

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULY SENATE
Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History and Speaker: "We have a quorum. Thank you all for getting here early to our first meeting. I want to remind all of you that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during this meeting. Will everyone please turn off any cell phone that you might have stashed somewhere? Please, before you speak, identify yourself and your department. I know some of you; I don't know others of you. I especially don't know some of you because I haven't been in the Senate for two years, although I was before that. I want to thank all of you who were involved in electing me Speaker last spring when I wasn't around. That's fine. I wish to warn you that I intend to wield a mean gavel and keep you all in order over the next two years. There will be three Good and Welfare speakers at the end of the meeting today. Those are the ones who signed up in advance. So each of them will get approximately 3 and 1/3 minutes. Actually, I should have brought a real timer along, but I will try to keep tabs on it. The first item on the agenda today is our new President, Jeffrey Lehman ,who will give his remarks and then answer questions."

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT JEFFREY LEHMAN

President Jeffrey Lehman: "I will spend the next 29 minutes in terror of the gavel. I wanted to say that I am grateful to be invited. I understand that by convention I am not a regular participant at Faculty Senate meetings, that the Provost represents me at these meetings. That's great, but I also want to say that my membership in this body is important to me, and I hope that you will be accepting if I pop in from time to time when I am in Ithaca, not always necessarily as someone to stand up at the front but sometimes just to participate. If I do that, I hope you won't take offense. I have already talked to the Provost about this, and I've been assured that she won't take offense if I do that.

"I want to say just a few words about how it's all going from my perspective - these two and a half months so far - and then take questions. The simple statement of how it's all going from my perspective is that it is fabulous. It is emotionally gratifying for me in a way that I thought it might be, but really couldn't have known. It has just been extraordinary to be here, especially having been a student here, having carried with me throughout my career all kinds of emotional resonances with Cornell that I didn't really understand, and I still don't really understand at all. They are not necessarily susceptible to intellectual analysis. They might be susceptible to psychoanalysis. They come back in the

most peculiar ways. I see a room or I see buildings or I see names, and they trigger a set of emotions in me, and it's kind of fun to think about where they come from. At the same time, of course, I'm learning a new role. I also want to say that it is exhausting.

"It is intensely important to me that I get out and engage the faculty as much as possible, especially at the beginning of my tenure as President. Doing that is hard in a school as big as Cornell, as radically decentralized and appropriately decentralized as Cornell is. So I have been trying to attend faculty meetings in different schools and colleges and to meet with individual faculty members and hear what their research is about and get educated about what people are working on here. I have been attending different kinds of faculty events and my wife, Kathy, has been joining me at some of these events. It's important that she also get a sense of the quality of the faculty, the richness of the work that goes on here, because in her ambassadorial role as a symbol of Cornell, it is important, I think, that she have a fine-grained understanding of the institution. I've been meeting with Charlie and talking with him and getting a sense of the Faculty Senate, its history and its significance. All of these things take time. At the same time that it's been exhausting, it has also been exhilarating, because one of the things that I have immediately sensed is that there is a lot of healthy, fervent disagreement around campus, differences of perspective that are deeply held and articulately voiced, and that's great. That is what a great university should be like. It has been helpful to me to see that and appreciate it up close.

"What have I been telling people when I make these forays? I have been trying to explain what I am about or at least how I think of myself during this first year. My hope is that I will stay President for a long time. You never know, but that's my hope. The way I have been framing the goal for this year and for my presidency is this. I have been saying that I think we all need touchstones and the sesquicentennial is a natural touchstone for a university. That's 2015, twelve years from now, and it's reasonable, I think, to say that's the right time frame for me to think about a term for my presidency and the right time to think about goals. Then I think about this year as the first year; that's the time to try to get a sense of what those goals might be and some preliminary sense of what needs to be done in order to achieve them. One of the things that I have been trying to impress upon people is how little I know at this point. I mean I'm not totally uninformed; I've been around a lot, and I have ideas. The ideas are all at different stages of development. Some of them I think are very well thought out, and I'm unlikely to budge about them. Some of them, especially in the areas where I am a novice, are quite poorly formed, and they are likely to shift around a lot. What I have been trying to do is to project a sense of how I hope to see my own ideas develop in consultation with the faculty and with other people who have a stake in Cornell over the course of the next year.

“So, to be concrete about it. Last December I gave my acceptance talk, and I saw that as a chance to push some tentative ideas about Cornell out into the conversation and to get people to engage back. There is another one of those symbolic moments when I am going to have a chance to do that, and that is going to be my inauguration as Cornell’s eleventh President. That will be one of those times, when at least I might have people’s attention for just a few minutes, and they can listen and go ‘yuck’ or they go ‘how wonderful’ or whatever they will say, probably all of the above. What I am going to be doing during the inauguration is in part symbolic, so the structure of the inaugural week actually is going to symbolize the breadth and complexity of Cornell. It is going to begin in Doha, Qatar. It turns out that a long time ago, it had been planned that there would be a ribbon cutting ceremony in Doha on October 12, which is a Sunday. Whoever the President was going to be was supposed to be there. So I am going to be there, but we have that decided since I am going to be there, we will also use that to kick off an inaugural week. It will give me a chance to talk a little bit about Cornell’s engagement outside the United States and how significant that is. We then fly back to New York City, and so we will stop in New York City and have some more ceremony on Wednesday, the 15th, in New York. It will be in part on the medical campus and in part out in the city where undergraduates engage in service work. That will be an opportunity to talk about Cornell’s presence in New York City, presence in the state, and the intellectual significance of our connection to New York. Thursday morning begins the time in Ithaca. We will have an event initially at the public library. The public library was Ezra Cornell’s first great institution in Ithaca before the university. It was also where Andrew Dickson White had his inauguration, actually not this building but as it existed then. We will then come back up and have a set of speakers in the morning talking about different ideas, and we’ll have an opportunity for faculty and student engagement with what the different speakers have said or read, as will be the case with some poets who will be reading. Then in the afternoon, there will be the procession and Ruth Ginsberg will speak and present me to the community. Then I do my soaring rhetoric.

“I just want to say where I am on the soaring rhetoric bit right now. We are still about three weeks away. It’s going to be a lot of questions, as you might expect, then kind of a ringing hortatory call for engagement by Cornellians everywhere. I’ll have to double check; it’s going to be Cornellians all around the earth and then I think Edward Lu is still going to be orbiting, so we’ll try to find a way to call him, too, to engage these questions. The questions are the kinds of questions that when you think about an institution like this, we ought to be asking ourselves periodically. They are not particularly surprising. They are the questions about what we teach. Asking, given who students are today, given what the world is today, what are the core intellectual qualities that we ought to

be nurturing in all of our students? What are the character traits that we ought to be nurturing in all of our students? What are the fundamental intellectual skills that we think every student should master before they graduate? What are the core bodies of knowledge interacting with words or numbers or technology that we think every Cornellian ought to have? And then how are we doing at teaching what we think we ought to teach?

“The question of who we teach is obviously important. We are an institution that has historically devoted most of its energy, but not all of its energy, to teaching students who are between the ages of 18 and 25, let’s say. Is that the right population? Do we have the same focus going forward on that population? Probably the answer is going to be yes, but it’s fair to ask the question I think, given how the world has changed and how peoples’ need to learn throughout the course of their lifetime has changed. Should we have the same focus on students from North America that we have? (That has been the tradition.) We have 3,200 students from outside the United States who study here, but we are still mostly studying here. How much should we be projecting ourselves elsewhere in the world?

“How we teach? Our pedagogy has evolved in many ways, but for most of us, certainly in law, it is mostly people co-located, engaging texts and talking about texts. To what extent should the new technologies change what we do? That’s a conversation that we regularly have and usually the result has been that the promise and benefits of the new technology have been outweighed by either the problems that it creates in either sustaining a particular kind of intellectual direction or the difficulty in actually using the new technology. Of course, technology changes and so we should, I think, be asking ourselves periodically, ‘Is the answer different today from what it was before and how?’ Then there is the question of where we should be pressing. Are there particular domains that we ought to be saying, ‘Wow, here’s an area where we are uniquely poised to make a distinctive contribution to a topic that the world really needs?’

“Last December I tossed out six domains that I thought might be susceptible to this. A lot of people said, ‘Oh, my goodness, these are the six areas that Cornell will be in the future, and I’m not in one of those areas, and I’m being invited to leave the University.’ That’s not what the project is about. So I will probably revisit the six areas that I mentioned, because I think they are all very important, but I will probably add in a few more to try and give the sense, which is real, that I am actually interested in having a serious conversation about whether there are thematic areas where collaborations across disciplines or intense focus within a discipline might enable Cornellians to make an even greater contribution to the world. We can come back to whether that is an appropriate metric, but actually this is one of the things I feel pretty strongly about. An important part of

Cornell's unique historical identity and mission has been about engagement in real world problems, sometimes from a very theoretical perspective but nonetheless a desire to engage and respond to the needs of our larger society. I consider this to be a fundamentally humanist, animating impulse for an institution, and I think that is part of what defines Cornell.

"At the end of the soaring rhetoric we have to find ways to engage in a conversation about all the questions I'm going to ask. Those who want to participate in the conversation will be welcomed. I will say that one of the ways that institutions try to do this kind of work is often to appoint blue-ribbon task forces to analyze them, and I will just let you know that by temperament I resist those things. I recognize that they sometimes do great work, and they produce documents of great value. When I was at Michigan I saw sometimes these kinds of task forces really were very important. The reason I resist them is because they tend to lead everybody else to disengage. If you are not on the blue-ribbon task force, it is somebody else's problem; you go back to doing your work and that's it. The other reason I resist them is that by their nature sometimes these groups end up with a voice that isn't really a voice. It's a committee voice where there is some kind of brokered compromise result, so that everyone who is on the commission can feel that they had a particular contribution or stake in it. It's not very satisfying.

"I don't have a good answer about how to do this yet, but I am trying to think of how to use the many different existing institutions at Cornell to sustain a kind of engagement with these kinds of questions. I am going to have to beg the indulgence of all the participants in those institutions. Some people might not be interested in engaging, and that's OK. But to the extent that existing institutions are willing, my hope is that people will respond to the great hortatory call and participate, because where I would like to be a year from now, is that I would at least like to know what I can do and then I'll be able to tell everybody what I can do, and they will have a point of reference with which to engage, disagree, say, 'OK, now we know what you are thinking, now we know you are all wrong.' That's fine. I will say that I hope that when that happens, and I assume that it will happen. (If I come up with a set of things that everyone agrees with, then I think something bad will have happened.) At that point my one request is that if I say something that you think is a bad idea, say you think I have a bad idea and do not blame the building that I work in. One of the amazing things that occurs in talking to people around campus is they say, 'Day Hall did a bad thing.' This was true at Michigan, too. People were always saying, 'The Fleming Building is doing a bad thing.' Now, at Michigan, Robben Fleming is still alive. Poor guy. Edmund Ezra Day at least is resting in peace, I hope. Although maybe not, because everybody is always blaming Day Hall for things. So please, if people think I'm doing a bad thing, I hope they will do me the courtesy of attributing

the mistake to me rather than to the building. So why don't I stop there? Do I still have some time?"

Speaker Norton: "Ten minutes."

Professor Joseph Laquatra, Design and Environmental Analysis: "I would like to know some of your thoughts on Cornell's unique position in the land grant and extension system. You mentioned our presence in the Medical School, but we also have a presence on 8th and Madison at the Extension Office. While you are in New York City, I urge you to consider stopping there, because this is a time, at least for Cornell, where that system is stressed, although we have offices in every county. We are leaders in this and Cornell is often looked to for leadership. Many of our programs serve as models for what other land grants do. In the Land Grant Panel Reports, one of the recommendations that cut across was to free ourselves from the stresses that we are facing from the continually declining federal and state support, that we look at endowments or campaigns in much the same way we do for teaching, research, buildings or athletics. I'm just curious about your thoughts on that."

President Lehman: "I appreciate the suggestion about October 15, and we will look and see what the scheduling is and whether it's possible either to make a visit or if that can't be done, then at least to make sure that I mention it. I'm going to be talking at all these places. I'll make sure that I speak of our extension presence in New York City and across the state.

"On the land grant mission more generally, I think, as all of you know much better than I do, we are in a difficult situation with the state and with SUNY right now because of the way in which our land grant activities in connection with extension and research are mashed together with our teaching activities and other kinds of research through the SUNY process. So at least as I understand it, the portion of funding from the state that is supposed to nominally be directed toward supporting our extension outreach and research activities hasn't gone up in a long, long time. There are several areas in which I am trying to figure out whether there are things that we can do. One has to do with the way in which we are funded and whether there is a way within SUNY to have a separation that says that this much is supposed to be for these activities and this much is for these and then we can talk separately about the different things that we are doing through the SUNY system. But more generally, I do think that it is unlikely that over the long, long run we can expect to see substantial growth in our support from the state.

