

Whereas, the Cornell Climate Action Plan, which seeks to “achieve climate neutrality on campus by the year 2050, and provide a model for solutions that will engage, educate, and inspire our state, our nation, and our world,” identifies energy conservation as one of the five recommended action areas and promotes “active leadership” and “campus engagement from faculty, staff, students, and alumni”; and

Whereas, bottled water wastes 2,000 times as much energy as tap water, and 85 percent of bottles are not recycled; and

Whereas, Cornell Dining sold 148,543 total Aquafina single-use water bottles in the latest fiscal year, a decrease of 33,575 units from the previous fiscal year, thus indicating declining consumer demand for bottled water on campus consistent with nationwide trends; and

Whereas, U.S. plastic water bottle production requires approximately 32 to 54 million gallons of oil, and three out of every four of those bottles end up in landfills, as roadside litter, or in an incinerator; and

Whereas, a 20-ounce bottle of water requires about one-third its volume in oil for manufacture, transportation, and disposal; and

Whereas, almost 50% of bottled water comes from the same source as tap water but is sold back to consumers at hundreds of times the cost; and

Whereas, bottled water, regulated by the FDA, is less stringently regulated than municipal tap water, regulated by the EPA; and

Whereas, Fall Creek the source of Cornell’s tap water, consistently exceeds EPA standards; and

Whereas, public tap water is safe and is significantly more affordable, accessible, and environmentally sustainable than bottled water; and

Whereas, bottled water undermines communities’ faith in their public water systems;

Whereas, 68 universities and colleges around the country including Brown University, Harvard University, Dartmouth College, Yale University, University of Pennsylvania, University of California-Berkeley, Belmont University, Oberlin College, New York University, Vassar College, Washington University, Oregon State University, Seattle
University and many others have already made campus-wide efforts to curb their bottled water use; and

Whereas, The Cornell Student Assembly passed a similar resolution on the 4th of November, 2010 demonstrating their support for the following actions.

Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that President Skorton issue a directive to all departments, facilities and functions discouraging the purchase of bottled water.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University invest in drinking fountain infrastructure by increasing the number of and, where possible, retrofitting drinking fountains on campus with spigots for refilling reusable bottles.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University encourage the use of and, where possible, sell refillable bottles at dining facilities, department offices and functions.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University authorize, endorse, and facilitate efforts to educate, via various media, the university community regarding the value and benefits of using the local water system for all of its water needs.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University will take gradual but concrete steps to end the purchase, sales, and distribution of bottled water on campus and at Cornell-hosted events, which will include:

- Gradually replacing bottled water with tap water and/or filtered water whenever possible;
- Specifically refusing to sell bottled water through Cornell Dining when future beverage contracts are negotiated; and

Be it finally resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the President’s Sustainable Campus Committee (PSCC) include a timeline of specific measures pertaining to decreasing the consumption of bottled water into its “annual progress report on Cornell’s campus sustainability initiatives and commitments” as part of the Climate Action Plan.
Resolution Presented By:

Take Back The Tap at Cornell
Kristen Loria ’11, President

Organizations Supporting the Resolution:

Cornell Student Assembly (Resolution Passed)

Environmental Law Society

KyotoNow!

Sustainability Hub

Society for Natural Resources Conservation

Roots and Shoots

Cornell Sustainable Design Team

Dilmun Hill

Engineers for a Sustainable World
EPC RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC WORK DURING BREAKS

WHEREAS student workloads have become an increasing cause of concern in relation to student mental health; and

WHEREAS short breaks from academic requirements are generally regarded as healthy,

BE IT RESOLVED that framing assignments in such a way that necessitates academic work for students over Fall Break, Thanksgiving Break, and Spring Break is strongly discouraged.
EPC RESOLUTION ON CORNELL PURCHASING A UNIVERSITY-WIDE LICENSE FOR TURNITIN

WHEREAS there is consensus among many at Cornell that academic dishonesty is prevalent on our campus, increasing faculty frustration and renewing a demand that the University purchase a University-wide license for Turnitin;

WHEREAS to the extent that Turnitin is employed, it is imperative that it be one component of a comprehensive educational approach, otherwise students are merely punished and deterred temporarily, but not educated, and the university fails in its mission to educate our students to become ethical citizens and professionals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that as one component of this comprehensive approach, the University purchase a University-wide license for Turnitin for use at faculty discretion;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that faculty are strongly urged to make certain that students understand course academic integrity requirements and know how to meet them; text in a course syllabus, without elaboration, may be insufficient for these purposes; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that faculty who use Turnitin are strongly urged to use it as an educational tool as well as a detection tool.
Educational Policy Committee Resolution Calling for Cornell University to Create an Initiative to Develop approaches to a Climate of Academic Integrity

WHEREAS there is a consensus among national experts in the field of academic integrity that cheating is pervasive at American colleges and universities;

WHEREAS there are numerous factors that contribute to this crisis of academic dishonesty at the college level, including: the predominance of cheating in secondary schools; a lack of preparedness and familiarity with requirements of academic integrity, particularly regarding plagiarism; increased access to electronic materials and the corresponding difficulty of detecting inappropriate use of such materials; increased stress, including pressure to excel; student perceptions of unfairness in grading and academic requirements; and inconsistent handling of academic integrity violations;

WHEREAS colleges and universities that have responded to this crisis invariably determine it necessary to develop a comprehensive educational approach, addressing the multiple causal factors and involving both the faculty/administration and students to create both formal and informal cultures of academic honesty;

WHEREAS to create a formal culture of academic honesty it is crucial to make academic integrity an educational component of the first-year curriculum, in the classroom and/or through academic co-curricular offerings;

WHEREAS as part of an educational response to inadvertent academic dishonesty, innovative educational responses (e.g., small, group, interactive classes) might be utilized;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost in collaboration with the University Faculty create an initiative to draw upon internal and external expertise to develop approaches to creating a climate of academic integrity on campus and to propose the steps and resources necessary to accomplish such a goal.
Professors-at-Large Selection Committee
Debra Castillo, College of Arts and Sciences