

A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor and Chair Department of Science and Technology Studies and Speaker, Bruce Lewenstein: "Good afternoon. I would like to call the meeting to order. I want to announce at the beginning, because we are beginning eight minutes late, I will allow the meeting to go until eight minutes after 5:00. And I apologize for the technical challenges that we've faced getting started, including the slow elevator to get everybody up here.

"Calling the meeting to order, I remind everyone there are no photos or recording devices, other than the official recording device, are allowed; ask you to please remember to turn off your cell phones and tablets and computers and other things that make noises, beeping watches, whatever; remind you that senators have priority in speaking and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote.

"I'm going to ask you to identify yourselves when I call on you and to speak up, because we are using a recording system with a single mic up here, rather than the floating mic's that we used in the old locations.

"I have had no requests for Good and Welfare, which means I will take that time and allocate it to the other items on the agenda, essentially allowing them a little bit of slack as we go.

"First item on the agenda is approval of the [minutes](#). Any corrections? Without objection, then, we'll approve the minutes as they were distributed.

"The next item on the agenda are faculty matters from Dean Burns."

2. [REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY](#)

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the University Faculty, Joseph Burns: "Thanks very much, Bruce. Welcome. I wanted to start off with the usual things that we do. First, we have four Cornell-derived apples, varieties out front. Please grab one. They started being produced in the beginning of the 20th Century, and the latest one just produced a couple of years ago. And at least the one I got was great.

“And then we do usually introduce ourselves to one another. If you are sitting next to somebody you don't know, please introduce yourself, give them a hug, or her a hug, but within bounds, please.

“Okay, that's enough of that stuff. And the speaker is reminding me, given the agenda items, we shouldn't be doing this today. At any rate, I wanted to go back to the agenda, if you don't mind for a moment, because the UFC asked me to say a few remarks about the agenda. You may recall that we had intended to talk about this romantic and sexual relations as a resolution in front of CAFPS at the present time, and the hope was last month that we would have that ready for discussion today; but it turns out that we then went, took that to the undergraduate assembly president and also the GPSA assembly president, got some remarks, and we had been rewriting it and it has not yet come back to CAFPS, so we'll have that instead next month.

“But there are associated items, as you see on the agenda, where here there's an AAU survey that was released within the last month. There have been changes in state and federal regulations that were announced at the end of the summer, or the end of the spring rather, and I thought it might be worthwhile to spend just a few minutes reviewing those very, very quickly, but just to sort of give you an idea of what the background is like.

“But the UFC wanted me to be clear that we don't think our resolution in any way is responding to these changes that -- it's very important that the university as a whole try to develop a holistic approach about how we can best protect our students. This is just a postage stamp over some very big items. So I wanted to say that.

“You will all realize, at least I hope you realize -- if you don't, you are really out of it -- that we are back at 700 Clark once again. Many senators urged us to try to change the location because of the difficulty of getting up the stairs and the size of the room and the old style of the room. We have now looked at our 16th other location, and failed to get access to it because of conflicts with other meetings, and we will continue to look for other sites. And we hope to have success certainly by the spring, but for the time being, we will have our meetings in this room, this very cozy room.

“I wanted to say a few remarks about the meeting style. You recall at the last meeting just six weeks ago, the president and the provost came, spoke. We had some questions and comments from the floor. Some of these were very tough

questions and comments. And we welcome those, but I'm here to plead with the majority of you; we need comments and questions and discussion from everyone.

"We always get the same four or five, six people standing up, and I think we need a broader spectrum. So I plead with you, please, if you have something to say, please say it, so that we get a broad cross-section of opinion at these meetings.

"That's only one step in trying to increase faculty involvement in senate affairs. We have also gone forth and you will see -- have seen perhaps in the call to the meeting, we put out a little score card for you of all the senate acronyms, in synopsis form, what the committees do, what their chairs are. And the hope of that is the discussion during the senate meetings when we talk about the EPC and FPC and CAFPS, people will know what we are referring to; but also that if they have concerns about anything, they will contact the chairs of these committees and make their opinions known to those, so that we can move forward. Again, we need interaction between all the constituents, if the senate is to work properly.

"We have also placed that score card on our web site, and the web site has already the full charges of these committees, as well as the full membership of the committee, so I urge you to look at those, if you have concerns about a particular topic.

"And speaking of our web presence, we have now gone and just signed up with the web consulting firm to redo our web site in order to make it a little bit more accessible, make it a little bit more modern, make it a little better organized, so we urge you to look back at that in a month or so, when it will be up and operating.

"You have noticed that we have David here with us once more. We record senate meetings and transcribe those recordings to produce minutes for each of the meetings. And then, as we just did, this body approves the minutes that were distributed before the meeting.

"I raise this now, just because following the last meeting, we received a very strong complaint from a new senator about our process and, as a result, the UFC spent about a half hour of one of its meetings talking about whether or not we

are doing the right thing with the minutes; should they be transcribed, should they be distributed, should we be using video recording and live streaming.

“And basically, the UFC approved or agreed that we are doing the right sort of thing. They reaffirmed our procedures, but we of course welcome any further comments that you have on the procedures that we are doing to try to distribute what happened at these meetings, what happens at these meetings.

“More about consultation. The faculty trustees, that is Barbara Baird and Mariana Wolfner, have approached me and said they would love to interact more with the faculty, and they are proposing having general meetings where they say we are here; come tell us your problems, your opinions about this or that. There will be one of these at the beginning of next week. It will be just before the board of trustees come into town.

“So if there are issues that you think the trustees should know, this would be a way to get those topics in front of the board of trustees, perhaps in a somewhat indirect way; but there will be notice about when and where for that, but it will probably be next Tuesday at lunchtime.

“We talked a little bit about these items. I wanted to just end with a discussion of we have a faculty forum coming up in a week from today, again up here. So stay in shape for the next week, so you make those seven floors. The faculty forum is entitled Cornell's Financial Aid Policies, Unimaginable Outcomes. And that's meant to be a little bit provocative.

“You may recall we have done faculty fora on MOOCs, we have done them on professional masters degrees, the library, items like that, mainly talking about the way to gather additional revenues and whether these make educational sense and whether the trade-off that we have between getting funds together to be able to carry out our educational research mission makes sense in terms of what we have to do. And my feeling is the faculty definitely needs to be involved in such discussions.

“This is the other side of the ledger. There are large expenses in the university. We know building costs are expensive, our own salaries are expensive -- maybe not as expensive as we'd like to be, but nonetheless expensive -- and financial aid is a growing cost at the university.

“If you look at the amount of funds that we are spending, the curve has a very steep slope, an increasing slope over the last few years. So I think that the faculty should look at that growing cost and whether or not it makes sense. And the provocative title is supposed to mean -- I have awakened in the last week, and I can see two views, possible views. If we continue with the amount of funds that we are spending on financial aid, one would be that we continue that growth and we don't have, as an institution, we don't have enough funds to be able to hire the best faculty we can and to put them in situations where they can succeed in their research. And so come 20 years from now, we end up we're a mediocre university, because we have misspent the enormous wealth that we have.

“The other option, equally unimaginable to me, is that we decide we just don't have the funds to really hire the best people, we'll take second best, and if we end up spending all our funds on financial aid, we won't have funds for the faculty. If we end up spending all our funds on the faculty, we won't have the funds that we need to carry out financial aid, and we'll end up with a university which is not as diverse -- not the Cornell that we know and we love.

“So I think those are equally unacceptable and unimaginable, but I think that they are nonetheless slight possibilities. And if they are, I think the faculty should be involved in discussions about what we should do in order to try and balance those two very important needs of the university. So I think we put together a very good panel here, in about 168 and a half hours from right now.

“And those are the sum of my remarks today. I'm open to answering questions or hearing any comments, if there is time.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you, Dean Burns.”

“Okay. Is this a little better? Remind the next speakers to speak directly into the microphone.

“Next on the agenda is the discussion of the sexual assault issues. I want to welcome Alan Mittman, our Title IX coordinator. And accompanying him is Marne Einarson from Institutional Research.

3. REPORT FROM ALAN MITTMAN, TITLE IX COORDINATOR

Alan Mittman, Title IX Coordinator: “Thank you very much. I'll be brief. I am one of the Title IX coordinators. I'm responsible for the investigations that the university does. I want to spend a minute or two on some of the recent statutory

and regulatory framework around Title IX; but as Joe suggested, these items are the floor beneath which universities, employers, et cetera may not go below. They are not the holistic approach that Cornell and others do.

“So with that introductory remark, I just start with Title IX, a 1972 statute, 37 words, basically says that universities that accept federal funding shall not discriminate in their programs or activities, based on sex. Those 37 words have led to any number of regulations and other interpretations and guidances from the federal government.

“These are just a few of the things that have happened recently, starting with what many of you may know as the Dear Colleague Letter in April of 2011, amendments to various statutes protecting women, disclosure requirements, reporting requirements for universities and others; leading up to the most recent statutory framework from New York State, which is called the Enough is Enough Law. It was effective October 5th, and is something that the university and all universities in New York state are obliged to comply with; again, setting the floor, not the ceiling that we aspire to.

“These are some of the items there, a mandated definition of consent, known as affirmative consent in sexual relations, sometimes shortened to yes is yes, not the no is no that you might have heard about. There's a student bill of rights, of some dozen rights students have in this context of sexual violence, stalking, dating violence and other sorts of activities along those lines.

“There's also a “Your Rights” statement that all universities must post. We hope that faculty become aware of it. Much of this is on our really good web site called share.cornell.edu. It's got much good information on it, and I recommend it to you.

Some more of “Enough is Enough” gives us guidance on alcohol and drug amnesty; so if somebody reports an event, they won't also be arrested, or JA'ed, as the expression goes, based upon them violating an alcohol or drug regulation.

“It talks about interim measures, very important measures the university takes when a complaint of some sort is brought in, what needs to be done before a resolution is reached. And this is more guidance on that.

“Transcript notations, what happens when somebody's found responsible under our policy, what gets reported on their transcript; a biannual climate assessment

that colleges and universities in New York must do to capture the climate in these areas; and various training and education requirements that we are involved in, as we speak.

“Finally, some opportunities. This is just a snapshot of things that are happening at the university, opportunities to learn more. Some of you may have had heard about and maybe even took a course called Building a Culture of Respect at Cornell. We got some comments on that. We welcome them, and it's an overall 45-minute course that brings you up-to-date on all those recent developments under law, policy and things that Cornell aspires to, in a holistic approach.

“It also discusses responsibility for reporting events or incidents that come to your attention. As trusted advisors of many, many students, we know that from time to time you may be approached in this area, and there's some guidance in that webinar and also on the SHARE site, which is referred to there, about what you should do when you do hear concerns brought to your attention about sexual violence. Your Rights statement is something the unit is publicizing and should come to your attention as well.

“Two other items. There's an extensive revision underway on Policy 6.4, that prohibits sexual discrimination and other forms of harassment and discrimination. John Siliciano and Carol Grumbach are leading an effort, with the help of many of the constituents at Cornell, to revise the procedures for issues when students complain about the behavior of other students. So look forward to more information on that at one of your upcoming meetings.

“And finally, Joe mentioned there's a reconsideration going on about the sexual relations policy, of which you will hear more later. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Marne. There should be a minute or two for questions afterwards. You saw that she's the assistant director of Institutional Research and Planning.

“We also have our new vice president for Student and Campus Life, Ryan Lombardi, sitting in the front row. I don't know that many of you yet have gotten to meet him. I'm sure you will. So I'm going to turn it over to Marne to talk about the survey. Thank you.”

Marne Einarson, Office of Institutional Research and Planning: Great. Good afternoon: “I'm just going to spend a few minutes doing a quick overview of the survey itself. I'm going to highlight a few results from the survey, and then just tell you the link for seeing the full tables, complete tables of results from this

survey and a full narrative report, and to let you know we are still just really digging through these data; but given the constraints of time today, this is what we'll cover.

"I don't know your familiarity with the survey, but Cornell participated in this survey this past spring. This was a survey on the campus climate for sexual assault and sexual misconduct, which was organized by AAU. And there were 27 participating colleges and universities in total.

"It was a web-based survey. Westat, an independent research firm, administered the survey and conducted all the analysis done to date, although we have our own data file of Cornell-specific results. They're de-identified, but with which we can do our own further analyses.

"Our response rate overall was 19%. That's consistent with the aggregate response rate for across the 27 institutions in total. All students, undergraduate, graduate and professional, who were studying either here at the Ithaca campus or our New York City campuses, Weill or Cornell Tech, were invited to participate.

"The goals of the survey were really three-fold; foremost to ask about the incidents and prevalence of different forms of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, also to ask about students' views about the campus climate surrounding issues of sexual violence and about their knowledge and use of the various resources and programs available to them, again, related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct.

"The survey asked about a number of different forms of sexual assault, which is really, I think, one of the great strengths of this survey, because depending what question or issue you are trying to answer, there are lots of different ways you can break down or choose to define it.

"They asked about non-consensual contact involving either acts of penetration or sexual touching, involving any of four different tactics, physical force or incapacitation, coercion or an absence of affirmative consent, which is a new kind of tactic to look at, but also corresponds with what's happening with a lot of institutions, student codes of conduct; and then also it asked about other forms of misconduct, sexual harassment, intimate partner violence for students who said that they were or had been in a partnered relationship, and stalking.

“Today I'm just going to show you results on two of these forms of sexual misconduct. So the first one we're going to look at is nonconsensual sexual contact. In this case, it's combining whether it involved acts of penetration or sexual touching, and the tactic in use was either physical force or incapacitation.

“And this is kind of a standard; it's a broad measure, but a standard measure that you will see around a lot when folks are reporting on prevalence. And the prevalence here is since the student entered or has been at Cornell. So that's different rates of time, depending on where the student is at in their Cornell experience.

“This is just looking at Cornell results. The black bar shows that overall, the prevalence of this form of sexual nonconsensual contact was 11%, but you can see that females are in the red bars. The prevalence is higher certainly for females than it is for males. It's also higher among undergraduates than it is for graduate or professional students. And that's the kind of pattern we see repeated over a number of different forms of nonconsensual sexual conduct or contact.

“Just as a point of comparison, those bars added in are the AAU aggregate prevalence rates. They're remarkably consistent, which is neither anything to rejoice about, or whatever, but it shows that we're certainly consistent, if nothing else.

“To go back here, I just wanted to say a word about this. So we know that women and undergraduates in particular are more vulnerable to experiencing this form and other forms of sexual misconduct. Other vulnerable populations, though, include students who identified a gender other than male or female.

“So transgendered or gender-variant students, 16% of those overall said they experienced this since they entered Cornell. Students who identified sexual orientation other than being heterosexual had higher rates of prevalence, as did students that said they had a disability registered with Cornell Student Disability Service.

“First and foremost, when it comes to who students identified as being the offender, it was another student at Cornell, although not always someone that they know particularly well.

“So the second form of sexual misconduct that I wanted to look at here was sexual harassment, just because it's one that certainly is frequent, seems to be a frequent experience among our students, unfortunately. So what you can see here is that since entering Cornell, overall, just more than half of our undergraduate and graduate or professional students said they've experienced sexual harassment.

“Again, the other bars here break it down for women and by graduate and undergraduate enrollment status. And the same patterns that we saw before; undergraduate women report the highest prevalence.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Ms. Einarson: “Sorry. I should be saying respondents. Thank you. In terms of other vulnerable populations, we see the same patterns, as I mentioned before, students who report a gender identity other than male or female, students who said that they have a disability registered with Cornell's Disability Services, and certainly students who say they have a sexual orientation other than heterosexual.

“These are the AAU aggregate comparison rates for these forms of prevalence. And again, they're just pretty consistent. The other point that I'd say here is when students are talking about who the offenders are, the pattern is a little bit different compared to what I mentioned before.

“Again, the majority of students, of those who said they'd experienced sexual harassment, the vast majority said that they'd experienced it as a result of something that another student said to them; but especially for graduate and professional students, faculty members are also cited rather frequently, again, more so among graduate or professional female students. So for instance, among those students, among graduate or professional female students who said they'd experienced sexual harassment, 26% of them said it happened as a result of something that a faculty member said or did to them.

“They also were more likely than other segments of the student population to say that another staff or administrator at Cornell, so 10% of female graduate and professional students who'd experienced sexual harassment said that it had come -- the source of it had been a staff or administrator at Cornell. So it's definitely something else to keep in mind.

“So these kinds of prevalence rates are troubling enough. I guess another aspect that I'd add in here in the last sort of survey finding I will share with you is of students who said that they'd experienced some form of misconduct or nonconsensual contact, they were asked if they'd reported that or made contact with any of a number of different resources or programs here on campus. There were ten listed, for instance, for the Ithaca campus.

“And I guess the troubling news is that very, very few students who said they had experienced something also said that they had reported that or made contact with a program. So this doesn't have to be like an official report to actually start a big process going. It could be Gwinnett Health Services, for instance. So it depends upon the form of sexual misconduct that was being considered.

“You can see that almost more than a third of students who said that they'd experienced stalking contacted someone about that. And the lowest reporting rate is certainly students who said that they experienced sexual touching that involved incapacitation. That could be on their part or the perpetrator's part, or both.

“The other general pattern, I guess, that students, they are more likely to make contact with some sort of resource or program if sexual penetration is involved, rather than sexual touching, and if force or threats of force are involved, rather than some form of incapacitation.

“So I guess the last thing I'll say here is that there is a full report available and a full set of tables. They're all on the SHARE web site. We're be continuing to dig through the data and find other ways of breaking this out. I don't know if we have time for questions.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have about three or four minutes for questions.”

Professor Debbie Cherney, Animal Science. “I'm not a statistician, but is a 19% response rate legitimate? I mean, is it just the 19% who had been involved or –”

Ms. Einarson: “It's an excellent and a fair question. Of course, the lower your response rate, the more you might be concerned about non-response bias; that is, are the students who responded to the survey, is there a difference in prevalence rates for them compared to students who chose not to participate in the survey. The problem is -- and response rate isn't a guarantee. Even a higher response rate, there can still be non-response bias operating, right?”

“Westat has done some non-response bias analyses, they're detailed in our narrative report, where they compare early responders to late responders, students who got an incentive compared to those who didn't, because there were differences in response rates. They throw in other control factors. They found little evidence of non-response bias, but those aren't perfect measures.

“I guess the other thing to take away, though, two things: 19% is not unusual for us in terms of external surveys and response rates. The other thing is even if it's not, if you were to say there was response bias and we don't know if we should say this is an estimate for the entire student population, we still had over 400 students who said since they've been at Cornell, they've experienced nonconsensual sexual contact, either penetration or touching.

“So whether you say it's representative or not, I think, is a separate issue from is it something to be concerned about, but it's a fair question.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] “is there any [Inaudible] for some assessment over longitudinal pattern? How is this situation; is it improving, is it worsening? Even if we have 2%, it's bad, but I'm saying is there any sense of” [Inaudible]

Ms. Einarson: “We haven't participated in this survey before, and it's a brand new survey, so we wouldn't have exactly these kinds of measures. There have been some student surveys done of undergraduates over the past few years, where there's just been a couple of questions asked about have you experienced nonconsensual sexual contact.

“The problem is, if the question isn't framed in exactly the same way or it includes different forms of behavior or tactics, you really can't compare them. That's part of why we see so many different figures floating around about what's the prevalence of sexual misconduct or sexual violence.

“The other thing, even though our rates were really close to the AAU aggregate rates, there's tremendous variation across the 27 participating institutions in prevalence rates, and tremendous differences in response rates as well. So that's a long answer to say no, we don't really have good longitudinal data; but I think moving forward, that's certainly something that I imagine Cornell would want to be doing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] "how are the 27 schools selected? Are they voluntarily, are they randomly picked across the –"

Ms. Einarson: "No. AAU actually invited all its member institutions to participate. And 26 of these were AAU institutions. Dartmouth also participated, even though it's not a member of AAU. So we're just the ones who decide to do it. Other institutions, some of them were already doing their own surveys or had plans to do their own, so chose not to participate in this particular one."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Time for one last question in the far back corner. Please identify yourself."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] Sociology. "[Inaudible] inappropriate harassment on the part of faculty, sexual harassment, this comes up because a professor at UC Berkeley just recently got allowed to remain on campus after nine years of offending [Inaudible]"

"Administration is now under fire for their response, or lack thereof. So I was wondering how Cornell [Inaudible]"

Mr. Mittman: "Cornell's policy, for as long as I've been here, has always prohibited sexual harassment by faculty and staff of students. And my office has always been the office, since I came here in 2002, to investigate those matters, including having a faculty coinvestigator, at least one of whom I noticed in the house today, to come to some conclusion as to what occurred. And those reports are given to the dean of the appropriate college."

"What's new, at least in terms of my office, is that we are now also investigating claims by students against other students, and we now have two full-time investigators who do primarily that work. Had been done in the JA's office, the judicial administrator's office, and now that's under my office. As we had always been investigating claims, we added the student part to it."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you very much. I know there were a couple more questions, but we have to move on to the agenda. The next item on the agenda is a 75-day report from the provost."

4. [REPORT FROM THE PROVOST, MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF](#)

"Thanks, Bruce. Good afternoon. Professor Burns asked me to give a report to the faculty senate about the activities that I have been engaged in since starting in August, and so I'm pleased to do that. Thought I'd talk about the major initial activities that I'm undergoing in the provost's office; and those are, first, budget - - I'll update a little bit on where we are on curriculum, admissions, tuition and financial aid, public and global activities, and academic technologies.

"So the curriculum, admissions and financial aid, public and global activities and academic technologies are all working groups that I'm putting together, and I'll show you the status of those, trying to involve faculties in those activities, to try and make some progress on some issues that I perceive and that I'd like to make some progress on.

"And then we have a couple of other working groups that I'll talk about. And I'll give you a little admissions and financial aid update, a little update on where we are with the entering class this fall.

"So budget, my goal really is to eliminate what has been a structural deficit at the center of the university and that we will eliminate in fiscal year 17. So we will do that in a way in which we increase in many cases the overall reinvestment in colleges, but we have several strategies. One is controlling costs, second area is allocating many of the costs that had been in the center of the university to the colleges, and then some financial aid also to the colleges, and then reinvesting in the colleges to a net zero balance, using some historical financial data.

"So it's a bit of a long explanation, but I think the bottom line here is that going into FY 17, we will have a balanced central budget, something that we've not had for some period of time, and we also will begin paying off the aggregate deficit that we have accumulated over time, after the 2008 downturn.

"And that's allowing us then to develop a five-year budget that will do the things that I've stated here: One, provide colleges with their financial information for five years to promote responsible financial management and strategic decision-making and allow long-term planning. And so through that process, we'll give colleges information that they need to plan for the future.

"We will also develop a strategic fund at the center, so we'll build back some surplus, so we can invest in strategic university priorities and also begin to increase our investment in our capital infrastructure.

“We have not been sufficiently investing in deferred maintenance at the university, so this should get us back, I think, on the right track, investing in academics and doing the things that President Garrett and I have talked about.

“And then I'd like to stop talking about the budget. I'd like to move from that, out of a constant annual discussion about what the budgets are for colleges, and move to a five-year plan where we set those; individual leaders of colleges know what they can expect, make decisions, benefit from their decisions in the future.

“One of the things that I've focused on initially is the issue of the curriculum. There are a number of reasons to do that. We haven't addressed holistically Cornell's undergraduate curriculum for many years, and we are now in a bit of a different budget situation. So the university, for the first time, is pooling undergraduate tuition, and then distributing undergraduate tuition to individual colleges, based on certain metrics that are not going to change.

“Part of that is the college of enrollment of the students, and part of it is the college of instruction of the students. That really emphasizes the collaborative combined enterprise that we're engaging in, in undergraduate education from the different colleges.

“We have now free flow or somewhat free flow across colleges; many, many college-shared minors and majors. And really, we've also had a number of initiatives, whether it's the reading project, we have university courses and other initiatives designed to develop a first-year experience or a student experience at Cornell.

“The conversation that I would like to promote as provost is what Cornell's aspirations are for every undergraduate entering this institution. I don't have an answer for those, I don't have an agenda for those aspirations, but I do think it's appropriate for the provost to foster that conversation, to develop a discussion about whether we want to have combined curricular elements in our undergraduate education; if so, what those are.

“So I have listed here some of the considerations. Those are common curricular components, shared distribution requirements. They tend to vary very much between colleges. Gateway course limits, so the fact we have several gateway courses across our undergraduate curriculum that tend to be limited in terms of capacity, these are chronic problems. They tend to be dealt with by ad hoc negotiations. We'll give you more slots, if you give us more TAs, that sort of

thing. And this is an effort to try and address that on a more consistent basis. Differential credit hours between colleges; and finally, advising, differential policies and approaches to advising.

“So we would also like to, as part of this, recommend a process to avoid or resolve course duplication or overlap and avoid financially motivated curriculum development. We now have, by pooling our tuition -- and this was anticipated when we went to a new budget model -- we have the possibility of benefiting by capturing students either from another college or our own students. And one of the things we want to make sure is that we're making decisions about our curriculum for the appropriate philosophical educational reasons, and not as a strategy to relieve budget pressure.

“So we've set up this committee. We had our first meeting yesterday. And I show the committee membership here, and it's really a ridiculously large committee. The reason for that was we really wanted to engage, first of all, faculty from every college; secondly, individuals from the EPC, the UFC, the faculty senate and the FPC.

“And you will see here, I've highlighted in bold the members from the EPC and FPC and UFC. And then in red, faculty that are not members of those bodies, but are also members of the committee. And we have two students to be determined that we're talking to the student assembly about nominating.

“So the idea here is to be as inclusive as possible, to be as broad as possible, to address some very difficult problems. And we started yesterday to try and parse out how we will go forward and make recommendations about these issues.

“Secondly, admissions, tuition and financial aid. We have tended, in my view, to look at these issues, particularly financial aid, in a cycle of every two or three years, after things get to a point where we feel either we have to make some modification, financial pressures are high or we feel our peers are doing something we need to respond to.

“And it was my feeling that we really needed a working group to look at this on an ongoing basis and make adjustments on an ongoing basis, and take an intensive look at the data.

“I'll show you a little data at the end of the presentation that I've asked be prepared, but this will monitor undergraduate admissions, enrollment in

financial aid activity, and make recommendations to the provost to align activity and policies with Cornell's mission, including open access and diversity, in the context of available resources, essentially the issues that Joe set up.

“This is the makeup of this working group. I have highlighted in red the faculty members and UFC faculty senate and FFP members for this. And we have one additional faculty member that we will appoint. And if there's any volunteers in the audience, please e-mail me.

“Third, public and global activities. We, of course, have an Engaged Cornell opportunity through the Einhorn grant. We've developed initiatives that are kind of RFP, requests for proposals from the faculty. Those have been evaluated, and we're starting on some Engaged Cornell projects.

“My sense was it would be useful to marry those activities with our international programs, which are ongoing, Cornell abroad programs and our land grant outreach programs that we have a long history here at Cornell and bring together a working group that perhaps shares best practices and integrates these overall efforts into our combined strategy, again, related to what the expectations are for our undergraduates and students at Cornell.

“So the scope of this will be community engagement programs, international collaborations, as well as engagement programs in New York City, in which I include Cornell Tech.

“Then fourth, academic technology. This is an area in which we have had a number of perhaps overlapping initiatives and efforts in many places, and also some from the center which have developed these MOOCs and specific university courses, in which that were designed for online or blended activities.

“And so my effort here is to try and decentralize this a little bit and gauge the faculty more. Those tended to be initiatives that were coming from the center, from the provost's office.

“My effort is to, as I say, institutionalize these a bit, engage faculty in the process and try and have a broader impact, rather than selecting individual demonstration programs and cycling this over and over, trying to think about strategies that will lower the barrier to adoption for all of our faculty, try and promote the creativity of our faculty and ease the ability of faculty to use technology in their courses.

“So this is meant to be very broad. I've changed this a little bit from what's put on the web, Joe, so we can hopefully change this, but the idea is both online, in classroom and blended.

“And then I'll say a couple more things. You are probably getting tired of my committees, but the provost's Strategic Capital Planning Committee is a committee that will look at capital planning and capital investments across the campus. And this is an observation that others have made and I have agreed with; that what we've tended to do a little bit is to foster projects in which an individual college or individual unit had a need and had money. And then that went forward as a project conceived by that unit.

“What we lacked was a context for many of those projects, so a context in terms of what else exists on campus. If you're building classrooms, what is the existing capacity of classrooms? What is the occupancy of those classrooms? Can we utilize our existing resources, rather than building new?

“And a second point, of course, is: What are the deferred maintenance needs of the unit that is proposing new space? Before building new space, should we have a discussion about what the quality of the existing space is, and if that could be upgraded and used in a creative way.

“So this committee is meant to create that strategic context and also develop a kind of five-year capital plan for needs across the university that include the deferred maintenance and problems that we see across our campus, where we don't have an advocate for an individual building, or at least we don't have an advocate with money.

“So I think Schoellkopf is a good example of a building that's been suffering for some period of time without a real solution. So this committee is meant to be a first kind of pass or filter that is a strategic context, then projects can go from there, go to the president's desk in another committee that looks at the overall budget and the ability to mount these programs.

“This committee is shown here. We've finished this one. We haven't met yet, but you will see I've engaged three faculty members in this committee initiative.

“And then finally, I think our Administrative and Support Costs Committee, and that's just a committee to try and think about where we're spending our money

in support costs, this idea that I talked to the faculty senate previously about and seemed to get some response, which is how do we make sure that we're as efficient as possible in those areas where it's important to be efficient, but we perhaps don't need to be number one.

“And I mentioned that our goal is not to be number one in compliance. Our goal is to be compliant. And so this is a committee that will look at our allocated costs on an ongoing basis, try and evaluate those strategic investments that we'll need to make that will provide enhanced efficiency and working progress, but also put pressure on those areas in which we perhaps don't need to make those investments, but we need to make as efficient as possible.

“And this is that committee. I didn't highlight these, but you see Dave Taylor, Larry Blume, Chris Schaffer and Bruce Lewenstein have agreed, four faculty members have agreed to serve on this committee.

“So that's it for committees. I just thought I'd end with a couple of data slides and show you where we are in a couple of areas. And one area that I found very interesting was the cost of education, corrected for inflation, over time at Cornell for our student cohorts. And we divided this up into cohorts from the bottom to the top.

“So this, from the bottom to the top, are financial aid cohorts at Cornell. So red here, you will see, is family income, adjusted family income, 60K and below, going up 60 to 75, 85 to 120. 120K plus, that cohort goes all the way up. You can get financial aid if you're a family with an income of \$300,000, if you don't have much in the way of assets and you have, for example, five kids. So you'll get less support, but you'll get some support.

“And these are the cohorts. And the point that I would make is that the cost of education over the last two decades has come down dramatically for three of our five cohorts and has stayed the same for the fourth cohort, roughly.

“This is a very different message that we see publicly discussed, and it is an important expression of our values. It is something that we've done, it has been very costly, it is not out of line with other institutions that we compare ourselves to, but it is something that has significantly enhanced access, enhanced affordability and access to students here; but the other trade-off here is that it has come at the cost of an acceleration of the purple not aided group in a way in

which we see an increase in cost that's occurring at a rate that many argue is unsustainable.

“So I wanted to provide the faculty with this context and this bracket, perhaps as a teaser for the forum that's coming up. These data are actually for endowed students. If you do contract college students, the message is roughly the same, except for that yellow group there. It has risen a little bit, mainly around the policy of the last three years of increasing the same dollar amount between endowed and contract, and that has increased the percentage of our contract college students and has caused that to increase a little more; but roughly, the same holds that over two decades, the cost of education has either come down or has increased very, very little for four of our five quintiles.

“I'll give you a little bit of the results of this in terms of undergraduate cohorts. So we're enrolling 3,219 freshmen. There's the average scores, 523 transfer students, percent of students awarded need-based grant aid are 43.3% of our freshmen and 42.4% of our transfers. So a very large cohort of our students.

“This is our applications, admits and enrolling data over time. You see these data show an increase in applications that we talked about, although last year total applications were slightly down.

“This is our fall transfer applicants, which continue to rise. And then importantly, 46.2% of our students in the freshman class identify as students of color, up from 42.9%; 23.5% are underrepresented minorities, up again; 17.5%, children of Cornell alum; 13.3, first-generation college students. 9.4, international; 7.2, recruited athletes. And quite a geographic diversity as well.

“And then finally, just for balance, I'll show where we are in our graduate and professional schools. In grad school, 19,000 applicants; 2,127 entering; much lower URM percentage, students of color, 15; international, 54%. So very different cohort.

“DVM program, 948 applicants, 104 admits, 15% URM, 25% students of color, 3% international. Johnson, you can see, MBA, URM, a percent lower. That varies with programs. A couple programs within Johnson, and then our law students, JDs, very high application to admit rate, 18%; underrepresented minority, 45% of the JD students are students of color.

“And finally, Cornell Tech, you can see we've substantially increased the entering cohort for Cornell Tech, as we've started to grow the master's program on that campus.

“So with that, I'll stop. I think we have about ten minutes for questions?”

Speaker Lewenstein: “About 15 minutes.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English, American Indian Program: “So I'm concerned about the [Inaudible] there's no one on that committee who represents any of the important programs in Arts and Sciences. I mean FGSS, Latino studies, Asian-American studies, I mean the American Indian Program. And Cornell's supposed to be committed to diversity. You're going to be talking about changes in the curriculum, so it seems to me we need voices on that committee that represent those positions, and we don't have any.”

Provost Kotlikoff: “I'll take that under advisement. One thing I will also do is discuss this with the committee in terms of the ability to represent those programs, but I'll look at that carefully.”

Professor Richard Bense, Government: “I have two questions for you. They both come from my department. I really appreciate, like Bernie Sanders –”

Provost Kotlikoff: “That's the first time I've been compared to Bernie.”

Professor Bense: “But I think that's going to be a difficult sell for two reasons: One of the reasons is there's the budget crisis that hit came as a real surprise to my department, and they still do not have an answer or explanation for the suddenness, what the causes were, the transparency, for example, who is responsible for making whatever decisions that led to it.

“It's a suggestion, more than a question, that one of the things you might do as provost, the new provost, is really make that transparent. Tell people why, where, who and why that [Inaudible]

“The other question, and this is also kind of a suggestion, the other question comes from my colleagues; is they want to know -- we know money's being accumulated in the center. They don't know how it's being spent. So I know you are preparing a budget, make it public and so forth, but I think it would be a really good idea –”

Provost Kotlikoff: "So let me answer both of those questions briefly, Richard. So one, in terms of how we got here, I started -- we have a new administration. We started with a structural deficit and accumulated deficit. That deficit derives from the center spending more money than it had. And where did it spend that money? It allocated money to the colleges in excess of the revenues that it had. That generated the deficit.

"To your second point, Richard, about you know that money is accumulating in the center; money is accumulating in the center, but it has a negative sign on it, or has been. So what we will do in fiscal year 17 is essentially zero out the budget by sending all the money at the center to the colleges. It will reinvest in all the colleges in a way that aggregates to all the resources the center has.

"What are those resources? Those resources are the tuition tax, so-called USP tax, which is the center takes a percentage of all the tuition revenues across the institution, and it's giving it all back. The center also gets some endowments and some revenues that come to the center. All that is going out as reinvestment as well.

"Now, in addition to that, there are expenditures that relate to those structures in the center, the provost's office, the president's office, facilities, all those; but those are costs that are allocated to the units. And those units pay their cost based on their metric or their number of faculty or their number of students, and use the money that the center is providing them to pay those bills, essentially.

"So the strategy here is to try and control those costs, to allow individual units to keep the revenues that they get and to try and build some strategic reserve at the center; but I have to dispute your premise that somehow the center has monies that it has accumulated and is somehow spending in ways other than going to academic units, because that's where all the money has been going. Actually, more than all the money, because that's where the deficit comes from.

"I'm not sure if I made that clear. This is something I'd rather not be talking about, because we are coming out of it. This is past tense. We've been in a situation of deficit where this has occurred, but we are now looking to a period in which colleges are growing, we are looking to increase our investment in academic programs. And President Garrett and I are committed to try and control our costs and redirect our resources to the extent that we possibly can into academic excellence."

Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology and Genetics: "I also have a question about the curriculum committee. So say there's a course that's judged to be a duplication, for the wrong reasons. How do you envision that ax falling, and will there be an appeal process?"

Provost Kotlikoff: "The answer, Linda, is I don't know. So this is a committee decision, which is what processes do we want to adopt. And let me give you a couple possibilities. One is you're worried somehow this committee becomes the decider and says no, you can't do that. That's one possibility. I think it's unlikely.

"A second possibility is that this committee proposes certain processes that are consistent across the university, that -- I see David nodding his head up and down -- that this committee says each college before it can mount a new program, needs to have its own EPC that takes into account and talks to and collaborates with other courses that will be affected or overlapping, et cetera, and that we really prescribe consistent processes, and that the EPC or the senate oversees that process. That's another potential outcome.

"There are others. We could have a new university committee that we develop that thinks about appeal processes, et cetera; but I do think what we need to have is clarity around a process to address this, because currently, we don't. When faculty say this is what the EPC is already doing, it's not doing this, and it is not in its current mandate, which is to look at educational policy. And these overlaps are not considered policy."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: "I have a few things I will say quickly, so you can do all the talking, and this is related to some of the issues that came up in the UFC that I hope that you can share with everybody. One is that you had talked in UFC about the Executive Budget Committee, and I guess that has only administration on it at this point, and we had asked you about having faculty representation on that. So I hope you could talk about that with everybody.

"The other thing is the governance path that would be envisioned for these various working groups and committees; that is will recommendations go back to our elected standing committees, so that those committees can then make recommendations to the senate. How will that work, rather than only going to the provost? How is governance built in there?"

“And then the other thing I noticed is it appears you are on every committee. And since the recommendations are being made to you, I wonder if you could address whether that structure works.”

Provost Kotlikoff: “Good question. So the first, in terms of the Executive Budget Committee, that's a committee that is really the final decider of budget parameters that then get taken to the trustees for approval; and that is the president, the provost, the CFO, Joanne DeStefano, and the vice president for planning and budget, Paul Streeter.

“I haven't yet discussed this with President Garrett or the other members of that committee, but I don't envision this as a kind of working group or governance committee of the nature that I have discussed otherwise, which is why I didn't talk about it here. I really think about this as a committee that makes those final financial decisions. What are they?

“Once we look at the macro situation of what our tuition increase is, what our endowment payout is, what our financial aid policies are, et cetera, that really approves those final recommendations and then takes that to the trustees.

“So I will have that conversation with the group, but my current thinking about that is it's not a governance committee of that kind. It's really a leadership committee that has to make those final decisions.

“The second, who do we recommend to? These are committees that I have set up, and they do make recommendations to the provost. What I would propose -- and again, I don't want to really have a lot of conversations about who does what. I just want to get things done. And I would be very happy, for example, if the EPC would take on a complete role of the curriculum committee. We could offload that and I could do something else, but I don't think that's likely to happen for a number of reasons.

“So to answer your question, Risa, I think that these committees will report to the provost, but I anticipate that those reports will also be available to the faculty senate. We don't align committee-to-committee in every case, and I would suggest the faculty senate then take those reports, consider them, make resolutions associated with those reports, and utilize those in the same way that the provost will in terms of trying to integrate that information with other policies and make decisions.

“And then third, as far as me being on the committees, I do take that point, and I would love to see these committees get going. Many of these have chairs that are other than me. The curriculum committee, once we have a new vice provost for undergraduate education, I will turf the chair to that person, and I would like to step back from these committees, and particularly if I'm inhibiting them, but I want to make sure that they are working and functioning.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We are now out of time. Thank you very much. I know there are many more question, but unfortunately, we have one more item on the agenda, romantic and sexual relations with students report from Elizabeth Adkins-Regan.”

5. [REPORT FROM ELIZABETH ADKINS-REGAN, CHAIR OF CAFPS](#)

“Yes, I'm here as the chair of the Committee On Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty. This committee is currently considering proposed revisions to the existing romantic and sexual relationships between students and staff/faculty resolution, which is a resolution that was originally approved in 1996.

“That's a very short policy. It was sent to all of you with the most recent call for the meeting, and it concerns romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and staff having supervisory or other positions of authority over students.

“Much more recently, a committee of people, including Joe Burns and Kent Hubbell, assisted by Alan Mittman and Pam Strausser, have been revising this policy and have brought a proposed draft policy to CAFPS for discussion and consideration. I want to first tell you what the primary changes are in the new draft policy before I tell you what CAFPS has been doing with it.

“The first one is probably the one of greatest interest to faculty, because it represents -- it is a proposed substantial change. It would prohibit faculty and staff from pursuing and/or engaging in romantic or sexual relationships with undergraduate students, period, not just in cases where the faculty member has a supervisory or other authoritative relationship to the student of an academic sort. This more blanket kind of version of a policy does already exist at some of our peer institutions that are named there.

“Another change in the draft policy is that the notion that people should not be engaging in these relationships with people that they have supervisory authority over is extended to graduate TAs and undergraduate TAs and other student

roles that are supervisory or have grading involved or whatever, with other students.

“With respect to graduate students, the draft policy includes a recognition that when graduate students are admitted, you don't know who they are going to end up working with. And so it prohibits having relationships with graduate students where there might be some kind of academic supervisory relationship later on; and on the other side, that if there has been a romantic or sexual relationship in the past, those parties cannot have a romantic or sexual relationship later on.

“Another change is what happens if such relationships do develop or occur. Those are supposed to be disclosed and to specified offices, and remediation is to be pursued by those offices. Failure of the faculty or staff member to disclose the relationship is considered a violation of policy.

“Supervisors have the job of resolving conflicts with this policy, and violations can lead to discipline, up to and including termination.

“Several features of the revisions do reflect the adoption of the guidance of the Office of Civil Rights, the federal office, that they now use language that contains a strong presumption that any sexual activity between an adult faculty or staff member and a student is prima facie unwelcome and nonconsensual, even if the student is of legal age; and it would, of course, always be unwelcome and nonconsensual in their view, if the student is below the age of consent.

“So those are the primary changes that will be of interest to faculty. So what has CAFPS been doing? We met twice to discuss the draft with these new features. The first meeting, we had Alan Mittman and Pam Strausser there to help us review data from a number of other institutions that have updated their romantic relations policies. We also had Alan brief us about the changes that have occurred in the federal and state regulations surrounding all kinds of matters having to do with sexual relationships on campuses.

“A lot has changed, it's clear, in the two decades since our own policy was passed in 1996, and so it is thought that a fresh look at our policy is probably in order. Cultural expectations have changed, as well as federal and state regulations, and many of our peer institutions have changed their policies accordingly. We solicited input from representatives of undergraduate and

graduate student bodies because, of course, this policy very much affects them as well.

“We are in the process of finalizing our position on all of these proposed changes and discussing the pros and cons of them and how they should be implemented and the wording of the policy. We are not finished with this, nor is there a complete consensus about the most controversial policy of the changes, which is the blanket prohibition against relationships with undergraduates on the part of faculty.

“There are certainly arguments in favor of it that have been expressed by committee members. Here's a couple of examples: I support a ban on relationships between faculty and undergraduates, because the gross power imbalance is incompatible with the notion of consent. In a similar vein, however well-intended a relationship may be, it could be viewed as an abuse of power.

“Many of your students are quite young. How they view these interactions may change markedly over time. And Chicago, in fact, has a policy that includes language to the effect that people could be accused of sexual harassment later on, even if they thought it was consensual at the time.

“There is a minority opinion on the committee that is equally thoughtful and rational. Here it is expressed verbatim, on the part of someone who holds a minority opinion: I am opposed to the blanket prohibition against all faculty/undergraduate romantic and sexual relationships. I'm reluctant to judge and regulate the personal choices of consenting adults. Cornell generally considers its undergraduates as adults when it comes to FERPA and HIPAA regulations, and should do so when it comes to their personal relationships.

“So the committee is focusing on faculty rather than staff. We have discussed adding certain exceptions to the ban on romantic and sexual relationships with undergraduates, if we think that such a provision should be adopted. We have suggested modifications to some other parts of the proposal, including matters related to reporting, sanctions and remediation.

“What I'm telling you right now is really an ongoing status report that's meant to be a heads-up for the fact that this draft policy will come to you at the November faculty senate meeting for discussion and consideration.

“So I very much want all of you senators to go and consult with your faculty constituencies, to get their views about these most important changes to the policy. There will be a new draft that has some revisions that reflect some of the input that's already come to the drafting committee, which is not my committee. It's a different committee.

“That revised draft will be made available to all of you prior to the November faculty senate meeting, so you can actually see the detailed language in it; but the dean of the faculty and I wanted you to be aware that this policy is under consideration, so that you can do some homework to find out what your faculties think prior to November.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “So we have time for about five minutes of questions. Professor Lieberwitz.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I have a lot to say about the whole thing, but what I wanted to just point out right now is that the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education has not stated that there's a blanket prohibition on faculty/student relationships.

“As you pointed out, there's a presumption, but in the 2001 guidance from the Office of Civil Rights, they make it very clear that in post-secondary situations, like in higher Ed, that there's a totality of the circumstance approach with regard to welcomeness and consent. It is not the same sort of approach as would be done in elementary school, and not even the same as in high school.

“And so it seems to me extremely important that this doesn't get translated into well, we are simply responding to requirements from the government. I think that's really essential.

“And I would just simply second the minority opinion that was put up there. I think it was stated very, very well in terms of our respect for people's choices and their decisions, and that the original policy that we all have –”

Professor Adkins-Regan: “Yes, you are quite correct; there's not currently a federal prohibition against all of these kinds of relationships. The presumption language could be interpreted as meaning that's where the federal regulations are headed, and that will happen, but it is not the case now; that's correct.”

Professor Robert Thorne, Physics: "My question is about what happens when a sexual relationship does exist and how that's handled. And I don't know if that's within the purview of your committee, but I was party to a situation where we were collaborating with a graduate student and the graduate student's advisor. And there were problems with the interaction with the graduate student, between my graduate student and that student.

"And it ended up that collaborative relationship ended when we found out that the professor and the student had been involved in a relationship for two years. And somehow, I wasn't told about it. And the fact is that collaborating graduate students are at risk. There's a severe conflict of interest if you are having a relationship with your graduate student and collaborating with another graduate student.

"So how is that handled? In our case, I talked about it with people in my college, ended up going to the ombudsman's office, who told me his research found well, it was basically an HR issue. And that just doesn't seem satisfactory to me.

"I understand that this is complicated, but I also have a company, and I know that I have to disclose everything to anyone I collaborate with. And I think the risks in this kind of situation to a collaborating graduate student is even greater."

Professor Adkins-Regan: "Yes. Certainly, for relationships that also would involve an academic supervisory relationship of any kind, conflict of interest is at the heart of one of the problems with that. The draft that you will see does take pains to try to lay out a process for what should be done if such relationships form, and that's where the requirement to disclose them comes from.

"And then the designated person -- it's not clear yet exactly who that's going to be -- is responsible for figuring how to remediate the situation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We are going to move on. Professor Brown."

Professor Dan Brown, Animal Science: "I just have a brief suggestion and a question. The suggestion is that one of the things they talked about, adult faculty versus students, that would suggest that you drop the word "adult" for two reasons. Unless there are 17-year-old faculty here, it's redundant. And it also infers the students aren't full adults, which they are. They are not children. And I think they [Inaudible]

“The question I have is, and it is not entirely theoretical, is the prohibition period, which I pretty much agree with, I agree with pretty much everything that you have there, except there has to be some type of -- it's not hard to imagine that a faculty member is hired and her husband finally decides, you know, I want to go to college.

“And does that mean Cornell would not admit them? It's not that far-fetched, especially if you include graduate students and so on. Obviously, these sort of period, no exception thing, you know --”

Professor Adkins-Regan: “That's part of what that second line up there refers to. This came up explicitly in the committee's discussion, that it would be silly to prohibit that person from taking Cornell courses, just because their spouse was hired and is teaching somewhere else on campus. Several people expressed the opinion that would be silly. So that's part of what's being referred to there.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Three minutes left. Please stand up.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “Quickly, if you can, why the distinction between graduate students and undergraduate students? Why not have a reasonable expectation that you might blah, blah, blah clause for undergraduates rather than [Inaudible]”

Professor Adkins-Regan: “That's a legitimate question. I think it has to do with the difference in the average age and maturity of the parties.”

Professor Jerry Stedinger, Civil and Environmental Engineering: “I have a lot of staff I know that get very involved in managing students, particularly the example the director, a secretary that handles things. A lot of interaction. So I have some discomfort with a strong distinction between faculty and staff.”

Professor Adkins-Regan: “I don't believe the draft policy actually makes a distinction. It's just that my committee is charged with academic freedom and professional status of the faculty; and so, in the interest of time, we are trying to focus our attention on faculty opinions about the draft. There are other people involved in considering the staff position.”

Professor Nicholson: “Are there any built-in protection for faculty members who are falsely accused?”

Professor Adkins-Regan: "That's a good question. I'll have to go back and look at it and see. I don't believe there are at this time, but that's certainly -- the committee is trying to provide as much feedback to the policy drafters as we can about things that are of concern to the faculty."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you very much. We are at the end of the meeting. Declare the meeting adjourned."

(Meeting Adjourned)