

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULY SENATE
Wednesday, October 9, 2002

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Speaker: "I would like to call the meeting to order. First, I would like to remind you that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during this meeting, and I ask that you identify yourself and your department when you speak. We have no Good and Welfare speaker at this time, so we will allot that time to the discussion of the College of Architecture, Art and Planning. I would like now to call on Provost Bidy Martin for remarks."

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTONS FOR PROVOST BIDDY MARTIN

Provost Bidy Martin: "Good afternoon. I used my time in September to emphasize the importance of open and responsible exchange of ideas and debate on the national and international political and economic situation. I just want to take a few seconds today to reiterate the my plea for all of you that we as a community engage in the open, free and responsible exchange of ideas about what's going on politically and economically across the country and the world. Aside from that, what I wanted to do today because I was afraid you might not have many questions is give you a list of—that was a joke—the projects on which the Provost's staff is currently hard at work. I hoped for a one-page with all items on it, and that didn't work out in my office. So I'm just going to give you sequentially some overheads that list some of the important issues on which we are working, so that you can think of some questions to ask me if you weren't able to think of any before. They are not in any order of importance.

Provost's Overheads

- Future of College of Architecture, Art, and Planning
- Arts and Sciences Dean Search
- Budget Planning for 2003-2004
 - tuition
 - endowment payout
 - salary programs
- Capital Campaign Planning
- Workforce Planning
- Administrative Systems Implementation
- New Life Sciences Initiative - Planning
 - program and facilities planning for Life Sciences Technology Building, new facilities in the Baker-Olin-Clark precinct, mouse facilities in Vet
 - coordination of faculty recruitment efforts

- Land Grant Mission Review
 - response to recommendations from panels
 - implementation of recommendations
- Undergraduate Education
 - book project
 - North Campus programming
 - West Campus program and facilities' planning
 - undergraduate research initiatives
 - diversity initiative
- Center for the Environment
 - implementation of lead dean model
 - appointment of new director
 - response to research initiatives
- Einaudi Center
 - implementation of lead dean model
 - appoint a new director
 - formation of university-wide faculty council on international studies
- Social Sciences
 - implement decisions about new investments
 - work with Social Sciences Advisory Council on details
 - continue planning for institute
- Ethnic Studies Task Force
 - assessment of ethnic studies programs
 - development of recommendations
- Arts and Humanities
 - communications
 - development of support nationally
- Grad Student Unionization
 - follow-up
- Tenure and Promotion
- Enrollment Planning and Financial Aid
- Facilities' Planning
- Ongoing work with colleges on college-specific goals

“What I would like to say about each one is that the collaboration and cooperation we have with the Faculty Senate has been vital and continues to be vital. In the case of the College of Architecture, Art and Planning and the proposals about its future, we have been working with the CAPP Committee. I should say CAPP Committee has actually been working carefully with the College and will continue to do so. We have been trying to coordinate our efforts. On the Dean search in Arts and Sciences, we have an outstanding search committee, and the work of the committee is going extremely well and quickly. Budget Planning for 2003-04 is always underway at this time of year, and that is no different this year. The work is actually probably harder this year than in some previous years, but we are currently at work on budget planning for the next year, and we have the help of the Financial Policies Committee of the Senate to think about some of

the critical issues, including endowment pay-out and also tuition rates for next year. Here are some of the other items on which we are actively working. They are probably familiar to most of you. You have heard about them either in print or in forums of various kinds. The Land Grant Mission Review process is about to end as most of you know, and we will be formulating recommendations based on the reports. I hope you all have used the opportunity to comment either through e-mail or in person or some other form of writing about those recommendations of the Land Grant Review Panels. The Administrative Systems Implementation—I want to make a note here that that process is now working well. We expect to have a new system for Alumni Affairs and Development up and running by a year from now. That would be an important success. We are approaching administrative systems very differently than we did during the so-called Project 2000 period by essentially trying to tackle it more and more piecemeal fashion and succeed at smaller pieces of the entire puzzle rather than trying to do everything at once. On the undergraduate education front, we are of course already at work on a book for next year's Book Project, and I welcome suggestions from all of you. I also thank those of you who participated this year, not only in the Book Project proper, but have continued to participate by attending the events on North Campus. The West Campus Program and Facilities planning continues, and we are at work now on the funding of undergraduate research initiatives that will reduce their foundation funding this next year. I'll just keep going, adding a few of the other items on which we are working actively, but saying nothing more about them. I think most of you are aware that these are the projects, which we started last year, some of them, or the year before, and are continuing to work on this semester. I have used up my five minutes? And I'm at the end of my slides. That was pretty good for my first time using overheads."

Professor Richard Durst, Food Science and Technology, Geneva: "One thing conspicuously missing is the presidential search. Anything new on that?"

Provost Martin: "Ah, I'm not working on that."

Professor Durst: "Oh, that's not under the dean search?"

Provost Martin: "The reason why I didn't list the President search is because the Provost's staff is not part of the presidential search. As you know, the Presidential Search Committee is made up primarily of Trustees but there are I think three or four Cornell Ithaca faculty members who are participating in the search committee. I can tell you that the Presidential Search Committee believes that its work is going extremely well. They say that they are ahead of schedule. Now what schedule you might ask? They tend to compare themselves to the last time they (at least some of them) sought and actively and successfully recruited a new President, and that was when Hunter Rawlings was made President some seven years ago. They had named a new President by the first of December. So when the committee says it is ahead of schedule, I believe they think they mean they might be able to name the President before the first of December."

Speaker Howland: "Additional questions for the Provost? You have more time, Provost Martin."

Provost Martin: "Actually, the items on the agenda for today and in particular the future of the College of Architecture, Art and Planning is extremely important to us which is secretly why I put it first on my list, even though I said things were not in any order of significance. The only thing I would like to say there is that I think most of you know that the President and I met with Porus Olpadwala, Dean of the College, and the department chairs this summer. We followed up with meetings with each of the departments. Your CAPP committee has also met with the three departments in the college. I have asked Walter Cohen, Vice Provost, with day to day responsibility for that college, to meet individually with every member of the faculty in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning over the next month, as well as to meet, as he already has, with the chairs as a group and help mediate the discussions in that college of the various possible outcomes of the discussions that are underway. If there is anything else we need to do to help mediate and facilitate the discussions in the college, we will do that, but we won't force all of the work on Walter. You can imagine the amount of time he is putting in, but now that he has agreed to meet with every single faculty member in the college, and I appreciate that enormously, because I think that will be a critical way of discerning what the individuals in the college actually think. I would be happy to answer questions about that now or later or at any other time."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you Provost Martin. The speaker would now like to call on Dean Cooke for remarks."

2. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "I have two somewhat related topics to present. The first is to call your attention to the fact that the Provost and I have appointed a committee to review intellectual property policy for the University. That is copyright as well as patent policy. I put this charge up, because I wanted you to at least be aware that sometime during the course of the year, you will have a chance to interact with them. In the meantime, so that you might communicate with them if you have suggestions or questions for them, this is the membership of the committee, a rather large committee but a well engaged committee. (Appendix 1)

"The other topic is on scholarly publishing and in effect a plea to you from me for faculty involvement in dealing with a problem that really has bedeviled the University for many years. To be successful in our faculty role of teaching, research or outreach we have to have access to the literature. I suspect everyone

in this room is aware, as the librarians are painfully aware, that we have been through at least a decade in which the libraries had to cancel subscriptions, not because the material wasn't of interest but because the budgets wouldn't sustain it. It has continued. The librarians have spent a lot of time working on that, but unfortunately their efforts so far have not solved the problem, and we still are on a serious collision course. The collective budget for research libraries in universities, one hundred and eleven of them in North America, exceeds \$2 billion, so it is a serious problem that goes well beyond Cornell. (Appendix 2)

"One of the discussions that the library has underway is this seminar that will occur tomorrow that is open. So you are welcome to attend if you wish to participate, but it is one that really touches the soul of this University, because we simply cannot function if we cannot have access to the intellectual resources we need in order to do our work. I'm convinced that if we continue along the path that we are currently following that we are going to have a meltdown. We are going to become dysfunctional, because the body of knowledge keeps growing exponentially, doubling about every 12 to 14 years, and yet the number of journals is actually shrinking.

"Here's the punch line. I think the faculty has to join in with the library community to address this problem. The librarians are, after all, acting on our behalf in trying to keep the library functional for us, but it really is the faculty who use the material in a serious way and for whom this is a necessity. I think the time has come for us to try to engage the faculty with the librarians and try to think through this problem. In particular I think we ought to do it in a way such that the solution that we find at Cornell is portable to the rest of the nation, because I think there is some commonality, and if we find some workable solutions, the effort ought to be to do them in such a way that it's usable on other campuses as well.

"A group of us have been working on this problem for some time. This is a listing of the group, and this is in effect a pre-announcement that we have, in fact, gotten a grant. I am the PI for it. Ken King, who some of you will know, Ken was the Vice President for Computing about 20 years ago and went on to become the President of EduCom, which was the national higher education computing group. He has retired, is living here in town, and I think it is noteworthy that he is donating the services without charge to the project to lead this effort simply because of the passion with which he believes in this. We think that we can produce a remedy for this problem.

"After spending a lot of time thinking about it, I am completely convinced that we have to put aside the current model that has been in use for many, many years, but that it has been captured. And the only way out for us that seems

plausible to me is go for open access, instead of the crazy policy we have now where faculty and the University spend the money to create the scholarship, and then we give it away to third parties who then have a monopoly power over selling it back to the libraries,[which] has produced the expected result of what happens when you have a monopoly. So no surprise there. But it is now reaching the proportions at which we are just not going to be able to deal with it. I think the time has come for us to find a method by which each university can pay for its own scholarship publishing costs and give it away to the entire world. That means that every university then will be freed up of trying to buy it back. It means also that you would not need to buy a copy at every campus and store it just in case somebody would wish to read it, but you could download it and then turn it into paper and print it at the time you need it. Because most of the material is used on an occasional basis of that sort, there are huge savings. Instead of having one hundred and eleven universities trying to duplicate everything, we share it.

“Anyway we are at a very early stage. There is one piece that I want to tell you about now, because we want to make some progress on it before the next Senate meeting. The MIT library has started working on what they call a ‘super archive.’ They have created a digital file server in which faculty members at MIT can store material and the library takes on the responsibility of ensuring that it is readable sometime in the future, which is one of the real liabilities of digital documents at the moment. This means that they can store all kinds of things, from lecture notes to working drawings. Just to be specific to Architecture, Art and Planning, imagine being able to on a routine basis, not a special basis, but on a routine basis being able to store architectural plans, photographs of art work, photographic exhibits, on and on you could go, to be able to store it and have it stored and protected and available to you and to other colleagues. This will be organized on a community basis so that sub-groups of the University will decide the conditions of what is stored and who has access to it and under what conditions. So we are at the very early stage of getting this underway. I would welcome suggestions from you. If you think about the number of things that we do that involve data from studying radio telescopes to geology to dairy-herd records, to the music department, being able to store music. Libraries now do a fairly modest job of dealing with any mode of materials, and this would put them on a routine basis so that you could count on it working. I will be in touch with you as we develop the ideas further. The grant does provide money for bringing that to Cornell.”

Speaker Howland: “Questions for the Dean?”

Professor Rebecca Schneider, Natural Resources: “This is the first I’ve heard of it. If understand you correctly, you are proposing replacing the journal system

which publishes research with a university-based publication, but where does the peer review process happen for that?"

Dean Cooke: "Well, I don't know that in the short term it is going to replace it but in the long term it may well. What I have described is an internal archive, a way to warehouse intellectual output of the University, which has a reason to see that it continues into the future. We would build on top of this a layer that would be for publishing. We will need to do the other things like the vetting. Here are two ideas. One would be to commission professional societies to look at this federated database. If every university had its own database, and you had a common index so that when you search, you search everywhere at once, then if you would commission a society to look at everything in that database and pick out the ones that are worthy of attention and are appropriate to that particular professional audience, then there would be in effect a Duncan Hines stamp of approval. Incidentally, Duncan Hines was invented here at Ithaca. Maybe that's a good metaphor. That way there would be the ability for people who are now doing the vetting, the gate keeping, to still have that role. Another possibility would be to say that everything in this database would have an index, so if you add a new article and it refers to a previous article, it would automatically build an index with the previous articles mentioned, so that if you write an article on cold fusion, somewhere down the road you are going to be found out. The peer review then would not last for six months or a year, but it would last in perpetuity. It would make it a much higher standard to meet."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Our time is up."

Dean Cooke: "I would be glad to talk with you after."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Howland: "The speaker would like now to call for approval of the minutes of the September 4 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Any corrections or additions? Hearing none, I assume unanimous approval of the minutes. Thank you. I would like now to call on Associate Dean and Secretary, Charles Walcott, for a Nominations and Elections Committee report."

4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I'm sorry I have only one transparency for you today. This is it, and there you have it."

REPORT OF NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2002

Faculty Advisory Board for Information Technologies (FABIT)

Vernon Briggs, ILR

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education

Rosemary Avery, CHE

William Brown, A&S

Jonathan Macey, Law

Local Advisory Council

Molly Jahn, CALS

Thomas O'Rourke, Engr.

Nominations and Elections Committee

Ted Clark, Vet.

University Benefits Committee

Alan McAdams, JGSM

University Committee on Human Subjects

Jeffrey Sobal, CHE

University Faculty Library Board

Peter Dear, A&S

Scott MacDonald, A&S

Speaker Howland: "The speaker asks for unanimous consent to approve this report. Hearing no objections, I assume unanimous approval. Thank you very much. We now pass to unfinished business. I would like now to call on again on Professor Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary."

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Professor Walcott: "I would like to move the Divided Motion from the Clinical Professor Enabling Legislation, Section VII."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT

VII. Committee to Investigate the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

A. The Faculty Senate directs the Dean of the Faculty to appoint a Task Force or task forces to investigate the status and conditions of employment of non-tenure-track faculty including their terms of employment, particularly job security, rights to academic freedom, access to appropriate grievance and appeals procedures, eligibility for sabbatic leave, eligibility for emeritus/a status, and voting rights.

B. The Senate is mindful that the Dean of the Faculty may determine that the present Task Force on Professorial Titles should continue to work on the issue of titles.

C. Any body or bodies appointed to study these issues will report to the Senate on the progress reached no later than the second Senate meeting of the Spring of 2003, but may report earlier, if any specific proposals are ready for action.

Speaker Howland: "It needs no seconds, so the motion is on the floor and I will call on Alan Bell, Professor of Animal Science and Chair of the Professorial Titles Task Force."

Professor Alan Bell, Animal Science and Chair of the Professorial Titles Task Force: "I'll be very brief. I think you should all recall that this was first introduced and added to the proposal for Enabling Legislation on the Clinical Professor Title at the May meeting of the Senate. And it was considered a friendly amendment by the Task Force. It was severed from the consideration of the full proposal at the September meeting of the Senate, and I guess it was very clear that the reason for that was to keep this thing afloat in case the rest of the proposal was voted down. So the original offerers of this amendment, Professors Shiffrin and Lieberwitz, I believe through the membership of the UFC have somewhat amended the amendment of what, up until now, has been called item VII. I don't think it has been altered in any great substance, but I do believe that section B here has been deleted, but just with that context I would ask the amenders . . ."

Speaker Howland: "I have the amended motion, and it eliminates section B."

Revised Resolution (10/1/02), sponsored by UFC

Committee to Investigate and Make Recommendations Concerning
the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Be It Resolved That

I. The Faculty Senate directs the Dean of the Faculty to appoint a Task Force or Task Forces to investigate and make recommendations concerning the status and conditions of employment of non-tenure-track faculty, paying particular attention to such matters as titles, job security, rights to academic freedom, access to appropriate grievance and appeals procedures, eligibility for sabbatic/study leave, eligibility for emeritus/a status, and voting rights.

II. Any body or bodies appointed to study these issues will report to

the Faculty Senate on the progress reached no later than the second Senate meeting of Spring 2003.

Professor Lieberwitz: "Would you like me to talk about it?"

Speaker Howland: "Yes, just briefly. Do we have a second for that amendment?"

UNKNOWN: "Yes."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "We are making this resolution as a substitute motion, and as has already been stated the differences are really pretty minor. The reason that we put the resolution as it is here as a substitute motion was for the reason of taking the piece which had been separated as possible continuation of the Task Force on Professorial Titles, and rather than separating that out, we thought that would really be quite artificial. Instead what we have done if you take a look at the first part is to include as the task force or task forces, but assuming for the moment that it is one task force, this would include the investigation and recommendations that would look at titles as well as other issues that are included in here and emphasized with regard to job security, academic freedom, etcetera. I think it makes sense to consolidate that all in one package, so that if we have a task force looking at this then it will be a task force looking at everything. I think substantively it really is the same idea, but that it can eliminate confusion that might occur if the idea of titles was somehow separated out as a completely separate or independent issue from the other substantive ideas. So it is just to combine them."

Speaker Howland: "So the substitute motion is now on the floor, and we can have a discussion on the merits of the substitute motion."

Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I am just wondering if in faculty here, does that include post docs, research associates, in other words people who don't usually go in front of the classroom? What was the intent of the authors?"

Speaker Howland: "Did you hear the question?"

Professor Lieberwitz: "With regard to non-tenure track faculty, the idea would be to be inclusive and to have a task force that would look at everybody who is considered faculty but who are not on tenure-track lines. The idea is to be inclusive, but I think that in looking at this a task force would be able to say, in

addressing all of the different kinds of non-tenure-track faculty there are, whether there are significant differences among them which would make a difference with regard to the evidence that is brought forward as to their positions and the kind of recommendations that would be made.”

Dean Cooke: “Just on the parliamentary counts Tenure-track faculty are members of university faculty—assistant, associate and full professor and a few other special categories. In general, lecturers, senior lecturers, research associates, senior research associates are members of college faculty but not of university faculty, and I assume that would be a legitimate concern.”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “I think we need a definition of the word faculty, because it was my belief that, for instance, in the Arts College post-docs and research associates are not members of the faculty, that is they don’t have the same rights that the Arts College faculty do. Professor Lieberwitz feels that in fact those titles would be under the jurisdiction of this committee, so it seems to me that it’s vague in the motion at the moment what is meant by faculty. I think it ought to be well defined so we know what we are passing.”

Speaker Howland: “The chair would like to point out that the wording in this section is the same in both motions. We are discussing now whether to substitute this motion for the original motion, so we might want to handle that later. OK? Could we have more discussion on the merits of the substitute motion as opposed to the original motion? Hearing none, I think you are ready for a vote. All those in favor of substituting this motion before you, say aye.”

“AYE.”

Speaker Howland: “Opposed? Unopposed. So this is the motion we are discussing. We are now discussing this as the main motion, and we can continue on this.”

Professor Kay Obendorf, Textile and Apparel: “My interpretation of this would be academic appointments, which would include extension associates, senior extension associates, lecturers, senior lecturers, research associates and senior research associates, but not post-doctoral associates.”

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law: “I don’t think it would be a productive use of the time of the Faculty Senate to have extensive debates about how faculty ought to be defined. It seems to me that the resolution is a good idea. The task force is not going to be able to do everything, but it will be able to concentrate on what it thinks would be beneficial for the Faculty Senate to consider. Vagueness is a bad thing, but there are worse things than vagueness.”

Speaker Howland: "Additional comments?"

Professor Lieberwitz: "Just a follow-up on what Steve Shiffrin was just saying that actually I think in this case vagueness is not a bad thing. It's probably a good thing. I think it goes along with his initial comments, because the idea is to have a task force that looks at people in the university who would be considered faculty. It may mean that there is in fact some vagueness about how people consider different groups of non-tenure track faculty that we find in different colleges, and that it would be very useful for us to have a task force that comes back and says, 'Here are all the different categories of people we have in the position of non-tenure track faculty and the kind of work that they do. Here are the kinds of working conditions that they are working under, and here are some recommendations with regard to the status of people working under these conditions and in these kinds of teaching and research positions.' So I think that it does make sense to go ahead and say to the task force to broaden the positions."

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics: "My understanding was when the committee started looking at the issues of non-tenure track faculty the concern was whether the title lecturer was sufficient to enable certain types of people who would be engaged in on-campus teaching to be attracted and then retain them. I guess I erroneously thought that when we were talking about this resolution that we were going to insert the word 'teaching' after non-tenure track in point one of either the original or the amended motion. So I would actually . . . I don't know whether I'm permitted to do this according to the rules, but I would propose an amendment in this motion, that we insert the word 'teaching' after the word non-tenure track to make it clear that basically we are looking at the class of people who currently are called lecturers or whatever the new titles are that we have talked about. That should really be the initial concern of the faculty of the university."

Speaker Howland: "I would rule that that is a non-trivial amendment, and hence is not appropriate at this time. It requires 24 hour notice."

Professor Stein: "I would like to offer an amendment which is trivial, mostly because I think this is a bad thing because people argue about it. I don't have a position on this, but it seems to me that the two proponents of the measure want that to say, 'all non-professorial, all non-tenure track academic appointments.' That's what I think we should say, because that's what it seems to be they want it to say. I think that's just a clarification; that's not a policy change. That's what they mean it to be."

Speaker Howland: "So, I'm trying to understand what you are saying. Rather than saying 'non-tenure track faculty,' you wish to insert the trivial change of 'all non . . .'"

Professor Stein: "All academic appointments other than tenure-track faculty. Academic status is a well-defined title that in fact has got all the people we talked about, extension associates. It does not include graduate students. If you're asking for all this information, whatever it's called—how many non-academic appointments do we have, then I need a precise number. It's well understood and it corresponds to what they say."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Stein, repeat your wording one more time. I will ask for unanimous consent of the body to insert it."

Professor Stein: "OK, my wording is 'employment of all academic appointments other than tenure-track faculty.'"

Speaker Howland: "Everybody got the wording? I ask for unanimous consent for this change."

NO. NO. NO. NO.

Speaker Howland: "Failed. Thank you. Further discussion of the motion."

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "I have just one concern and that is the number of things that we are asking this task force to do before spring 2003. I hope you will make it clear to the task force that to tackle a few of these tasks well would be a notable achievement. They don't have to do everything."

Dean Cooke: "That's a progress report, not a final report by that date."

Speaker Howland: "The Dean points that it was a progress report in the motion."

Professor Gary Rendsburg, Near Eastern Studies: "I'm still a little unclear in my mind. Do the proponents of this task force imply that the post-docs who are here for one or two years or visiting faculty who are here for a year all come under the rubric of this?"

Professor Lieberwitz: "The idea is that this is a committee that is supposed to look again broadly at the way in which teaching and research is done in this university. So one could imagine that logically somebody would say well if somebody is a visiting faculty member for one year or somebody is here as a

post-doc for one year, then that person is not really doing the same exact work as somebody who has been in a lecturer position on longer contracts. So the committee would then, I would think, logically say that we are going to report on differences as well as things that are the same across groups. I think that a good task force will look at all the ways in which we have teaching and research done in this university, and then will report back to us on what currently exists and hopefully will have some recommendations on what would make sense."

Speaker Howland: "Seeing no hands, I think you may be ready for the vote. All those in favor of the motion say aye."

AYE.

*Committee to Investigate and Make Recommendations Concerning
the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty*

Be It Resolved That

I. The Faculty Senate directs the Dean of the Faculty to appoint a Task Force or Task Forces to investigate and make recommendations concerning the status and conditions of employment of non-tenure-track faculty, paying particular attention to such matters as titles, job security, rights to academic freedom, access to appropriate grievance and appeals procedures, eligibility for sabbatic/study leave, eligibility for emeritus/a status, and voting rights.

II. Any body or bodies appointed to study these issues will report to the Faculty Senate on the progress reached no later than the second Senate meeting of Spring 2003.

Resolution (10/1/02), sponsored by UFC

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? The motion clearly passes. I would like now to call on Provost Martin again for a response to the April 10, 2002 Resolution regarding Computer Science."

6. RESPONSE TO APRIL 10, 2002 RESOLUTION REGARDING COMPUTER SCIENCE

Provost Martin: "I'm not entirely sure how to proceed here, but it is my fault in any case because I didn't give the CAPP Committee enough time to respond to my responses to their questions. So I apologize for that to the CAPP Committee. You have in your packet, with your agenda for the meeting, the letter that the

CAPP Committee sent me and my very brief answers to those questions. I would be glad to take questions from this group if you have any.

“Let me simply remind you that last spring and actually throughout this past year, the Senate has taken an interest in what we would do to resolve the issues still up in the air about the location of Computer Science and the governance of the faculty of Computing and Information Sciences. I begged your forbearance and asked you to wait until we had a new Dean of Engineering, until we made final decisions, and I worked very carefully through many hours with Dean Fuchs (I’m sure you all know Dean Kent Fuchs now, our relatively new Dean of Engineering) and Bob Constable over the summer, and we then made an announcement about the decisions we had reached and Dean Fuchs is here today, as is Dean Constable, to answer questions that I am unable to answer. I say that only because what we resolved to do is to have the two deans agree on the proposal that we released in the summer, the decision that we reached in the summer, and continue working on the fine points and details with one another. And they are doing that without intervention or help from me. So if you have questions, I would be glad to answer.”

Speaker Howland: “Questions for the Provost?”

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “This motion that was presented by CAPP last spring, that passed by a vote of 63 to 4, had a number of points, the first six were whereas, the seventh one was asking for initiation of action. The ninth one asked for a report, which is what we are getting now. The eighth one was the operative one, and it said what the Senate expected by way of disposition of the administrative arrangement. When your letter was produced it seemed to have a good deal of ambiguity in it, I think probably intentionally, and it is difficult to lay that document up against the Senate resolution and determine the extent of compliance or agreement, between your letter and your proposal and point 8 of the Senate resolution. You have given a few responses very recently to 8; I think CAPP should consider them, but even at that point it is not clear to me that one can now measure them against each other and determine from the rather clear language of point 8 what exactly has been achieved. I think it is clear at the moment that a number of things that were asked for in point 8 were not achieved. I think issues of traditional roles with regard to the budget of the department, being held by the Dean of an existing college, I believe that is not the situation as it pertains today in your plan. There are probably other issues as well, so at the moment what I’m saying is that since this is the reporting comment there is substantial confusion as to whether this agreement agrees in some sense with the Senate motion and in a few places there is, I think, substantial disagreement with the Senate motion as reported.”

Provost Martin: "I think that's accurate."

Professor Fine: "I meant it to be, thank you."

Provost Martin: "I know you do, Terry. I think we would both be disappointed if there weren't some disagreement, but of course there is. I think the simple way to put this is that the Senate was concerned as was I, frankly, about the fact that in the interim period it seemed the FCIS was serving as a tenure granting or tenure home for members of the faculty in Computer Sciences, and we agree—that is you as a body and I—that that was not appropriate and not suitable, and so the agreement that we did make, the decision we reached, has identified the College of Engineering or the college in which any member of Computing and Information Sciences as a faculty belongs as the appropriate tenure college.

"It is also true in point 8, although I don't have the numbers down as well as Terry, but there was a request the decision grant the usual budgeting authority to an existing college dean for the Department of Computer Science and there it is true in the language that Terry used that I have not complied. I should say the President and I have not complied fully with that request for the simple reason that we don't think in the circumstances that's the best decision to have made. So the budget for the Department of Computer Science is held by the Dean for the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences but is transparent to the Dean of Engineering, and Dean Fuchs can answer any questions you have about how well he thinks that is working and will work. As I said, the agreements that we reached, the decisions that we made about the Department of Computer Science, its relationship with the College of Engineering and to the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences, were reached jointly and collectively by Deans Constable, Fuchs and myself."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I have a question. It's about what that word means. What does it mean for someone to control a budget that is transparent to someone else? I guess it's technical budget terminology that I'm not familiar with."

Provost Martin: "It means that the budget is actually administered by the head of the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences, but it also means that Dean Fuchs has an advisory role in relation to that budget and will, by transparent I mean literally that he will be able to see the budget and will be working with the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences on those budgetary issues for the Department of Computer Science. There will be other faculty in Computing and Information Sciences, there are already, whose tenure home is not the College of

Engineering but say the College of Arts and Sciences. In that case, the Dean for Computing and Information Sciences will need to consult with the Deans of the relevant colleges, but in the case of that one department, Computer Science, there is transparency for the Dean of Engineering to that budget.”

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Sciences: “Should the Dean of the Faculty of Computer and Information Sciences and Dean of the College of Engineering disagree on some aspects of that budget, who makes the final decision?”

Provost Martin: “The Dean of Computing and Information Sciences has authority over the budget, but he will make available to the Dean of Engineering all decisions he makes. You could ask why. Why should the Dean of Engineering see the budget if the authority for using it was given to the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences? The reason is this. There is enough overlap in the projects that it is important for planning purposes for the Dean of Engineering to understand and be able to consult about what is going on in Computing and Information Sciences. The idea is not that they should agree on or collaborate on every single budget issue.”

Professor Kallfelz: “It seems to me that means that the Department of Computer Science actually becomes part of the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences.”

Provost Martin: “That’s right.”

Professor Kallfelz: “That dean is calling the shots.”

Provost Martin: “No, not all the shots, but on budgetary issues for the most part yes. I can’t answer the very specific questions you might have about what would happen if X and Y occurs, because the deans are in the process of working out the details with one another. As I said, I have offered help if they need it, but they haven’t needed the intervention of the Provost’s Office. And I believe it is fair to say that Kent, you and Bob feel that you are making good progress on working out the details.”

W. Kent Fuchs, Dean. College of Engineering: “Yes.”

Provost Martin: “I think if the question that Terry is raising and others have raised about whether this is an anomalous set up, the answer is absolutely yes. Is there ambiguity in what we said about it? Yes, but not in order to hide what we have done, but because there is genuine ambiguity in the set up until the details have been worked out. There is no subterfuge; it is anomalous. Some of the structural mechanisms are still ambiguous, because the details haven’t been

worked out. I want to be completely open about that, but is Engineering the tenure home for Computer Science? Yes. Will appointments and tenure promotion processes be handled in the way they are in other colleges? Yes. Does Engineering serve in general as the administrative umbrella for the entire operation of the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences? Yes. In much the same way we have tried to use other colleges as the administrative umbrella for other kinds of inter-college or cross-college units – the Einaudi Center and the Center for the Environment and their location now in, for administrative purposes, the specific colleges are additional examples of such set ups where we are trying to save administrative costs at the Center but not make cross-college units specifically or uniquely one-college domains.”

Professor Arms: “There is no indication of the relationship between the Arts College and Computer Science. Yet Computer Science has a rather substantial major in that college. Can you comment on the major relationship between Arts and Sciences and Computer Science.”

Provost Martin: “It remains exactly the same as it has always been. That’s because computer scientists believed they were actually voting members of the College of Arts and Sciences, but in the research I did when I was actually still in the Dean’s office in Arts and Sciences, we discovered that’s not the case. So the major will continue to be offered to students in the College of Arts and Sciences. It is an Arts and Sciences major, approved by the Arts and Sciences College’s EPC and that will continue just as has it has been run to date. There won’t be any changes.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I have a question about budgeting. With the kind of control that you are talking about of the budget and the Dean of the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences, how far along does control of the budget make the faculty actually into a college? You know me, I have an underlying question, so for example on something like tenure lines, you usually think of at that as the being doled out by the dean of the college where the tenure lines should be and that’s one of the budgetary questions. So that is the sort of question that I think comes out of the question is the issue of where the budget is and who makes those kind of choices. And then doesn’t it make the dean in Computing and Information Sciences more like dean of a college?”

Provost Martin: “It makes the dean there something between a traditional dean of a college and something other. I mean it’s . . . I’m sorry. I’m tired and I’m not being as articulate as I should be. It does not make the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences the same as the dean of college, because it is not a tenure-granting unit, and it won’t be. It does put the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences in charge of a budget that he requires and that the faculty of

Computing and Information Sciences requires if they are going to continue doing the extraordinarily effective cross-university work that they have been doing, and the evidence for the success of this university wide project is abundant, and I would be happy to review it with any of you who wish.

“The reason for creating something anomalous is precisely because of the success across the university of these cross-college initiatives in Computing and Information Sciences and a desire to keep what is working well and what is innovative going and working well. Does it accord with our traditional structure? No. Why not? Because it’s working well; it’s new; we want it to work well, and it can be worked out (I believe fervently) between the two deans. If I were not convinced by those two deans that they could work it out in a way that would be rational, understandable to the people involved, and promote the welfare both of the College of Engineering and of this innovative university-wide project, then I wouldn’t have gone along with this decision.

“So does it differ from our traditional mechanisms and structures? Yes. Is that a good or a bad idea? I think it’s a good idea. As I said in my report that I published in the *Chronicle*, and I know you all read it, we really do have to do a combination of preserving those traditional structures that work over long periods of time and have proven to work and we also have to be open to the possibility of some innovative structures and mechanisms, because of the changes that are occurring not only in bureaucratic and administrative grounds, but most importantly in intellectual and educational grounds. I feel like what we have come up with is a kind of compromise formation that retains some of what is important traditionally, tenure homes in existing departments and colleges, following college procedures and something slightly anomalous which is budgetary authority in the hands of a dean who cannot operate in the way deans of traditional colleges do because it is not a tenure granting unit, and it is not fully autonomous from other colleges, and it won’t be.

“If I sound a little fervent it is only because I’m tired and I get a little more articulate when I get fervent. But I am simply trying to say that if you have a feeling that this is an anomalous policy, you’re right. The idea that deans of the colleges and heads of other units not only have to work together really closely and with great collegiality, but should, is something I would like to support as opposed to fear. They will have to work closely together. They will have to be collegial. They will have open and honest with one another. They will have to show each other the budgets of their units and talk about what is going on. But frankly, giving the budget authority to the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences and the projects that have been authorized by this university protects the College of Engineering, and Dean Fuchs will explain to you why he thought so. But it’s pretty obvious. As these fields grow, the College of Engineering does

not want to have its projects abridged by the necessity of adding positions to that new initiative. There are many complexities. I'm trying as well as I can in a short period of time to explain them. I thought that the Senate's most passionate belief and most significant point was that it is not legitimate to have tenure granted at this university in anything other than a traditional college procedure, through those procedures, and I agreed with that. We have insured that appointments and tenure belong in an existing college. That some of the other arrangements are anomalous I grant you. Any other questions?"

Speaker Howland: "We have two, Professor Stein and then Professor Fine."

Professor Stein: "I'm trying a little bit to understand this. If you imagine a continuum, which is a department inside a college and another continuum with a department that becomes a college, there is a whole continuum of what kinds of relationships between department chair and a dean. They are closer to the model of a department in a college than a department that has got the relationship with the college. When you outline the way that Computer Science is, it seems to me that it is much closer to an independent college than to a department within a college, and the reason I say that is, if I look around at what's really important I think the tenure home is not really very significant. As you know, at Cornell we promote the vast majority of the people who departments recommend for tenure to tenure. The actual role of the dean is really not that important. The kinds of things that are important are budgets, lines, and who gets lines, what teaching obligations are, what advising obligations are and so on and so forth. Those are the daily work of a college and a relationship between a department chair and a college. I'm not quite sure I understand all the ins and outs of this, but it does seem to me that what's being described is much closer to an independent college than it is to a department inside an existing college."

Provost Martin: "Well, let me make a couple of remarks there. Most colleges don't make their budgets transparent to other colleges. Most colleges don't give the decision making about majors and approval of majors within that college to other colleges. Most colleges, all colleges, have tenure-granting authority. Those are already distinctions, but let me also make something clear, and that is when I sat down with the members of the Computer Science Department, the Chairs in Engineering, the Dean of Engineering and the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences, my question was not what risk do we run that this might look like a college from a bureaucratic prospective? My question was how can we use the traditional structures that we know work and that have served us well while allowing some innovations that will permit this interdisciplinary cross-college project to flourish as it has begun to flourish?"

“One of the things you said is really very helpful here, and that is that, forget about the name college, any unit or group of faculty who want to mount interesting new curricula offerings for our undergraduate and graduate students do need to have enough budget authority and enough faculty resources at their disposal to mount those new curricular programs. And that is exactly what the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences was charged to do some time ago, sometime before I became Provost, and that’s what they have been doing. The necessity to give significant budgetary authority and flexibility to that operation has everything to do with extraordinary work. I would have to say to all of you truly extraordinary work that these faculty have done to mount new courses, new concentrations, and new curricular offerings that our students are taking in the hundreds. It’s a decision. One final thing, it does matter I think. The question about whether this could slip into something that would look like yet another college at Cornell does matter to me. I’m not saying that doesn’t matter to me. The purpose was not to permit it to be a college, nor would I wish for it to become a college. But it is an anomalous structure. I know that rational, logical and smart people can parse this in a way that will make it seem as though there is enough lined up under it to make it seem like a college. I understand that. Somebody could actually win that debate if they could invent more items on their side than on my side, but the point I’m trying to make is that we are trying to do something larger than decide whether or not that’s a danger.”

Speaker Howland: “Thank you. The Speaker will now call on Jennifer Gerner, Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies for a CAPP progress report concerning Architecture, Art and Planning.”

7. CAPP PROGRESS REPORT CONCERNING ARCHITECTURE, ART AND PLANNING

Professor Jennifer Gerner, Policy Analysis and Management, and Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies: “We have given you a progress report in writing (Appendix 3), and I will let that stand, but I do want to tell you about several things that have happened in the last week so you know what we have been doing and might want to think about this as a revised progress report. Last week we learned that the Dean of the College of Architecture, Art and Planning, Porus Olpadwala, had attended a meeting that contained people from each of the three departments. I think that must have happened on Monday of last week. We also on Tuesday met with the Provost to talk with her about her views and about our recommendation to her that she be in touch again with the faculty in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning to be more specific and more clear about exactly what she expected from those faculty. Today she has sent a letter to the faculty in that college, which I think does substantially clarify what she is expecting and talks about her interest in working with the committee

that Dean Olpadwala has charged with this task and also urges those three departments to consider a wide range of different possibilities. I think that has been helpful, and I hope . . . I'm ever the optimist, so I would be optimistic that at least some productive conversation will now occur.

"I also want to say that after reading our report of what we had heard from the various faculty in the various departments, I have heard from a number of those faculty, particularly some faculty in the Department of Architecture who want to make clear that there is by no means a unanimous agreement that that department has about what the outcome should be. We appreciate that, and we know that and I want to acknowledge that. I think it's helpful for faculty of different points of view to begin to talk to each other.

"Our position as the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies is to try to have some productive discussion. We don't at this moment have any position on what ought to happen, but we do think that there ought to be discussion and creative discussion among those three departments and within those three departments to come to some better institutional structure whatever that may be. So that's where we are."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The Chair would now like to call on four senators from the College of Architecture, Art and Planning. Would they come forward and introduce themselves. They have 9 minutes amongst them to make their remarks."

"I'm Todd McGrain from the Department of Art."

"Jonathan Ochshorn from Architecture, and Archie MacKenzie who also represents Architecture and is sitting down taking notes."

"Lourdes Beneria from City and Regional Planning."

Professor Todd McGrain, Art: "Ground zero—the example of our era of the interrelated nature of architecture, art and city planning. What we do at ground zero must be a memorial, a building, and as we prepare to build we must address essential issues germane to the discipline of city planning.

"This is not the time to break these disciplines apart, but is the time to foster and strengthen the links between them.

"For the past year the Department of Art has engaged in a conversation regarding strategies for invigorating our program. The administration's charge

that this college legitimizes its joint existence has brought a sense of urgency to this conversation.

“Of the many initiatives we have discussed those which strengthen our ties with Architecture and Planning have engendered the most enthusiasm. These proposals include shared curriculum through interdisciplinary programs, technology initiatives, and an increased focus on critical theory.

“Add to this the professional nature of our degrees, our admission policies which include portfolio review, and the strong studio component of our programs and we are convinced that we belong together as a college.

“The Department of Art is committed to working with Architecture and Planning to create an integrated college that prepares our students to tackle the most complex and engaging questions of our era.”

Professor Jonathan Ochshorn, Architecture: “I have a short statement. It hasn’t been officially endorsed by our department. We haven’t had a chance to meet formally, but it is endorsed by the Chair, and it has been distributed to faculty members in Architecture and seems to have some support. So let me just read it.

“The President and Provost have asked each of the departments of Architecture, Art and Planning to examine the following question. Into which other college at Cornell would you best fit academically and administratively?

Based on internal discussions within our department as well as assurances from the Provost and President that they are open to considering a variety of options, committees within the Department of Architecture have begun considering three realignment models. One based on our integration into a different college at Cornell; the second involving a reformed College of Architecture, Art and Planning and the third based on an independent School of Architecture. We expect to complete this initial examination within the next few weeks.

While individual members of the Department of Architecture may hold strong and divergent views on this question, the Department of Architecture as a whole has not and will not take an official position advocating the adoption of any specific realignment model until the examination process is complete and until we have an opportunity to analyze the proposals that may emerge. In light of this, we cannot agree with the Senate Committee on Academic

Policies and Programs' characterization of our department's attitude towards realignment, which was referred to by Jennie Gerner just a moment ago, that the Department of Architecture would as a first option prefer a full, autonomous school and that our department is not interested in exploring other options until this autonomous school option has been removed from the table. On the contrary, we wish to explore all options before reaching a decision on the best course of action."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you."

Professor Lourdes Beneria, City and Regional Planning: "The six points that I am going to read have been agreed to by City and Regional Planning faculty. There will also be here on the table some more facts about our department in case you are interested. The first point is about the College of Architecture, Art and Planning as the only place at Cornell dealing with the built environment, unless we move to Engineering. It builds with its designs, such as in architecture, urban design, and land use planning, with its protection of the environment, historic preservation, for example. It builds with production, such as in the case of real estate, with its enhancement, fine arts, with its history, planning history, architectural history, with its guidance, such as with planning and planning policy, and with its social and economic policy affecting people as well as governance, such as with social planning, community development and regional planning. Thus the college defines an intellectual territory that no other college deals with at Cornell. If the administration dismantles the college, there will no longer be a central focus on the built environment. Within other intellectual territories it will be dispersed, diluted and probably downsized.

"The second point is that within this context, CRP is unique in its focus on urban and spatial matters, combining the study of the built environment with social, political and economic aspects of organization and regional planning, thus bringing together physical on the one hand and social planning on the other, an equally important component for the social sciences.

"The third point, the entire faculties of both CRP and Art most strongly argue to retain the college. We feel that the pedagogical strength of our departments would be hurt, perhaps fatally, by moving to any other university venue that we have so far been able to investigate.

"Fourth, the administration's instruction to explore the dissolution of the college demands a response, but we need new information and detailed analysis to propose such an important change in the overall structure of the university. We need the process that would shed light on several things: 1) The costs associated

with alternatives to the current situation. 2) The overlaps and conflicts among academic programs in the three departments within the college. 3) The possible alternatives to be worked out within an improved college model, such as the possible infusion of the Department of Landscape Architecture.

“Fifth, a comprehensive discussion in the Senate of the fate of the college requires this information. Therefore, we call on the Senate to first support the CAPP report’s request for verification about the President’s and Provost’s objectives and about the conditions under which the dissolution of the college may be considered. Second, to undertake a broader investigation leading to an eventual Senate position on the question of college dissolution. This task of information gathering could be either done through the CAPP Committee or through the establishment of a Senate ad hoc committee.

“Finally, it’s important to mention that the Senate should be aware that the reactions from alumni of all three departments have been overwhelmingly strong against the college dissolution.”

Speaker Howland: “Does the remaining senator from the college wish to say anything?”

Professor MacKenzie: “No. That’s sufficient.”

Speaker Howland: “This topic is open for discussion by the Senate. You may direct questions to any of the senators or administrators.”

Professor Joseph Laquatra, Design and Environmental Analysis: “I just want to correct – I’m not taking a position – this is just to correct a statement - there are other departments that focus on the built environment. My department, Design and Environmental Analysis focuses on the built environment. The School of Hotel Administration includes that focus as part of its curriculum as well.”

Professor Kathryn Gleason, Landscape Architecture: “I’m from another department dealing with the built environment. I would like to speak from experience rather than research in saying that the current configuration of the college is the standard one at our peer institutions, and the alternatives are quite limited. I would hope that the faculty develop their own plans and look at the whole range of configurations. If you look at our peers, it is really either a school of architecture or one school that contains the design arts. I’m not sure that everyone would agree with that.”

Professor Stein: “I have a procedural comment to make. I mean this is all a very complicated issue obviously. I think that most of the people sitting in this room

really don't know enough to comment on it. The question I have is how can a body like this, a body of one hundred members deal in a helpful and meaningful way with an issue like this? It seems to me, I have been watching for the past couple of days another senate debating a resolution, which is sort of vague, and it makes me a little upset to my stomach. It seems to me that while you hear a lot of advantages of vagueness today, there are disadvantages to it, because you don't know what is going to happen. I tend to opt for something that is not vague. It seems to me that at some point, and that point ought to be before the trustees act, and my understanding is that the plans for the administration are to bring something to the January meeting of the trustees, I think that this body ought to be presented with a resolution that is not vague which says exactly what the plan is. That means—will there be a college or won't there be a college and exactly where the three departments are going to go, so that this body can say either we recommend adopting or we don't recommend adopting that. Anything short of that I think will not enable a body like this to make any kind of an intelligent contribution to this debate."

Professor Kenneth Reardon, City and Regional Planning: "It seems like the current administration has made quite an effort to institute strategic planning practices to improve excellence and scholarship in teaching. It seems ironic that for such a fundamental change they wouldn't use the system that has been put in place, which starts with the self study, external review, goes to a campus-wide faculty strategic planning group and then reports back to the Senate. It seems to me that this is so important that it deserves the kind of careful study that Peter talks about, particularly in the absence of any compelling evidence that there is a specific and clear problem."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Following up on that. It seems that the point that was made in the CAPP report, number seven, about clarification of objectives is important, and it follows from the point that Ken just made. I don't know if Provost Martin wants to comment here today more about the specific objectives. Is it financial? Is it not financial? Is it curricular? How clear can we be perhaps today on what the objectives are of the administration and then also about the issue of careful review? Once we are clear on the objectives, then there is that issue that we return to again and again in the Senate that we would like to see a careful study made before action is taken. So one thing I would suggest is to avoid what appears to be a rather precipitous move to say that something needs to be done right away so that something can be taken to the trustees in January. There is no reason that I can see why the trustees need to have something in January. That's an imposed deadline that seems to me to be creating a sense of panic and rush when what we need is careful consideration, so that we can actually end up with something better than what we started with."

Speaker Howland: "Provost Martin would you like to respond to that?"

Provost Martin: "I thought maybe Professor Ehrenberg wanted to."

Professor Ehrenberg: "I actually wanted to pick up on Peter's point and ask if it's appropriate to ask the CAPP committee to consider bringing a motion at the November meeting like he implicitly suggested that before a final decision is made that the Senate know what the alternatives are and give its view on the alternatives."

UNKNOWN: "But that's the point – next month."

Professor Gerner: "I have to say that we started thinking that maybe we would have a motion endorsing some action or other. We are unlikely to have such a motion I think. We will come back in November with something further to say, but I don't know if it will be the clear-cut resolution that says we ought to take this path or that path. I think at the current time that seems unlikely that will be true."

Provost Martin: "In response to Ken. Actually this administration hasn't been a major proponent of strategic planning. When President Rawlings came he did institute program review, and the faculty program review process as you know has been underway for some years and actually there are external program reviews of at least two of the departments in the college. Strategic planning is not the same and has not actually been promoted by President Rawlings since he has been here.

"Nevertheless, the question about objectives is important. It is not a question of an objective, Risa. What the proposal said and what we continue to repeat is this, and let me put it as clearly but also as gently as I can. This proposal emerged out of a perception of governance, budgetary, educational and research problems in the college. We are open and remain open to a variety of different outcomes in response to the proposal that the faculty in that college consider the problems and consider whether dissolution of the college and realignment of each department, or all departments together, is a good idea, or whether having the college remain intact in some reformed version, as someone put it, would be a better option. We asked each department to think about where they would be – in what alignment their programs would be enhanced.

"I don't think it would be appropriate nor do I wish here to go through all of the problems that we perceived and that have led us to propose that this be taken seriously by faculty in the college. As I said, they span a range of issues. I think the college faculty members are doing a really good job of considering

thoughtfully what some of the problems are. They are tackling the questions we raised about why there is no active curriculum committee, why there is so little interaction educationally among the students across the different departments. We await more information about that and more responses to it. The budgetary issues are issues that are also under review by faculty in the college and also in the Provost's office. We are working hard together to try and come to some shared understanding of where those problems lie and why they have emerged in the forms they have. The problems span a wide range of different areas, and the idea of proposing this possible dissolution really emerged I would say from difficulties we were having understanding the lack of educational and intellectual coherence and interaction within the college, even though we understand theoretically why these fields are aligned elsewhere and why they could usefully interact with one another. But we are worried about what is happening in practice not what could be true in theory. We are worried about that, and we are worried about some of the governance problems, and as we have said consistently, budgetary problems as well."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I'm puzzled, and I'm going to ask you a question, but I'm sure I won't get the answer I would like. I'm trying to understand this administration's view of politics. I look at their rough treatment of deans, like Dean Hopcroft of Engineering, Dean Lewis of Arts. I look at their willingness to create a kind of shadow college; I'm not quite sure what it is, with respect to Computer Science. It isn't a college; it walks and talks like one, but it won't be given the name. OK. On the other hand, to show there is even-handedness, they are also willing to on a very short time table, the January trustee meeting, to dis-establish a college that has been around for I don't know how long. It has been around for a very long time.

All of these things seem to me to be worth a lot more, to invest in a lot more care, a lot more consideration than I think they are getting. It's very unclear. Is CAPP going to respond to this in the case of Architecture? It's very difficult for CAPP to figure out what is going on. What CAPP could do is try to bring the Senate the two arguments and let the Senate decide. CAPP isn't going to decide this. We don't have the competence to do that. We have to prepare the work for the Senate. That means needing to know one side of it, which is your side of it. I'm not sure we know that. We know we have got a deadline. But it seems a little funny to have that deadline before you really know what you are doing. It's a very serious deadline, to take something to the trustees. So I'm kind of puzzled by what the overall view of this administration is. Certainly colleges have become a very fragile kind of entity. You can beat up on deans, and you can build new ones and take apart old ones. What's happening in this context? I told you it wouldn't be easy."

Provost Martin: “Actually, it is very easy. It is extremely easy. The answer to that is, the things you have just listed, as if they are all connected, are not. So let’s talk about Architecture, Art and Planning. I’m not going to address the treatment of deans here. I couldn’t have agreed less with what you just said, and let me also add that the category of this administration is somewhat obfuscating. Let me just say what I have to say from my point of view. Let me also answer one thing that you said. The colleges at this university are doing extremely well. I think most of the colleges at this university, were they to compare themselves to their peers elsewhere are in great budgetary shape, have excellent deans, have enormously distinguished faculties and very strong students. Nobody aims or is in my view doing anything to undermine that.

“Architecture, Art and Planning—I just explained that issues have arisen over the past few years that seem to make it important to raise questions about the college as a college. Why? Let me put it even more broadly than I have. Because from all the evidence we can gather what we have here are three independent units, which operate as a college but which are so independent of one another, these three departments, that infrastructure costs are replicated in every unit. There is as I said before no active curriculum committee for the college. There are no requirements for undergraduates that are college-wide requirements. The admissions are done by department. There is, in our view, at least an interesting question to be raised about why that is the case. If you have three essentially independent units, housed in what’s called a college, that are not interacting with each other and are not sharing the costs of infrastructure, whether it’s student admissions or a number of other things, then it’s at least worth asking the question why. In part, because some of the theoretical reasons we have been given about why it’s important to have three such departments in a college together, interacting with one another, are compelling enough for us to want to know why at Cornell does this not work? Everything I have heard from meeting with faculty since we have made this proposal convinces me that there is a strong argument to keep these departments in interaction with one another, but they are not interacting.

“Now let me say this, because at some level I just like to be honest and whatever happens happens. I would not do anything, however painful it is for people—and I realize that this is painful to people in the college, if you create anxiety for people outside the college, it’s not easy on any of us to try and make major decisions about things that appear not to be working well—but I would not do any of this out of some cynical effort to diminish the health and well-being of a college or of a dean or of a faculty in a unit. And if the faculty felt that it had administrators who were so cynical and cared so little for the institution that we would do things that we either had not thought about carefully or for some cynical reason wanted to do for negative reasons, then we ought to be

gone. And you need to find people in whom you have some faith, that they are thoughtful about these things, that we acknowledge the pain and anxiety it causes to ask major questions of this kind, that we understand why people raise questions about structures that may seem anomalous and what I'm calling innovative.

"That's how I feel about it, but that doesn't mean that the decisions that we reach are right, because there is no perfection, and I understand that. It's important to disagree; it's important to criticize; it's important to debate. But if a serious number of faculty really believe that you have got administrators who care very little for the institution and its well being, care very little about the intellectual health and the curricular health in any one college or across the board, care so little that we simply throw out proposals or make decisions about deans and academic administrators on a whim or in order to weed out people, then you really should ask us not to serve. But I don't think the kind of cynicism that produces these kinds of remarks publicly really helps any of us. Now I hope you can understand that I distinguish that from strong disagreement and strong criticism for decisions that we make. But these jobs, just like yours, are really not easy jobs, and if you could convince me that I have taken part in decisions of any sort in a way that is cynical, that is beating up on people for bad reasons, for no reason, and then I will step down. That's how I feel about it. I feel very strongly about it."

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: "I'm sorry that isn't easy to contest this issue, but is the rush necessary? That is my question. Is there a need to rush to meet the January deadline?"

Provost Martin: "The President has wanted to try and make some decisions that he thinks are important to make before he leaves office, because he has taken the position, which I believe is a responsible one though people can disagree, that he would like to solve some problems and not leave them for the next president, who will come in with a full range of problems, which we can all imagine, and that's his position. Is he willing to have this process last longer if it is necessary? Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. President Rawlings has already said to the chairs of each of these three departments and to the dean that if we can't come to what we consider to be a thoughtful and sound decision by December in order to go to the trustees in January, then we will lengthen the process.

"I honestly think the questions that many of you are raising about how the Senate can be helpful are really serious and difficult ones, because it is really hard from outside the college and from outside the fields that are actually represented by the college to get a good handle on why there has been little interaction in the recent past, how there could be more, what form it would take,

what it would add to the students' education if there were more interaction within the college, how some of the governance and budgetary issues could be addressed without cutting out of the budgets of other general purpose colleges. All of those are really difficult questions, and I actually think that the faculty in the college itself are going to be the important informers on these issues. I, and the people in my office, notably Walter Cohen and Carolyn Ainslie, will be happy to provide the Senate, as we are happy to provide the departments in the college, any information that you think will be helpful in addressing it. But I think it is a serious question. It's really hard to understand. Even if you take a year or a year and a half or two years, no one is going to know better than the faculty in that college I think what is actually possible for those units and those intellectual fields than they are. That's my view on it."

Speaker Howland: "Point of order. Ladies and gentlemen, would you please turn off your cell phones when you come to this meeting. Proceed."

Professor Tony Simons, Hotel: "Is the administration's proposal written?"

Provost Martin: "Yes."

Professor Simons: "Can I get that from you?"

Provost Martin: "Absolutely, and the letter that I sent to the faculty today clarifying, as CAPP had suggested we do, what we would like them to do as part of the process is also available. You are welcome to it."

Dean Cooke: "We can forward that letter to the Senate."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "I would like to ask whether the option of having a separate school of architecture is on the table or whether the architects should move on to consider their other two possibilities?"

Provost Martin: "Lisa, what we have said, and it's clarified in the letter we sent today, is that we won't consider any proposal from any of the three departments or any grouping of the faculty unless they have considered all the options that are proposed in the college through this college-wide committee, and that means that the Department of Architecture can certainly propose to be an independent school. President Rawlings made it very clear from the beginning that all possible options would be considered if they seem sound and if the faculty are convinced that they would be a good option. But we will not accept from the Department of Architecture or from either of the other two departments a proposal to stand alone unless they have also worked carefully with other members of the college to assess the possibility of keeping the college or

changing the college in some way that would benefit all of the units in the college.”

Speaker Howland: “Very rapidly one last comment.”

Professor Ehrenberg: “I would just like to thank the Provost for her continual willingness to engage the faculty on academic issues and thank her for pointing out that the administration is not the enemy; it is us. And thanks to all of you.”

APPLAUSE.

Speaker Howland: “That brings us to the end of the meeting. I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. The meeting is adjourned.”

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary

COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Preliminary Charge

Review the university's existing Copyright Policy and policies on intellectual property, and recommend modifications needed in light of changes in technology and the educational environment that have taken place over the past decade and any that can be anticipated. Any recommended modifications should address and accommodate the sometimes competing principles of stimulating and rewarding the creativity of members of the University community, exercising responsible stewardship over University resources, and disseminating information in the public interest.

Members

John E. Hopcroft, Chair, Professor, Department of Computer Sciences

William Y. Arms, Professor, Department of Computer Science

W. Ronnie Coffman, Professor and Chair, Department of Plant Breeding

Bruce Ganem, Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Geraldine (Geri) Gay, Professor, Communication

Peter B. Hirtle, Director, Cornell Institute for Digital Collections

Peter W. Martin, Foster Professorship of Law

Patricia A. McClary, Associate University Counsel

Polley A. McClure, Vice President for Information Technologies
and Professor, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

Douglas D. McGregor, Professor, Immunology

Tracy Beth Mitrano, Director of Computer Law and Policy, Office of
Information Technologies

Maureen O'Hara, R. W. Purcell Professor of Management

Scholarly Publishing: A Need for Faculty Engagement

The Problem: Increasingly we are unable to deal with the costs associated with the library – but the library is absolutely vital to the faculty.

Responses:

The librarians are painfully aware of the dilemma.

- They have been cutting subscriptions for many years (despite an ever-increasing body they should be collecting).
- They have engaged the commercial publishers (largely unsuccessfully) in trying to find a financially sustainable approach.
- Most faculty have been engaged only peripherally – but some have been exploring alternatives – with some notable success.

If we continue along the path we've been following, there is little reason to believe that the faculty's fundamental need for access to the scholarly literature will be satisfied.

The faculty must work with the librarians to bring about some fundamental changes in our approach to scholarly publishing.

I'm specifically inviting the Cornell Faculty to join a group of us in addressing what has become a serious problem for all of higher education. I think it is entirely proper and normal for Cornell to provide national leadership in addressing this serious difficulty.

A group of us has already initiated a response and we invite your participation and support. I'm the PI and Ken King is project manager for a grant that is about to be formally announced.

J. Robert Cooke
Kenneth King
Bill Arms
Paul Ginsparg
Tom Bruce
Polley McClure

Richard W. McDaniel
Karl Joseph Niklas
Sarah E. Thomas

I believe the remedy is for us to shift to a system of Open Access to the scholarly output of every university – that is, modify our approach of giving away an exclusive right to third parties to control access to our scholarship.

Key Concepts:

1. Universities will assume responsibility for publishing and archiving its own scholarship.
2. Speed the transition from paper to digital paradigm to improve service and to contain costs (dual systems now increase costs).
3. Current approach has become too expensive to sustain into the future (\$2 Billion ANNUAL Operating Budgets for 111 Research Libraries)
4. Squeeze out unnecessary (national) duplication (now every campus aspires to acquiring and storing in perpetuity a paper copy of everything) With a national approach we should be able to share a single copy (with some, not aspire to total redundancy).
5. Speed the transition to the digital paradigm (for those who desire it).
6. Part One – create a university-based digital archive.
7. Part Two – create a university-based, federated publishing model with collaboration whenever our goals of open access can be respected.

September 30, 2002

Report from CAPP to the Faculty Senate Concerning Architecture, Art and Planning

CAPP has met with the Dean, each Chair, and the faculties of Architecture, Art and Planning. The follow are brief items that we believe we have heard in these meetings.

1. Faculty in all three departments, as well as the Chairs and Dean agree that the three departments do not collaborate or communicate as much as might be possible and desirable. This suggestion has caused them to think about ways such collaboration and communication might expand and be helpful.
2. Each of the departments sees itself as substantially engaging in professional education. To each of these departments this means that each department needs control over its curriculum and a “core” curriculum such as is found in the College of Arts and Sciences would not serve any of them well. Thus it is not surprising that there is little student cross-over among departments within the college.
3. None of the three departments see an easy or comfortable fit within any other college at Cornell. This is for a variety of reasons, most prominently the professional nature of the education the departments offer.
4. The Department of Art and the Department of Architecture teach much of their curriculum in studio classes that are of limited size. In addition, the professional focus within these departments means that the character of the studio is an important part of the education, leading these departments to want to control who is in particular studios as well. Although both of these departments could offer more studios to serve out-of-major students if resources were available, when resources are tight, these are the very courses most likely to be cut.
5. The Department of Art and the Department of City and Regional Planning believe that points number 2 and 4 notwithstanding, there might be ways in which the education of undergraduates within each department could benefit from more interaction across departments. These two departments would like to engage in a discussion exploring these options.

6. The Department of Architecture would, as a first option, prefer an autonomous school. This department is not interested in exploring other options until this autonomous school option has been removed from the table.
7. Because of point 6, CAPP has written to the Provost to request clarification about the conditions under which an autonomous school might be considered. In addition, we have asked for some clarification about the objectives the Provost and President would like to achieve in the final disposition of AAP.