

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**April 12, 2006**

Speaker Barbara Knuth called the meeting to order. "We do not yet quite have a quorum but it is happening slowly as people come in. We are going to proceed with the meeting. I'll begin with some of the routine announcements that you hear every meeting. Please remember that no tapes, tape recorders or photos are allowed during the meeting. Please be sure to turn off all your cell phones. When you speak, please stand and project your voice so that everybody can hear you. To my knowledge we have no Good and Welfare speakers, so we will not have that component of the agenda. We also will not have the first item on our agenda, which usually are comments from the Provost. Provost Martin is ill today. So our first agenda item will be to call on Dean Charles Walcott who will give us some announcements."

Charles Walcott, Dean of the University Faculty: "I just have a very brief announcement. You should have received a ballot for various functionaries in the Senate, the committees and all those good things. You will have noted that the ballot for Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty contains but one name. This was not due to lack of effort in trying to find additional candidates, but we were not successful. People who were willing to do it intended to go on sabbatical and other inconvenient things and so we were left with only one candidate. That is why you will notice that there are two boxes underneath the candidate's name: approve, disapprove. I personally hope very much that you will check the approve box, but that's just a personal statement. I just wanted to explain why that is. That's all the announcements I have."

Speaker Knuth: "Thank you Professor Walcott. While we count for a quorum we are going to skip the next agenda item for a moment, I hope, which is approving the minutes of the meeting. I would like to call on Professor Stein. Sorry to pull that on you, Peter. I would like to call on Professor Stein to move forward with a report on the status of the University Club. You may recall that the agenda listed this as an item for ten minutes of attention and I would like to allocate, if Professor Stein needs, up to fifteen minutes of attention, we can do that. I will also ask Professor Stein to let me know if you would like to have Senate input or if this is solely comments from you, so I can watch the time."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I was taken in such shock. I was about to have my cookies."

Speaker Knuth: "Shall I give you a five minute warning or so?"

Professor Stein: "There's a handout (Appendix 1) on the table there, which is a resolution that got passed overwhelmingly by the Senate three years ago, almost exactly three years ago. There are a bunch of whereases, which you may or may not have read, but the action item is the last paragraph down there - 'Therefore Be it Resolved that the Senate strongly supports the recommendation of the University Club Task Force that Cornell establish a University Club with the following mission and with the following characteristics and capabilities.' If you are interested, the mission and capabilities are on the handout.

"This is an effort that started some four years ago by a group of people, namely the people who are on the board of the Statler Club, of which I was one, who were thinking once again about how to make the Statler Club a little bit better than it was. Some people around the table said, 'well it is so far from what we think Cornell should have as a faculty club that we really ought to look into not how we could improve the Statler Club by a small amount, but what we could do to actually have in our lifetimes a real functioning University Club.' We approached the administration and asked the administration to support a notion of appointing a task force, which would look into how we could in fact go about doing that. In fact, this Senate endorsed that resolution three years ago. I think I was looking at the date when the Iraq war started, anyway that was a long time ago and the Senate did support a resolution asking the administration to appoint the task force. That task force then met and I was the chair of it. We produced a report and we brought the report to the President. We also brought the report to the Senate because the Senate had urged the President to appoint the task force and the Senate overwhelmingly endorsed the goals there, which were that we construct a University Club, like most of our peers have somewhere on the campus.

"It's now been three years since it started, two years since that resolution, and at various times either I, or both Dean Walcott and I, have reported to this group that we were having encouraging discussions with the administration, but we never described what those encouraging discussions were. I said I was modestly optimistic and Charlie said something perhaps somewhat stronger, that he was optimistic. I thought it was now time because it now seems to come to a conclusion. But, nothing ever actually ever comes to a final conclusion at Cornell, as you probably know. You know the great poem, it's very dangerous to quote poetry, but, 'this is the way the world ends: not with a bang, but a whimper.' Well this sort of describes the University Club.

"We brought it to the administration, first to President Rawlings and President Rawlings essentially said he was on his way out and he said that he would leave it for the next President. We then made a presentation to the next President, Jeff Lehman. He was quite enthusiastic about it. We got back a proposal from him, which was not what we asked for. It was not for an independent, self-standing Faculty Club or Faculty and Staff Club; it was unlike any other that we had seen in the investigations we made. But, we thought it had some possibilities. It was essentially was for an upgraded Statler

Club that would be in the same facility, but it somehow would be bigger and better and cost more for the University to support. We started to engage in a discussion with the President and the Provost about this. We felt that the Statler Club as it's presently constructed does serve a need on the campus but it does not serve the need that we wrote down in the mission of this Club, namely to be a social center, a place that would be the center of all celebrations at Cornell, a place where one could bring a guest to with a certain amount of pride, a place that one would get some feeling of what it meant to be a faculty member at Cornell. There are a lot of places around that we visited, that in fact had clubs like that, who did to some degree or other fulfill that particular mission.

"We did not see that the Statler Club given its location, given the constraints on what it can do, given the constraints on how it could expand, could ever do that but we searched for a way that it might somehow be the nucleus from which such a club could emerge. We then had further discussions with the administration and we could not agree on (a) that the goal would be to emerge at some future time with a full fledged University Club, or (b) what they were suggesting for the Statler Club, could in fact turn into it. While we never had a rejection, and we had a series of discussions of possible things that we might do, it became increasingly clear that the current administration does not believe that this University Club has a high enough priority, is of important enough interest to members of the faculty and staff on the campus, to merit such a club, to merit either the space or the expense of building it. Therefore, it looks like it's not going to happen, at least in this administration. However, we are going to have a new President, and it's possible that the new President, will in fact see this as an opportunity to develop the social cohesiveness that we on the task force thought was so deeply lacking at Cornell, and that the attempt to establish a center like that at the price tag that we felt that it could be accomplished with, was a worthwhile endeavor. However, I think that the current administration does not see it that way.

"If nothing else had happened, I probably would not have and reported to you. What has now happened is that Charlie and I had a meeting with Carolyn Ainslie, who is the Vice President for Planning and Budget. The Statler Club as currently configured, serves about 60 people for lunch on an average day, at a modest price, serves a very limited buffet and soup and rolls. It has a membership of some 200 people on the campus, and as I say roughly 60 people eat there each day. It is housed by the School of Hotel Administration and the University pays the School of Hotel Administration a substantial amount of money to carry on that activity. The School of Hotel Administration finds that work to be, what shall I say, hosting that activity in their facility makes a significant 'lost opportunity cost' for them. That is to say, if they weren't hosting that they could do something else. They feel that the lost opportunity cost is inconsistent with the amount of money they are getting. They have asked for what I think might be a reasonable increase in the amount of money that they get. However, it turns out that that money is a lot of money. At the current time, I figured it out and it would mean that the University is subsidizing each of those lunches, each

of those 60 lunches, by a faculty member to the tune of something like \$15 to \$20. It's not clear that that is a justifiable expense. I don't want to go through all the details. It seems to me, that if I could read the tea leaves right, that the administration believes that it can no longer in good conscience carry on this subsidy, which by the way has to do not with what another Faculty or University Club would cost but what it would cost to run it in that building with its fixed costs and its obligations and its lost opportunity costs. I have the feeling that it may well close in the not too distant future. It's not a decision, but that's my sense of what the meeting was like. Charlie was that your sense of what the meeting was like?"

Dean Walcott: "That is very much my sense."

Professor Stein: "So it seemed to me, that it was important to convey that to you. I was deeply disappointed. You know I have had a lot of disappointments in my life, and some of them were worse than not having a University Club at Cornell, but I must say I was disappointed by the fact that the overwhelming vote of this body, as a representative of the faculty, was not considered of significant interest. It became clear to me in my discussion that there had not been the kind of interest that justified going to the expense and difficulty of having such a club on the campus, that the almost unanimous voice of this body was not considered to be a significant voice. I find that very distressing, and even more distressing than the fact that we probably will not have at least under this administration a University Club. That finishes what I have to say."

Speaker Knuth: "Any brief questions for Professor Stein."

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering: "Have they ever given any consideration to including this in the big capital campaign, as something to sell to an alum, a named faculty club, like the Pete Meinig Faculty Club, or something like this?"

Professor Stein: "I think that in my experience it goes the other way. It's a combination of things. When there's a significant interest, the question is, who decides what goes into that campaign? There's a group that decides it, and the Senate is not a member of that group. That group writes down what the priorities are and then they go to the fundraiser and they say, 'do you think you can sell this? do you think you sell that? is this something that's apt to be funded or not?' That's the normal way it happens, but if nobody thinks it's worth doing then, in fact, it doesn't go on the list of things that are examined for funding possibilities. I believe that is the place where it failed: in whatever group of people it is that make the decision of what is examined for possible funding. It didn't make it onto that list. It has to be on that priority list. We estimated the cost, maybe four years ago, of this facility as being eight million dollars or something like that, so it's probably ten million dollars by now. I can't believe that the social center of Cornell for ten million dollars would be a hard sell. There are a lot of

alumni. I think the problem is that it didn't get to that stage. People also said, by the way, where would you put it? Our response was, you have to charge somebody in the Architect's Office to go and look at the campus in the same way that they do for other buildings - where could it be and so forth? But it didn't make it that far."

Speaker Knuth: "I think we need to conclude discussion but thank you for rendering your report.

"We'll return now to an agenda item that we skipped over. We do have a quorum. Our next item is to approve the minutes from March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Faculty Senate meeting. You may recall that the minutes were available to you via the Senate web site. I would like to ask for approval of these by unanimous consent. Are there corrections to the minutes that should be noted? Seeing no corrections indicated and no objections, I'll declare the minutes approved.

"We will move on to our next item, which is the major item for this agenda and that is to ask Professor Lemley to come forward as Chair of the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Lemley will be introducing five different resolutions. I will ask that you introduce each resolution one at a time. We will take discussion on the first one and then move on to the next one. Just as a point of information, there is no second needed because they are coming from a Senate Committee. Then we will vote on each one."

Professor Ann Lemley, Textiles & Apparel, Chair, Educational Policy Committee:  
"After we discuss all five?"

Speaker Knuth: "Is it necessary to do that?"

Professor Lemley: "No, on each one is fine."

Speaker Knuth: "What you have is roughly ten minutes for presentation and discussion on each."

Professor Lemley: "Thanks Barb. I decided we had talked long enough in EPC on a number of items, and so for the agenda for one meeting I decided it was time to make a decision for action on these items. I couldn't believe that at the end of the meeting, I had five resolutions. I ask you to bear with me. My reading of these is that they get a little more controversial toward the end. Let me preface this by saying that we brought some of these here because we knew that there would be discussion. My feelings won't be hurt, the committees' feelings won't be hurt, if you have some strong opinions either way. If you have friendly amendments to change things, we are trying to bring these out. We already have had a significant amount of discussion on all of them. We are only a small group. We have talked to some other people but we didn't do massive campus surveys because I think none of us have had time for that."

Speaker Knuth: "Excuse me a minute. Just in terms of a friendly amendment, the rules of the Faculty Senate are, that minor wording changes that don't change the substance of the resolution can be introduced. Any substantive amendment, substantive wording changes, need to be submitted in advance of the meeting. We cannot take substantive changes at this point."

Professor Lemley: "Well there was one suggested to me earlier, which may fit into the allowed.

"This first resolution (Appendix 2) goes back to the original Faculty Senate resolution that was passed saying that median grades should be on the transcript and they should also be on the Web. It reads,

'Whereas the Faculty Senate resolved that median grades should be posted on the student transcripts and the web, and

'Whereas, the median grades are now posted on the web, but not on the student transcripts because of delays due to adoption of a new Student Information System which depends on new Oracle software, and

'Whereas, students shop for easier courses based on posted median grades,

'Therefore, Be it Resolved that the Senate instructs the Registrar to remove median grades from the web until such time as median grades can be posted on student transcripts, and to report to the Dean of Faculty:

- 1) the date by which removal can be accomplished;
- 2) the fact of removal, when it has been accomplished; and
- 3) the date by which posting on transcripts can be accomplished.'

"I know if any of you who have been involved in, or anyone who is an Associate Dean in a college, can tell you that there are some significant issues with the Student Information System. For a whole bunch of technical reasons, and the take over of one computer company by another, the Student Information System has been pushed back. There are economic reasons for delaying it. A lot of faculty outside of our committee felt very, very strongly that having this information on the web and not having it on the transcripts is a serious problem.

"There are other faculty who have asked me to talk about eventually reopening the question of whether it should belong on the transcript. We may come back to you with that discussion.

"I open the floor for discussion. Is that appropriate now?"

Associate Professor Mike Shapiro, Communication: "What evidence do we have that students are using this to find courses? My experience with this is that at least the on-line posting has the potential to create discussion within departments. I presume that the purpose of this is to discourage grade inflation, and that when it's posted like that it at least has the potential to create discussion within departments about, well why does your class - as so many classes do, not just in our department - have a median grade of A or A minus? I really think that the benefit far outweighs the few students who are looking for gut courses."

Professor Lemley: "Where is my friend Rich Galik from Physics? He is one of the people who felt very strongly. He is not here today. I ask you to ask yourselves how many of you have had discussions in your departments based on the posting of the median grades on the web. I actually never look at courses on the web. I still use my hard cover 'Course Enroll' and I think our students are faster at it than the rest of you. Anybody else have any other opinions on this? The strong sense, both from our committee and from some people who asked for this, is that it's accomplishing the opposite even though that might not have been the intention. Other thoughts? There was one in front of Mike and then we'll move around the room. Do you have something, the person in front of Mike Shapiro?"

Professor Kevin Clinton, Classics: "We have had this discussion in my department."

Professor Steven Beer, Plant Pathology: "I don't understand the linkage between the median grades appearing on the web and on transcripts. Why?"

Professor Lemley: "Some of you who can remember that was the Faculty Senate Resolution. I think we are going to get some history from Peter."

Professor Stein: "Kevin Clinton and I are probably the only people in this room who remember that discussion. There was a lengthy debate in the Senate. It was an early Senate and it went over three meetings. It was very hotly contested and a lot of issues were raised. Frankly, I think it was the best discussion of an issue that I have heard since I have been here. I felt really good about it.

"At that meeting, the logic of the linking of the two was that the idea was not to oppose grade inflation; that was never it. It was truth in grading. The sense was that nobody knew what these letters meant, A, B, C. They meant a whole lot of different things at different places. Why not tell the world when we give a grade, if they are suppose to make sense out of it, why not tell the world what it is we are doing with grades? That was the notion of the median grade. That was hotly debated. But then people said, well if we believe in truth, why not tell the students? Why not give that information?"

We don't want to hide this information, so we'll tell students what the grading practices are. Since we are telling the world also, why not tell the students? That's why they were linked. Then the University Registrar's Office said, well we can't do it immediately but we'll do in a couple of years. That was ten years ago. People said shouldn't we wait until then to post it on the web? And the answer was no, why wait because we thought there were these two effects. One is the students would look for the easy courses and the other was that people would be embarrassed to make it public knowledge that they gave all As in their courses. It wasn't clear what the effect was. Those were the arguments.

"I find it distressing, frankly. I mean I'm distressed about a lot of things including the University Club, but why in the world has it taken ten years for the decision that this body made where its decision is the University decision. Why has it taken ten years? That's a long time, to institute this decision. I believe that there has to be some answer to that question."

Speaker Knuth: "I'm not totally defending it, but I address that in terms of software issues so we won't go into the details of that here. Let's stick to talking about the resolution."

Professor Lemley: "I can't defend it, or not defend it but I gather there is some reason."

Professor Rich Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management: "I would like to take this rare opportunity to completely agree with Peter Stein. I think this really is an issue of truth in advertising. It's really an issue of opening the light of day to what we do in our class rooms. I like that idea. I like this original resolution and I think we should do both. I see no reason to take the true information out of the market place - let people know what's going on and let them make their decision."

Assistant Professor Sergio Servetto, Electrical & Computer Engineering: "There is something I don't understand. What is the coupling between having the grades on the web and on the transcript? What is the rationale for moving now to put them on the web and then putting them off again once they become available?"

Professor Lemley: "I think it goes back to Peter's point that they were originally linked in that it would tell the world with the transcript and then all the faculty know about it. The point is, and what we are trying to correct here, is that if it is only on the web and for whatever reason it can't be gotten on the transcript for several more years, with it just on the web the students are shopping for easy courses and it never shows up on their transcript that they might have taken a bunch of easy courses. That was a very strong feeling from quite a few faculty. Once it's able to be on the transcript you can have it both places. That was the very strong feeling and there were a lot of other faculty who don't seem to be here who felt that way."



Professor Gregory Lawler, Mathematics: "I just want to make the obvious statement and just a small comment. This information can be made available to departments and faculty without posting it directly on the web. If the reason is the faculty can have the information, it can be given to faculty in other means."

Professor Lemley: "And department chairs can have a discussion if they wish to."

Dan Shawhan, Graduate and Professional Students Association: "There was a question earlier about whether we know that the students are shopping for grades. There was an econometric study by a colleague of ours who is a professor in Economics. I didn't look at it in preparation for this meeting but I recall seeing it about a year ago and taking a quick look. His conclusion was that there appears to be a relationship between the introduction of the median grade postings on the web, and either median grades at Cornell or enrollments. I don't recall exactly. Maybe someone else has seen it."

Professor David Levitsky, Division of Nutritional Sciences: "This is not the only source of information students use in finding the easy courses. I don't see what advantage there is to taking the information away from students. It seems that the more open we are, the better everybody is."

Speaker Knuth: "We'll have to take a final comment. Is there anybody who would like to make a comment who hasn't had a chance?"

Professor Anton: "I fear if we take it off the web that it will remove the pressure on the Registrar's Office to solve the problem of getting it on the transcripts, in which case this will never happen."

Professor Lemley: "I respond to that in one sense. Actually, EPC did approve last year a version of the transcript with the median grade. It really isn't that at this stage that they don't want to put it on the transcript. It has to do with the shift over of the Student Information System. It really has to do with that. We had it all ready to go and they were ready with the new Student Information System, but then Oracle took over PeopleSoft and there is a whole bunch of things on hold. This is only one of them. I just wanted to say that the resolution also says that we have to have the date by which it can be accomplished. That is as factually as we can come up with it."

Speaker Knuth: "I would like to proceed with the vote at this point. You have the resolution (Appendix 2) before you. We won't reread it because I believe you can see it. I would like to ask for all those in favor of this resolution to please say aye. All those opposed say nay. I think I'll ask for a standing vote. All those in favor, please stand. You can sit down. We would like the no's to stand. Thank you very much, you can all sit down now."

Motion failed.

Speaker Knuth: "We will move on to the second resolution."

Professor Lemley: "This one (Appendix 3) has to do with the fact that we are not following our own rules. We would like to have a time period where we might collect some data, so that if we need to change the faculty rules, we can. The current rule for final exam does not allow for exceptions. It says each course should require a final examination or some equivalent exercise to be conducted or due during the period set aside for final examinations. There are courses that are not following this rule and, I will parenthetically state, perhaps for good reason, perhaps because of the nature of their course structure. They have cumulative final projects and you could add some other things to that.

"Therefore, be it resolved that an addition be made to the end of this rule that states, "unless there is a written approval from the Dean of the Faculty," ' and that the Dean of the Faculty be encouraged to publicize this rule and that an annual summary of the exemption requests be shared with EPC. The point being that if we need to change the rule, we should have some information over time to change it. We would like to add this exception right now and the current Dean of the Faculty has indicated that enforcement will be perfectly reasonable. I'll throw that in as a little bit of background. We had discussions from people who teach lots of different kinds of courses. We felt that if it's widely not followed, we need to do something and we weren't really prepared to say what all the options are. I'll open the floor to discussion based on that."

Professor Anton: "I have a question. What distinguishes some equivalent exercise in the first paragraph from a cumulative final project? What triggers the need for an exemption?"

Professor Lemley: "Actually, maybe we can clarify this. It has to do with the fact of when it is. The equivalent exercise has to be during the time period set aside for final examinations."

Professor Anton: "So it's a due date?"

Professor Lemley: "It's a time thing. Sometimes they have a final cumulative project due in the last week. That's the only way."

Professor Anton: "If I understand correctly, then you would need a letter from the Dean of the Faculty to have a final project that was due outside of the final exam period?"

Professor Lemley: "That's a big part of it. Let me let David speak to this."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "In our department, and in several of the other engineering departments, there are a lot of courses that have cumulative final projects. Some of them are due during finals period, some are due the last week of classes. They are group things. They are not necessarily cumulative final exercises. There are other things, like a design project. So it's a new kind of animal, different from traditional final exams. Also, in Architecture, Art and Planning there are studio courses that have huge numbers of students in them. There's not way to shoe horn all presentations of the studio work into the final exam period. It is partly a unique problem and it's partly a nature of the work problem. Having Charlie report, as the Dean of the Faculty, this list of exceptions and letting the EPC look at the information, say maybe in the year 2006, we might then need to rethink the final exam rules. That's my take on the resolution."

Professor Beer: "On what basis does the Dean of the Faculty decide on these petitions? Is the Educational Policy Committee prepared to offer him guidelines?"

Professor Lemley: "Good question. I think what we discussed was that there were a lot of these that already are being done in violation, and the kind that David just spoke about, seem to make sense. Charlie, did you want to give anything else to that?"

Charles Walcott: "No, I don't think so. I think it is some of the obvious things but we honestly don't know what's going on except that we do know there are lot of courses that are not following the rules. At least this is some way of discovering what their practices are in some of these various departments."

Professor Lemley: "I think it would also be if it makes sense that they really can't do it. They can't follow the rules. There is a good academic reason. Perhaps that's the best way to say it, if there's a good academic reason they can't follow the rules."

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics: "Is this intended to apply only to undergraduate courses or across the board to all courses?"

Professor Lemley: "That's a difficult question because one of our discussions was that we have a feeling that there's lots of things that are violated with respect to graduate courses. Theoretically, I think the rules apply to all and I think it should apply to all. The rule already applies to all so any change that we make applies to all. If you are violating with graduate courses, which we probably do, maybe people want to bring to us the topic of changing it. I think the rule already applies so we don't change that."

Associate Professor Kim Weedon, Sociology: "In my department, I would say there is probably one of maybe fifteen courses that actually follows this rule, because it's just

not appropriate for our particular discipline. What I really want to say though, is that if you really want this as an exercise of gathering information might I respectfully suggest that having the Dean of Faculty collect self identified people who are breaking the rules is perhaps not the best way to get the information. You are going to have a lot of people who say, that's me and I'm not even going to bother to contact the Dean of Faculty. I'm just going to do it. So if what you really want is a count of what percentage of courses are breaking the rules, this method is not going to give you the appropriate count."

Professor Lynne Abel, Classics: "I was going to suggest something along the same line. I don't know what the forms for course approvals look like in colleges other than Arts and Sciences. I am speaking only for Arts and Sciences. When we propose courses we have to say what work is required, how many pages of writing, how many exams. We have to say all that on the form. Our course is approved with a certain set of assumptions about what we as instructors have said we are going require. I don't think it would be very complicated to collect that information from the secretary of our college's educational policy committee. If that's true in other colleges, it would be a better way to gather information."

Professor Lemley: "Yes, my college would do that too. However, I've often wondered if people are still teaching the way they wrote the proposal. David is on the committee so I want to give him a minute."

Professor David Henderson, Mathematics: "I want to talk about other examples. One of them is, that there seemed to be cases where it was purely a matter of the faculty member wanting to leave campus early at the end of classes. There are other cases in some departments where final papers are not due the last week of classes or the exam period, but into the next semester, often the beginning of the following semester. That's also an issue. If it makes sense, sometime that should be brought up. I want to point out that it's not just the case of whether or not the students are getting their whole academic benefit or something like that, but it interferes with other courses. I often have students in my courses from various parts of campus, some graduates, some undergraduates. When they have all of their stuff due in the last week of their courses, they are not working in my course. That interferes with what's happening in my course. Sometimes they can't even attend class because they have a design project due the last week and they can't attend my course."

Professor Dick Miller, Philosophy: "This strikes me as a bad rule. I think that's why it's not being followed in a great many courses. Experience in my department, like the one that Professor Weeden reported in Sociology - I can't imagine advance courses, primarily for graduate students, you can almost imagine, the vast, vast majority do not obey this rule and it would be irresponsible of them to do so considering the nature of the subject matter that we want to encourage people to concentrate on. In particular a long, written project. There are other courses, which are fairly advanced and the vast

majority do not conform to this. Often a project is due before the exam period. I can't imagine how the EPC would be able to form judgments on the exception requests, without a burden on themselves and the people describing what they are doing, which I think would be bureaucratically too heavy and also inappropriate. You just can't judge. You are going to be highly discriminating in most of these cases. I think the rule should be rewritten to express the substance that the EPC would like to convey, subject to discretion, which will inevitably be occasionally abused. But, I do think at least those gross misuses should be made illegal under the rule."

Professor Lemley: "Let me have one response to that. The spirit of this and I think even the letter of it is, if you vote for the resolution you are opening this topic so Charlie can at least capture some information. There's nothing that says EPC can't look for other information. The point is, I think, if you vote in favor of it you are saying that the rule isn't being followed, sometimes for good reason and sometimes for not good reason, and we should move ahead and figure this out. This doesn't say that this is the only thing we could do."

Professor Martin Hatch, Music: "May I suggest that there are many courses, of the one or two credit variety let's say, that are finished basically before the exam period and there's no allowance in this resolution for that kind of course. I'm thinking of my department, of our musical ensembles. If this passes, one has to request exceptions for these courses or deferments for the courses."

Speaker Knuth: "If I may, let me just make a clarification here: the standing policy is that all courses are required to have something going on during the final exam period. There are many instances currently in violation. What this resolution is trying to do, is at least allow a mechanism for those to no longer be in violation."

Professor Hatch: "What I guess I'm suggesting, is it seems like there's better things to do than to say, 'you are in violation of the law and now explain why.' There may be other guidelines or changes in the rules that accomplish what is needed."

Professor Charles Greene, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "I understand the reasoning behind what you are trying to do with this resolution but it seems to me that the issue is enforcement. It seems that rather than the Dean of the Faculty, you are much more likely to do it if you require written approval from the chairman of the department. The chairman of the department knows in each instance whether it's appropriate or not, as was pointed out."

Professor Lemley: "As I say, I don't think we are trying to enforce, I think we are trying to eventually change the rule if it needs changing, so we want to gather information. But that's a point."

Professor Greene: "But I guess the point was raised before that people will just say why report it. Why should they report it?"

Speaker Knuth: "Let's limit this to new people or new comments."

Professor Servetto: "I cannot imagine how Dean Walcott would want to, or even be able to, make an informed assessment as to whether in my course I should have an exam the last week of classes during exam week. It should be up to the instructor."

Professor Lemley: "I think the spirit of this rule is to try to make life reasonably fair for the students. If every instructor does everything they want, things can be very difficult for the students. I'm sure that is why it was instituted."

Professor Rebecca Schneider, Natural Resources: "It's become clear that two things that come out of this discussion. Your intent is a good one, to try to gather information, but from what people have said it's pretty apparent that this happens in a lot of departments. What you propose is a rather confrontational and an attacking kind of way that would create a lot of negative feelings by faculty, like you broke the rule and you have to petition as to why you should be allowed to break the rule. And so I don't think that's the best way for us to be trying to get information and get people on board. I would suggest a method that other people have mentioned, or perhaps the chairs taking inventory in the department and get people to give you a quick statement of what they do their final week would be a less adversarial way to get faculty on board to this issue instead of this confrontational way."

Professor Lemley: "It was certainly not meant to be confrontational. Who else hasn't been heard on this?"

Professor Michael \_\_\_\_\_, Mathematics: "Just a point. If the purpose of this resolution is to get the information as to whether or not, or how much is being violated, you have already gotten that information. It's being violated by many people in many different departments."

Professor Lemley: "It's much broader than we had thought."

Professor Michael \_\_\_\_\_: "We can question whether or not the rule ought to be there, but I don't think you need this resolution for to know the rule is not being followed."

Speaker Knuth: "We'll take one last comment."

Professor Beer: "Did the committee actually consider the possible wisdom of the existing rule?"

Professor Lemley: "Yes. I think we did. We certainly did. But we had enough good examples of where we thought there should be an exception and we had a feeling that there were probably some others. The cumulative design projects that David talked about and graduate courses. We thought that this was a very, very sweeping rule and that life has changed. While at the same time we are trying to protect the people teaching the other classes and the students and their schedules toward the end of the semester. We were trying to come up with a way to balance all of these things and we don't have the answer yet of how to balance all of these things. This was an attempt to get there."

Speaker Knuth: "Given that, I am going to call for a vote on this resolution (Appendix 3), the rule on final exams, which you see before you. We'll try this by voice vote first. All those in favor of this resolution please indicate by saying aye. All those opposed say no. Would the no's please stand. My judgment is that the no's have it.

"The motion fails."

Professor Lemley: "And I said the first three would be easy. This is fine. We wanted to get this kind of conversation out.

"This third one (Appendix 4) has to do with follow-up to one that we brought to you last year regarding the final exam schedule and to give the students some more time between exams. We stretched the timing out so that the third period during final exams is an evening exam. At that time many of you indicated that Friday evening was going to be a problem, and indeed it is.

"The new final exam schedule has two Friday nights. One is for make up and that can be relatively easily handled. But one of those two Friday nights has exams on it and it creates a problem for large numbers of students who have religious observances. This is being done at the request of the University Registrar, and others who have concern. I'm sure that others who help students know that there is a problem.

" 'Be it resolved that the Senate instructs the registrar that starting next fall' - we can't do it in time for this spring - 'that starting next fall that exams that were to be scheduled (the first Friday), be moved to the Wednesday evening of study week at 7:00 p.m.'. We maintain the same schedule but we do not do that Friday evening schedule.

"The floor is open for discussion on this one."

Professor Shapiro: "More of a question here, what do you consider evening? I'll point out why I am asking that question. Sundown in Ithaca in December actually comes

quite early. The three to five period for students who might get home before sundown actually can be a problem."

Professor Lemley: "Is that the second period now in the new schedule?"

Professor Shapiro: "I think it's three to five, something like that. So that's an issue. And then for Muslims students, is Friday all day a problem?"

Professor Lemley: "I don't know the answer to that question."

Dean Walcott: "One point of information, Diane tells me it starts at 2:00 in the afternoon. That's a little better, but still might be a problem."

Professor Philip Nicholson, Astronomy: "A point of information, starting on the Wednesday evening, that means the regular exams start Thursday. Is this moving everything up one evening?"

Professor Lemley: "One evening by when regular exams start. Instead of Thursday morning, they will start Wednesday evening."

Professor Stein: "It seems to me that if you are going to make an exception based on religious grounds, you have to make an exception based on all religious grounds. If there's an equivalent problem for Muslim students then it seems to me that should be addressed as well."

Professor Lemley: "I think that the issue is that when we have had Friday exams in the past, evidently there hasn't been an outcry. Moving exams to Friday nights scheduled this past fall and this spring has created a very significant problem. It's a practical response rather than a response on principle. You have Saturday morning language exams. I never understood how they worked. The big problem that got us is the Friday night exam. It's just reality. That's what we are told and that's what the students are complaining about."

Associate Professor Susan Piliero, Education: "I have a question about what you did with the Student Assembly when you decided to make those changes. Certainly this is not the first time changes to the exam schedule has been discussed, nor will it be the last. One of the models that was discussed in the EPC about five years ago was to move the final exams so that they would start on Wednesday and it was floated to the Student Assembly. There was a near revolution. Their rationale for being upset was, 'this is just one more example of how the faculty is screwing the students in order to accommodate their own personal schedules'."

Professor Lemley: "This does not shift the whole exam period to start on Wednesday."



Professor Piliero: "It doesn't shift it to start on Wednesday morning, but it is starting on Wednesday night."

Professor Lemley: "But it doesn't change the end point. One cannot use the argument that you use, but that's a valid point. The whole idea with doing evenings was done with the Student Assembly wanting it done. I do not know if they went back to them with this Friday night, other than responding to a very significant outcry."

Professor Piliero: "So in response to that, my sense is that while I think there's some merit to the resolution, before the Senate votes on it if, I wonder if we ought to consider tabling it and seeing if the Student Assembly would also care about that now, or if you would end up opening up a can of worms."

Professor Lemley: "If you table it, it can't be done for next fall and we're going to have enormous, enormous, enormous numbers of make ups. That's reality. I don't know how you want to deal with that."

Professor David Henderson: "I just want to point out it's not a question, there's a University policy already to take into account religious observances of the students. I will be teaching calculus text fall and I will do that for all of the exams, no matter what the religious observance is. The question is to try and minimize the disruption."

Professor Lemley: "That is a good point. It's practicality. There's just a large number which makes it very difficult to deal with it."

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics, and Civil & Environmental Engineering: "Just a question. What is proposed to be done with the Friday night make-ups? That's not addressed in here. Is that planned to be continued to be offered?"

Professor Lemley: "I think the idea is that we continue that and then one can make the individual exceptions. It's not as difficult if you don't have a whole bunch of them scheduled. It was felt that that could be handled."

Speaker Knuth: "Are there any new comments? I think we are ready for a vote on this one. You have the resolution before you on the final exam schedule. All those in favor of this resolution (Appendix 4), please indicate by saying aye. All those opposed, please say nay."

Motion passed.

Professor Lemley: "This resolution (Appendix 5) comes to us from the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education (FACAPE). In extensive

conversations with Athletics, issues came up with respect to whether practice times weren't shifting into the academic day, and there were many discussions about the number of venues for practicing and sharing venues. There has been a lot of negotiating back and forth. The one thing that the Athletics people asked FACAPE, and they agreed, and then proposed to EPC, was that evening prelims be changed to start at 8:00 rather than 7:30 in order to allow the student athletes time to shower, eat and get to prelims on time. Keep in mind that practices are somewhat constrained by the amount of facilities we have. Students would not have time if they are let out at 7:00 to shower and change and get to prelim promptly, so they were asking that as of fall 2006, evening prelims shall begin no earlier than 8:00 PM. I'm going to call on Doug Fitchen as the first person to speak because he e-mailed in advance about this."

Professor Douglas Fitchen, Physics: "Physics has a number of large introductory courses using the evening prelims so that all the students can take the same examination, even though they can't come to the same lecture. I have been involved in some of those courses over the years and they seem to work all right, so this resolution was a surprise. I talked to some of my colleagues who were teaching these big courses now and asked whether they had been contacted by the EPC and what their reaction was to this proposal. None of them had been contacted, though it clearly has an effect on the way the course runs. None of them was in favor of the proposal of shifting back to 8:00 p.m.. The feeling was that none of these people had had problems with student athletes. If the student comes and says, I have a conflict, can I start the exam late? We typically have a significant number of students doing that, and that may have been what has been used by some athletes in the past. People do it for performance reasons and there are other situations that are handled informally with ad hoc arrangements. Students with disabilities who need to have extra time to finish, sometimes they will start early; sometimes they will start late. Athletes who are involved in away games have special arrangements made for them. The reaction of the people involved in teaching the courses was that this will actually make for a later evening. Most of the students in the course and the TAs and faculty who were administering the exam, and in some cases to grade it afterwards. It just didn't seem like a real problem that had to be solved in this way. I later heard that there is, in fact, a part of the faculty handbook that says under scheduling afternoon and evening activities that there are three hours that can't be scheduled anything, between 4:30 and 7:30, but after that it's okay. The other thing then is that this proposal is sort of a change in that policy and so the question was should we re-examine that statement if there really is a problem. But the reaction of my colleagues was that they didn't really think there was a problem."

Professor Delchamps: "Is there anyone from FACAPE here who can recount the discussion that they had with Athletics on this issue?"

Dean Walcott: "I'm not a member of FACAPE but I sit with them and I can tell you that we had representatives from some of the various teams. I think it was actually the

football team and some of the coaches who said that this is a significant problem because it means that students have to get out of practice early to be prepared to get to the examination. They like to take a shower, maybe, and maybe have something to eat before they take the exam. The amount of time in between the end of practice at 7:00 or 7:30 and the beginning of exams is just awfully tight for them to do this. That was the basis of the argument, fundamentally. It is true. I have also taught a big class, Biology 101, and I simply let the kids come later and carry on a little bit later because we always had to give extra time to some students and so we were going to be around anyway. I agree with Doug that that's a possible solution but there are other courses apparently, which are not quite so generous in their start times and tell students that they really have to be there right at the beginning of the exam."

Professor Burkhauser: "I teach 450 students in Econ 101 and what I do is give it at two times, 5:30 to 7:30 and then 7:30 to 9:30 and you are allowed to do that as long you offer the exam at a time after 7:30. This way we get around the problem of making 8:00 the dominant course by offering it at 6:00 to 8:00 for usual students or an 8:00 to 10:00, which is probably what I would do if we choose to do this. It would impact on some graduate students. I would flip and instead of the 5:30 - 7:30 be the exception for people who couldn't do it at 7:30 - 9:30, I would just switch it the other way. I don't see this as a major problem for very large classes. It might be actually a bigger problem for smaller classes."

Professor Stein: "I realize I can't offer amendments, even if I were a member of this body, and I'm not, but it seems to me that the solution that my colleague Doug Fitchen proposed indeed solves the problem. It solves the problem if people are told that they should make an option for student athletes. Would not that solve the whole problem? If this body said, 'student athletes with good reason because of outside extra curricular activities could start late and the faculty member is strongly encouraged or possibly even required to adapt, by offering or by allowing the student to come to the exam late."

Professor Lemley: "I think one could encourage that without having that be a resolution and I think that the Dean of the Faculty in e-mails to faculty in the beginning of the year could do that. I thank you Doug for checking with folks because I kind of ran out of steam and there's a limit to how much surveying we can do on some of these things. I appreciate that and so I think that is a very possible solution, some encouragement to those who aren't doing it."

Professor David Williamson, Operations Research and Industrial Engineering: "The sense in talking to some of my colleagues is that the three hour window that we are supposed to allow between 4:30 and 7:30 should be sufficient for athletic activities as it stands.

“Also I was asked to read this statement from Steve Vavasis who is the Faculty Senate person from Computer Science. He says that, ‘The Computer Science faculty is unanimously against the later start for evening prelims. One big disadvantage of the later start time is that students will be even more tired in their Wednesday and Friday classes following prelims. The second drawback is that our graders, undergraduate and graduate students who usually work in the grading sessions starting immediately after exam until all the grading is done, would have to stay awake until very late at night and then walk home well past midnight.’ ”

Professor Lemley: “Well I was a TA in large chemistry class when I was a graduate student here and I’ve done those marathon grading so I can appreciate that.”

Assistant Professor Phoebe Sengers, Science and Technology Studies. “Maybe I’m totally off base, but I just don’t see the big deal for a football player, or a baseball player or whoever, who must occasionally leave practice 15 minutes early. I don’t see that it’s worth forcing all the other students to stay up late, to work late, when they might not be so fresh and ready to do a good job, just so that these people don’t have to miss any of their practices.”

Professor Lemley: “If you still want to say something fine, but I think we can get the vote on this one without spending any more time.”

Speaker Knuth: “We’ll move forward on the vote on this resolution. All those in favor of the resolution on evening prelim times (Appendix 5), please indicate by saying aye. All those opposed, please say no.”

Amendment not approved.

Professor Lemley: “I do appreciate your input because I think it does give us the option that perhaps might encourage people to be willing to be flexible in accommodating students.

“We all learned something about giving two exams as long as you can do one in the legitimate time. I knew you were clever.

“I had a little bit of earlier discussion on maybe some of the wording on this last resolution (Appendix 6) but let me see if we can discuss it. The concept is that a student can be found guilty, in a hearing in his or her college, of academic misconduct and then in some colleges just drop the course so that the only punishment for that is a note in a file somewhere, which may never get anywhere else. So that’s the easy way out. Therefore the resolution is that we make this addition to the Cornell Code of Academic Integrity that a student who is found guilty of academic misconduct in an official University hearing may not drop the course in which the transgression took place. I

will also add this would not preclude that if there were some negotiations before, between the instructor and student before it got to the hearing and a guilty verdict at a hearing, that dropping the course is certainly still an option.

“Lynne Abel has some concerns regarding academic integrity. May I call on Lynne to be the first person to speak because she has some thoughts on this.”

Professor Abel: “What I would like to do is to propose, what you all have to determine is either a friendly or a substantive amendment. It is the following: ‘Therefore be it resolved that a student who is found guilty of violation of academic integrity or of academic misconduct...’ In other words, the insertion of those three words ‘of academic integrity ... in an official University hearing...’ and then do it the same way. That is my suggestion and I would like to explain why. In the Code of Academic Integrity, ‘academic misconduct,’ on page 2 for those know this intimately, ‘academic misconduct’ is defined rather specifically and in particular in section B it says academic misconduct is not violation of academic integrity. The student may however seek the review of so forth and so on... If you voted for this, a student who was found guilty of academic misconduct, which means talking during exams or sharing notes in some sort illegal way, or reproducing something, they are examples, could not drop a course but a student who outright plagiarized or outright violated the Code of Academic Integrity and had been found guilty, could still drop a course. So I am in favor of the spirit of this, but I think that if you insert those words you are getting what the committee meant.”

Speaker Knuth: “Just so I understand this, we are saying that if a student is found guilty of violation of *academic integrity* or of academic misconduct. Let me just ask if there is unanimous consent to make this change.

Unidentified: “Objection.”

Speaker Knuth: “Given that there is an objection, I don’t feel that I can accept that as non-substantive wording.”

Professor Abel: “I think it is myself; I think it is an important substantive change.”

Professor Delchamps: “Since I do agree that it’s the committee’s intent that everything in that yellow book is covered by this motion, and if it’s viewed as a substantive amendment that we should table the motion and send it back to the committee.”

Professor Lemley: “That could be one outcome here.”

Speaker Knuth: “Are you offering a motion to table?”

Professor Delchamps: "Yes, if that's fair to do."

Speaker Knuth: "Let me just indicate it, as I understand, you are offering a motion to table this to the next meeting, correct?"

Professor Stein: "Point of order. Allowing one to make language that is clarifying, differentiating that from a substantive amendment, surely includes this. What Professor Delchamps said is that what Lynn Abel offered was the original intent of the committee, so it is really clarifying language."

Speaker Knuth: "I'll offer two points of clarification, one we have a motion to table that has been made that has not yet been seconded, so before it's seconded I will offer further clarification. If the body would like to overrule my ruling that because of an objection to be considered substantive wording, the body can do that. I believe it's a two thirds majority vote to overrule me. Before we go forward with that, there has been a motion made to table to the next meeting. Is there a second for that tabling?"

Professor Delchamps: "I withdraw the motion."

Speaker Knuth: "If there's a motion to overrule my decision?"

Unidentified: "I'll make that motion."

Professor Stein: "Point of order. Roberts says it's a majority vote to overrule."

Speaker Knuth: "I'll stand corrected on that because I don't have Roberts Rules with me. So the motion that's on the floor, that has been seconded, is to treat as a non-substantive change the insertion of the wording regarding violation of academic integrity."

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson School: "Can we have discussion? I object. Maybe I misunderstood Prof. Abel's comment, but it seems to me that you are raising the danger to the people who have the lesser problems when you throw them in here with these people. Is that what you are intending? Please explain why it's the other way around if that's what you are saying."

Professor Lemley: "I think the point was that we perhaps left out inadvertently the people who were guilty of the larger or major infractions."

Professor McAdams: "Which is the major infraction?"

Professor Lemley: "Integrity. Misconduct could be a low level one."

Professor McAdams: "I don't like misconduct being in there at all given what you said."

Professor Lemley: "Misconduct can also be, bringing unauthorized materials into the examination room; it could be disruptive behavior in the classroom. The intent was really much more the academic integrity, but there are things within the misconduct too. A lot of this misconduct has to be pretty bad before it's taken to a hearing and found guilty."

Professor McAdams: "There's a lot of minor stuff there."

Professor Lemley: "Yes, but very little of that goes to a hearing in the college."

Professor McAdams: "It seems to me if it's the integrity you are adding now that is pretty substantive. It should not be just thrown in."

Professor Lemley: "It was the intent."

Professor McAdams: "How do we know that by looking at it."

Professor Henderson: "It certainly was the intent. I had no idea there was a difference in these two terms when I was discussing in the EPC."

Professor Steve Shiffrin, Law School: "It seems to me that it is clarifying in the sense that you would have to get up very early in the morning to figure out why somebody would want misconduct in there, but not integrity."

Speaker Knuth: "Are there any other comments on the motion to overrule the speaker's interpretation about the substantiveness?"

Professor Williamson: "The question is, did the committee intend the 'and' of misconduct and integrity, or just integrity in place of misconduct."

Professor Delchamps: "My recollection or my impression when I discussed and voted on this motion, and by the way this was tweaked because there was dissent from other versions, as David Henderson said, we were trying to cover everything in the Code of Academic Integrity and that includes the page 2 definition of misconduct and as Ann pointed out getting to a hearing with that kind of thing is a lot harder than getting to a hearing for academic integrity. I was thinking cheating the whole time, but I was I was intending to cover the whole yellow book."

Speaker Knuth: "I'm going to call for a vote. If you vote yes, that's indicating that you consider to be non-substantive the change, to include the wording 'of academic

integrity.’ Those in favor of the motion to consider non-substantive the insertion of the violation of academic integrity wording, please indicate by saying aye. Those opposed please indicate by saying no.”

Ayes have it.

“We can move ahead with further discussion of this and I am including the nonsubstantive wording additions. Any further issues?”

Professor Sengers: “I think that this rule has the potential of straight-jacketing students inappropriately in courses that they might drop for reasons that are not related to their academic misconduct. I had a student last semester who cheated on one homework because she was having so much trouble in the class. It was not really intentional. It was definitely a violation, but it was one of those things - students work themselves into corners sometimes and they get themselves stuck in these bad situations where they should have used better judgment but didn’t. The student also had problems in subsequent exams and home works and I think it would have been reasonable for her if she wanted to, to drop the class just because she couldn’t cover it. With this she would have been stuck as soon as I found her guilty.”

Professor Lemley: “Did you have an official hearing?”

Professor Sengers: “We had an official hearing. It went through the whole thing.”

Professor Bob Kay, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences: “How long does it take to get a judgment out of the various levels of committees and appeals, etc? It seems to me it will take a long time to get this whole machinery done. By that time, there’s no question of dropping a course.”

Professor Delchamps: “One hearing is enough. The primary hearing counts as the governing hearing.”

Professor Carol Rosen, Linguistics: “In the case where it goes through a hearing, the first hearing that is, and found guilty, and doesn’t appeal, and is informed that the penalty will be a failing grade in the course, the student can then certainly stop attending and stop working in the course. I’m saying this in response to your remark that it would then be the equivalent to dropping the course.”

Professor Fred Gouldin, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering: “Just a point of clarification - if I understand it, if a student is found guilty at a first hearing, then they are subject to this rule even if they are exonerated at a later date. Is that true? So they really didn’t commit a crime but working under duress and the pressures associated with being accused, their performance in the course could go to heck.”



Professor Lemley: "And that's balanced by students who are found guilty and just drop the course and that's the way out."

Professor Gouldin: "But my point is that in the end they are not guilty and yet by the way I read the rule, they still can't drop the course because they were found guilty in a preliminary hearing. Did I misunderstand that?"

Professor Cynthia Farina, Law and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I actually think that would be an unreasonable reading of the rule. It's one thing to say it comes into effect once there has been a hearing. I think it's another thing to say, if then that judgment is reversed the rule continues in effect nevertheless. I think it would be very strange to read this rule to say that. In other words, there is a period of time until the original decision is reversed when you can't drop the course. But once that decision is reversed, then the rule no longer controls what happens."

Professor Abel: "Just to complicate things further - I think that something like this is extremely important. In my previous life as Associate Dean, what I know is that practices in colleges widely differ. In some colleges, students as soon as they are found guilty - whether the penalty is an F on a paper or on an exam or an F in a course - the student without the instructor's permission would just simply through the normal machinery go online and drop the course. This does seem to me to be not good faith, that the instructor that had to deal with the academic integrity issue and all the pedagogic and other issues involved, is simply out of the loop. Again, colleges differ. In Arts and Sciences we decided we didn't like it that there was no university ruling to govern dropping courses after such a situation, so we actually in our own college's Educational Policy Committee passed a resolution that said, 'that a student who is found guilty of academic integrity may not drop a course unless the instructor approves.' And it's again in Courses of Study and it says that adding and dropping, well we say after the third week, but that's when you have to petition, 'that the conditions for dropping the course are the instructor approves, the adviser approves, the advising dean approves, the drop does not result in fewer than 12 credits and no issue of academic integrity is at stake.' We say pretty much this, but if you are in a situation where it makes no sense, particularly if academic misconduct is there, and some of the academic misconduct has been rudeness to the instructor or obstructing class or something where you would really like to get that student out of class, you would actually like to have the possibility of dropping as long as the instructor who has dealt with this is not out of the loop and feels that it is not a miscarriage of justice in any way. I don't want something like this not to pass because I think it's real important."

Speaker Knuth: "I have to intervene here. Thank you and excuse me. By the orders of the Senate we need to adjourn by 6:00 PM unless there's a motion to extend. So unless I hear a motion to extend with a second and voted upon, I'm going to go ahead and call

for a vote on this particular motion. Hearing no other motions to extend, I'm going to ask for a vote on this resolution on academic misconduct and dropping courses as revised (Appendix 7). All those in favor of the motion, please indicate by saying aye. All those opposed, please say no. Can the aye's stand please? Will the aye's please sit and the no's please stand? Thank you very much. The aye's have it.

The motion carries.

"Given the time, we stand adjourned. - 6:00 PM"

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia R. Farina  
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

Appendix 1**Resolution to Establish a University Club**

Whereas, the Provost, with the approval of the Senate, charged the University Club Task Force to " ... develop a plan for a more vital and appealing university club on the campus", and

Whereas, the Task Force found thriving clubs on 16 of the 19 peer campuses Cornell uses for faculty salary comparisons, and

Whereas, the Task Force has visited and examined the characteristics of a successful clubs at a number of Universities, and based on its findings, has presented to the administration a plan to establish a self-supporting club at Cornell,

Therefore be it resolved that the Senate strongly supports the recommendation of the University Club Task Force that Cornell establish a University Club with the following mission and with the following characteristics and capabilities.

**Mission of the Cornell University Club**

In 1921, president Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University created the Columbia Faculty House to provide a place and a setting that would bring together "scholars having diverse intellectual interests ... in a social unity that will both increase their satisfactions and add to their influence in the community as individuals or as a group .... The Faculty House ... is as much a part of the equipment of the University as is a library or laboratory". Because Cornell in 2003 is far more complex, broad and diverse than Columbia was when those words were written, the goal of a university club, to forge a social unity and increase the satisfaction, effectiveness and cohesiveness of its faculty and staff, is even more vital to Cornell's well-being today than it was to Columbia's in 1921.

A Cornell University Club that fulfills its purpose will be far more than a good restaurant. Its aim will be to become a symbol of what Cornell is, a place whose appearance, style, ambiance and programs will foster and reinforce a sense of fellowship between the men and women whose joint and separate labors make Cornell great.

The Cornell University Club will be a key element of the University. Faculty and staff will find it a convenient and attractive hub for meeting, talking and dining with friends and colleagues from across the campus. Its dining facilities will present opportunities for scholarly discourse, administrative matters and social interactions. It will make a major contribution to building a sense of community and fostering pride in and allegiance to Cornell. It will serve as the University's premier venue to welcome and entertain visiting scholars, corporate leaders, recruiters, alumni and donors. It will contribute to the intellectual climate and work of Cornell by hosting lectures of general interest to faculty and staff, receptions, and departmental retreats.

Faculty and staff will find it a welcoming place in which to conduct business or to honor special occasions and accomplishments. New faculty and staff, initially in a social void, will acclimate to the Cornell community through its congeniality. The Cornell University Club will further provide faculty and staff a convenient opportunity to bring their spouses and children into the university environment, and in so doing, demonstrate Cornell's commitment to family.

In summary, the Cornell University Club will be a cornerstone of the Cornell community.

#### Characteristics and Capabilities of the Cornell University Club

The club will be a membership organization open to all faculty and staff, housed in a rent-free architecturally significant facility, located no more than a five minute walk from Bailey Circle (the geographical center of the Cornell faculty). The club will be a self-governing unit within Cornell, with responsibility for its financial affairs. It will not receive financial support from Cornell beyond in-kind contributions for major structural repairs and utilities. It will have the capability to provide distinctive, high quality food and beverage service, maintain a comfortable and up-scale ambience, and attract a substantial special function revenue from its members. In its appearance and programs, it will visibly demonstrate alignment with Cornell's quality, traditions and character. It will occupy roughly 12,000 net square feet, and will have a maximum seating capacity of 250 diners.

University Club Task Force  
3/31/03

Appendix 2

**RESOLUTION ON WEB POSTING OF MEDIAN GRADES**

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate resolved that median grades should be posted on student transcripts and on the web, and

WHEREAS, the median grades are now posted on the web, but not on the student transcripts because of delays due to adoption of a new Student Information System which depends on new Oracle software, and

WHEREAS, students shop for easier courses based on posted median grades,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate instructs the Registrar to remove median grades from the web until such time as median grades can be posted on student transcripts, and to report to the Dean of Faculty:

- 1) the date by which removal can be accomplished;
- 2) the fact of removal, when it has been accomplished; and
- 3) the date by which posting on transcripts can be accomplished.

Educational Policy Committee  
4/3//06

*(not passed)*

Appendix 3

RESOLUTION ON RULE ON FINAL EXAMS

WHEREAS, the current rule for final exams does not allow for exceptions, "...each course should require a final examination or some equivalent exercise ... to be conducted or due during the period set aside for final examinations." (2002 Faculty Handbook, \ p. 81), and

WHEREAS, some courses are not following this rule in practice because of the nature of their cumulative final projects,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that an addition be made to the end of this rule that states, 'unless there is a written approval from the Dean of the Faculty,' and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dean of the Faculty be encouraged to publicize this rule and that an annual summary of the exemption requests be shared with EPC.

Educational Policy Committee  
4/3/06

*(not passed)*

Appendix 4

**RESOLUTION ON FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE**

WHEREAS, the new final exam schedule (effective Fall 2005) has exams on two Friday nights (first one for scheduled exams and the second one for make-ups), and thus creates a problem for large numbers of students who have religious observances on Friday nights,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate instructs the University Registrar, that starting Fall 2006, exams that are scheduled on the first Friday evening be moved to the Wednesday evening of study week at 7:00 PM.

Educational Policy Committee  
April 3, 2006

Faculty Senate Approval  
April 12, 2006

Appendix 5

**RESOLUTION ON EVENING PRELIM TIMES**

WHEREAS, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education (FACAPE) has suggested that evening prelims be changed to start no earlier than 8:00 p.m. in order to allow student athletes to have time if they are let out of practice at 7:00 to shower, change and get to the prelim promptly,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that effective Fall 2006, evening prelims should begin no earlier than 8:00 p.m.

Educational Policy Committee  
April 3, 2006

*(not passed)*



Appendix 6

**RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND DROPPING COURSES**

WHEREAS, a student found guilty of academic misconduct can currently drop the course in which the misconduct occurred and suffer no consequences,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following be added to the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity, Section II, B. 4 c., "A student who is found guilty of academic misconduct in an official University hearing may not drop the course in which the transgression took place."

Educational Policy Committee  
April 3, 2006

*(This original resolution was not approved – a modified resolution was approved.)*

Appendix 7

RESOLUTION ON  
ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND DROPPING COURSES

WHEREAS, a student found guilty of academic misconduct can currently drop the course in which the misconduct occurred and suffer no consequences,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following be added to the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity, Section II, B. 4 c., "A student who is found guilty of academic integrity or of academic misconduct in an official University hearing may not drop the course in which the transgression took place."

Educational Policy Committee  
April 3, 2006

Faculty Senate Approval  
April 12, 2006

*Special Note: Motion revised to correct wording, 9/13/06 Senate Meeting*