"So we do have to think about what the role is of land grant activity within the institution. Here I guess one of the things that I did in my early weeks back was

to read more about the history of our stature as a land grant institution. I was caught up short in realizing that I had been making a mistake in thinking about the Morrill Act and the land grant status of Cornell that I actually think a lot of people make, which is to think that the term land grant has to do somehow with agriculture or activities in connection with the land. And of course that's not true. The land grant was simply the mechanism by which the federal government chose to invest and to give funds to the states to support universities that were actively engaged in meeting the practical needs of the society after the Industrial Revolution. Yes, they were primarily talking about agriculture and the mechanical arts, but the word 'land grant' didn't have to do with agriculture or anything like that. It had to do with engagement with the practical needs of society. So that feature of Cornell was with Cornell from 1865, long before there were any of the contract colleges. It was part of the founding mission of Cornell University. It was thirty years before the Veterinary College, which was the first. The land grant spirit, the spirit of engagement and contribution in a practical sense, is part of the entire mission of Cornell. How that plays out then ought to be, I think, not dependent on the relationship with SUNY and the contract colleges. It's really a much deeper question about how we are structured fundamentally. That leads to the question of our endowments, and our endowments are often tied to particular schools or colleges but sometimes not, and I don't think there is a need for endowments that we raise in this area to be tied restrictively to a particular school or college. That's the extent of my thinking right now on that topic. I don't know really where that leads in terms of pragmatic next steps or an agenda, but that's about as far as I've gotten on that."

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School: "I just have a question I hope gets included in the inauguration speech. I think one of the things that students need to learn is how to think normatively in a rigorous way. I won't go into detail about this, but I think the University is ill organized to promote that goal. So one could put it as a question. Could the University be better organized to train students in normative thinking?"

President Lehman: "In my categories of questions one of them was what should we be teaching, and are there particular intellectual dispositions that we ought to be nurturing? So one of those candidates might be a disposition towards a rigorous and self-critical normative thinking. I have to agree with you. I actually mentioned this. I don't know if any of you saw my convocation welcome to the new students. There is a disposition on the part of the current generation of students sometimes to disengage quickly and to say that when two people take different normative positions, it's simply a matter of opinion and that's the end of it. There is not any possibility for continued engagement in a serious way, and I think that is deeply problematic. I think part of the purpose of an institution like this is for people to find a way to engage in normative discussion without

necessarily having first to specify a set of foundational ethical assumptions that they agree on completely, because that is a project that is futile. So if you can't do that in a deductive manner, how is it that we can have the kind of conversation that we all have all the time every day? I guess I agree with you. I think it's important that we think about how to ensure that all of our students have that possibility. I hope that you have a particular thought about an institutional mechanism. I don't know why I thought you might. I hope you will pop that into the hopper of conversation."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "Here's a small point, not a big point. I was listening when you were talking about trying to think about why is it that we say Day Hall and not the President. It occurred to me that that is a reflection of the way bureaucracies tend to be organized. We talk about the Pentagon; we talk about the White House; we talk about Albany in that same way and it's because they have organized themselves so that they speak with one voice. When one is outside, one doesn't know where it's coming from, so we call it Day Hall. Maybe it has to be done that way, but I just thought it might be an interesting arrangement if in fact the inhabitants of Day Hall might somehow have disagreements, which become public. That's a small observation."

LAUGHTER.

President Lehman: "I can assure you that Bidy and I have disagreements. You know, it's a serious question. When should those disagreements become public and when should they be things that we thrash out and then Bidy gives up?"

LAUGHTER.

President Lehman: "I think your point is exactly right. I don't know the answer to that. I think this is one of those areas where I'm going to definitely be sort of feeling my way on what makes sense as an institution. It can't be the case that we can never disagree publicly. I think it's fine for Bidy to say incorrect things in public. No, that can't be right. On the other hand, it can't be right that we never reach agreement on how to move forward, which involves some cession of what was initially a disagreement, even if there is a private disagreement on what continues forward. I don't know how you decide on what the boundaries around what those two categories are. Actually, if there is any literature on this subject out there, . . . because I don't know what the right thing is. I think you are exactly right about why people tend to subscribe...well, actually I think that's one of the reasons. I think another reason is that people have a healthy civility about them. It feels easier to express disagreement with a structure than with a person. My hope is that if that is the motivation, people can find a civil way to

express disagreement with the person that doesn't involve a sometimes uncivil attack on buildings."

Professor Paul Ginsparg, Physics, Computing and Information Science: "Have you given any thought to what in the long run would be the best channel for faculty to communicate their ideas and concerns to you?"

President Lehman: "I have, and there are several. One of the things I'm wrestling with right now is e-mail. I use e-mail. President@cornell.edu has been discovered by a lot of people, and I try to respond. Sometimes I don't respond very quickly, but I try always to respond. I don't know if that's sustainable over the long run. I think it just depends on how long I can get by on the amount of sleep that I get by on. I think it is sustainable, but I just don't know whether it is. So that's one direct channel that's there that I actually enjoy and hope is sustainable, but I can't be sure.

"I guess what I wanted to say was the question said a 'preferred channel.' I'm sure that presumes something that I don't agree with. I think there needs to be multiple channels. I think, as faculty members, one of the interesting things that is true in a modern university is that we are part of many, many different constituent sub-communities within the university. I don't think it always should be mediated; I think sometimes that it needs to be direct. Also, I don't think that when it's mediated, it should always be through one structure or another. I don't think it should always go through a dean or through the Dean of the Faculty. I think there need to be as many different channels as possible. There is probably some way of dealing with complex networks that works to provide communications. I think part of it has to do at some level with intensity of preference as well. One long-term possibility is people will come to understand that they will use e-mail as a direct, immediate cry when they feel something with deep intensity, and they will use other means that are less intrusive into the daily structure of my life where they feel less strongly. We're going to figure it out as we go along. I don't have a very clear answer to that right now."

Speaker Norton: "Thank you very much."

APPLAUSE.

Speaker Norton: "I am now going to call on the Provost for remarks, and she will also answer questions. I am informing the body that the Provost has already told me that she wants me to tell her when eight minutes are up, so I will do that."

Provost Bidy Martin: "I've decided to give up in the face of the President and cede my time or some of my time to you all for questions to Jeff if you wish, because, as you know, I'm always here. So if there are people who want to ask questions of Jeff, I would be happy to give my presentation next time."

Speaker Norton: "Are there further questions for the President or should we turn to the Provost? It looks like people want to hear you, Bidy."

2. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST BIDY MARTIN.

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: "Yeah."

Provost Bidy Martin: "Oh, Brad, you're so sweet. Thank you. What was it that Sally Field said? 'You still love me!' You know I was going to do a presentation, which I will do next time, and it was a presentation that I gave to the Board of Trustees at the end of May this past year, and it was a summary of faculty hiring last year. I thought it would be interesting to you to see the number of searches and some of the critical hires we made this past year. I'll summarize a couple of things now and then perhaps if you are interested give the longer presentation at another point.

"We had 113 approved searches last year, and there were over 60 hires. Of course, it differs by college how many searches and appointments were made in each, and that's the information that I thought I would present to you at a little greater length when we have time. I also wanted to point out that we now conduct, as I think you all know, orientation sessions, which we don't call orientation sessions (we have a better category for it), but sort of introductory sessions for new faculty. Of the over 60 new faculty we have on campus, I think between 55 and 60 have responded that they will attend this session that we are offering. The session will introduce them among other things to President Lehman but also to questions about tenure and promotion, and in addition to that questions about our research resources for new faculty. If any of you are interested in the session, you are certainly welcome to attend, but also if you want information that we provide to new faculty, we will give you that, too. I'm going to save the rest of that presentation for later.

"I'm going to ask you a couple of things that I just realized that I need to ask you. Did all of you receive by e-mail the message inviting you to be part of the academic procession for the inauguration? So you actually do read those mass e-mails? Some do; some don't. OK. My fear was that because it was a mass e-mailing that as faculty you would perhaps have chosen not to read it, because it didn't have a name attached, and I want to point out to you that you are all invited to march as part of the academic procession and then to encourage you to

please send your responses back in. The other thing I want to do is thank you for participating in the book project. I know that many, if not most, of you in this room did take part in it. We had a few glitches this year, and we apologize for that, but I hope you will attend the *Antigone* production that Theatre, Film and Dance is doing that starts this weekend. I hope some of you at least will attend. I hope some of you are going with your students and that you will sustain the discussion and be part of the larger debate about the theatre production.

“We have four dean searches this year, as you know, the Law School, the College of Architecture, Art and Planning, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the College of Human Ecology. Those searches are almost all underway. There have as yet been no formal meetings of the search committee for Human Ecology or Architecture, Art and Planning, but they will begin next week. I wanted simply to report that we expect to be done with the Law School search by the end of the semester if not sooner. So that’s the update there. We’re just about at the end of our preliminary interviews that the search committee is conducting with the range of prospects and will be narrowing the list down to finalists and having those finalists meet with the faculty in the Law School very soon. The other searches will no doubt last throughout this academic year or at least into March and April, as dean searches typically do. You will be getting updates of the searches as I try regularly to provide you in each college and at Senate meetings, but if you have any questions, given that we have so much going on this year.... In addition to the excitement of having a new President (I can’t remember which disagreements I have had with him), it’s really a joy to work with him and we have we have a new Dean of the Faculty with whom also it has been really fun to work and a new Associate Dean of the Faculty, who has brought me a low-carb bar of chocolate. All of that is very exciting, and at the same time, we have a lot of difficult jobs to do this year, including these important dean searches. So if you have any questions for me about any of the perhaps more mundane operational issues at play for all of us, please feel free. I know you do.”

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Science: “Could you reveal to us the composition of the College of Human Ecology Search Committee?”

Provost Martin: “The question was could I reveal to you the composition of the Human Ecology Search Committee?”

Professor Rasmussen: “And if you can, would you please do so?”

Provost Martin: “Oh, you noticed that there were two separate questions. I cannot, and the reason is not for reasons of high-level secrecy, but because of the people we wrote to and invited initially, a couple have declined, and we haven’t replaced them. What I did do was come up with an initial list and send it to the

Faculty Senate's Nominations and Elections Committee, as we always do. You all sent back to me an approval in general but also some suggestions. I incorporated some of those suggestions, sent out invitations and now need to make a couple of new appointments. So as soon as I know, of course I'll reveal it. In fact, what we always do is send out the names of the search committee members with the call for nominations to all the faculty and staff in the entire college. I am actually visiting the faculty of the College of Human Ecology at their first faculty meeting to discuss the search, so I will be there, and I think Jeff will be there actually as well at the end of the meeting to talk about other things. Any other questions, any other revelations you wish to know about?"

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Senator-at-Large: "Some years ago we had a Division of Biological Sciences which was dissolved. At the time of dissolution, I recall it being said that, 'Well, we'll see how it works. Then we'll review it and if it's not working, we'll maybe do something else.' So, since we have a new President and we have many exciting things going on in the biological sciences, it might be a good time to look at that and see where we are, both in research and in education and in the general health of biology."

Provost Martin: "Did everyone hear Howie? That's right. We did say that, and what we also said at the same time is that we would create two important mechanisms for staying on top of how we are doing in the life sciences: one, the internal Life Sciences Advisory Council, which is composed of distinguished life scientists from all over the campus, and an external Life Sciences Advisory Council, which is actually chaired by Harold Varmus and is also made up very distinguished scientists from outside Cornell. That group visited us this past year and delivered a report to which we have been responding and which we obviously responded to immediately, but we have been busy implementing some of the recommendations.

"Jeff and I have now concluded that we should have them back this year in the spring, instead of waiting for the two or three year gap that we had initially thought we might wait. The one thing that they did not do, and which I think we need to do now, is review the continued success of the Undergraduate Biology Program. That matters to all of us a very great deal. Kraig Adler who is Vice Provost for Life Sciences has been keeping in very close touch with Jeff Doyle who is the Director of Undergraduate Biology and is aware of its continued successes and of some of the challenges there. I think it would probably be a very good time actually to take a hard look at the health of the Undergraduate Biology Program, especially since there is so much new science to be integrated into the undergraduate curriculum. And I think one of the questions is how quickly and effectively are we actually integrating some of the new research we are doing in the life sciences into the undergraduate

curriculum. That is something that we should set out to do this year, so I would urge you to take a look at the reviews that have come in, and I emphasize that we are going to have another one this spring by the outside group and also take your suggestion that we take a formal look at the Undergraduate Biology Program.”

Professor Charles Walcott, Dean of Faculty: “Is that review currently available for others to examine? Is it public information?”

Provost Martin: “You can have a copy of it. Yes, absolutely. Any other questions? Thank you very much. Next time, if you want, I’ll give you more information about our hires. I simply want to say, as you know, there is nothing more important than the faculty, the composition and the quality of the faculty. We made a lot of fabulous hires this past year, and we’re doing extremely well. The simple number of searches and appointments is a testimony to the health of the university, financially and otherwise. I think you will be excited when you see some of the examples outside your own fields.”

Speaker Norton: “Thank you, Provost Martin. Now I would like to call on the Dean of the Faculty.”

3. REMARKS BY DEAN CHARLES WALCOTT

Dean Walcott: “Thank you very much. I have a very brief report, which is the activity of FACTA. Fifty-one files were reviewed, seven of which were reviewed by the full committee. There were forty-nine positive recommendations, two negative, and the Provost agreed with forty-nine of the FACTA recommendations, which seems to me to be an outstanding percentage.”

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, Industrial and Labor Relations: “Should we infer from your remarks that the two she did not agree with were the two negative recommendations?”

Dean Walcott: “I don’t think the slide says anything about that, and not having been on FACTA, I cannot answer your question, unless the Provost wishes to comment.”

Provost Martin: “My memory is failing me is the problem. I know that in the spring group, FACTA recommended against one case, and I agreed with FACTA. So if there were two disagreements, they most have occurred back in the fall, and I really regret to tell you that we have a young male President and an old female Provost, and I can’t remember what happened. Was it that I

disagreed with the positive or with the negative recommendation? I think I probably disagreed with.... I don't know, but I'll get the information for next time. Is that OK?"

Professor Terence Irwin, Philosophy: "Can you give any general characterizations of the reasons for the two negative recommendations?"

Dean Walcott: "Again, I cannot, because I was not on the committee and I was not Dean at the time, so I have no sense of that, so I cannot be helpful to you. Again, that is something that I can investigate and report on to you next time. I simply don't know."

Professor Stein: "It seems to me that in the subsequent report you give of FACTA operation it would probably be a lot more useful if you would break down what the disagreements were. Were they the positive or negative ones?"

Dean Walcott: "Thank you. I will take that suggestion under advisement."

Provost Martin: "In response to Terry's question, it might be helpful to remember that FACTA makes a decision about whether tenure is justified by the dossier, if you see what I mean, not on the merits of the case. That is a partial answer to your question. It wouldn't be on the substance of the person's research but on whether the dossier actually successfully made the case that the person deserved tenure."

Dean Walcott: "That's my report. I will have a couple of further things to say later on."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 14, 2003 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Norton: "The next item on the agenda is the approval of the Minutes of the May 14, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting. May I ask for unanimous consent for the approval of those minutes? All in favor please say aye."

AYE.

Speaker Norton: "Opposed? The minutes of the May 14 meeting are approved. I will now call on Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty for a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

5. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Cynthia Farina, Law and Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty:
 “Charlie has established an extremely efficient and well-ordered mechanism for approving the Nominations and Elections Report, which I respect but cannot fully abide by today, because one item here requires a written ballot. But we’ll start off in the time-honored fashion. These are the bulk of the committee assignments for the university committees. I believe the phrase is, ‘You can read them as well as I.’ So, Madame Speaker.”

**Report from Nominations & Elections Committee
 September 17, 2003**

Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty

Steven Beer, CALS
 Locksley Edmondson, Africana Ctr.

Committee on Academic Programs and Policies

Roberto Bertoia, AAP
 Rodney Dietert, Vet.

Affirmative Action Committee

Helene Dillard, CALS
 Margaret Kroma, CALS

Educational Policy Committee

Drew Noden, Vet.
 Dawn Schrader, CALS

Faculty Advisory Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid

Stuart Blumin, A&S
 Steven Carvell, Hotel
 Ann Lemley, CHE

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education

Tove Hammer, ILR
 James Bisogni, Engr.
 Robert Gravani, CALS

Financial Policies Committee

Richard Burkhauser, CHE
 Brad Anton, Engr.
 Andrew Novakovic, CALS
 Leslie Trotter, Engr.

Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA)

Bruce Ganem, A&S
Bruce Levitt, A&S (fall term)
Richard Rand, Engr.

University Committee on Human Subjects

Donald Hayes, A&S
Deborah Trumbull, CALS
Virginia Utermohlen, CHE
Elaine Wethington, CHE

University-ROTC Relationships Committee

Paul Bowser, Vet.
Jeremy Rabkin, A&S

University Assembly

Ellis Loew, Vet.
Douglas Kysar, Law

University Lectures Committee

Jean Locey, AAP

University Faculty Library Board

Michael Kammen, A&S
Richard Penner, Hotel

Minority Education Committee

Mary Pat Brady, A&S
Christiane Linster, A&S
Jan Jennings, CHE
Amanda Miller-Ockhuizen, A&S

Music Committee

Molly Diesing, A&S
Clare Fewtrell, Vet.

Professors-at-Large Selection Committee

Richard Durrett, A&S
Douglas Fitcher, A&S
Bruce Levitt, A&S

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies

Evan Cooch, CALS
Paul Ginsparg, A&S
Suzanne Loker, CHE

Faculty Programs in Residential Communities

N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Ctr./Education

Speaker Norton: "I ask for unanimous consent for approval of this slate of candidates. Without objections, so ordered."

Associate Dean Farina: "Now, the Speaker will be asking for your consent to conduct a written ballot for Speaker pro tem. There was a slate for that approved at your May meeting consisting of Professor Rosemary Avery from Policy Analysis and Management. There were no nominations from the floor, but the balloting itself was not conducted."

Speaker Norton: "May I have unanimous consent to conduct this written ballot? If everybody agrees, we'll pass out ballots, and they will be collected later. I see no objection, so that is so ordered, and the ballots will be passed out. Please, only members of the Senate may vote on this."

6. RESOLUTION AND CONTINUED DISCUSSION REGARDING NEW LIFE SCIENCES STRATEGIC CORPORATE ALLIANCE PLAN

Speaker Norton: "Right on time, I will now call on the Dean of the Faculty and Robert Buhrman from Applied and Engineering Physics regarding the Life Sciences Strategic Corporate Alliance Plan."

Dean Walcott: "As you know, last spring we discussed in some detail a proposal which was entitled *The Life Sciences Strategic Corporate Alliance*. This was basically a strategy, a way, of involving companies in supporting research here at Cornell. We discussed that, as these agreements came on line, the Local Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate would, on behalf of the faculty, examine these agreements to see what they thought about them. At the time, the motion to do this was tabled, and my sense from talking with the University Faculty Committee and members of the faculty is that there was considerable uncertainty among members of the faculty and various worries and concerns about these kinds of arrangements. As we duplicated the copies of the Life Sciences Strategic Alliance Plan for you, it came to my attention that there is a new version of this plan entitled simply *The Strategic Alliance Plan*, which has lost its life science coloration and has become rather more general in nature for the University. Interestingly enough, it contains a section that recommends from the Board of

Trustees that the Local Advisory Committee examine these agreements to see whether they meet certain requirements of the faculty. Thus, to some extent rendering our motion moot.

"I've asked Bob Buhrman if he would come and bring us up to date on his committee's view of these kinds of alliances and then because we have sensed some uneasiness amongst the faculty, we are planning at the end of October to have a faculty forum on a Wednesday afternoon to discuss these matters. So what I would like from all of you is to get your thoughts about those parts of the Strategic Alliance which cause you uneasiness, unhappiness and concern so that, as we organize that faculty forum, we can see that those concerns are addressed by appropriate speakers and in the discussion. So hopefully, as a result of that Faculty forum we can understand the implications of this plan and its details, but I asked Bob to start us off with a brief summary of the LAC's plans.

Professor Robert Buhrman, Applied and Engineering Physics and Member, Local Advisory Committee: "Early in this year, then-Dean Cooke asked our committee, which was set up by the Senate to advise the central administration on research related issues in the physical sciences and engineering, to take a look at this document. We only had a little bit of time, given the schedule at the time. I don't think if we had had more time, it would have made a difference in our outcome. The new committee, which met for the first time on Monday, revisited that in preparation for this meeting today.

"So the first comment is just a few words about the context of our analysis and our report, which is summarized and I think made available for this meeting. All the members of the committee are active researchers. Many of them, but not all, have had corporate sponsors or have done consulting with companies or things of that nature, so that's a certain subset of this university. Not everybody is of that constituency. We did not think at the time that it was our job to decide whether or not Cornell should do corporate sponsored research. We have done it for a hundred years, I suspect. From what President Lehman said at the beginning of this meeting, our founding was to practice the mechanical arts as well as the fine arts. There are lots of organizations here where we have programs with industrial consortia; there are contracts coming in. I'm told there is roughly \$25,000,000 a year in research with industrial sponsorship. So this is not a new thing; it's about 5% of the overall enterprise here. Many of us have programs, including myself for full disclosure, let's say from the Science Foundation which requires in order to get the Science Foundation money that we have industrial partnerships, industrial advisory boards and so forth. So that concept was basically embedded in this committee. If you don't like that concept, then that's a different issue that perhaps the faculty forum can address, but in that context we looked at this proposal.

“This proposal is to change the way in which things are being done a bit, with the idea, personally I think, of getting more resources to Cornell for what we want to do anyhow. Most of these industrial connections and research programs that we have right now are bottom-up. A group of faculty gets together or individual faculty gets the proposal and does the projects, then Sponsored Program vets that by their standard rules and Cornell regulations. We follow that. Here is where people get a little bit nervous, because the central administration, in the interests of trying to get the larger resources initially for Life Science, but there are other ones coming on actually a little more quickly, and the question is--are we going to sell our soul or are we going to sell your soul to satisfy this particular project? And that's the issue.

“There is this famous case called Novartis. Does everyone know about the Novartis case? If you are in the sciences or read *Nature*, you know about it. If you go into Google and Novartis and Berkeley, you'll find out about it very quickly. There the Plant and Microbial Biology (I haven't heard that word before) basically, the administration of that department made a five-year deal with Novartis to do research for Novartis, and Novartis would give them \$5,000,000 a year and that caused lots of problems, because there is the issue of proprietary research and who gets access to it and so forth. We don't necessarily do that, but that raised a lot of issues. There is still a big debate at Berkeley over whether it's a good thing or a bad thing. It made Berkeley look bad, I think, on average around the country. We want to avoid that. Why was it done? Well, people who led the department there didn't think it was a bad idea.

“We think the way to deal with these potential fears, from our committee's point of view is to have, as one of the opponents of the Berkeley thing said, 'Let there be light.' That is--have a non-interested group of faculty take a look at each proposal and if they think there is a problem, they will bring it to this body and raise it. If we worry about every possible scenario up front, you are not going to get any of these resources. That may be a desirable outcome but not one from our committee's point of view. We want the resources, but we want them without selling off Cornell's principles or Cornell's practices, which we think look pretty good. So that was our recommendation, 'Trust but verify.' If you want to take that point of view, that is let this go ahead. Some of us had different opinions about how big a resource this could be. Companies get enthusiastic about things. For example, Novartis has basically gotten out of the business which they funded the Berkeley department to do, because ag bio is currently in a slump again. So there you have it. Back and forth. That's our recommendation, and that's all I have to say. I would be happy to answer any questions.”

Professor Thomas Bjorkman, Horticultural Sciences: "One of the questions from the spring was if the Advisory Committee found something it didn't like, it didn't seem like there was a clear mechanism for having those concerns addressed."

Professor Buhrman: "What we would do is report it to the Dean of the Faculty. Hopefully, I'll be off the committee by then. This is my last year. The idea would be, for example, this past year we had another fairly sensitive issue the committee looked at. We made the report; it was submitted to the Dean of the Faculty and to the central administration and that's the way it goes. I think we have trust in our elected Dean. If you would like another mechanism, that would be fine, or if you would like a different committee. I might say that the LAC when we made this recommendation did not nominate itself. I would say that somehow the best intentions go punished."

Professor Bob Richardson, Vice Provost for Research: "My concern is, because the LAC actually has a lot on their plate, if there are several of these that come up in a year, that I might want to go to a procedure where we would still have Senate input but another faculty committee do it, just because it will take a lot of work to go through it and parse it line by line and worry about. I, frankly, welcome having that group look after faculty interests. It's a terrific group of people to work with because of their experience and understanding in the sciences. Anyhow, we might have to, at some point, have another committee, because I don't want to over-burden the LAC."

Professor Buhrman: "The LAC would be delighted with that."

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Environmental Engineering: "I wondered if any of the alliances are under negotiation now or are appearing on the horizon?"

Professor Buhrman: "Speaking from my understanding, there are lots of things going on right now where a group of faculty are making arrangements. There is a program I think with a DOD sponsor, which requires corporate participation, and that looks like it is going to be another substantial win for proposals from the Engineering College and maybe Chemistry or Chemical Biology. I don't know if there are any negotiations right now that are of the type envisioned, which is kind of coming out of the administration down to the people. Most of this stuff is bubbling up, which I think is the way most of these things happen. In some sense, having independent faculty vet these arrangements, which have been going on for years, if we actually do it that way, if we think there are enough that might be significant, might be an improvement. For example, we have an on-going agreement with Corning, a blanket agreement for research. Not everybody likes the current agreement."

Vice Provost Richardson: "In fact, it lapsed."

Professor Buhrman: "Sorry, we had an on-going agreement and now it is lapsed. Now we get to the argument. Some faculty want to get that agreement right back in place, because they had great collaborations and they no longer have it. Other faculty members say, 'Well, you are giving away my patent rights that I want to be able to have, because Corning is going to be able to have first crack at it.' Well, all of these things are in conflict, which is the nature of a university. You have to make these decisions. To the extent that we all know what is going on and most people are involved, I think we are better off. The biggest thing that bothers me about the Berkeley issue is the senior faculty or a group of the leadership of the department basically committed the junior faculty to being part of this team. That's not the way I was brought up here at Cornell where everybody stands on their own legs and does their own thing. If you want to buy in, fine, you know what you are doing. If you don't want to buy in, you go do your own thing. So I think it's very useful to have a public disclosure."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "In reading your report from your committee, one of the concerns that is expressed a couple of times is that a number of people on the committee found it very troublesome that, in a corporate funding arrangement of this kind on a certain large scale, the funding would be a quid pro quo for exclusive licensing rights given to the corporation, to the funders. Perhaps you could talk a little bit about what was going on in your committee discussions."

Professor Buhrman: "Well, again, we may or may not have explored it as much as we should. We had limited time. Again, you are going to get diversity of opinion. Corporations don't do this out of complete goodness of their hearts; they do it because they expect to get something. I will give you my perspective. A small start-up company approached me and they wanted to support some work here at Cornell, partly because they wanted my group's name on their proposal to the federal government. I sent them Cornell's current policy, which says they can see our work that comes out of this ahead of anyone else. They have sixty days and then it's public knowledge. They didn't like it, but they wanted to fund us. We ended up not going, because we didn't want to do what they wanted us to.

"That's Cornell's current policy, and we kind of like that. That is, we have to be able to publish everything we do. We'll give some sponsors time to look at the work first. As far as initial patent rights, currently there's a federal policy that you can sign those agreements. Correct me if I'm wrong here. The whole idea of course is—I mean there's a debate about what patents are for. Some people

think that by giving a company patent rights, you are able to get your knowledge and the benefit that it will give to society out quickly and the company won't support a person. That's an issue that I think you can discuss. The committee was quite happy with the current Cornell policy for that. We were not happy with one faculty member not being able to talk about his or her work because the University signs an agreement with a different company. So basically, we are going to have a lot of openness here. I don't think I completely addressed your concern. We talked about it, but we didn't feel...as long as people knew what was being signed, they could opt out, and we were OK with that."

Professor John Guckenheimer, Mathematics: "I think one of the issues that the faculty forum should consider is what the threshold is for triggering an agreement to be considered by the LAC as one of these corporate alliances. You mentioned the concept as being something top-down, but sometimes faculty from the bottom up have very ambitious plans."

Professor Buhrman: "I agree. If you flood any committee you have, then they will just rubber-stamp everything or reject everything, so you have to have a threshold. I agree with that. Currently, we are pretty set with raising funding, and it seems to be getting better, partly from the faculty we have been hiring lately. It is an issue. We don't want to march too fast; on other hand we can't marshal every \$50,000 contract. So it would have to be big enough to involve enough activity."

Professor Shiffrin: "This is not a question. It's just a suggestion in response to Charlie's question about what kinds of things should be considered by the forum. It seems to me that one of the most important things for the forum to consider is what principles should guide the LAC or any other committee that might be formed, which would require looking at what does Cornell do now with respect to individual faculty members? To what extent does that differ from other universities? So you would be reviewing what we are now doing. What kinds of disputes would one expect to take place within the LAC in evaluating proposals? What would those debates be about? So that the general faculty can be informed in terms of perhaps developing a set of principles that should guide a faculty committee in evaluating proposals."

Professor Buhrman: "I think that's a good point. It would depend upon the faculty forum raising the issues and making the committee think about those. I should say the LAC was unanimous in this document for whatever value that has."

Associate Dean Farina: "An issue that I would like to see the forum address, and I wonder if you talked about it in the committee, is the timing question. To the

extent that these proposals do turn out to be top-down ones, where there is a heavy investment on the part of University Development in the negotiation process, it's likely to require a lot of energy on both sides. If the LAC or whatever committee is presented with a proposal that has basically been fully negotiated at that point, there is enormous pressure on everyone involved with respect to approving the decision. Yet certainly there are going to be claims of (and they are probably quite reasonable) confidentiality issues during the course of the negotiation. I would like to see the forum address the question of how you balance that, and wonder if you all talked about that."

Professor Buhrman: "We talked about it a little bit, and my opinion is the faculty of this university are not muzzled very well. The pressure can be there, but so what? Yes, that of course raises the biggest concern in the interests of the University. Development goes out and tries to get a significant alliance that will bring significant resources here, and then who is this little committee to The committee will say what it wants; the question is 'will it be too late?' It's also unfair to the Development people who are trying to benefit us. That's what they are there for. So the best thing to do, if we have a well-developed set of principles, we know and everyone knows up front. I think this is a very healthy process that we are working our way through.

"I have no one on the LAC who wants anything like Novartis, but everyone on the LAC thinks that there can be substantial benefit to the University. We hope that there can be substantial benefits if it works. They know it would be a substantial benefit from their perspective. What we don't want to do is get into a mess. If we have to have a test case up front, I think our committee felt, we will suffer the test case and then we will know where the University stands. Hopefully, we won't have that problem with the faculty forum and some more discussions. By the time we get to an alliance that is really there, all these red flags have been painted white, and we look pretty good, and we are comfortable with it. Then we will not have Berkeley and Cornell in the same article in *Nature*, unless it says Cornell did it right; they learned from Berkeley. MIT, by the way, seems to be doing some of these things. Of course, they are a very technological institution and not having that sort of problem. I think it's important to have object lessons, but sometimes you learn too much from them in that the really bad example stops you from doing good things, important things that would benefit the institution."

Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences: "You mentioned the principle of shining light on the whole process, and in that spirit, I would like to offer two suggestions for the faculty forum. First of all, several years ago when the earlier incarnation of the Life Sciences Initiative was getting underway, (it was called the Genomics Initiative and that was very grassroots) there were a couple of

forums. Faculty from the ethical, legal, social issues committee at Cornell were asked to help frame the decisions that we were going to have to make, in addition to people who had a stronger interest in seeing that move ahead. So would it be possible to have people from other universities or from the LAC group or elsewhere to present opposing views and make sure that all of the issues are out there for us to consider during the forum? The second suggestion is when the committee is doing its case by case review sometime in the future, is there some way to notify the community as a whole as to which cases are being reviewed, so that people can weigh in and act as a counter-weight to any tendency that might or might not exist for that committee to drift in one direction or another?"

Professor Buhrman: "I understand that question. I'm not going to speak for the administration. There is this issue that you may ruin any of these things from happening if you shine the light too soon. That is if a company is thinking or a group of companies are thinking about doing something, and it starts appearing in the *Ithaca Journal* that Cornell may be selling its soul or Cornell might be doing this great thing, I'm not sure the negotiations are going to go that smoothly. At the same time, we can't let the signatures onto the table unless we know what is going on. So I don't know. Bidy, you look interested."

Provost Martin: "I always look interested. Actually, Jeff has some very balanced formulations about this issue and probably he should speak to it, because he will be more involved than I will."

President Lehman: "Now you are seeing a very serious disagreement."

LAUGHTER.

President Lehman: "I think Bob has articulated the tension here very well. I think one of the challenges for a university when it is acting in the outside world is that universities can act foolishly and shoot themselves in the foot by doing the things that are very important to them, which is ventilating thoroughly and broadly. So people sometimes think universities do a bad job of exercising market power in negotiating, because they give it all way. It's like when you go out to buy a car and you bring your child along and the child says we have to buy this car, and you lose all your negotiating leverage. The question is you are supposed to have the conversation at home first and make a decision. So I guess one of the challenges for a university is how to have secret conversations at home first that really stay secret, and how to include the possibility of a dissenting voice early, where the understanding is that at the end of the day, after the dissenting voice has been heard, there won't then be a public disagreement at a moment when it can be damaging to the university's ability to be effective in the

larger world. That's a hard problem, and I think it requires a certain level of trust in order to make it happen."

Speaker Norton: "Thank you. Orders of the day call for moving on to the Good and Welfare portion of our agenda. May I ask anyone who has further suggestions for the faculty forum to send them to the Dean of the Faculty by e-mail or otherwise. I also inform the body that the Dean of the Faculty had already noted to me that at the conclusion of the faculty forum the University Faculty Committee will take under advisement whether any particular steps need to be taken further by this body or other groups after the forum has occurred. I will now move on to the Good and Welfare. As I said there are three people. Professor Duane Chapman is first. I'm going to hold you to your three minutes."

7. GOOD AND WELFARE.

Professor Duane Chapman, Applied Economics and Management: "I thought you said three and a third minutes."

Speaker Norton: "Three and a third. Well, my watch isn't accurate enough to do a third."

Professor Chapman: "I'm sure we all remember fondly the old Cornell logo. It was the open book and motto roughly like this. 'I would found an institution where any person can find instruction and study.' I mourned its passing in silence until this past August when the *Cornell Daily Sun* published, as you know, its cartoon editorial linking the new logo to J.C. Penney. This was followed by some comments about this at the ALS College meeting where the President was introduced and followed once again by a conversation at our Warren Hall coffee. It was not quite an uproar but a loud mumble on this subject. Professor Conneman provided the selection of twenty panels of red with white lettering. There are a number of interesting panels here. I personally think that we should consider selecting a committee to revisit this question and see if we might come up with something a little more appropriate for Cornell."

Speaker Norton: "Professor Peter Stein for three and a third minutes."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I spoke before you at the end of last semester on behalf of the University Club Task Force. We presented to you a resolution asking you to support in principle the recommendation that we made to bring a university club back to Cornell, and you approved that by an overwhelming margin. We decided that we really needed to communicate with individual faculty about this to try to understand the depth of the support behind it and

also to try and assemble a group of people we could turn to for answers to the many specific questions that come up as we sit and try to think through what Cornell needs.

“It’s very difficult to communicate with faculty members. We sent out a mass e-mail, and I frankly was surprised at the lack of response, but when I talked to people they said, ‘Oh, yeah. I saw it; I trashed it. I didn’t open it.’ These mass e-mails I must confess I do the same thing. I don’t open them; there are just too many. I open when I recognize who it is that is sending it. So, here is my request that I have to make of you. Two things. One, that all of you, presumably with maybe two or three exceptions, who said aye when this resolution came up, would you please say aye again by going to the web site and clicking on it and looking to see if you still think it’s a good idea and then writing your name down? That is request number one. Request number two is that you send out just a two-line. . . . I mean, we are a representative group; we are the way of communicating with departments. I’m asking you as Senate representatives to send an e-mail to your department with the name of the web site, asking them to look at it and put their name on it if they think it’s a good idea. I won’t bother to tell you the web site, because you will lose it, but first thing in the morning you will have an e-mail in your box . . . Please don’t trash it. It will be from Diane LaLonde, Dean of the Faculty’s Office. The website is instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/courses/UniversityClub. I’ll send it to you in the mail.”

Speaker Norton: “The third person is Professor Robert Bland.”

Professor Robert Bland, Operations Research and Industrial Engineering: “I am a member of the task force (Robert Bland, J. Robert Cooke, T. Michael Duncan, David Shmoys, Dotsevi Sogah, Gary Thompson, Charles Walcott) that was created last year by the previous Dean of the Faculty to study issues related to scheduling of classes and examinations. The first issue that the task force chose to tackle had to do with final examination scheduling. This was prompted in part by concerns raised two or three years ago by the Student Assembly having to do in general with stresses caused during exam week and particularly stresses caused by having back-to-back exams – a student in a 5 1/2 hour period having two 2 1/2 hour examinations, separated only by a sprint from one examination room to another across the campus.

“A subset of this group, David Shmoys and I, together with a Ph.D. student in Operations Research, Dmitriy Levchenkov, have begun a computational study of that issue. We are working with Cindy Sedlacek in the Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office who is providing us help with acquisition and analysis of course registration data. We were asked by the former Dean and the present Dean to report to you briefly on what is going on with this study.

“The only data we have examined so far, the only data we have gotten access to so far, are from spring of 2003, the most recent semester concluded. There were more than 3,600 instances of a student having exams in consecutive exam periods on the same day during exam week in the spring of 2003. There were more than 200 instances of a student having back-to-back-to-back exams – three exams in an 8 1/2-hour period last semester. This exam period is a time of great stress for most students and that this stress is exacerbated considerably by these kinds of features of the examination schedule.

“So the task for us was to look into whether the schedule could be improved in this regard. So far, with the spring 2003 data, looking retrospectively with the data in hand showing, for example, three pair of courses, how many students are enrolled simultaneously in both courses, we can find an alternate schedule using discrete optimization techniques that would reduce dramatically, in the order of 90%, the number of occurrences of back-to-back exams, the number of occurrences of three examinations in one day. Within the next two weeks we’ll be getting data from more historical semesters prior to spring 2003. If those inquiries look similar to what we saw with spring 2003, it looks like there is a real opportunity to make an improvement on behalf of the students in the way this is done, but there is one catch.

“The catch is that the present convention here at Cornell is to publish the examination schedule, to tell each student before they even enroll in their courses, which exam period each course will have its exam scheduled. We could try to overcome that by forecasting from prior year’s data how many students we expect to be in any given pair of courses, that may not lead us where we want to go in terms of our ability to reduce the number of back-to-back classes. But we will find out soon when we get these new data sets within a couple of weeks. What is more likely is that if the data we see from other semesters look similar to the data from the spring 2003 semester, that we may be coming back and asking the Student Assembly and asking this group to consider whether it’s really important to fix so far in advance which exam period each course has its examination in. If we could, for example, postpone that until a few weeks after pre-enrollment, then we would have the ability to probably greatly reduce the number of back-to-back exams and still give students six to seven months of lead time to make travel plans, etc. So we will be reporting back in a month or two. We will also be reporting to the Student Assembly once we have had a little more conversation about the data that we will be getting. Thanks for your attention.”

Speaker Norton: “Thank you very much. I wanted to report on the result of the written ballot for the Speaker pro tem. The outcome is sixty-seven votes yes, zero no, and zero abstentions. The Speaker pro tem, I will now inform you, will

be chairing the next Senate meeting, because I have a previous commitment to be out of town that was pre-existing before I was elected as Speaker, so there is not a lot I can do about it. Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.”

Adjournment 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty