

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

March 13, 2002

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Speaker: "I would like to call the meeting to order. No photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and I would like to ask speakers to identify themselves and their department when they speak. I would like to remind presenters that they must not utilize more than half the allocated time for that item for their presentation. I will try to enforce that limit because we have a very busy schedule. We have only one Good and Welfare speaker today, Professor Stein. I would like now to call on Provost Biddy Martin for remarks."

1. REPORT BY PROVOST MARTIN

Provost Biddy Martin: "Good afternoon. First, I am delighted to announce we have two new deans or we will at least be nominating for approval to the Board of Trustees this week, two names. A new Dean of the Graduate School, Alison (Sunny) Power, was endorsed by the group of faculty who attended the meeting held by the President and I this afternoon of the Graduate Faculty. As I think most of you know, Alison (Sunny) Power is a Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and of Science and Technology Studies, and her research focuses on insect transmitted plant diseases. I can't say that I know the specific types either of insects or plant diseases. In any case, she belongs to four graduate fields at Cornell; she is currently serving as the interim Dean of the Graduate School and is doing an outstanding job, and I'm delighted to be able to nominate her to the Board. For the College of Engineering, we will nominate to the Board of Trustees, Kent Fuchs, who is currently the Birck Distinguished Professor at the Purdue University. He is head of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Purdue, and prior to heading the department at Purdue, he was in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Illinois, also a fine engineering school. Kent Fuchs will join us on July 8, 2002, this summer. We are delighted to have him, and I believe faculty in Engineering are delighted to have made this selection and to have gotten his acceptance.

"Secondly, the solicitations about the book project will be coming around to all of you. That is the effort to try and get you to volunteer to lead discussion groups of new freshmen on *Frankenstein*, and I hope you will all agree in the same numbers you did last year or in even greater numbers and join the new students in a discussion of this book. Thank you very much in advance.

"Finally, I have on my desk a report from a task force charged with coming up with recommendations for the Einaudi Center for International Studies, and I have now sent that report out to the deans of the various colleges and the directors of the area studies programs. I have asked the deans to be sure to share it with any of you who do work in international studies or might have an interest in the report, and I hope to get feedback from you in a couple of weeks so that we can make decisions about the Einaudi Center. But if any of you are interested and want to contact your deans for copies of the report, they now have an electronic copy.

"Have I taken up my four minutes? Finally, let me say a couple of things about the Department of

Computer Science and the faculty of Computing and Information Science during the time I have now, and then I would be glad to answer questions later if it becomes necessary or desirable. What has occurred over the past year and three quarters, as you know, is a search for a new Dean of Engineering. I was asked to explain again why we didn't make any decisions about the ambiguous status of the Department of Computer Science during that time, and the answer now is the same one I gave some time ago though some of you are new and will not have heard it. And that is, I did not want the status of the Department of Computer Science or the future of the College of Engineering or of the faculty of Computing and Information Science to be an item for negotiation with the dean candidate. It seemed to me that the issues were too serious and the stakes too high to make that a matter that would be negotiated with someone from the outside coming in to accept a deanship.

"Now what has occurred, of course, is that the search for an Engineering Dean took longer than we had hoped, although not so extraordinarily long, despite the feelings of many of us on the Search Committee that it seems to take a long time, but it has now ended successfully. And now that it has ended successfully, the question of the status of the Computer Science Department and the future of the FCI can be addressed more directly. I spoke with the new Dean of Engineering, Kent Fuchs, yesterday by phone, and he prefers to be a part of the solution to this—one could call it problem—or opportunity to make a decision. Some had suggested that the new dean might prefer to have the ambiguous status of the Department decided before he arrived so that he wouldn't have to be involved in the decision. He understands that argument but prefers to be part of the solution, and I will honor his request to be part of the solution. Let me say that I stand strongly behind the notion that departments should belong and follow the administrative and procedural guidelines of colleges. We don't need any new colleges at Cornell University. We can stand to have fewer colleges; not that we are going to, but that would be the direction in which to go, not the opposite direction. I think those are the quick answers to most of the questions on the list, but if they don't address everything, I'll be glad to come back to any of these items later."

Speaker Howland: "Questions for the Provost?"

Professor Kevin Clinton, Classics: "At the meeting on October 10, Peter Stein asked you about any progress you could mention on the Median Grade Policy. This was a policy that was passed by this body six years ago as actually two parts—one is to publish at the end of each semester the median grades for the entire community to look at, and the other is for the median grades to be included on the student transcripts. The last set of median grades that was published was for spring 1999. So far the median grades have not been included on student transcripts. In October, you responded, 'So noted.' So I am wondering if you can tell us now about what is being done on these two policies or if you can't tell us now, would you be able to report back at the next meeting?"

Provost Martin: "OK. Sure, Kevin. Actually, Bob Cooke can tell you more about it than I simply because on the basis of discussions Bob and I have been having about it, he has approached the Registrar, David Yeh, about how quickly some of these things could get done given the status of our systems projects. And actually the news is not good on that front, and Bob has more specific information he could probably give you when he makes his remarks, but we are still working on it. It is just not going to happen quickly."

Professor Clinton: "What about the publication on the web at the end of each semester?"

Provost Martin: "Of median grades?"

Professor Clinton: "That's right."

Provost Martin: "I don't know about that; Bob does. He will give you the latest on that. I'm sorry that I don't know all the specifics. Any other questions?"

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The Speaker would now like to call on Dean Cooke for remarks."

2. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "Let me first respond to the question about the Registrar's Office. The issue was brought to the attention of the UFC, which discussed it, and I have had a conversation with the Registrar's Office. And as you point out, there are two parts. The part that deals with changing the computer software to add something new¾ frankly it is my judgement that the system is so unstable that if I were sitting in the position of the Registrar, I wouldn't tamper with it in this fashion either. It is a discretionary change, and it is simply foolhardy to go in and do something now. You will recall the famous word 'Project 2000' that that was going to be the best managed university—it wasn't clear whether it was going to take 2000 years to become a best managed university or if it was going to happen in 2000. Anyway, that's where that stands, and if you direct us to do otherwise, we will continue to press the issue."

"The second part is posting the grades. The UFC did discuss it and decided that we would bring it to you as soon as we had an opening on the agenda that was not so full and so heavy with other issues. It was not something that we felt should usurp our conversation about professorial titles or the Department of Computer Science and so on. So I assume it will be in front of you at some point. Frankly, my personal view is doing anything that allows students to exercise a grade-grabbing trend, the tendency is already there. The Registrar reported that the only time this site is used is just before registration for courses. I don't think, in reading the minutes, that was the intent of this group to allow students to compete on the basis of the grade they would get instead of on the intellectual content of the course. So I frankly admit that I have some misgivings about it, but we will see that it emerges, and you can then decide to rescind the previous position or to enforce it, and we certainly can implement that without any instability in the operation of the Registrar's function. So those are two separable items."

"I will make my comments quite brief, because we do have a heavy agenda, and I want to emphasize the Garza agreement as the item that the UFC and I have been interested in bringing to the fore and having a public discussion about. The position I have taken to the administration on your behalf is that it is an agreement not a recommendation, not even a considered recommendation, but something that was discussed extensively over many months by this group and others, and it was agreed to. A policy was issued at the hands of the Vice Provost with the full blessing of the President and Provost, and so in the words of one of the popular commercials, my advice is, 'Just do it.'

"What we are doing today is giving you an opportunity to react to what has been presented and the history, so that you can decide whether in fact you agree that we are headed in the right direction or you wish us to go in some other direction. The direction we are pushing it is that it is an agreement, and we are not asking to reopen all that conversation of many months from two years ago. Instead we are saying that was an agreement arrived at in good faith by all parties and now is the time to go ahead and get real about that. There are no motions today; it is simply for discussion, and you will decide after this conversation whether we need to go the route of motions."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 13, 2002 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Dean Cooke. The Speaker would now like to call for approval of the minutes of the February 13 Faculty Senate Meeting. Any amendments? Objections? Hearing none, the minutes are approved.

"The Speaker would now like to call on Associate Dean and Secretary, Charles Walcott, for a Nominations and Elections Committee report."

4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior, Associate Dean and Secretary: "I believe that you have all received the report ([Appendix 1](#)) in your call to the meeting. It is a great long list of people who have very kindly agreed to do a variety of different things. These are the usual faculty committees and a series of land grant panels to which people have been appointed with the advice and consultation of a variety of folks including the Committee on Nominations and Elections. So I bring those matters to you for your approval."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. The report is before you. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to approve the report. Hearing no objections, the report is approved.

"The Speaker would like now to call on Professor Peter Stein for a resolution to modify appeals and grievance procedures."

5. RESOLUTION TO MODIFY APPEALS AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Professor Peter Stein, Physics, and Chair of the Task Force on Appeals and Grievance Procedures: "This resolution ([Appendix 2](#)) was placed before you at the November Faculty Senate Meeting, and at the November meeting the representative from the Law School asked us to defer until this meeting, until the Law School had an opportunity to examine it and make recommendations about it. And this body decided to do that. The Law School has now looked at it, and we bring it back to you. We bring back to you the original motion. We have made a couple of small changes in the procedures, which I would like to discuss with you based on the conversations that we had.

"I'm not going to go through the whole thing. I am going to assume that you recall it or have read about what the issues are, but I think the issues are pretty well stated in the 'whereases' of this resolution. The committee talked with a number of people after the last meeting. Once again, we talked with the deans and/or policy committees of the Law School, the Hotel School and the Johnson School. We spoke to the University Counsel at some length, and we spoke to at least one other faculty member that had an interest in it. As a result of those discussions, we can now say that none of the deans or policy committees oppose this recommendation that we are making to you, and they support it with various levels of enthusiasm.

"We made two changes. The first one was suggested by the Dean of the Law School. We are suggesting now that in the small colleges, like in the large colleges, if a non-tenured faculty member is

denied tenure that that non-tenured faculty member has the right to ask the dean to confer an ad hoc committee to look over that decision. The Law School had not done that previously. In fact the Law School does not regularly use ad hoc committees. Their concern was that since it comes at a point when all the members of the Law School had voiced an opinion on that, they were concerned that there may not be enough other faculty members on the campus who would be competent to form an ad hoc committee. The argument is that the Law School is a particular sort of academic organization, which is dissimilar from other academic organizations in its notions of teaching and research and that only a Law School professor can understand that. So we added a clause simply saying that the ad hoc committee that they appoint could be tenured members of the Cornell faculty or tenured faculty members from an appropriate academic institution outside of Cornell. So that in fact, the Dean would have the freedom to add law school faculty members from outside of Cornell. I think that is probably not a major change.

"The other change is a major change or at least major in the context of the Grievance Procedures document. It has to do with a paragraph, which is practically incomprehensible, but I am going to tell you what it means. In particular, it is the last sentence of 2.f., which has been added: 'However, if a school or college adopts a procedure as described in 2.g. below, the members selected by each of the parties may select any individual holding an academic appointment at Cornell as a chair irrespective of any existing reporting arrangements.' That has been added. And if you read it, you may not be able to decipher it, so let me tell you what it means. The committee had a concern that when there was a grievance filed by a faculty member against the dean that the notion of allowing the dean to appoint as one member of a grievance committee someone who reported directly to that dean might be seen as giving the dean too much of a hand in the outcome of the deliberations of the grievance committee. Namely, that someone who reports to the dean is not as independent of the dean as someone should be on a grievance committee. So we made a recommendation on the first half of this that there be a general exclusion from a grievance committee of anybody who reports to one of the parties of the grievance. Then the question came up, 'Well, what about if you have a grievance committee where side A appoints one member, side B appoints one member, and then the two members appointed by side A and side B together choose a third person to be the chair?' That is a standard grievance committee in labor circles, I understand. Then the question is how do you interpret the above exclusion? Namely, since the dean's appointee has got half the responsibility for appointing that person, does that mean that someone who reports to the dean should not be able to serve on that committee? Well, you could decide that either way. It was ambiguous in the way we had written it. After discussions with the Hotel School, they were particularly concerned that the Hotel School is a special place that is unlike other colleges in a variety of ways. They felt it would be unfortunate if two members of the grievance committee had to be by definition from outside the Hotel School. So they said, 'How about this compromise—that you not exclude that possibility? The persons jointly appointed by parties to the grievance may decide that a person in the college is sufficiently independent and detached from the dean, and if they mutually agree to that, there is no particular reason why that person shouldn't serve as the chair. That is the argument, and I don't think I am capable of saying it any clearer or that I have anything more that I want to say about this document. So I present it to you for your consideration."

Speaker Howland: "Good. The motion is open for discussion. Does anybody wish to discuss the motion? Evidently not. I think you may be ready for a vote. All those in favor of the motion say, 'aye.'"

"AYE."

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? It passes unanimously.

"We have now a resolution to recommend that each course syllabus include a reference to the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity. I call on Professor Abby Cohn."

6. RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT EACH COURSE SYLLABUS INCLUDE A REFERENCE TO THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Professor Abby Cohn, Chair, Linguistics: "I will speak very, very briefly since we have a sort time, and I would be happy to take any questions. This resolution ([Appendix 3](#)) grew out of a dialogue between the chairs of the Academic Integrity Hearing Boards of the various colleges and the Educational Policy Committee and a general concern for supporting academic integrity at Cornell in all of its senses. We see this resolution as being a vehicle for educating students, strengthening academic integrity and taking also a preventive step where, hopefully, we will have fewer violations of academic integrity that have to be dealt with, and also as a vehicle to foster dialogue. So I am happy to address any questions."

Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "I move this resolution."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. The motion is open for discussion."

Professor David Grubb, Materials Science and Engineering: "I feel that this motion is very well meaning, but I find it very difficult to support it. I would support an alternative suggestion that every instructor of any course for which academic integrity is not to be invoked should mention it specifically."

Professor Cohn: "The practical problem is that the Code of Academic Integrity as it is currently stated says that anyone who deviates from the Code as defined has an obligation to put in writing how it deviates. The experience of the EPC in their discussions and the experience of the chairs of the Academic Integrity Boards in our discussion is that every course frankly deviates in some fashion or another, and the best way to address that is to call upon everyone to be explicit. We also feel that this is one of the most effective ways of both educating the students and frankly encouraging better compliance among the faculty. We can't think of a better way to do that than just ask that people to put it in writing so that it is there explicitly and available for discussion."

Professor Manfred Lindau, Applied and Engineering Physics: "I think to say that what students' own work is and what collaboration is might be difficult to define in some cases. I don't know if I would say there is a lot of sense to this unless we know exactly what it means."

Professor Cohn: "Let me assure you that it is better for each instructor to attempt to define that before an apparent violation takes place."

Professor Elaine Wethington, Human Development: "I had a similar question. In the Academic Integrity Code, it is also forbidden, unless the professor gives explicit permission, that the same work be handed in for more than one class. I was wondering if you had discussed what the possible implication might be of ending the sentence as 'will be the student's own work' without mentioning that part of the Academic Integrity Code?"

Professor Cohn: "Since it is an explicit part of the Code, I don't think by just saying 'it will be the student's own work' and not adding reference to that particular place, that that is necessarily a problem, but if there was a sense that that needed to be added, I don't have a strong."

Professor Wethington: "If I could just briefly follow up, I have found that to be one of the least known aspects of the Code and one of the most frequently violated."

Speaker Howland: "Yes."

Professor Susan Piliero, Education and Chair of the Educational Policies Committee: "One of the ideas that we tried to consider in looking at various statements was to have sample syllabus statements on the web. Our concern was that no one statement might be comprehensive enough to apply universally in every situation. So what we tried to do was to include a general statement about the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity, and reference that and say that is the ultimate source. We didn't need to define every single bell and whistle of that code. Students, therefore, having that in writing would be held to the Code of Academic Integrity in all its parts."

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School: "I think before speaking I should say that I disassociate myself at least in part from the position that the Dean took on the capacity of other faculty members to evaluate material from the Law School. I do have a concern about this, which is prompted by one of the questions that was raised. If each individual faculty member gives their interpretation of the Code of Academic Integrity with respect to collaboration, one might expect that they will be giving different interpretations. So when a student is accused in some course of violating the Code, the student will be able to say, 'Oh, well. I took Professor Somebody three years ago who told me that collaboration meant X.' By not having uniformity and asking professors to spell it out, this could lead to some significant problems down the road. Also, the language here—it started off saying you are strongly urged to do it and you are strongly urged to do it in writing as opposed to talking about it in class. Why, I'm not sure. Then in lieu of writing, faculty may use the generic comprehensive statement. That speaks in terms that there is more obligation involved here. I am not sure how to fix that, but I'm more concerned about the collaboration and multiple definitions."

Professor Cohn: "I think that you have to consider the current state of affairs, which first of all is that we do have a code, and the code is fairly explicit in a number of areas. So that is what the Academic Integrity Hearing Board and other people fall back on when asked to interpret whether something is or isn't a violation, and that doesn't change in any way. But the range of practice currently at Cornell is very, very wide. If indeed we were successful in getting the vast majority of faculty to include such a statement, then the students would be hearing about it every semester and it would be extremely obvious to them that it didn't matter what Professor X said three years ago, because what mattered was the statement here. In lieu of a specific statement there still is the code to fall back on."

Professor Danuta Shanzer, Classics: "Have you thought of publicizing sample illustrative cases in the *Sun*? I don't know how often academic integrity cases come up, but some universities do this. It is not a stupid idea, and it gives them some idea of the range of different types of things that go on."

Professor Cohn: "That discussion has taken place at two levels. We have certainly had that within the Arts College, and we have had some brief discussion among the chairs of the boards. I think there are a number of reasons why it is somewhat problematic. Even though we have a uniform code, how we do things across the colleges has some range. And there is an incredible variation in terms of the nature of the course what kinds of violations we see. While one can imagine there being a benefit in doing that, what we like about this approach is that it is a much more constructive and positive one, rather than emphasizing the punitive and negative."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I think we have exhausted even our expanded, shared time on this. I would like to move to a vote. Are you ready for the vote? Good. All in favor of the motion as

presented say, 'aye.'"

"AYE."

Speaker Howland: "Opposed?"

"NO."

Speaker Howland: "I think we had better have a count. Let's raise hands, please. All in favor, raise your hand. Mr. Secretary, will you help count that half of the house? And I'll count this half. And opposed, please. It passes forty-one to twenty-two.

"The Speaker would now like to call on Professor Terrence Fine for a resolution to rename the Laboratory of Nuclear Studies."

7. RESOLUTION TO RENAME THE LABORATORY OF NUCLEAR STUDIES

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies: "This is a request, as you can see, to rename the Laboratory of Nuclear Studies to Laboratory of Elementary-Particle Physics. The rationale is that that is what they have been doing for the past thirty years. A careful examination suggested that there was no other department at Cornell University that could lay claim to elementary-particle physics. If they are here, they can announce themselves. So unlike biology, we thought that this was a fairly clear matter."

Speaker Howland: "The resolution is before the house. Any comments? Professor Stein."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I have a comment about the hyphen. That's not common usage is it? The word elementary particle without the hyphen is the way it is mostly written."

Speaker Howland: "There should be no hyphen?"

Professor Fine: "We defer to Professor LePage."

Professor Peter LePage, Physics: "The hyphen was introduced when people were concerned that the name would be read as elementary physics of particles."

Professor Stein: "It's called the 'dumbing-down of titles.'

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Fine. I think we are ready for the vote. All in favor of the motion say 'aye.'"

"AYE."

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? The motion ([Appendix 4](#)) passes. Thank you, Professor Fine.

"And I would now like to call on Professor Fine again on progress made in fulfilling the terms of the agreement presented to the Faculty Senate by Vice Provost Garza on May 10, 2000."

8. CAPP REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE IN FULFILLING THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY SENATE BY VICE PROVOST GARZA ON 10 MAY 2000

Professor Fine: "Well, the title just about presents what I have to say. Dean Cooke made reference to this. Provost Martin made reference to this. We have a discussion of background. It was the abrupt removal of the Computer Science Department from the administration of the College of Engineering, and then the task force report, which came in two parts in June and November, encouraging university-wide instructional and scholarly engagement with computational thinking practices.

"Out of those two main issues, there arose a desire for an agreement for a policy, if you will, a plan. The 1999-2000 Senate, of which some of you may have been a member, met to discuss this in September and met twice in October; they had a special meeting in October. They met in December; they met in February, and it was also on the agenda in May. It was discussed fully by the Senate; it was discussed repeatedly by CAPP with various people, Vice Provost Garza, Dean Constable, I see here Dean Hopcroft. A number of people were invited to attend those meetings of CAPP. CAPP, in the words of Vice Provost Garza, brokered the agreement on behalf of the Senate. It was presented to the Senate in February. There was an opportunity for consideration, and then it was announced at the May meeting that it had been accepted. The exact language is in the report that you have ([Appendix 5](#)). It was accepted by the President and Provost to be pursued for implementation. This was a very thoroughly discussed matter and it involved many hours of people's time throughout the period. I remember meeting around Christmas time on this thing in Garza's office. So this was not done lightly. It was done with great due and I think careful deliberation. The status of the agreement, as Dean Cooke pointed out, is that it was issued by the Vice-Provost, and accepted by the President and Provost. It is not really a recommendation, something that one accepts or doesn't accept at one's whim.

"That is the background. There are some issues with the implementation. In some areas, there has been good progress. A Faculty of Computing Information was created. It is functioning. And by the way, as I walked in, I also received this document ([Appendix 6](#)) which discusses me in not particularly favorable terms. Some people say even unfavorable recognition is better than none at all, so I will accept it in that spirit. But I think it helps to understand that there is a distance, a distinction, between the CS department and the FCI. In other words, I think there have been good productive activities on the part of the FCI, which is a group of faculty members, led by Dean Constable and the CS Department. One third of the committee, I believe, are members of the FCI. So to better understand that what we are addressing is not so much the FCI, which I think is functioning somewhat as planned, but the role of the CS Department. With respect to that, there has been no progress and I would say indeed resistance. I presume that will be demonstrated to us after I stop speaking. The Computer Science Department will be located in one or more of the existing colleges based on the recommendations of the five-year academic plan. I've heard debates about the word 'located', 'college', what have you.

"Our position at CAPP at the moment is that we are not rearguing the whole case 'de nova.' We spent enough time arguing the case, coming to an agreement, coming to a plan. The idea is to implement that agreed upon plan. We include some comments from Dean Lewis and Dean Craighead that say that this is still a live issue. The location of the CS Department is still one of concern and still of importance to the College of Engineering and of interest to the College of Arts and Sciences. We are concerned by evidence of lack of commitment by the Provost to carry out some of the terms of this agreement and by evidence that the CS leadership continues to resist the reinstallation of CS. We did hear something, I think, in the right direction from the Provost at the start of this meeting on that

matter. I'll return to that briefly. It is further evident from remarks made by Computer Science faculty that I have been party to that Dean Constable and Provost Martin have been remiss in the past year and a half in not preparing the CS faculty to meet the terms of this agreement.

"I'm going to cut this short, because I want to leave some time for discussion. What I believe is necessary at this point or shortly is concrete evidence of a firm commitment to carry out the statement in this report—that particular statement. We are not saying that it needs a detailed budgetary, administrative plan, but I think that it needs concrete evidence of a firm commitment to carry this out, meaning the words to mean what they usually mean. I talked to Vice Provost Garza. I believe I can quote him fairly. He believes it to mean what you meant it to mean. It was not meant to be a devious document; he is not a devious person. So it is meant to be interpreted pretty well as it stands. And I think what we would need is some concrete evidence towards that. And failing that, we will have to come back to the Senate to see what is your will in that matter. None of this is a challenge to the importance of Computer Science both in the College of Engineering and in the university. If they were not important, this wouldn't be worth the time we have spent on it. They are a very important unit of the university and of the college. However, I don't think they can fairly lay claim to 'exceptionalism.' You may hear some such claims, I think, in their defense that they are somehow different from all other departments. I don't think that they are."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Fine. So this report is open for discussion. Yes."

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "I am one of the senators from Computer Science. I asked if I could have just a few minutes in front of you, because this is so important to the department. First, and I actually prepared some slides ([Appendix 7](#)), first of all, we all should thank Bert Garza for his efforts in defusing an extraordinarily complex and bitter situation. Unfortunately in doing so, he left behind some ambiguity and conflicting promises for today's provost. And I don't envy you having to sort out the mess that others left you."

"The department is really quite concerned about this report, and it suffers from what we call 'Randelism,' which is discussions about an academic unit, you've just seen part of them in front of you, without even letting the academic unit know the discussions were going on. I think it is really sad that CAPP didn't talk to anybody in Computer Science; they didn't seek to talk to the chair; they didn't talk to the deans; they didn't talk to the FCI. If they had, they wouldn't have so many small mistakes of facts in their report. In particular, however, what I last ask the Provost to do is not dwell on the past but take a look at what has happened in the last two or three years."

"There are three questions here that I think you might pay attention to. One is what has happened to the Computer Science Department in the last two and a half years. The reason for the rush was because the department was imploding. In 1999, six good faculty left, and there were offers on the table to many more. Since the changes, the department has thrived, and there is good solid evidence for that. I think you should look at why that happened and whether it was more than coincidence. Remember this happened in the 'dot.com' boom when other departments were in real trouble. Secondly, a question that I think it would have been nice if the report addressed, was how has the role of the Computer Science Department within FCIS helped the initiatives that are going on across the university? I have named some of them. Many of them are happening in CALS. I have just come back from a meeting in the Law School, and so forth. Thirdly, there is innuendo in the report suggesting that interactions between Computer Science and Engineering are in bad shape. I think the evidence is exactly the opposite. They are in supremely good shape, both education, research and in doing recruiting. I hope you look at those and try to understand as you do your study."

"So the department has really got two requests—one is a recommendation to the Faculty Senate. I think we should ask CAPP to withdraw the report. It is basically just a sloppy report, and it is impolite to have a report about an academic department that the department didn't even know was under discussion. The second request is to the Provost, and you really have answered this already, please resolve the current uncertainty. We, all of us, want to have it. And please do it in an open way that we can all be proud of. You will hear strong arguments that the current situation is working well for the university, and many of us would argue that that should be the permanent relationship, but fundamentally the decision is yours and I hope that you do that in a way that we can all sign up to and accept."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Arms. There seem to be two opinions about this report, so I would like to alternate speakers if I could. Would anybody like to speak for the report? Fine. Would anybody like to speak on the other side again?"

Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I would just like to ask the question¾ why now? Why the rush? If you look at the report, there seem to be two concerns of the authors. One is that the Provost wasn't consulting the CAPP, and I think the Provost in her opening remarks gave a very clear explanation, at least clear to me, why she didn't do so. I don't really see the problem there. The second issue raised in the report is more like innuendoes. Innuendoes that the current situation is creating problems for Engineering.

