

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, May 12, 2004

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History and Speaker: "The chair declares that a quorum is present as it walks in the door. I would remind everyone here that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, except for the official tape recording of the minutes. I ask you all to turn off your cell phones, which I just did. I will ask those of you who wish to talk to identify yourselves and your department affiliation when you speak. There are no Good and Welfare speakers at this time, so unless some emerge in the course of the meeting, we might actually get out early from the last meeting of the year. I will now call on the Provost for remarks and to answer questions."

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST BIDDY MARTIN.

Provost Biddy Martin: "Good afternoon. My remarks have first to deal with the salary update. I will have a couple of other things to say at the end of this presentation, but I want to give you a faculty salary update. Why? Because, the news is good. If it were bad, I would still give you one, but I wouldn't be as happy about it.

"Please remember our goal. This was an initiative that Hunter Rawlings and I undertook three years ago. The Financial Policies Committee worked with us to define our goal, and faculty in a number of colleges encouraged us to set the goals and we did. The goal was to reach the average of the peer groups for endowed and contract colleges—on the endowed side by the end of a five-year period and on the contract side at the end of six years. The first year of the new salary program was 2001-02. The 2003-04 faculty salary increases are shown here (Appendix 1). On the endowed side there is a 5.4% increase and on the contract college side, 4.8%. You are then given the five-year average. If you have questions as I go along, you should feel free to interrupt. This graph (Appendix 2) shows the growth in the average salaries at Cornell within the contract and endowed. The trend is very, very positive.

"Here (Appendix 3) is a comparison of endowed and contract averages at this point—\$107,794 is the average of all endowed faculty on tenure track who are eligible according to this survey, which means actually not everyone, but let's not go into that, and \$89,519 on the contract side. In order to understand better whether there was really such a gap between the actual pay of faculty on the endowed side and faculty on the contract side, Carolyn Ainslie and her group decided to look at the payroll data. There is a very specific set of constraints on what we submit for this faculty survey. If you look at the calendar year gross pay as opposed to the average nine-month salary according to the rules set for the survey, you see that there is a different set of numbers for the endowed and contract side. You also see that as a percent of total pay, on the

endowed side the nine-month salary is much higher than it is on the contract side. Why is that? Because 70% of contract college faculty actually have 11 month appointments. So what you see up here, the \$105,000 is actually the calendar year, actual pay, but the nine-month average is \$89,519. What else could be said to account for the difference between the endowed faculty average and the contract college faculty salary averages? You probably know yourselves. There is a different mix of faculty. Bear in mind that on the endowed side, we include the professional schools. Salaries in the professional schools are significantly higher than they are in the other endowed colleges as well as in the contract colleges. If you take out the professional schools, the endowed faculty average is \$101,000, not the \$107,000 you see here. So there is a different mix of disciplines. We have the professional schools on the endowed side. There are other minor bits of noise that account for the difference. Right now, our office and Carolyn Ainslie's office, Budget and Planning, are working with the Financial Policies Committee of the Senate to do studies discipline by discipline to see whether there is this kind of distinction between endowed and contract college faculty pay, if we look at it across disciplines as opposed to these large averages. Are there any questions on that information?"

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical & Applied Mechanics: "Is this for Ithaca?"

Provost Martin: "Ithaca only."

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Sciences: "Is there a difference on the contract side in the salaries between the professional college and the other schools?"

Provost Martin: "Yes, but what that difference is I couldn't tell you. We made an agreement not to do this college by college."

Professor Kallfelz: "Yes, I understand that. You made the point about professional schools on the endowed side."

Provost Martin: "As they say in the courtroom, I opened myself up. You are right, but if you will permit me to simply say yes without further information, I would appreciate it.

"So the endowed faculty salaries – you remember it was the Senate, the Financial Policies Committee in particular, that defined this group of peers on the endowed side. The point I want to make here actually is that when we started in 2000 - 2001, the gap between the peer average and our average for full professors was Hold it; that was a terrible transition to my major point. We are doing very well on our average as you can see (Appendix 4, Appendix 5). We imagined taking five years on the endowed side and six years on the contract side to get to the peer average. We are already at 99% on

both sides, but we are doing less well on full professors than on the other two ranks. That's what I wanted to emphasize, but I got there too quickly. Now, be there with me.

"In 2000 - 2001 the difference between our full professor average and the average of the peers was 13.2%, last year it was 7.4%, and this year it is 4.7% *below* the peer average for full professors. So we are making progress there, too, but we are not doing quite as well (and I think that is predictable) as we are on beginning faculty salaries or at the associate level, where we are actually *above* the peer average already. Any questions about that?"

"On the contract side, it is also the case that we are not doing quite as well at the full professor level. There we lag the peers by 3.4% now. In 2001 on the contract side full professor salaries lagged the peers by 11.9%, so again we are making progress. However, on the full professor end we are still not quite at the peer average."

UNKNOWN: "Is that based on nine months for the contract schools?"

Provost Martin: "Yes, that has been adjusted for the nine month period. Are there any other questions on that? This graph (Appendix 6) shows the wonderful progress we have made over the past three years. It is adjusted for inflation. Is it not, Carolyn? It wouldn't matter on this one but would on the next one. You have gotten the major points. I'll simply end by saying that we have now agreed for this next year on a range of increases in the various colleges between 3% and 6%. I have met with all the deans and have agreed with them based on the information they have given me about market in your particular disciplines in specific colleges, whether they should be on the lower or the higher end of the 3% to 6% (Appendix 7). So some colleges will be at the low end - that is, will see overall a pool of about 3% - and there is one college that will be as high as 6%."

Professor Richard Durst, Food Science and Technology, Geneva: "These numbers could be quite significantly biased by the numbers of junior faculty in the colleges. I was wondering if there is any way of normalizing these and also for comparing to peer universities in terms of the ratio of junior to full professors, for example."

Provost Martin: "The rank distribution is adjusted when we look at the peers. It is adjusted to match ours. We take our rank distribution and then we adjust the averages of our peers based on our rank distribution. Isn't that right, Carolyn? They are all adjusted to our rank distribution? So there is no gap there."

Carolyn Ainslie, Vice President, Planning and Budget: [Nodding yes.] "The endowed college peer salaries are adjusted by the endowed rank distribution. The contract college peer salaries are adjusted by contract rank distribution. That's the dilemma of

having two separate peer groups there. Ron actually does the survey work for AAU on this, so he could probably tell you in a lot more detail.”

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics: “All of the comparisons that you see use the Cornell rank distributions to compute the average salary at the other institutions. So the average salary for the other institutions will not be what you see published. We asked the question— if their rank distribution was the same as ours, what would the average salary look like?”

Professor Douglas Fitchen, Physics: “First, I commend you on the progress made so far, but note that there is still a way to go. I wondered if copies of these tables are available?”

Provost Martin: “They are available to the Financial Policies Committee of your group, the Senate. We haven’t put them on the web, and we haven’t made copies for all the senators, but there is no reason that we couldn’t. I’ve just shown them to you, so if you wanted copies, you could have them.”

Carolyn Ainslie: “The survey results are on the Institutional Research Fact Book pages already. We also put them in this format, which shows it relative to these particular peer groups. Last year, I think we sent it to the Dean and he posted it on the Faculty Senate web site.”

Provost Martin: “If any individual wanted a hard copy for some reason immediately, you could ask me and I would give you my copy. Thank you for the commendation. You should be thankful to Hunter as well for having agreed to set this goal and having worked with us, with my office and Carolyn, to do what it would take to make the money available to do this, which has been considerable and which has also meant not being able to do other things.”

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: “I’m sure this is an unpopular question to ask, but these numbers can be corrected for some sensible measure of the local cost of living, right? What is that index called? Runzheimer Cost of Living Index? If we were to do that, what happens?”

Provost Martin: “Cornell looks a lot better than many of these peers, but we made an agreement with the Senate, which I supported, not to do that.”

Professor Anton: “I understand.”

Provost Martin: “There were many reasons why people didn’t want to have us use Runzheimer’s Cost of Living Index and adjust the salaries on that basis. Again, at the

time, I happened to feel strongly that it was right not to use the cost of living index. Now, I feel totally differently.”

LAUGHTER.

Provost Martin: “No, I still feel the same way. Are there any other questions? We will still work on the full professor salaries, and we will work to get beyond 99% to 100% and over. We won’t see the kinds of pools for the next several years that we have seen. Let me remind you, we always intended to front load the initiative, meaning that we had the biggest pools in the first two years. That was always the plan, so you would see a reduction in the total pools in any case, but perhaps a slightly larger reduction in the amount of pools over the next couple of years. Based on what we have seen the peers doing and anticipating what they will do over the next few years, we are still going to try and make more progress, especially on the full professor level. So that’s the news.

“I think I still have about two more minutes? I just didn’t want to talk only about salaries. Since it is the end of the year, I thought it would be important to announce a few things. I will rattle through them quickly. We are making enormous progress on the new Institute for the Social Sciences. It will be located in Noyes Lodge on Beebe Lake within the next two years. The language lab that is currently there will be moved and will make room for the Institute, which will operate to some extent on the model of the Society for the Humanities, which has brought such prestige and intellectual vitality to the humanities here. I think we should all feel extremely good and hopeful about the kind of intellectual environment in the social sciences that will be promoted as a result of that.

“We also have a lot of momentum still in the Life Sciences Initiative—a number of extremely good hires at the senior level but more of them at the junior level. The fund raising for the Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biology, which will be a cornerstone of that initiative when the new Life Sciences Building is up, is going well. The faculty are working hard to recruit senior scientists to lead some of the work in that institute in an area where traditionally we have not been strong enough in cell biology. Those efforts are also going well.

“As you know we have four new deans hired this year—Peter Lepage in Arts and Sciences, Mohsen Mostafavi in Architecture, Art and Planning, Stewart Schwab in the Law School, and now Lisa Staiano-Coico in Human Ecology, who just accepted the offer of the deanship in Human Ecology. She is currently Vice Provost for Medical Affairs linking Weill Cornell in New York with Cornell Ithaca, and I think she will do a stupendous job. Mohsen Mostafavi comes to us from the Architecture Association in London. You may have read about him in *The Cornell Daily Sun*; the story was completely wrong. It really was. It was completely offensive in the way they did the reporting, actually to my surprise, because the *Sun* has been doing such a great job, but

this one was really off in the way that they went about getting their information. They basically copied an incorrect story in a newsletter. Anyway, he is coming despite all of the misleading and offensive press in this country about his departure from the AA, and he is an extraordinary intellectual and human being – one of the kindest people I have ever met. He was here for three days and very, very positively affected by the intellectual life of the campus. He is very hopeful about taking the College of Architecture, Art and Planning in a new direction.

“The book project, as you know, is Kafka’s *The Trial*, and it wasn’t chosen just because I’m in German Studies. In fact that had nothing to do with it, I promise you. We didn’t have as many faculty sign up for this as usual, at least on the first couple of tries, and I’m told that I should now send you a letter under my own signature. I could do that, but what I want to say is we have fewer scientists and engineers than usual, and I fear that you think you shouldn’t lead a discussion on the trial unless you know something about Kafka or early 20th century Prague or the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but I promise you that this book has so much relevance – do I need to spell it out? – in today’s political climate that you don’t need to be studied in German or European literature at all to use Kafka’s *The Trial* in a way that I think will be extremely interesting. So I hope that more of you who haven’t signed up will do so. I suppose I’ll end with that, although there is other good news. Intellectually I think we are thriving all over the place, and I would rather talk about that than just salaries.”

Speaker Norton: “Thank you. I will now call on Dean Charles Walcott for brief remarks.”

2. REMARKS BY DEAN CHARLES WALCOTT

Charles Walcott, Dean of the Faculty: “And I will be brief. We discussed suspension last time, as you may remember. This I have now presented to the deans who had various suggestions and possible amendments and modifications that they wanted to undertake, so discussions are ongoing, and it will be back to you in the fall for further consideration. The Corporate Strategic Alliance is underway in terms of a document. It is under its final revisions, and we plan to send it to all the members of the Senate and to department chairs to be talked about a bit in the departments, and that will go out sometime during the summer for discussion in the early fall. Finally, I can report that there is going to be an outside committee coming in to review the possibility of a university club (Peter Stein’s initiative with some of his colleagues). They are coming in August and are going to examine the situation here and will make a report as to its feasibility and offer suggestions. Finally, I have the sad duty to announce Bob Lucey’s death. Bob was Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty for six years, and I would like if I might to have a moment of silence in his honor. Thank you.”

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE APRIL 14, 2004 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Norton: "The chair now asks the body for unanimous consent for approval of the minutes of April 14, which you have seen on the web site. Are there any objections? Seeing none, the minutes are declared approved. I now call on Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty and chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, for a report."

4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty and chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee: "Good afternoon. First, I am pleased to report the results of the election. These are our new trustee, senators-at-large, tenured and non-tenured, members of the Nominations and Elections Committee and University Faculty Committee. So I know you will join me in welcoming all of those.

Report of University Faculty Election

Faculty Trustee

Kathleen Rasmussen, CHE

Faculty Senate-at-Large, Tenured

Rosemary Avery, CHE

Peter Davies, CALS

Faculty Senate-at-Large, Non-Tenured

Susan Piliero, CALS

Nominations & Elections Committee

Cornelia Farnum, Vet.

Christine Olson, CHE

David Shalloway, CALS

University Faculty Committee

Elizabeth Earle, CALS

Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR

Alice Pell, CALS

This is the next batch of committee members for next year's committees for which the Nominations and Elections Committee seeks your approval."

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

May 12, 2004

Academic Programs and Policies Committee

Peter Davies, CALS
Shefford Baker, Engr.

University Benefits Committee

Sharon Tennyson, CHE

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics & Physical Education

Beth Ahner, CALS
Jeffrey Haugaard, CHE
Francis Kallfelz, Vet.
James Maas, A&S

Local Advisory Council

Joel Brock, Engr.
Thomas Gilovich, A&S
Terry Herter, A&S
Michael Kotlikoff, Vet.
Jeevak Parpia, A&S

University Committee on Human Subjects

Parfait Eloundou-Enyegue, CALS
Joseph Walther, CALS

University Conflicts Committee

Fred Gouldin, Engr.
James Houck, A&S
Kay Obendorf, CHE
Fred Schneider, CS

University-ROTC Relationships Committee

Duane Chapman, CALS
John Weiss, A&S

UNIVERSITY ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

University Hearing Board: Clare Fewtrell, Vet.
George Hay, Law
Anthony Ingraffea, Engr.

University Review Board: Mandayam Parthasarathy, Alt., CALS

Speaker Norton: "Are there any objections to the list, which was sent to all of you in the committee report? I assume then unanimous consent to accept the report. I now call on Professor Ron Ehrenberg, chair of the Financial Policies Committee for a report regarding admissions and financial aid, and you did get a document about this."

5. REPORT FROM THE FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE REGARDING ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics, chair of the Financial Policies Committee: "I would like to start off by thanking Vice President Ainslie and Provost Martin for their interactions with us over the past year. Carolyn has told me that she enjoys coming to our meetings, and committee members have told me that they really enjoyed interacting with her, so I think that they are doing something right. (FPC Report - Appendix 8)

"This semester, among other things, we have looked at financial issues relating to admissions and financial aid. This was motivated by a set of events. The first was a study by some researchers using data from the Consortium on Finance in Higher Education, which basically is a set of about thirty-five selected private colleges and universities, including the Ivy League institutions. The study discovered that on average only about 10% of the students at these institutions were coming from the bottom two-fifths of the family distribution of income. The vast majority of students were coming from the upper fifth of the income distribution and over half of the students were coming from the upper 5% of the family income distribution. Possibly because of this study, this motivated an announcement by Larry Summers, President of Harvard University, stating that no longer would Harvard expect any financial contribution from families with incomes less than \$40,000 towards their children's education. Following the decision by Princeton a few years ago to eliminate all loans from financial aid policies, we began to worry about the question of where is Cornell going to stand in the future in terms of our ability to attract students from all over the family income distribution.

"It turns out that Cornell, perhaps because of our founder, has always sought to attract any student; we have not focused our recruiting on students from particular social-economic backgrounds. For a long period of time we also have had policies in place (before the Princeton and Harvard announcements), which basically said that families with incomes of less than \$35,000 would not have any loans in their financial aid packages. We thought that we were probably doing OK, and it turns out that there is data on the distribution of family incomes that is public in terms of what fraction of undergraduate students at an institution receive Pell Grants. Pell Grants are the basic need-based financial aid program from the federal government, and you can sort of think roughly of the fact that virtually all students who receive Pell Grants come from

families whose incomes are less than \$40,000-\$45,000 a year, which coincidentally is the cut-off point for the end of the second quintile in the family income distribution.

“So here is the data that we have for the last year that is available, 2001-2002, and we are happy to report to you that among all of the selected private universities and all of the Ivy League schools, Cornell currently does the best in terms of recruiting students from the lower two-fifths of the family income distribution. Now some members of our committee said, ‘Well, clearly, this is because of the contract colleges and how about if you look at the private part of the university?’ So we sent Vice President Ainslie scurrying back to look at data for the private part of the university. It turns out that the percentage is roughly the same in the two parts of the university. On balance about 16% of the students in each part of the university receive Pell Grants. Across colleges there is some variation, but the variation is primarily in the endowed colleges where we range from a high of about 20% to 21% in Architecture, Art and Planning and a low of about 10.5% in Hotel. So this is the data.

“It is not up to our committee to say what the appropriate policy should be in terms of recruiting students from different points in the family income distribution. This is something that the admission and financial aid committee could look at. However, we did want to report this data to you, and our recommendation is that the university keep track of this type of information and report back to the Faculty Senate and also to the trustees on how they are doing. We know from our discussions with Vice President Ainslie that a lot of the trustees were very concerned when Harvard announced its new policy, and we think that information such as this should leave them feeling a little bit better.”

Speaker Norton: “Any questions?”

Professor Lynne Abel, Classics: “In a previous life I had something to do with admissions in the College of Arts and Sciences. I am heartened by what you found out, but I am not at all surprised, because Cornell has consistently made it a high priority to try to recruit from various socio-economic classes. What Cornell has not had as a high priority, and what disturbs me very much that it is not even mentioned, is recruiting the smartest students we can. Our goal I think as a university is to have as high-powered as well as a socio-economically well-distributed class. Our financial aid policies, and the way we differentiate among candidates for the best packages (we are still all need-based and no one gets more than they need), but given the fact that we cannot compete with Harvard and Princeton in terms of how much self-help is required The average really good student pays something like, at least last year, \$9,600 in self-help, and the average at Princeton was I think something like \$4,000 or \$5,000. I’m not sure about that, but it’s way, way lower than ours. We have by far the highest self-help expectations in the Ivy League. I think that at some point either your committee or the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, if that committee is active, needs to look

at bringing our financial aid policies in how we award packages into alignment with our academic goals, which is to recruit as high-powered students as we can.”

Professor Ehrenberg: “The committee has already discussed with Vice President Ainslie the desirability of collecting the academic indicators about our students as well as – we’re not concerned just about family income distribution – and that way we would be able to track if our financial aid packages are allowing us to attract the students that we would like to attract. It is, unfortunately, not the purview of the Financial Policies Committee to say what financial aid and admissions policy should be. We look at the budgetary implications of that.”

Speaker Norton: “One more question.”

Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis and Management and FPC member: “Could you put that last slide up again? Let me just respond to that, because although the members of the committee agreed it wasn’t our purview, we nonetheless talked about it in our sessions. So let me mention what we were thinking about. One of the schools which has made tremendous strides in getting the best and brightest in their university over the last few years is Washington-St. Louis. I think it is useful to take a look at their Pell Grants there to recognize that there may be a trade-off between these two important goals. I think what we believe is that one can target monies for the best and brightest without getting down to the 8%, but what it takes is a sophistication on the part of the people who are making these decisions to try to do both. I think these are both important goals and that we should be worrying about both of them.”

Provost Martin: “Well, the other thing is that they are not the only two. I mean our financial aid policy is very complicated, and we are actually looking at it in depth right now ourselves. Those aren’t the only two variables, so it is infinitely more complicated than income distribution and however one assesses or believes one is assessing the best and the brightest, which itself could take the rest of this meeting for us to discuss.”

Speaker Norton: “One more comment.”

Professor Abel: “I think that Washington University, too, is not bound by the need-based policy. I think all of us would be absolutely committed to stay in the Ivy League where we give aid based only on need, but many of those who are now recently doing very well, NYU, Northwestern, Washington-St. Louis, will give merit scholarships. We lose a lot of students, and there is nothing we can do about that. That’s the breaks. I think we need to stand by our principles on that regard, but how we package within our basic structure needs to reflect our actual intellectual and academic goals.”

Speaker Norton: "Thank you very much. The chair calls on Professor Robert Bland for a report on the Task Force Examining Final Exam Scheduling, a matter of deep interest at the moment."

6. REPORT FROM TASK FORCE EXAMINING FINAL EXAM SCHEDULING

Professor Robert Bland, Operations Research & Industrial Engineering: "Four years ago the Student Assembly passed a resolution taking note of the extreme amount of stress the students experience during final exam week and asking the Educational Policy Committee of this body to attempt to address that. I spoke just for a few minutes in Good and Welfare at the first Senate meeting of the year, and made you aware that David Shmoys, who is a professor in Operations Research, and Dmitriy Levchenkov, who is a Ph.D. student in Operations Research, and I had begun a study of the scheduling of final examinations. This is the sub-effort of a larger task force that Bob Cooke established that is working more broadly on class scheduling, pre-lim scheduling and final exam scheduling. We are concerned, the three of us, only with final examination scheduling and only in-class final examinations, except for Dmitriy who today is concerned with take home final examinations, which is why he is not here. We have been working with Cindy Sedlacek in the Arts and Sciences Dean's office, who is one of the few maybe unique persons on campus who knows how to get her hands on this data, which is not an easy thing to do. We have also been conversing with the Student Assembly and with the Educational Policy Committee on our work.

"To illustrate where stress gets exacerbated by the nature of the scheduling, in the spring of the last academic year there were more than 250 instances of students having three examinations scheduled in the same day. This is an eight and a half hour block of time with seven and a half hours worth of examinations. Those two thirty minute interruptions are basically sprints from one exam room to another. There are more than 3,000 students, in addition to the 250, who had not three exams on the same day but two exams one after the other on the same day with only a thirty-minute break. I can assure you that students feel that this increases stress enormously. When we spoke to the student assembly, one member of the student assembly said that even thinking about the possibility of having two exams one after the other was making her very unhappy.

"The overall scheme that is presently in place is one where there are twenty-one examination slots. There are seven days, not counting Saturday, the day on which language exams are given in common. There are seven days in which exams are given, and there are three time slots on each of those days for a total of twenty-one slots. The present scheme groups all of the courses giving final exams into twenty-one groups. Essentially, they are grouped so that courses that meet at the same time have their exams at the same time. Thereby, students who actually attend their classes are not likely to have two exams scheduled at the same moment. Some students do not attend their classes and do have two exams scheduled at the same time. We don't intend, at

least initially because we want to make things as simple as possible, to change the way that courses are grouped together. What we do intend to change, if everything works out as we think it will, is the way in which the twenty-one groups of courses are assigned to the twenty-one time slots. It appears that could be done in a way that will drastically reduce the pain for students, and I will give you a specific example in a moment.

“This table (Appendix 9) in the first column shows what actually happened. The entries on row A correspond to a single student having three examinations on the same day. Row B corresponds to exactly two exams on the same day, so these 4,598 occurrences are students who did not have all three exam periods on the same day but had two of them, maybe first and second, maybe first and third, maybe second and third. The third line shows how many of those 4,598 had either first and second or second and third – had exams back-to-back without any interruption other than the thirty-minute interval between successive exam slots. The two columns to the right do not necessarily represent solutions we would endorse but if we look back retrospectively, if we look at the data that tells us for each pair of courses how many students are in both of them, or for each triple of courses, how many students are in all three of them, then retrospectively one could have done these schedules in either of the ways that result in the numbers in the second column where you almost eliminate three in a day and you drastically reduce the number of two in a day, particularly the number of back-to-back exams.

“There are a number of alternatives that we can find that might be better choices than either of these two. I put these two together specifically because when we talked to the Student Assembly, I wanted to illustrate a trade-off. In trying to make one of these numbers smaller, you may do it at the expense of making another number that represents a different bad event larger. The trade-off in these last two columns corresponds to the fact that the third row, back-to-back exams, these are students who are scheduled for two exams in a day consecutively, that for most students is much more painful than having one in the first period and one in the third period with a three hour break in between. So the trade-off here is if you are thinking in terms of choosing between these two alternatives, in order to decide which one you like better, you need to tell us what the relative importance is of these two bad events, back-to-back versus first and third period. You can reduce by about 500 occurrences the number of back-to-back exams at the expense of increasing by 1,000 the number of students who have exams in first period and third but not in the second period. We put that particular choice to the Student Assembly specifically to learn if they thought it was twice as bad to have exams back-to-back as it is to have exams in the first and third period with a three-hour break in between. About three quarters of the students said that yes, it is twice as bad or worse.

“We went to the Student Assembly with two particular issues that we wanted feedback on, and I have a different issue on which I would like to get feedback from the faculty, not necessarily from this group today but over time. We welcome feedback on any aspect of this that people would like to bring to our attention. The issue of how to weigh relatively bad events is one that I think impacts students much more than faculty. I think they are the appropriate group to give us direct feedback on that, but we welcome hearing from faculty as well. The other issue that came up of course is that in order to accomplish this, we need to have at the very least estimates, if not the actual data, at the times the exams will be taken at the end of the semester: how many students are there who will be taking both CS100 and English 211 at the same time, for example. At present the exam schedule is published - the exam for my course was set for a particular time next Thursday in October - before pre-enrollment even took place. The feedback I am getting from students, including the Student Assembly unanimously, was that the students would be very happy to wait at least until after pre-enrollment to find out exactly the specifics of when each course is scheduled during those twenty-one exam periods of exam week. What we would like to know from faculty is if you think it is reasonable to expect instructors or at least departments, it may not be an irrevocable commitment, to make essentially a commitment as to whether or not a given course is going to have an exam in class during exam week shortly after pre-enrollment ends, not at the beginning of the semester when it is normally announced on course web pages and in lectures.

“The Educational Policies Committee thought that faculty who teach very large courses would be concerned about making sure that their courses have a reasonable chance of having the exam scheduled early in order to have more opportunity for make-ups. If people have feelings about that, we would like to know that. We would be very happy to receive other concerns of any sort regarding these issues. I have set up an e-mail address specifically for this issue (exam_scheduling@orie.cornell.edu). So I would be grateful if you sent e-mail to that address if you would like to give us feedback on these particular issues or any issues related to the exam schedule. Thank you.”

Speaker Norton: “Thank you very much. We probably have time for one or two comments only, but we are falling a little bit behind and I don’t want to go on too long.”

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: “I seem to recall when we set up the schedule, particularly announcing it at the beginning of the semester, one of the incentives for doing it was the thought that were the students to have the discretion, they would select courses where they didn’t have back-to-back exams, and so I don’t know to what extent that is operative, but if it is, it could increase the burden on your problem subsequently. Of course, the second reason cited was so students could book low cost plane fares out of Ithaca well in advance. Of course, we know that has evaporated.”

LAUGHTER.

Professor Bland: "If we wait until a few weeks after pre-enrollment, they still have plenty of time, many months, to book the plane tickets. The Student Assembly members told us that not one of them had ever looked at the final exam schedule before the beginning of the semester. They were very, very comfortable with the idea of waiting and some of them suggested we wait until the term actually begins so we would have even better data. Next week, Cindy is going to get us historical data on pre-enrollment that will enable us to ascertain how well pre-enrollment estimates do against what the final enrollments look like at the time of exams. If those match up well, I think we would be happy to fix the schedule a few weeks after pre-enrollment, giving students plenty of time to book their airfares and if they want to prearrange their schedule because of the examination times, they will be able to. The Student Assembly people tell us that that is not going to happen."

Professor Dennis Miller, Food Science: "I teach a large non-majors course, and the exam is always toward the very end of the exam period. I always have students who come to me with the excuse that they have to leave early. So we schedule a make-up exam. The problem is that the make-up exam times are all toward the end of the exam period. If we could move at least one of those make-up exam times earlier, then it would make it easier for us to have an exam that would be acceptable to students who have to leave early."

Professor Bland: "There are presently three make-up exam times, and I think they are Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday."

Professor Miller: "They are scheduled May 18th, 20th and 21st, and exams start on the 13th. So if we had one, say, on the 13th, that would be very helpful."

Professor Bland: "Of the three make-up exam times, the first two are scheduled in the evenings when are no regularly scheduled finals. So making a slot early would have no impact at all on what we are trying to do. It should be very easy to do."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I just wondered whether you tried to look and see if the conflict situation or the problem you are trying to solve is very sensitive to whether you use the actual enrollment or the enrollment from a previous year. Patterns are so similar that it may well be that you don't really need accurate data to get essentially the same result."

Professor Bland: "You need it to get essentially the same results. How much you give up—we don't have a determination on that. Cindy has already got pre-enrollment data for three semesters and by the beginning of next week, she should probably be able get that to us. Once we get the pre-enrollment data, I think we will be able to make a good

judgment on whether the pre-enrollment data is accurate enough to give us good results. I think to start without pre-enrollment is kind of tough, because you have a lot of classes that may change meeting times. You have classes that are only offered, if they are elective classes, every second or third year, and that confounds things quite a bit.” Professor Stein: “Yes, but big classes go on the same from year to year, and that’s where most of the problems are.”

Speaker Norton: “We have to move on. Thank you very much. We really do have to move on; we are already ten minutes behind schedule. The chair calls on Professor Donald Holcomb who is the co-chair of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, to present a recommendation and resolution for the establishment of new research titles. You should all have this.”

7. RECOMMENDATION AND RESOLUTION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW RESEARCH TITLES FROM TASK FORCE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Professor Donald Holcomb, Physics and co-chair of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty: “I’m obviously not Norm Scott. Norm was to present this report today. He and I have been the co-chairs of this task force. He was called out of town due to a death in the family, so he could not be here. We have tended to arrange the chairing in the following way. The point is that Norm has been the active chair for the later part of it; we had the feeling that it was quite appropriate that as we moved toward the recommendation phase that the chair be an active member of the faculty, rather than somebody like me.

“Let me make a brief introduction. The motion is in your hands, along with fairly detailed background for the motion (Appendix 10). Let me go back even further a bit and tell you why this committee was set up, its charge, and what we are doing here today. The committee was established in 2002 by this body to investigate the status of non-tenure track faculty. For those of you who are close enough to read it, at letter A it says, ‘to investigate the status and conditions of employment for non-tenure track faculty, including the terms of employment, particularly job security, rights to academic freedom, access to appropriate grievance procedures, eligibility for emeritus status and voting rights.’ And then there was another section, which instructed us to report no later than the spring of 2003. There is actually a logic break between Part A and Part C in the sense that the instructions in Part A were fundamentally impossible to accomplish in the period of time set forth in C. So, anyway, here we are.

“This action before you today, as I said, is the first installment of reports from this committee which indeed has covered most of those topics, and its final report will appear very shortly. There are two or three people in this room who have been working on that, and we will have that very soon. Let me just remind you of the membership of the committee, which is quite broad, a mix of non-tenure track faculty,

Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, a variety of faculty people, and a couple of very valuable staff people, in particular Mary Opperman, Vice President, Office of Human Resources, as we looked at this difficult question of who are the non-tenure track faculty.

“That is a rather ill defined term actually, and basically what we did was look at all of the academic appointments, which if you go to the *Faculty Handbook*, you will find it includes all these people, such folks as Teaching Associates. So here they are (Appendix 11). We came to the conclusion that the thing to do was to focus on those categories which are really very large numbers of people teaching and doing research and public service at this university, namely the Lecturers, the Research Associates and Extension Associates. If you add up those numbers, you will see that we are talking about approximately 800 to 900 people. So we chose to focus on those groups, and what we believe is that the report, which is about to appear, while it focuses on those three large categories, nevertheless much of what we will have to say is really applicable to some of the other groups. The issues in the various groups are somewhat different, and we thought we could make more progress and be of more use by focusing on these larger groups.

“The motion before you today represents the first fruits of the activities of this group, and it really focuses pretty obviously on the central category, namely the Research Associate pool. At the time we got this data, which was a year or two old, there were about 160 Senior Research Associates at Cornell. Even within that group with a particular title, there is actually quite a range of kinds of responsibilities and job descriptions. While the natural population of this new category that we are proposing, this new position category of ‘Research Scientist’ and ‘Principal Research Scientist,’ from within the university would probably come primarily from the present Senior Research Associates, it is certainly true that by no means would all Senior Research Associates be natural candidates to move into these positions. Some of them are actively leading undergraduates in research; some of them have responsibilities that are much more focused on technical support of large research programs. I think the only other thing that I need to say in preparation is that the committee, in particular Nancy Wurster, a member of our committee, did a rather wide survey of where other comparable institutions are with respect to this issue of titles in the research area. By mining the World Wide Web and a few other places, she accumulated a fair amount of data. Again, as you can see, there was a rather thorough sampling of the mid-western universities, primarily a study done at the University of Wisconsin and it also included MIT, NYU, and some information from Columbia, so it is a rather wide assemblage. What we found from that is that there are actually only two institutions in that group that appear to continue the title of Senior Research Associate. It is not used very much. MIT is one of them; the other I think is Penn State. The question was did they have some titles like Research Scientist? Often Senior Research Scientist has been used. The present proposal has the terminology ‘Principal Research Scientist.’ Many of them have

some level of Research Professor. The issue of examining the Research Professor category at Cornell was actually discussed in the joint meeting between our committee and the Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures. There was a preliminary discussion; the issues are quite different there, and it seems that it is a separate issue from this particular one. You have before you the rationale of the motion, and I think I will just stop there. I would be happy to answer questions prior to the discussion if there are any about the activities of the committee."

Speaker Norton: "Are there questions for Professor Holcomb?"

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Science: "I couldn't tell from the resolution what the difference was between a Senior Research Associate and a Principal Scientist."

Professor Holcomb: "Maybe by example. As I said, there are many different kinds of caps under the umbrella of Senior Research Associate. There are people who are in fundamentally highly technical and nevertheless support functions. With the Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist there is more of an implication of initiative or judgment call – within the Senior Research Associate category there are rather different kinds of tasks. We assume that many Senior Research Associates, if these positions were established and seemed to be more attractive, would make an application to move into them but by no means all. They are really non-overlapping."

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "I just want to clarify whether the new titles of Research Scientist would be allowed to be the PI on the proposal without special petition to OSP and also whether Research Scientists would have the same mechanism to be allowed to be a member of a graduate committee, to be on the special committee?"

Professor Holcomb: "Well, I think that is a little down the road, that last question. This is going to be off the top of my head, but I think that given the rationale and expectations for these positions, I would guess that a larger fraction would end up being members of graduate special committees. On average, this group is oriented more towards people operating; they may have grants for which they are the principal investigator, and that is much less the case with Senior Research Associates. I think the answer is clear that it is very likely to be true that a higher fraction would become members of special committees."

Professor Barazangi: "This is really a critical issue to really give some more meat to these titles. I have raised this issue repeatedly. Until you give these titles some special privileges, specialists ought to be PI on proposals. Under the current system, many of our peer institutions allow Research Associates to become PI; we do not. This issue has been discussed for many, many years though the Vice President for Research before Norm Scott allowed many associates to become so by special petitioning of the OSP. As

to graduate committees, that's a more tricky and a more elaborate procedure, because there is a graduate committee that takes care of this issue. I hope you will allow that for Research Scientist. Otherwise you are just giving a title without any meat."

Professor Holcomb: "Perhaps in response here, let me make one comment. I think it might make the discussion move forward more effectively. Most of you will be aware that in fact the College of Engineering has actually quite independently proposed this move to these new titles. In fact, we are not completely independent in the sense that we adopted their terminology of Principal Research Scientist. It is really a confluence of their interests and the interests of many of the non-tenured faculty, and it just seemed to be, particularly after we had done this survey, that it was the right direction. Other members of the committee, Professor Shiffrin, might also want to respond to that."

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School: "I just wanted to make the point that the premise of this resolution is that one size does not fit all. Different colleges might have different expectations as to what particular functions people would be performing. The colleges make proposals to the committee and the academic senate that then comes to the Senate for approval, so that a proposal in Arts and Sciences might be different from a proposal in Engineering. So what is before us is whether those titles should be available to colleges, not the specifics as to what would happen with respect to those titles. That would be up to the colleges as approved by or not approved by the Faculty Senate."

Professor Joyce Morgenroth, Theatre, Film and Dance: "You have been talking essentially about the sciences, and I'm wondering if you considered some of the other areas that have quite different needs and different situations but that have strong representations of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in their departments, such as my department and language teaching. How much did you discuss the specific needs of those areas?"

Professor Holcomb: "There was a little background discussion of connections among these three very large groups, but the committee really had no specific proposal on the floor and the report will not address this question. It is for the future. We talked a little bit about this, and we guess that the issue you allude to will come up. We did not spend much time looking at it."

Professor William Trochim, Policy Analysis and Management: "Can you talk a little bit about why you chose the title 'Principal Research Scientist' as opposed to 'Senior Research Scientist,' and was there any other institution you found that has used the term 'Principal Research Scientist'?"

Professor Holcomb: "I think I would like to punt at this point to the Engineering end of things, because they introduced that term; it seemed to us to make sense, and I think it's better to ask someone from the Engineering College to comment on that."

Professor Kenneth Birman, Computer Science: "I was on the Engineering Policy Committee and was involved in that discussion among others. The brief answer is that because the Senior Research Associate position will continue to be used for some time there was a concern about confusion, and actually the committee on titles, which also discussed the title, felt that the 'Principal' title would be more appropriate. It was originated by them out of a concern that there not be confusion.

"Let me say that there is very strong support for creating these titles and using them in Engineering, so the proposal has been under discussion for more than a year now. The hope in Engineering is that these titles, particularly the more senior title of Principal Research Scientist, would be used for a person who might be the equivalent of a professor elsewhere. I have a colleague in Computer Science, for example, who gets tenured full-professor offers on a regular basis from peer institutions. He prefers to be here as a researcher, but we need to offer these people a prestigious career path, and these titles allow us to do it. That individual is a member of the Computer Science Graduate Field but is not allowed to be the principal investigator on proposals now. We would like to see this move forward and would like these people to be treated very much as research faculty, not necessarily with professorial titles but with membership in the field and with the ability to submit proposals independently and conduct a reasonably independent research grant. The Dean of Engineering is here too and could answer questions."

Professor Trochim: "Do we know of any other institutions that have used that title?"

Professor Birman: "I don't know of any."

Speaker Norton: "Other comments? I think we can open the floor for discussion on the motion."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "At present are the requirements and the opportunities for Research Associates and Senior Research Associates uniform at the university level? Will it be a change to have the specific requirements for these titles be determined by the colleges?"

Professor Holcomb: "I think the answer to the first question is easy. You can essentially guarantee that there is non-uniformity across the university."

Professor Earle: "I mean according to the *Faculty Handbook*."

Provost Martin: “Well, there is not uniformity in the way that they are used across the colleges. There is uniformity in certain constraints that govern what you can and can’t do at the university level, such as sign through OSP as principal investigator. But that I don’t think the Faculty Senate could decide anyway going forward.”

Professor Holcomb: “I am presuming that if these positions are established, that then there will be a much more refined description of obligations, methods of appointment, qualifications and so forth.”

Professor Rebecca Schneider, Natural Resources: “You mentioned that a report is about to come out. I would expect that some of the information that we are asking questions about that relates to actually resolving the issues about these titles would be in that report. Could you elaborate a little bit more on what the content of the report is and how this discussion relates to that? How soon is the report expected to come out? Are there recommendations at the end that led you to put the title issue up first?”

Professor Holcomb: “It will come out soon – within weeks. We are absolutely honing in on it. It will be out quite soon. The rationale I would say is interwoven in many aspects of the report having to do with the fact that titles and their relative qualifications and so forth need to be consistent and well expressed. I’m not sure how much detail there is in this part of the report.”

Professor Shiffrin: “I don’t think there is much in the report that is specifically relevant to this recommendation. The report deals with things like academic freedom, leave policy, what should happen to people in terms of retirement, job security – so that there are a range of issues that are discussed, but this is all that is discussed with respect to titles.”

Professor Holcomb: “I should say that the committee felt that this recommendation is quite consistent with many of the general background themes and concerns which spread through the report.”

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Senator-at-Large: “I have two comments. The first one is with regards to what was said by my colleague in Engineering. Namely, he described a Principal Research Scientist in a way that sounded like it was just going to be like a Research Professor. That seems to be a very big step if we are going to create a Research Professor. I don’t think we should call it something else and sneak it in. I think we should debate that. If we want to have Research Professors in this university, we should address the issue straightforward.

“Secondly, there was another point raised. Since it has to come from the colleges, then go up to another Senate committee for negotiations there with the colleges as to what happens, it seems to me we do have the possibility of using the same title with people

who have different privileges in different colleges, and even though I realize that Cornell has a lot of non-uniformity, nonetheless I think that the *Faculty Handbook* outlines clear delineations of the Senior Research Associate and Research Associate. I would not like to see us get into an even greater non-uniformity in using titles.”

Professor Holcomb: “Speaking personally, I would certainly very much hope that if these positions are established, that the issue of trying to describe in as accurate and informative way as possible what the qualifications are would be an essential step.”

Speaker Norton: “The chair will point out that we are beginning to approach our time of adjournment. We have one more item on the agenda following this one. We do have no Good and Welfare speakers. I had no amendments proposed in advance, so basically the Senate will be asked to vote up or down on this resolution, and the chair would like senators to address their comments as to whether they are in favor or opposed to this resolution as we have it before us.”

Professor Stein: “I would like to make just a couple of comments. One is that I am surprised at the use of the words ‘Principal Scientist’ because if I remember right, much of the argument for it was that we ought to have a title like other places have, that have the same set of responsibilities, because the problem with Senior Research Associate was that all the granting agencies did not give that same respect to title that other places use. So it just seems a little odd to me that we are not using the recognized title that is used for the same position elsewhere.

“A second observation is that I think it is true that a field can invite anyone to join the field. The question as to whether you could be on a graduate committee is field dependent. There is not a university policy on that. And third, you haven’t answered the question as to whether a person with this title would be able to apply for a grant automatically. I thought that was one of the strong arguments for making this title. Has that not been worked out yet?”

Professor Birman: “If I could speak to several points about that. Today the Senate is only being asked to create the titles, to reiterate a point that was made earlier. There is a very detailed proposal for a policy that would govern the use of the title in Engineering that would have to be approved by the Senate. I hope it will set a high threshold for future such proposals. It governs every aspect of the questions that have been raised, and the Senate would have an opportunity to debate those questions and perhaps to reject the proposal or ask for improvements in it before it would ever be approved. Today it is not necessary to speculate on, for example, criteria for appointment to this prestigious rank. You will have that in front of you. It is a detailed review of a sort of tenure like nature, and the Senate will have an opportunity to look closely at it.

“With respect to the use of the word ‘professor,’ that is a tremendously sensitive topic. I think that is obvious, and we hope the Senate won’t go there. In other respects, I’m afraid Professor Stein is just incorrect. The Graduate School determines membership to the fields. Graduate fields can only propose people. I’m not sure what the policy is for the special OSP exemptions. Although the Engineering proposal will ask that people in Engineering with the title will always have that.”

Professor Howland: “Point of information. Could someone tell me if it is true that a proposal has to come before the whole Senate or is this not just decided by CAPP or a committee.”

Speaker Norton: “No, that is part of this resolution that we have in front of us. It goes to CAPP, and then it comes to the full Senate – any proposal from a college for implementing the use of these titles. So the details would come back to us. Are there further comments?”

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences: “I don’t have any trouble with the Research Professor or whatever you want to call it. I just have real trouble voting for a title without having guidelines on how that is going to be used and how it is going to be defined and how it is different from what we already have. What rights do these people have? What are the guidelines? What is their security within these guidelines? Even though it will come back from CAPP, I have trouble also with the concept that each college will be coming up with different guidelines. I know Cornell has non-uniformity, but I think that’s a problem. I think we need something uniform for these people, with some clear rights and privileges, so I have a hard time voting just for a title.”

Provost Martin: “I just want to consult with my consultant, Susan Steward. The new titles would have to be approved by the Board of Trustees?”

Susan Steward, Director, Academic Personnel Policy: “Yes.”

Provost Martin: “I cannot imagine that the Board of Trustees would cede to any committee all rights to decide whether the use of a title should be uniform or non-uniform. In other words, the trustees are not going to approve this I feel certain, unless there is some dedication to uniformity at least about certain rules and regulations governing the title. I am just assuming that that is going to come. I am a little confused about what the committee has set up, too, I must say.

“I favor the creation of the titles. Susan and I are working all the time on the difficulties that are created by the limitations we have on titles. It is not just this one we need. But I am a little confused about this discussion of uniformity or non-uniformity. We are not going to get any titles through the trustees, nor should we be able to, unless there are

certain rules and regulations governing the use of the title. We have that for all other titles. It won't be different with this, and neither a Senate committee nor the provost can simply decide that each college can have its own rules and regulations governing the title. Would you agree, Susan?"

Susan Steward: "I would agree, and I would add that the tradition has been that the broad strokes with intention for the title are voiced by the Senate. However, the title description is actually written and approved by the provost but certainly in a consultative fashion. Then it is forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review."

Provost Martin: "So I'm just not sure if I understand the intent of the resolution. But if the idea is that a Senate committee will approve college-by-college ways of dealing with this title, we just can't do that. I mean the trustees won't let us. Maybe we can amend this slightly? I don't know, but do you see the problem I'm having? We already have rules and regulations governing how you get titles approved and instituted at the university, which this proposal seems to somehow contradict."

Professor Shiffrin: "I can see how one might think that it contradicts them, but if I heard Susan correctly, what can happen is that the recommendation goes to you. It is never going to get approved. It has to go through the trustees, and so it will go in some form to the trustees with some limits placed on the title. This, I assume, is what has happened with Clinical Professors, and so, yes, it will go to the trustees and then colleges will be giving proposals just as they do with respect to Clinical Professors, or don't do with respect to Clinical Professors, as to the specifics of how their review procedures would be and so forth within the college to the extent that they are permitted discretion."

Provost Martin: "Well, I mean that's the issue. I'm not sure the colleges can be said to have complete discretion about the way we use titles."

Professor Shiffrin: "With respect to Clinical Professors, colleges can present to a committee which then sends to the Senate a proposal to establish Clinical Professors as approved by the trustees, and there are certain criteria that have to be followed in order to do it. Ultimately, I think the thought of the committee is that this is what will happen here."

Provost Martin: "Whatever. I mean the Clinical Professor example doesn't seem like a great one to me, because it is not working, and it seems like in its current form it never will. So I'm not sure I'm happy with the idea that this will work just like that, if you see what I mean."

Professor Shiffrin: "Well, the reason it is 'not working' is not because of the lack of uniformity. It is because of the high requirements in order to get it through a

committee. If it got through a committee, and you have one in the Vet School and one in the Law School, there would be some distinctions between what those people do, but the trustees would have set the standards as to what the limitations are.”

Provost Martin: “I think we are confused, and we should go back to the Clinical Professor legislation and see if we have a problem, but all I want to say is this. For any title at the university that is approved by the trustees, there has got to be a certain amount of uniformity. There will be rules and regulations governing what can and cannot be done with it. That different colleges and, even within colleges, different departments tend to use the title somewhat differently within limits is true. However, the title still has to have a definition in the by-laws approved by the trustees that will rule some things in and some things out. So the idea that different colleges can define the rules and regulations governing a title differently is simply wrong. And if we did that with the Clinical Professor title, we did something problematic, and we should look at it.”

Speaker Norton: “The speaker will render a judgment from the chair which is that there is no disagreement here between the Provost and Professor Shiffrin. As he just said, I get a sense that there is nothing in this resolution that precludes having the Board of Trustees define what the titles mean. This is just a procedure that is outlined here for using the titles or applying them. The chair already called on Professor Farnum.”

Professor Cornelia (Nelly) Farnum, Biomedical Sciences and Senator-at-Large: “However, when this body passed the legislation enabling the Clinical Professor title that did deal with such things as what kinds of searches would be involved. How would those individuals be promoted? Would they be eligible for sabbatical leave? Would they have independent access to space? What level of voting rights would go automatically no matter what college they might be in? I think that is what is missing here. There are no broad strokes or definitions. You could even put in a little paragraph that would say what the boundaries are that we are talking about for the use of this position.”

Speaker Norton: “That is certainly a position that a person could take. It is entirely possible to argue that this resolution is in some sense premature.”

Professor Nicholas Calderone, Entomology: “I guess I see it as form without substance at this point or maybe putting the cart before the horse.”

Speaker Norton: “The speaker would comment that if senators do not feel that this proposal is ready to be passed, they should vote against it. That is always a possibility, and we have six minutes left before our time to adjourn. So unless someone wishes to move to extend time, the chair would point out that since we do have one more item on the agenda, I would like to finish up this discussion.”

Professor Kent Fuchs, Dean of Engineering: "I think the College of Engineering feels like we are in a 'catch 22.' We had a faculty meeting. After extensive discussion on this proposal from our Engineering Policy Committee about these titles and the rights and privileges of them, the faculty met. We had over 100 out of 200 of our faculty there. If I remember correctly, the vote was virtually unanimous amongst those faculty. So we have no controversy in our college, and our proposal is very specific. We would like the opportunity to move forward with a very specific proposal about what these titles grant in terms of privileges and the authorization to have them.'

Professor Birman: "I would like to make an offer, which is that since we have to come back to you any how, we would be happy to see this enabling legislation and our proposal to you considered as a single event. We would like to move forward. This will not be rejected by the college after the Senate approves this. So the Clinical Professor situation is different."

Provost Martin: "This is just a thought, and maybe I'm just tired, and that's certainly true. It is not to contradict what Kent just said or Ken. Here is what I'm a little concerned about now that we are discussing this in more depth and thinking back to the Clinical Professor legislation. In general in every other case, we have titles at the university with a set of rules and guidelines pertaining to them. And when colleges have questions about whether and how to use them, they call if they find the *Handbook* and the by-laws confusing, and they ensure in consultation with us that they can use the title in that circumstance.

"With these two titles, for some reason, I sort of understand politically the reason, but I think it might be bad university policy to establish titles like Clinical Professor and Research Scientist and say those titles, unlike all other titles at the university, not only have to be approved by the trustees and have certain rules and regulations pertaining to them, they also have to go through two other steps: to a Faculty Senate committee and then to the full Faculty Senate. Maybe that's a good idea, but I don't feel, although I think I have attended every Faculty Senate meeting on these titles, I don't feel like I have heard a great rationale for establishing, and I'm thinking of the long-term interests of the university, such a convoluted and highly specific way of using new titles that is contravened by the way we have used titles at this university and other universities use titles in every other case. Talk about only pseudo addressing a problem. It sounds like there is a kind of grudging sense that we want new titles, but we want them to be heavily governed by a Faculty Senate that can say that a college might not be using them well when we don't do that with any other title. Is that a good idea? I don't know, but I wonder. I think we need a fuller discussion about it. It's a very bizarre thing."

Speaker Norton: "The chair will recognize Professor Stein."

Professor Stein: "I would like to move for postponement until the fall, because I find myself rather confused. I don't really understand"

Speaker Norton: "Professor Stein, do you want to make that motion more precise as to the first meeting in the fall or the second meeting in the fall?"

Professor Stein: "Yes, I would like to refer it back to the committee and ask them to bring it to the Senate again the first meeting in the fall."

Speaker Norton: "Is there a second to Professor Stein's motion?"

UNKNOWN: "Second."

Speaker Norton: "All those in favor, please say aye."

AYE.

Speaker Norton: "Opposed? The motion carries. The resolution is recommitted to the committee with instructions to bring it back in the fall."

Professor Holcomb: "Madam Speaker, this task force may not exist in the fall."

Speaker Norton: "Well, it has to exist long enough to reconsider this motion."

Professor Holcomb: "The obvious thing is for the Engineering College and our committee"

Speaker Norton: "Wait! There is one more item. The chair does not want to lose a quorum. I'm sorry, Professor Holcomb."

8. RESOLUTION APPROVING ESTABLISHMENT OF A PH.D. PROGRAM IN APPAREL DESIGN IN THE GRADUATE FIELD OF TEXTILES

Speaker Norton: "We have one more item on the agenda, and I'm sure that the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies would like to have this considered. The chair does not see Professor Gerner here. She is the one listed on the agenda as presenting it. Is there someone else from CAPP here to present this motion? If not, since it is coming from a committee, unless there is an objection, the chair will call out this resolution, because I am sure that there is a desire to have this adopted at this point. It is a resolution to adopt a Ph.D. Program in Apparel Design in the Field of Textiles at Cornell. I'm sure everyone in the Senate has had a chance to read it, because it was distributed with the Call of the Meeting. Is there any discussion on this proposal?"

Professor Stein: "Move the question."

Speaker Norton: "Thank you. Seeing none, I assume you are ready to come to a vote. All those in favor, say aye."

AYE.

Speaker Norton: "Opposed? Thank you very much. The resolution passes."

***Resolution to Establish a
Ph.D. Degree Program in Apparel Design
In the Field of Textiles at Cornell University***

WHEREAS, the General Committee of the Graduate School has reviewed and approved the proposal to create a new Ph.D. degree program in Apparel Design in the Graduate Field of Textiles,

WHEREAS, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has reviewed and recommends creation of the Ph.D. degree in Apparel Design in the Graduate Field of Textiles,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves the establishment of a new Ph.D. degree program in Apparel Design in the Graduate Field of Textiles.

We are adjourned.”

Respectfully submitted,

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

Appendix 1

040512-10030S

Appendix 2

040512-10031S

Appendix 3

Appendix 4

040512-10033S

Appendix 5

040512-10034S

Appendix 6

040512-10035S

Appendix 7

040512-10036S

Appendix 8

040512-10039S

Appendix 9

040512-10040S

Appendix 10

Appendix 11**Academic Titles
(2002 Faculty Handbook, page 27)**

professor
associate professor
assistant professor
university professor
professor *emeritus*
professor-at-large
senior scholar
senior scientist
instructor
senior lecturer
lecturer
senior research associate
research associate
senior extension associate
extension associate
postdoctoral associate/fellow
teaching associate
visiting fellow
visiting critic
visiting scientist
visiting scholar
university librarian
associate university librarian
assistant university librarian
librarian
associate librarian
senior assistant librarian
assistant librarian
archivist
associate archivist
senior assistant archivist
assistant archivist