"What do I mean by innuendoes? I'll be specific. If you have the report in front of you, you look at the bottom of page one and you see in the last line the word 'presciently' preceding a quote. It says the heads of the Engineering departments 'expressed themselves presciently as follows,' and then there is a quote which says that 'The creation of an autonomous unit, as suggested in the presentation, in our view would have significant adverse impact on the college of Engineering's reputation' etcetera, etcetera. OK? When you see that word 'prescient' you are thinking that, 'Oh, well, later in the report there is going to be a big shocker about what happens in the College of Engineering and how these guys foresaw it.' But if you actually look at the rest of the report, it is not there. There is no evidence in the report of problems in the College of Engineering caused by the creation of the CIS. The reason it is not in the report is because it didn't happen. There hasn't been any negative impact on the College of Engineering documented that I know of. And it certainly is not presented in this report from CAPP. So this is another instance of the sloppy presentation that Bill Arms was referring to in his talk. In fact, if I were trying to counter the argument that the creation of CIS has had a negative impact on the College of Engineering, I shouldn't have to work too hard, since no evidence has been presented for the other side.

"But I will tell you that I did gather some evidence to show that in fact the creation of CIS has helped the College of Engineering. I've gathered some facts, which I guess I won't present because there doesn't seem to be any opposition. But for instance, just so you know, in the current graduating class of the College of Engineering of about 800 seniors, 137 of them are Computer Science majors, and we also have our major in the Arts College, too, with another comparable number of students. So as far as we are aware the collaboration between CS and Engineering is going fine, and Engineering is not being hurt by the current situation. So we are left wondering¾ why the rush? Why now? Especially since the Provost explained quite clearly that the new Dean of Engineering would like to play a role in this, and he is not even here until July. This is yet an additional reason to ask CAPP to withdraw this report."

Dean Cooke: "Do you believe it is all right for the Provost to ignore the duly arrived at agreement that resulted from extensive consultations?"

Professor Arms: "I believe fundamentally that administrative questions are the responsibility of the Provost. I think that agreement in which many people settled down and came to this shared conclusion, the natural thing is to get the successors to those people together and make sure that they can reach the conclusion. However when the chips are down, I think this is the responsibility of the Provost."

Dean Cooke: "Not the President, who is still the President?"

Professor Arms: "Of course, the President. The President through the Provost."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Fine?"

Professor Fine: "I can't answer why the rush, because to me a year and a half, almost two years, doesn't seem like it's too hasty. We are obviously on a different time scale. So those of you who feel that waiting passively for a year and a half for something to happen is now rushing can feel that way. Why was the CS Department not consulted on this? Because it isn't about consulting the CS Department. It is about implementing the agreement. The agreement has a clear English sentence that states what should happen. It is not up to the CS Department to decide whether that in fact should happen or shouldn't happen or what their opinions are. I think their opinions are that they are quite happy where they are. That is not the issue. There was an agreement. There were a lot of things that were given over and some things that went another way. It is a matter of accepting the agreement. Now if you would like to argue that any agreement that took over a half year to reach, countless hours of time and people, can be set aside at the whim of the people involved, then I think we are in a very difficult position with respect to the administration. I certainly expect the kind of integrity and consistency from them that says a hard-won agreement will be honored. It is not fully honored at this point. I would like to see a commitment to completing that implementation."

Professor Shiffrin: "I am curious as to how long this agreement is frozen in stone. I have no opinions on its merits. But if ten years from now there were a new Provost and a new Dean of the Engineering College, would this agreement still be locked in place? And if not, we have a new Dean of Engineering, a new Provost, who didn't negotiate this agreement I take it, so I don't understand what the principle of longevity and change underlying this conception of the agreement is."

Professor Fine: "It is my belief, and we have a little debate with the Provost on this, that when she took over, she asked for a year, and I remember the word 'moratorium,' in which this would not be resolved. So in some sense the clock—was in fact, marked. There was cooperation with that. Now, in a hypothetical ten years, I think it is hypothetical and I can't address that; it's not the case. But the ink was hardly dry on this agreement in May before we had a suspension of part of it, at least a suspension of reaching a decision. We are now only a half year beyond that first year. That's where we are. It's the soonest we can go—for some people it's a rush."

Speaker Howland: "Provost Martin?"

Provost Martin: "Well, I would simply like to make one slight modification of what you said, Terry. What I said was that I didn't want to make a decision for at least a year. And the reason had to do with the Dean of Engineering search, which took longer than a year. If you read the agreement carefully, you'll also see that one of the purposes of moving CS out of the college was to permit it to flourish in its efforts to build interdisciplinary programs, which it has done. I took it from my predecessor that that would take some time however one interprets the notion that it should belong in a college."

"I think that I am caught in a bind, and that's fine. That's my job. The bind is making good on agreements as they were understood by predecessors and the people who continue to be here, who participated in the making of that agreement on the one hand and on the other hand feeling absolutely obligated to do what seems best for this university. My ardent hope is that we can work together to come to a solution that respects the actual complications involved in this issue. And the issues are extremely complicated, even more complicated I think than the substantive issues that could emerge in a discussion here. If you looked at some of the details of the administrative ambiguities and problems, you, I think, would be shocked and not want to participate very much in the discussions about how to deal with those.

"So it is a very complicated issue and for the good of the University my hope is that we can work with Kent Fuchs and work with the people who have been involved in these discussions in an open and consultative way, certainly, but also in a way that avoids acrimony. I don't think the good of the university will be served by great antagonisms about this. I think there are probably ways of insuring that both the College of Engineering and the FCIS and Computer Science can continue to thrive, and I hope to come to such a conclusion with help. As I say, I think the Garza agreement is very important; I don't take lightly the notion that I would do something that seems opposed to what my predecessor intended. The only thing I can say there is that there is a lot of ambiguity in the way various people who worked with the previous administration understood that agreement. Though I agree with Terry, that the one line about belonging to a college is pretty unambiguous.

"On the other hand I want us to look at what is going on right now as well as agreements that were made in the past and decide what is best for the university now and also in the future. Because let us remember that making structural decisions or decisions about institutional structure are decisions that will be with us and have implications long into the future well beyond the point where the individuals involved now are here. That's really all I have to say. What matters to me is making the right decision, not appearing to take lightly an agreement made by my predecessors. I don't believe there is any commitment made by my predecessor to this point that I haven't failed to honor, but [I am] also looking at what would be best for the university and what could possibly benefit all parties concerned, trying to avoid an antagonistic relationship where we do harm to a number of parties involved because of the antagonisms, and hoping for some wisdom both from this group and the people more directly affected. That's my statement.

Speaker Howland: "Thank you everyone. I think we have exhausted our time on this topic and should pass to the next one. I would like now to call on Professor Jennifer Gerner."

9. DISCUSSION OF COMPUTER NETWORK COSTS RECOVERY

Professor Jennifer Gerner, Policy Analysis and Management, Associate Dean, College of Human Ecology, and Chair of Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology: "I'm reporting to you in conjunction with Professor Tom Dyckman about a meeting that was held mainly between some representatives of the Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology and the Senate Financial Policies Committee with Polley McClure about pricing of technology that comes to us because of various proposals for changing that pricing. We solicited your comments and comments from the other faculty about what the pricing issues were and asked Polley to give us some insight into what the thinking of CIT was in their pricing decisions and where this was all going and also to express concern about the impact that some of these pricing decisions have on faculty research and faculty work. So let me just say that we, in soliciting these comments, got sort of three or four different types

of comments that we could broadly define.

"One is some discussion about the bandwidth and limiting the bandwidth and bandwidth issues, particularly with regard to the residence halls and I should tell you that one of the things that CIT is doing is limiting bandwidth availability and also imposing some penalties on students, on a very few students. Actually, it's only a very small number of students who are absorbing an immense amount of bandwidth in their downloading activities. So there is some work going on in trying to limit that and also trying to find ways that are acceptable for those students. So I think you should feel reassured that that is being addressed.

"There is also a discussion about the hubs and hublets policy which I think actually got many people really concerned about this. FABIT has discussed this a couple of different times, and one of the things I think we came to understand in our discussions with Vice President McClure was that the hub and hublets policy which, although CIT believed it was in place, and I'm sure it was in place, nevertheless had not been articulated in quite such a clear way ever before. One of the things that became clear is that the impact that the enforcement of that policy has on faculty research and also on departments was probably not well understood by anyone, because I think hubs and hublets had been invisibly multiplying. So one of the things that did happen is now a much clearer understanding of how many hubs and hublets are out there and what impact that has. FABIT actually has sent a statement to the Provost and Dean Cooke and also all the other deans concerning more general pricing, but also including this, which I will read to you. It says, 'FABIT members are concerned by the lack of broad discussion about the philosophy underlying cost recovery for the network at a major research institution like Cornell. The conclusions of the Network Recovery Task Force (which recommends a new pricing structure for CIT) allocate the costs to users—embodies one philosophy. But one might also argue that the network is a 'public good,' like a library, and thus should be funded centrally. Without a community agreement on a philosophy, it seems premature to be debating detailed mechanisms.' So I want to come back to that in a minute, and when I do that we will switch partners. 'Second, the new charging structure, while arguably 'fair,' has the potential to introduce discontinuities in units where needs for the network are significant but resources to pay are not.'

"And let me just say that it is the piece that FABIT is most concerned about and that we raised with Polley, and I think the Provost has now issued a continuation of the treaty on hubs and hublets (Is that fair?) for the coming year until some of these issues are actually better understood, because I think that was something that was not clear. The outcome of this meeting, among other things, was to ask the Financial Policies Committee if they would address this issue about philosophy and for that I will turn it over to Professor Dyckman."

Professor Thomas Dyckman, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I am here. Knowing this group, I am prepared. A faculty member does not come without an overhead. The problem is to get it so you can see it. I'm going to move over here, so hopefully out of the way of what's going on. It's not my picture; it's Polley's, but I have usurped her ideas here. One of the things that we have is Web Report, by the way, which some of you ought to read. This report, which I scribbled on, just so you know it's out there, is on the Cornell faculty web page. So you can find it and look at it.

"This is the report ([Appendix 8](#)) that was made by a committee to advise Polley as to how charges might be done if they used what we might call an indirect method. Basically, that means an enterprise method where the costs are attempted to be allocated to the user. Now even that process is not fully a direct method because in particular the backbone, which you see up there, will not be done that way. It will be done in an indirect approach. So it's a mixed bag even at that. But the point that Jenny raised, and which I actually dealt with when I served as Acting Vice President for CIT a long time ago

now, is that they have not addressed the more basic issue as to whether the whole affair ought to be basically an indirect approach. I don't particularly like the library simile, but it means basically a totally indirect approach or whether it ought to be a user-based approach as far as it is possible to do so, where in particular the Internet part would be user-based. So that is what we are going to look at on the FPC level.

"Now the report to Polley. This one is an advisory report. It was attempted to be written clearly; it's not necessarily true that everybody will understand it. It wasn't meant for the faculty. What we want to do in the FPC is to address the more basic question as to whether this ought to be a totally indirect approach or a mixture, which is more like what they have proposed here, and whether at a point there ought to be some subsidies on that. Jenny indicated there would be no change for a year. I believe that they are not planning to institute this until 2003 or 2004. That's the really important time, so there is a lot of time to deal with this particular issue, and in the process it may be necessary to assist those, if indeed the decision is to move to a hub-based approach, to allow some sort of subsidies to be made to those groups while they move from their current position to that new position. One should also remember that if indeed we got away from the hublet approach, each hub that is available would be less expensive because there would be more of them. There are an awful lot of them out there. We don't really know how many. That's one of the pieces of information that needs to be gathered. So we are going to meet to do that.

"Let me make an indication that when we get done, we will have a report by a committee which we will send out to all of you. We will find ways in which to introduce you into our process so that we get your input, and we will come up with a recommendation ultimately that goes to the administration. Remember they make the decision. We do not, but we certainly want to recommend based on more knowledge than we have now. In the process, let me be sure that you understand that this is a revenue neutral thing. We are not going to create new revenues this way. It is a cost allocation process, and we have to worry about the incidence of these costs, who subsidized who, what the effects are on graduate education, students and what are some of the behavioral issues. There is a lot of this that hasn't been considered. How you doin' old man? Do you want me out of here?"

Speaker Howland: "Yes."

Professor Dyckman: "OK. I will stop."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. This topic is open for discussion. Are there any questions, comments?"

Professor Joseph Hotchkiss, Food Science: "Vice President McClure came and talked with the CALS Faculty Senate about this issue and has unintentionally pressed a lot of hot buttons, as you might expect. One of the questions that I was asked several times about this was the make up of the committee. Many people are wondering why there is apparently no one from CALS on the committee, even though I assume CALS is a large user of computing services. More importantly, it seems as though the primary make up of the committee were administrators, whose responsibility it is to collect money indirectly or directly from faculty resources. There weren't any faculty on that committee whose livelihoods and research programs are heavily dependent on computing. Specific examples in CALS are people doing meteorology. The very nature of their work requires them to download large amounts of information, make no sense out of it, and then send it back out to us."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Hotchkiss: "They are worried that those kinds of people are not represented on your

committee. Your committee is deciding how to charge these people for resources that they need for their job."

Professor Dyckman: "Be careful about what you call my committee. This is not my committee. This was a committee set up by Polley. I'm actually a faculty member. I'm back in that role again. If you don't count deans, there were no faculty members on this committee. As far as deans, there were a couple and I'll let you decide what you want to do about that one. You are certainly right in your observation about the make up of the committee. And the FPC believes that the basic question of where the money ought to come from is still open. We need to discuss it widely amongst the faculty, and our committee has taken over the job of trying to make that happen. Our committee is all faculty and includes faculty from all parts of the university. So I think that we can do what you are concerned about, and we recognize the limitations of what you spoke about. It is certainly true, if you look at the members of the committee, they are all either in administrative positions related to the topic or there were a couple of deans who served on it as well who are very much interested in what happens. I hope I have answered your question. If I haven't, please follow up."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Gerner."

Professor Gerner: "I should just say that the Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology has representatives from CALS and everywhere else on campus. I think we are all faculty."

Professor Dyckman: "This report has gone by FABIT. FABIT has discussed it and looked at it closely, and they are faculty people. And they are of course the ones that raised this basic issue that we are now going to address. I don't want to speak for the committee itself, but it is my impression, and they can certainly correct it because some of them are here, that if you go to a direct method, as much as this is a direct method, that they find the approach is not necessarily all that bad. They have been pretty comfortable with it, but that doesn't mean that we are done with it."

Professor Gerner: "Right."

Professor Hotchkiss: "So what I'm hearing is that their interests are being represented here."

Professor Gerner: "While I think it is fair to say, correct me if I'm wrong, Fred, that FABIT does think this isn't a bad pricing mechanism, nevertheless there are disruptions and discontinuities that will result."

Professor Shiffrin: "Sorry to be so loquacious today. I was interested in your comment about the library analogy. Schools are not charged by the numbers of books that their faculty read or the amount of time that is spent in the library. I notice you said that you are not very happy with the library analogy."

Professor Dyckman: "I don't think it's totally appropriate. There are similarities."

Professor Shiffrin: "But I'm interested in what are the arguments against the library analogy?"

Professor Dyckman: "Well, the arguments against the library analogy are it's sort of like a road. You have a road built and you use it when you have to, and it doesn't matter what the charge is. A library is like that, too. In this case, however, we have a resource that, if it is essentially a free good as perceived by faculty, will be used extensively. Perhaps there will be additional costs over what there might be under a use basis. So we have to worry about what the total cost of activity will look like as well as simply its allocation. So the library doesn't quite fit perfectly. Most analogies don't fit quite

perfectly. It's not a bad one; it's just that you have to be careful when you use analogies."

Professor Hotchkiss: "This is the other question that people have asked me to raise. Have you surveyed any of what could be considered our peer institutions? Others have told me that they have done that and find Cornell, in using this enterprise model for its computing services, is quite alone in this amongst both land grant and Ivy League institutions."

Professor Dyckman: "Well, I can comment briefly. Somebody else may wish to speak on this same point, so you can call on him or her in a minute. My comment is a little bit indirect. My understanding from Carolyn, who has been very close to this issue throughout, is that they spent a lot of time talking to other universities, and all of them are dealing with this same problem. This is not unique to us. None of them have an ideal solution at this point in time, and I think that she would say that whatever data you have is not the kind of data that she has. There isn't an agreement on what models to use, and people are wrestling with the issue. There may be somebody else who wishes to speak."

Speaker Howland: "I'm sorry but our time is up for this discussion. Thank you. I would like now to call on Professor Alan Bell for a continuation of the discussion on professorial titles. Professor Bell, you have five minutes."

10. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF PROFESSORIAL TITLES DISCUSSION

Professor Alan Bell, Animal Science and Chair, Task Force on Professorial Titles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the last meeting you will recall we had our first somewhat lengthy discussion of a proposal to enable the creation of a new professorial title, that of clinical professor, to be implemented on a college by college basis. That meeting was followed by another quite extensive discussion a week later in a faculty forum. Some of you were here and many of you were not. The result of that discussion is 35 pages of printed transcription, which is posted on the faculty forum web site. For those of you interested in this question and considering how you might vote if we ever get it to a full resolution, I would encourage you to look at that material. I have tried to distil this into four major arguments in favor and four major arguments against ([Appendix 9](#)). I will post this also, hopefully to assist those of you who don't have time to wade through everything here."

"The arguments for the first two points were made a number of times, particularly by those of us representing the collective opinion of the task force that has worked on this for quite some time. They basically boil down to issues of fairness to non-tenure track appointees. I emphasize that does not necessarily mean existing non-tenure track appointees, for example in a lecturer or senior lecturer position. I think there is some confusion about this^¾ that we are looking at a device of substitution. This is not necessarily the case at all. The second issue, a pragmatic one, relates to the ability to attract and keep good people in such positions. This is less an argument than an assumption, the third point here, that the number of tenure track positions at Cornell will not increase in the future, and you can take that where you will. Finally, we would hope, although I think we have had some flaws in our wording here pointed out, that the cap on the fraction of total faculty in a department that could be non-tenure track combined with close monitoring by bodies, particularly this body, would to some extent allay fears that you will see in the negative arguments for possible substitution or drift in the direction of more non-tenure track positions at the expense of tenure track positions. A point that has been raised since then, which I think we as a task force need to consider, is should this cap include not only the new appointments if they are ever implemented but existing

appointments? In other words, should the cap include, for example, the total number of we'll say clinical professors plus lecturers or other non-tenure track appointees?

"I have to do justice to the arguments against. The first point I have alluded to already that a number of professors do believe that this would ultimately represent an attack on the tenure system. You can read faster than I can speak, I am sure. There is a more philosophical point here—why shouldn't all clinical professor positions, and we could by extension say all professorial positions, be tenured? And why just because some of the work people do in these positions is a little different from the classical 50/50 research and teaching should not these functions be elevated in value? Some lack of clarity in distinction between the definition of responsibilities and expectations was pointed out to us, and I think the task force will have to deal with that. Then we have had a suggestion that this new title could lead to the creation of what somebody referred to as a 'pink collar ghetto.' I've had my time."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Bell. This topic is open for discussion."

Professor Bud Tennant, Clinical Sciences: "Professor Bell talked about the hypothetical issues related to tenure with the proposition that the task force is bringing forward. What I would like to do is present an example of how this proposal is going to impact on my department, the Department of Clinical Sciences. There are two overlays here ([Appendix 10](#)). The first is from the document which is part of the web site presentation called 'Non-tenure Track Professorships in the College of Veterinary Medicine,' dated October 21, 2001. In that is a graph showing the distribution of tenure track faculty and lecturers, during the period from 1985 until projected 2004. In red with the diamonds is the tenure track faculty; below in pink squares are the lecturers, which shows that in 1995 there were 29 tenure track faculty and 3 lecturers. In 2001, that had gone up substantially and remains in this particular graph flat but shows in blue the proposed clinical professor titles that would be added during the next two years. This is a bar graph that summarizes the impact of the changes between 1995, the year 2001 and then in 2004. It shows that the tenure track faculty in our department is projected to rise about 10% during that period of time, and the non-tenure track, which includes both the lecturers and the clinical track faculty, would increase by something just short of 700%. So when people say this has nothing to do with tenure, it simply is not borne out by the facts. It is a tenure issue of substantial proportions. And that is all I have time for."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Additional comments?"

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Biomedical Sciences: "What I heard at the faculty forum was what Dr. Bell has put up, but I think that there is a university-wide issue that isn't being brought out in what he said. And I think that university-wide issue is that the legislation doesn't solve any problems, and it creates new ones. Particularly, it doesn't do anything to change the condition of lecturers and senior lecturers as you said and as was said in the forum. Second of all, it creates a new, alternate faculty, which was brought out. So the central question is—what other differences, such as presence or absence of scholarship, would justify classification into a non-tenure rather than a tenure track position? If they are not distinctly different positions, then why does one have the opportunity to achieve tenure and the other does not? If they are truly so different that tenure would not be reasonable for these positions, then why would they merit the title of professor? And I agree with Professor Fine who spoke, and I hope you will read what he said, at the faculty forum; he said that there is a reason that there is meaning behind the title professor. 'I don't think it is a question of fairness that one gives it out. It might be generous, but I don't think it is a matter of fairness. I think it would be unfair to give it to people who have not gone through the same process, who have not met the same standards.' I will stop there."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I'm sorry the time for this discussion is up. We pass now to Good and Welfare. I would like to call on Professor Peter Stein who will present a report on the Statler Club.

11. GOOD AND WELFARE: REPORT ON DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FACULTY CLUB

Professor Peter Stein, Physics and Faculty Trustee: "When I came to Cornell, lo these many years ago, something like forty, there was a Faculty Club here. Let me describe it to you very briefly. It was in the basement of Statler Hall; it was called the Rathskeller. It served three meals a day for seven days a week. It was full all the time; there was a place for faculty members to come and meet other faculty members. There was a library; there was a bar. There was a large coffee room upstairs. It had programs that people gave talks to; it had dances three times a year and parties. That was what the Faculty Club was. Oh, and the food was absolutely first rate, by the way. It was very, very good. It is now reduced to a small corner in the basement that has a salad bar that is competitive with Wendy's, I think probably somewhat better than Wendy's, but in that same league. And it has a couple of soups that are actually quite good.

"Everyone who has been around here for a long time knows this. The usual reason that is given is that there has been a steady attrition, because faculty members have changed. It used to be in the 'old days' that we faculty members were sort of pipe smoking, tweed clothed old guys that sat around talking, telling old prelim stories compared to today's prototypical faculty member who is a young woman eating lunch at her desk, chewing an egg, writing a grant proposal with one hand, reading *Frankenstein* with the other and bouncing a baby on her knee. She has no time to go and tell these old prelim stories. That's the general conception.

"Well, we on the Faculty Club Statler Board decided to look into this. The argument was that is the case at every major university. Let me show you that the preconceptions that you have are not necessarily true. Here is the first plot ([Appendix 11](#)) that shows you what the membership, the dues paying membership, of the faculty club was as a function of time. When I'm talking about the 'good old days,' I'm talking about days way back over here someplace. What happened was that ten years ago—it had its ups and downs as you see—then all of a sudden something seems to have happened roughly eight years ago. Unfortunately, the date that is of interest is missing, but that is all the data that we were able to collect. What happened was that there was a precipitous drop from 900 down to its current value of 200. One wonders why. That is to say this replacement of the old pipe smoker by the new grant writer, if it has taken place, did not take place in seven years. OK? If you look at it, you can get some clue as to what these up and downs are about. This is when the Rathskeller was closed; it dropped. The Rathskeller was reopened; it bounced back up to its most healthy point there. Then at this point here—unfortunately we don't know whether this is a straight line or if this goes across and down, we just haven't got the data—coincidental with the vast downgrading of the experience, the Statler Club membership went to hell.

"Whenever we talked about that, people said, 'Well, you know that happens everyplace. That's just the way of the world today.' We decided in sort of an unusual idea to try and see if in fact that was true. What we did was we commissioned a survey of peer institutions. You can get whatever answer you want by choosing whatever you want for the group to survey, but we decided to take a group to survey that had no connection with faculty clubs, namely the nineteen universities that we use for salary comparisons. Ten on one side and ten on the other, and that adds up to nineteen for some peculiar reason which I won't tell you about. We added up these nineteen institutions. We had a professional survey done by a group in ILR, the Computer Assisted Survey Team, which developed a questionnaire and then administered it to the managers or presidents of the faculty clubs. We found something that was extremely surprising, namely that this picture that faculty clubs are dead or near death everyplace simply was not true. Let me tell you

what the highlights of the surveys were.

"In the question about what services are offered we found—I should say of these nineteen institutions, all but two had faculty clubs. The two that didn't have faculty clubs turned out to be Yale and Michigan. But everybody else that we did the comparison with had faculty clubs. We found that of the services offered Cornell was at an extreme, and it actually was not a good extreme, it was a bad extreme. Those are the answers to our questions ([Appendix 12](#)). Sixty-three percent served dinner; eighty-four percent offered table service at lunch; some eighty percent have parking available. You can guess what the answers were for Cornell. The cost to the members—you could say, 'Well, OK, the Cornell Faculty Club is pricing itself out of the market,' and it turns out that is not true either. If you look at the cost to members, you find that Cornell was at the bottom end. It costs \$5.00 to eat lunch at Cornell and \$10 at the peer groups; dues $\frac{3}{4}$ \$74 at Cornell compared to \$169. I think the conclusion from this is inescapable. Either at Cornell nobody likes socializing with other faculty members, (I think that is not true; I mean that's a possible conclusion) or another conclusion is that when the faculty take a perception of the value they get for the price that they pay at Cornell, they find that ratio much lower than they do at peer institutions.

"The finances were interesting. We expected to find that healthy faculty clubs were financed by subsidies from the university. Not true. Only half of the peer group clubs receive a subsidy. Cornell's Faculty Club has a subsidy from the administration. As a matter of fact, it a subsidy that reminded me of Blanche DuBois. The Cornell Faculty Club is like Blanche DuBois. She exists on 'the kindness of strangers.' Eight percent of the Statler Club's revenues come from dues and ninety-two percent come from contributions from the administration. So it is at death's door. We found that all the other faculty clubs found that the lunch business was a money loser, and that they made up for it by functions, by lunches for colloquium speakers, by recruitment teams and so forth. At Cornell you can't do that; the Hotel School does that business, and the Faculty Club is reduced to waiting for handouts.

"Just as a summary question, we asked the summary question, 'On a scale of one to ten, where a one is nearly moribund and ten is healthy and thriving, how would you rate your club?' One club said 'one' for that question. Cornell's manager said 'two,' and some of us thought that was generous. The next lowest response was 'six,' and the median was 'eight' for that group. So our conclusion was that Cornell's Faculty Club is an anomaly rather than typical with the ratio for what they have. We went and talked to the administration, and we told the administration that we thought that a functioning Faculty Club was an important contribution to make to the morale of the Cornell faculty; that there was no reason why we couldn't do it at Cornell. We think that the problem has to do with the relationship between the Faculty Club and the Hotel School, and we asked the administration to take the leadership in putting together a committee to figure out what to do to bring us a Faculty Club. It's not money that's needed; it's a new plan, and we believe it's a commitment to make it happen that is needed. So that is our report."

Speaker Howland: "The meeting is adjourned."

Adjourned: 6 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary

