

Minutes of a Meeting of the
University Faculty Senate
Wednesday, October 8, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Bruce Lewenstein: "Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Bruce Lewenstein, the speaker of the senate. I'd like to welcome you all to today's university faculty senate meeting. Let me make a couple of introductory remarks before we get started: a reminder that there are no photographs or tape recordings allowed during the meeting, except for the official recording that is used to produce the minutes. I ask you all to please silence not just your cell phones, but also your computers with their e-mail notifications and anything else that's likely to make noise during the meeting.

"I also want to announce that I have, as is the prerogative of the speaker, appointed a parliamentarian. I am delighted to report that [Sam Nelson](#), who is a senior lecturer in ILR and director of the Cornell Forensics Society, has agreed to serve as parliamentarian. I should say that the Cornell Forensics Society, just this past weekend, finished second only to Cambridge, out of 148 teams at the Yale debate tournaments.

(APPLAUSE)

"When we have time for people to speak, a reminder that we ask you to identify yourselves and wait for the microphone, so that the recording can capture you and to identify your name and department. Also that, following practice that we have instituted in the last couple of years, we'll ask speakers to limit themselves to two minutes. Sam is actually going to help me with that, and he will flag you with his iPad timer to tell you that your two minutes are up. If you continue, then I'll become more draconian.

"We have one person who has requested time for Good and Welfare, so we will have the Good and Welfare discussion at the end of the meeting.

"First item on the agenda is approval of [minutes](#) of the last meeting. Does anybody have any corrections for the minutes of the last meeting?

"Seeing none, are there any objections? The minutes will stand approved, as circulated.

"Next on the agenda, dean of the faculty, Joe Burns."

2. REPORT FROM DEAN OF THE FACULTY

Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns, "Let me add my welcome to Bruce's for you coming to this October meeting. We are now more than six weeks into this semester, which is astonishing to me. Carrying on our tradition, we brought in some produce from Cornell. These are Macoun apples, developed at the Geneva Station, excellent taste. So I encourage you to eat them. Also some cider from the orchard, I believe, as well, and some doughnuts for the people in Food Science, who won't like us for that reason.

"Let's see; we should do our normal thing of introductions all around. Look around and see if you know somebody next to you. And if you do, don't talk to that person. Talk to somebody else, say who you are and so forth and so on.

(Mutual Introductions)

"Let's come back. In addition to the good news about the debate team, you may have seen that in the Nobel Laureates who were announced today in chemistry, two of the three are Ph.D.s from Cornell, one in physics, the other one in the engineering college. So that's quite a remarkable achievement.

"There was an announcement yesterday, you know, of a \$50 million donation for public engagement, and that is also good news, although I think it also could benefit from some faculty involvement that we would like to see in the development of that gift.

"So I have a few things I want to talk about, as you can see listed here. I would like to tell you a little about the presidential search, something about surveys, that our actions actually have continuing lives, and then something about what the Faculty Senate committees have been doing and that there's a possibility we will start rescheduling our senate meetings. So if I could have the next slide.

"The presidential search, as you know, concluded eight days ago with the announcement of Beth Garrett as the president-elect. I thought there might be interest in that on the part of the senate, so I can answer questions. Of the 19-member committee, there were four of us from the faculty. I think there was considerable faculty input in the development of the selection. Three of the faculty members met for lunch or drinks with each of the finalists. I was on the

final committee of six that interviewed all of the candidates and went to New York more than we wanted to. So we had significant involvement.

“We had an excellent pool of candidates. There were three finalists, any one of which would have been a superb president, and we just hope we selected the correct one.

“And then finally, during Beth Garrett's visit last week, she did meet with the UFC, the presidential search committee members from the faculty and selected faculty from the various colleges for an hour, for breakfast.

“Are there any questions about the process or the person herself? Yes, Carl. Wait. We've got a microphone.”

Professor Carl Franck, Department of Physics: “I heard from a friend who was a dean who got a job at Penn State, that he came in with an idea and he had to sell the idea. Does that ever happen in a presidential search for Cornell?”

Dean Burns: “I've only been on one search committee, and it didn't happen here. Anything else? Okay.

“Next item. There are a couple of surveys, one of which you have gotten already, another one of which you will soon get. The first of these is a survey on how the faculty are using the library and the library requests. Please take ten minutes and tell them about that, so they can better serve you.

“The second survey is one that will go out in about ten days, and only about a third of the faculty will be asked to fill this out; but the university is considering offering a parcel of property close to East Hill Plaza to a developer to develop housing opportunities, and they want to know what the staff, students and faculty wish for that housing opportunity.

“Next one. I also, in the meantime, I should step out of bounds here a little bit. I just see Peter Stein has appeared. Peter for years has been the parliamentarian and, as you know, a very active spokesman here. With Sam's coming in, we'd like to thank Peter for his service and the good comments he always makes.

(APPLAUSE)

“Two actions that the senate made in the last two years still have legs. The first one is that there's now an online learning development group -- acronym OLD, and I don't like that at all -- and it follows on the report from the Distance Learning Committee that came out about a year ago. There are eight faculty members on this. Half of them will come from the Distance Learning Committee, and the other half come from people who actually use these facilities of online learning.

“And the role of this committee is to continue looking at policies and practices in this realm, go forth and select MOOCs and other online avenues, look at technical solutions to various problems, and then also try to align what we learn in this realm to classroom teaching here on campus.

“There is also a more recent committee report that came out as part of the divestment and reinvestment that we passed last December, I believe. You'll remember that had two requests. One involved divestment and reinvestment of our funds. The second of these involved shortening the time at which we reach carbon neutrality to 2035, and a committee was appointed to study that issue and come back with some ideas.

“That committee composed half of faculty, a little more than half, and some staff members. It has now reported to the senior staff, to the senate here a month ago, to the deans, to the university assembly yesterday, and will make a recommendation or make a statement to the board of trustees next week. So it's moving along.

“The question is what happens to the report afterwards. What are the next steps and so forth? What will the president and the board of trustees do with the report? And that is not yet clear, I believe.

“Any comments or questions on any of these items?”

Professor Richard Miller, Department of Philosophy: “I was on the ad hoc Distance Learning Committee. From this brief report, I know it had to be brief. I actually don't know whether the online development group is continued: the life of our report, death of our report or something in between. I don't know how the faculty were appointed, who chairs, what the ratio of faculty/administrative staff is.

"Joe, we were both on the committee, so you know these were contentious issues, and the committee did decide. How much can you tell us now or -- and will we have a chance to follow up and assess later in the semester or at the beginning of the next semester?"

Dean Burns: "To be brief, the charge to the committee and the membership of the committee is on our university faculty web site. As I said, there are eight members to the committee who are faculty members, and I think something on order of four others, who include people like we saw on the other committee, namely Ted Dodds, the chief technology officer, somebody from Center for Teaching Excellence, things like that. The charge of the committee is much like what we asked it to do. And was there something else, Dick?"

Professor Miller: "Who is the chair of the committee?"

Dean Burns: "Laura Brown is the chair of the committee. I believe that's right. The membership of the committee was chosen from a list we supplied from nominations and elections. Anything else?"

Professor John Brady, Food Science" "Will the action on the carbon neutrality report have to await the next president, or will that be taken by the current president?"

Dean Burns: "I cannot speak for the president. Okay, let's move on."

"The Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status has been fairly active. It has looked at a conflict in the wording between the guiding principles behind the formation of FACTA and what our tenure appeals process is, if somebody gets a negative tenure decision. And it turns out that those two sets of rules conflict with one another, and so CAPFS has now written something that agrees between both of them, and they are also considering the possibility that in all cases -- right now, the way FACTA is to come into play in the case of a negative tenure decision is if there's a positive departmental decision, a negative decision from the dean of the college, then the file will go to the provost. The provost will decide whether or not he finds it problematic and, if he does find it problematic, he will send it to FACTA.

"And the proposed change is that under all circumstances where the department voted positively and the dean voted negatively, it will go to FACTA for their

advice to the provost, before the process continues further along. That is still something we have to finalize, but that's the direction in which we're moving.

"Academic Programs and -- oh, that group is still considering the possibility of a research professorship title. That is expected -- I'm hoping that can get through the committee and into the senate within the next few months.

"Academic Programs and Policies, that's a committee that is required to oversee the college rules and regulations for clinical professorships and professors of the practice. Some of you will recall last April, we approved a title of professor of the practice. Earlier this month, we got our first request for a professor of the practice in the College of Human Ecology.

"That went through CAPP. It is now among the department chairs to see whether or not they have a problem. This proposal sits on the dean of the faculty web site, and we are welcoming comments to that.

"I also sent it out to the entire faculty, because it was the first of these, and I like to send e-mail. Not seriously. So we are waiting for the 60 days to transpire. We'll go back to CAPP; and presumably, we'll come in front of the senate at the December meeting.

"Educational Policy Committee has been looking at a variety of issues. Financial Policy looked at the budget model, and moving on to, after hearing Paul Streeter speak to them a couple weeks ago, they encouraged us to have him come here and speak clearly to us. We're also starting to gather faculty salary information, and that will probably come to you next month.

"Educational Policy Committee is considering these issues, and the University Faculty Committee -- you will hear from one of the members of that -- discussed faculty forums, met with the president-elect and also discussed governance with the provost in the last month.

"The last topic is one that the provost has brought to us. He is introducing and has elsewhere introduced policies that would require all senate business, all university business to be held at meetings between 8:30 and 5:00 p.m. As you note, we'd only have 13 minutes left today. And so we're going to have to rearrange our meetings. And we only heard about this last Friday.

"And we have had vigorous debate about it, how to accommodate this policy. We will presumably accommodate it, almost certainly will accommodate it, and we are now starting to try to figure out by the UFC, how do we solicit the senate opinion or faculty opinion about what are the appropriate times to do this.

"One possibility would be just stick with a Wednesday, and here are a few times. We are trying to find are there rooms that would hold 100 people or more on those days. Should we maybe sometimes do it Wednesday, sometimes do it other days? Should we do it on the weekend in place of church? The whole batch of possibilities."

Professor Dan Brown, Department of Animal Science: "I've only been to a few meetings, but the faculty senate voted to do this or -- provost doesn't have authority to set our meeting times. That's our business. I don't understand why we are accommodating something--"

Dean Burns: "The provost is in the back of the room. You want to speak, Kent? Or you want me to answer that?"

Provost Kent Fuchs: "It's brought forward by faculty that have families and have day care, and some in this room here need to pick up their children by 5:00. And so it is out of consideration to those faculty that have families. That's it. And indeed -- I wouldn't describe it as a policy, but I would encourage you to do this."

Professor Brown: "-- had kids and so on, just that this will exclude people who teach afternoon labs."

Dean Burns: "It's things like that that the UFC would like to know about. Who will this influence, so forth and so on?"

Speaker Lewenstein: "Time for one very quick question."

Unidentified Speaker: "I was just wondering with respect to the -- I don't know the right person to ask. Has anyone surveyed how many regularly scheduled activities extend past the 5:00 barrier, and what this policy, if implemented fully across the board, what its impact would be on demand for classrooms during the 9:00 to 5:00 times?"

Dean Burns: "I don't think we have any answers to that, but that's something that should be taken up by UFC, as it considers this. Thank you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We move on to the next item of business, which is a report from Risa Lieberwitz from ILR and a member of the UFC on the faculty forum on international programs."

3. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY FORUM

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, and member of University Faculty Committee: "All right, thank you. So yes, I am here reporting for the UFC, and specifically a summary for people about the forum that we had on international programs and partnerships. Maybe some people were there already and maybe some people have watched it on CornellCast, but we thought it would be useful for those who weren't there, haven't watched it, just to give a summary.

"As you know, the title of the forum was Cornell's International Programs and Partnerships, What Are They and Who Decides? We had a really great panel: Fred Logevall, Vice Provost of International Affairs; Rebecca Stoltzfus, Director of the Program on International Nutrition and the Program on Global Health; Eric Cheyfitz, the Ernest I. White professor of American Studies and Humane Letters; and Shelley Feldman, International Professor in Development Sociology.

"The forum had description and analysis. The descriptive part was about what are the programs. People covered in various ways the scope of the kinds of programs that we have. And the second question we asked people to talk about is who decides in terms of faculty governance, which of course is of particular interest to the faculty senate to figure out what are the faculty governance processes that should be used and how should they be used in creating international programs and partnerships and the various kinds of programs that could be considered.

"And of course, this is part of shared governance, which is itself part of the academic freedom that faculty exercise in their collective governance role. And given that it's the 100th anniversary this year of the AAUP, it seems particularly warranted for us to think about that.

"So just some key points from the panelists' perspectives, and this also includes some of the comments at the end of the program when we had Q&As and discussion. Some key points had to do with the importance of the international

programs to the student experience. We also discussed the multiplicity of MOUs, the memoranda of understanding that are entered into across the university and the different colleges, some of which, of course, affect multiple units and multiple colleges, and therefore bring in the governance issues at the university level.

“There were also questions that came up about new forms of international programs. For example, Fred Logevall talked about the consideration of having so-called consulates, which are not full-fledged campuses, but perhaps a kind of study center in China. And the question here in terms of governance is who should be involved in this decision. What is the nature of faculty governance bodies that should be involved?

“We raised questions more than we answered them at the forum, which of course, poses the next question of what we should do after this to make some of these governance issues happen. I will return to that in a second.

“Other questions that were raised had to do with partnerships between Cornell and other academic institutions in other countries. And for example, Rebecca Stoltzfus talked about the global health minor and the partnerships that exist with other institutions. Again, these are cross-college issues in many instances, which brings in the university faculty governance issue.

“And some of the questions in that area that were raised had to do with whether, for example, there are or may be certain conditions -- for example, women's rights, labor rights, academic freedom issues -- in other countries that could or should lead to decisions in terms of governance about whether to enter into partnerships at all. Is there some line that gets crossed, where we say disclosure to students about issues is not enough?

“Knowing ourselves about conflicts or contradictions that may exist in these areas is not enough. Perhaps there's a place where we cross the line and say ethically, academically, in terms of human rights issues, perhaps the answer should be no, we shouldn't enter into these programs or partnerships; but then, of course, as a process matter, the question is how should we do that. How do we really reinvigorate a faculty governance role in this area?

“Examples that were discussed, of course, you can anticipate had to do with the lack of an open and full debate by faculty governance bodies involved in

decisions about the medical school in Qatar and the New York City Tech in relation to the Israeli Technion and that partnership.

“Again, there are the substantive questions about whether these relationships that we should enter into. Most importantly for the governance issues is how do we create that kind of full, open and transparent debate on a campus to address these issues.

“Another point that was raised was how to engage in meaningful faculty governance with the decentralized system that we have at Cornell. And there are issues in that decentralized system; again, at the university level of governance dealing with educational policy affecting more than one college, which brings in the senate and our committees.

“And also other questions that were raised had to do with not just programs and partnerships, but questions of funding and the way in which funding, particularly accepting large amounts of funds, may affect more than one college; and therefore, the governance issue would come in there as well.

“So I really just picked out the main points, given that I had a small amount of time to summarize it here, but I would just emphasize that what seems obvious is, as we anticipate having a new president coming in and a new provost, that it's particularly important for us to think about the faculty committee that in the UFC we have discussed is hopefully going to come back to life.

“And that's the faculty committee that is a faculty/administration effort to look at reinvigorating and adopting and institutionalizing protocols, so that when we have programs or partnerships of the kinds that we were talking about in the international arena, that the issues are discussed before the decisions are made, rather than talking about why there wasn't faculty governance prior to decisions being made. So it seems to me this is a very, very important time for us to be paying attention to these issues.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have time for one question.

“Thank you. Next on the agenda is planning for the sesquicentennial with Glenn Altschuler, Dean of the School of Continuing Education and Summer Sessions and chair of the of the Sesquicentennial Committee.”

4. [REPORT ON UPCOMING SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION](#)

Professor Glenn Altschuler, American Studies, and Dean of Continuing Education and Summer Session: "Thanks, Bruce. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm here really to alert you, remind you, maybe even get you excited about the sesquicentennial this year. Try to sell copies of my history of Cornell.

Speaker Lewenstein: "I sent mine to an alum yesterday."

Dean Altschuler: "Very kind of you. Looking for bulk purchases, actually. But for my sins, I have been serving as chair of the University Sesquicentennial Planning Commission. As you may know, 2014-2015 has been designated as the sesquicentennial year. There's some debate about this. The charter is signed in 1865. The university didn't open until 1868, but we are doing it in 2014-2015. That's the way we do it in Day Hall.

"So my responsibilities are for Charter Day Weekend, April 24th through April 27th. This will be an extended save the date invitation to all of you. We would very much expect and want the participation, the attendance of students, faculty and staff on that weekend.

"There's been very extensive planning that's occurred. The University Charter Day Sesquicentennial Commission consisted initially of a faculty group. I served and serve as chair; Joe Burns, Isaac Kramnick in Government; Rosemary Avery, Human Ecology; David Feldshuh from Performing and Media Arts, I think it's now called.

"And each of my colleagues on the committee formed a subcommittee with faculty members to set up what will be about 25 panels, presentations, performances, events for the weekend. We think it's a very capacious set of events that I want very quickly to walk you through the weekend, give you a sense of what's occurring. If there's a little bit of time for question and answer, I'd be happy to do that.

"So Charter Day Weekend. Let's have the next slide, if there is a next slide.

"As you may know, there are many events by Alumni Affairs and Development around the country and throughout the world. I view them as opportunities to sell copies of my book, but they also seem to include other events, for some reason as well. The first of those occurred in New York City. In November, Washington, D.C.; December, Hong Kong; January, Boston; February, West Palm

Beach, Florida; March, San Francisco and Los Angeles. April charter day, here on campus; May, London; and then reunion on campus.

"The faculty responsibility and our faculty group is for the Charter Day Weekend. All the other events are Alumni Affairs and Development. Any of you who would like the timeline for all of the events, just e-mail me. I'll be happy to send it to you. Let's have the next slide.

"So we believe, my colleagues and I believe that Charter Day Weekend will be the centerpiece of the sesquicentennial celebration. We don't know how many people will come from outside of Ithaca for the event. We're certainly advertising it to them. All events will be open to the community.

"We've decided on a nominal registration fee, but that's only for us to know how many people are coming to a particular event, and we are applying that money to either financial aid or employee relief funds and so on, to make clear that this is not an attempt to pay for any of the events.

"Next slide, please. So as you can see -- I'm sure you can read that very carefully. I designed it so that I wouldn't get too many questions about specific events -- Friday evening is a celebration for students and the community. And Friday evening will begin with a talk at Bailey by Steve Squyres and Bill Nye.

"People will then be encouraged to come to a birthday party at Barton. And along the way and inside Barton, there will be images and imaging planned by Joe Burns and his colleagues, will be a centerpiece of the whole weekend. And we're very excited about that theme in Barton. Will be community bands and student bands performing. There will be a birthday cake. David Skorton and the mayor will -- if they are not fighting with one another -- appear on the same stage. And a good time will be had by many; I'm quite sure.

"Friday and Saturday are the 25 events I talked about. They include organ performances, readings by some of our most-esteemed novelists and writers, Richard Price, Junot Díaz, Lorrie Moore. There will be panels on sustainability, on the death penalty. There will be on Sunday a panel with all living Cornell presidents, Drew Faust, the president of Harvard, on the future of higher education.

"On Saturday evening, there will be a gala event, also known as a gala event or an event, and it will include readings from Cornell's history. It will include

music by the Cornell symphony orchestra of compositions of Cornelians, and I think it's going to be really quite an extraordinary evening. I mean that in all sincerity.

"More panels, as I've said, Saturday and Sunday are the panels. Then this body voted to cancel classes on Monday morning, April 27th. We will then have a re-enactment, so to speak, of the bestowal of the charter on Cornell. We believe that the governor, Rob Astorino, will be there in 2015.

(LAUGHTER)

"You're laughing. I make political predictions for a living. So I was hoping this might be recorded for posterity. According to the polls, the race is getting closer. So the governor, we have every expectation, will speak. David Skorton will speak. Isaac Kramnick and I, as the ostensible historians of Cornell, will speak.

"There will also be the world premiere of a video about Cornell, made by Micah Cormier, who is an extraordinary videographer, and I will tell you I have seen the visuals for this video. Even I, not prone to emotional display, got choked up. It's stunning in its beauty. The content I can't vouch for, but the aesthetic setting will be worth the price of admission, and there is no price of admission.

(LAUGHTER)

"So I would encourage all of you; you can put on your robes, or you need not put on your robes – but we would advise clothing, however, of some sort for the event. That will be in the morning. And I think it's an appropriate way for us to celebrate Charter Day.

"So let me also say that all of this -- and I say this with some pride -- all of this planning, which has taken almost three years and which is bringing some of our most distinguished alumni back to campus, which is featuring some of our most distinguished faculty for the weekend, which is unlike many events, really showcasing the academic scholarly contributions of Cornell, past and present, has been done with volunteer effort. Our entire paid staff in planning for this is one person. Everybody else has donated his or her time.

"So I would like to make sure that if you seek any information about this, please, we are going to ask you again and again to make sure that your colleagues, your

students, undergraduate students, professional students, doctoral students, are aware of this event and are really welcome to come to it.

"So Bruce, is there a couple of minutes for questions?"

Speaker Lewenstein: "Yes, there is."

Professor John Weiss, Department of History: "Glenn, watching this both as someone teaching here for 40 years and also a veteran, but someone who has not yet bought the chair of the committee's book, awaiting perhaps for it to get down somewhere into that used category at Amazon --"

Dean Altschuler: "Most of my books go directly to remainder, but this one's full price."

Professor Weiss: "And noting that the final ceremonies will be held in Barton Hall, which I must ask about, whether this sort of aspect of Cornell, which is not only a university of higher education and research, but also a university dedicated to service, including military service, that Cornell includes, among its alumni, the most decorated soldier from World War II, I want to ask about this flavor of bits in that purple square in the middle, or the green one -- I can't read any of them -- but whether that sort of aspect of Cornell is emphasized. How does that thread work through the ceremonies?"

Dean Altschuler: "We have made contact with ROTC, and ROTC personnel and students will be involved in the sesquicentennial celebration. I think we will have much reference to service over the course of the year, as well as in the colleges, which are doing sesquicentennial celebrations, to service of all kinds.

"And I would also add, as I should have earlier -- and this is related, John, to your point -- that you will notice, because you can read it so clearly, that one of our events is going to be student innovators in action. And we are going to have presentations by dozens and dozens of student groups, many of them involved in service activities of a variety of kinds.

"So this program is pretty well set, but thoughts like those that John gave are most welcome. And we'll try as much as we can to be more inclusive and more accommodating to them."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Lieberwitz."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Are there going to be programs or sessions dealing with Cornell's tradition of protest?"

Dean Altschuler: "Yes. As a matter of fact, Risa, as you may know, each of the colleges has responsibility for sesquicentennial planning throughout the academic year, and all of you might be interested to know one of the signature events for the College of Arts and Sciences will be a return to campus for the first time of Vietnam War protesters from the late '60s and early '70s, as well as some supporters of the war at that time to talk about protests and also to talk about their subsequent activities in those years. That's one of what I hope will be many discussions around dissent of various sorts. So yes, we are very much mindful of those things."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Is that part of the weekend activities as well?"

Dean Altschuler: "Certainly there will be folks who are dissenting. We have a media presentation, and that will incorporate dissent of all sorts and how it gets on the media."

Professor Lieberwitz: "But it's not one of those little boxes, which we can't read?"

Dean Altschuler: "If you are asking whether there's a specific session on protests, the answer is no. And there are not sessions on many, many other things as well.

"Oh, there will be one permanent legacy of the sesquicentennial that our committee worked very hard on. It's a commemorative grove. You can see it now, if you go to Ezra Cornell's statue and then look down the slope beyond it, the grove will have -- I'm from Brooklyn, so I don't really care all that much about the bushes and grass and all that crap, but in addition to those lovely pastoral kind of things, there will be benches with a chronology about Cornell's history and quotations from many Cornelians.

"I regret to say that although this is just up, it's already been vandalized, and someone with a sledge hammer went to one of the benches. And it's a heartbreaking thing. This is a very lovely commemoration of the institution, and it's hard to understand why someone would do it. Regrettable, but there will be a commemoration, kind of inaugural, an opening, so to speak, a week from Friday morning at 10:30 at the site of the grove. And of course, everyone is welcome to it.

"The timeline includes protest activities of all sorts. And here I will say, as someone who's worked on Cornell history for a very long time, if you buy the book, or even if you look at the book fugitively, you will have no difficulty finding serious treatment of Cornell protest activity, and that has been incorporated in the work that we have done throughout the commission's deliberations.

"I think I'm done."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you Dean Altschuler.

5. REPORT FROM VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUDGET AND PLANNING

"Our next speaker for our primer on the new budget model is Vice President for Budget and Planning Paul Streeter."

Vice President Paul Streeter, Budget and Planning: "So thank you. I appreciate the chance to be here to talk about the budget model. I'll try to go through this fairly quickly to leave some time for questions.

"It's important to understand I'm coming at this from a central administrative perspective. The budget model, for those who don't know, the campus went through an analysis studying the budget model over a series of years. A task force report was issued in 2010 led and eventually it resulted in the implementation of a new model in fiscal year 2014. That was last year.

"We're in the second year of the budget model implementation. The budget model changed the way resources and expenses are distributed between central administration and the colleges in administrative units. The budget model, as it may have impacted you at an individual faculty member level, program level, department level, are issues within your college. The new budget model was not intended to be pushed out in detail at the department or program level as the methodology simply wouldn't work at this level of detail.

"I won't be able to comment much on the budget model issues that you may be experiencing based on implementation actions taken by your dean within your college.

"What was the old budget model? I think it's important to understand where we came from, so you can understand what was adopted. I will try to stay at a

simplistic level, but three main budget models were in play for the colleges. There was what we call the general purpose budget model, or GP.

“That model governed the resource distribution and expense distribution for Architecture, Art and Planning, Arts and Sciences and Engineering. The closest thing I would call it, an appropriated model or allocated model.

“The second model had to do with the contract colleges. Resources for the contract colleges largely went to those colleges directly, and they generally paid their bills directly. The major exception is state appropriations, which flowed through the provost. The provost would decide on how that appropriation was distributed, but only to the for-contract colleges, and those being CALS, Human Ecology, ILR and The Vet School.

“Then lastly, there was a model that was termed the Tub model. That refers to colleges that managed directly their own resources and all associated expenses. They received their resources directly, and they paid all their expenses directly and they did not rely to any significant extent on any appropriation of any sort from central administration. The units under this model were Hotel, Johnson and Law School.

“That was the old budget model. Those three, when you go back and think about the old budget model, three different scenarios that are very difficult to understand across the whole campus as to how resources and expenses were distributed.

“I will show you how the distribution of resources under these three models worked, but it's a different model for each of the three colleges, so to have any common understanding across the deans, across administration, faculty, staff was very difficult.

“What the Taskforce was charged with back in 2010 was to establish a single budget model. What came out was a single budget model applicable to all colleges. Probably one of the most significant changes in this, was the creation of an undergraduate tuition pool, in which resources, all undergraduate tuition came in and the provost now distributes out.

“Another major change is how we distribute university support costs and facilities-related costs changed significantly. The way those bills were distributed in the old system varied across the three different models. Some

colleges received bills directly so they understood what the bill was. The bill could be reviewed, discussed, challenged and managed because it was understood.

“For other colleges, their associated costs were not visible to them. They were paid in the old model by the provost, and those costs were not visible. We moved to a model which makes all costs visible under a common distribution methodology for all colleges and now these costs can be understood and better managed.

“Lastly, the creation of a university support pool is a significant change. This pool is a set of resources that is intended to be used to fund strategic priorities for the campus. Right now the pool is used to stabilize the model; but long-term, it's designed to provide some money at the central administrative level to invest in priorities of the university and to give some flexibility centrally.

“It is important to understand, as I talk further about the changes in the budget model, that the budget model has not changed the financial position of campus at all. It didn't increase revenues in any way and it didn't increase expenses in any way. The implementation of the budget model has had no impact overall on the Ithaca campus financial position. It simply changed how resources and expenses were redistributed.

“This slide shows how the three old budget models worked for the major elements of revenue expense. Looking first at the Tub Colleges consisting of the Johnson School, Hotel School and Law School. They received their revenues directly with tuition revenue based on actual students enrolling and paying tuition. That money was directly assignable to the college, and they paid all their bills directly. They saw their facilities-related bills, they paid their utility bill, their building care bill, the maintenance bill for their space. They paid their share of university support, administrative cost, overhead costs from central administration. They paid those costs directly. Based on a set of metrics, cost accounting exercise, they were assigned a bill.

“The one piece that they participated on a shared basis was that these colleges received some money for cross-college teaching. If Hotel taught students from another college, there was a movement of money to recognize this. Same for Johnson and Law; but largely, those three colleges stood on their own. They received their revenues, they paid their expenses.

“For the contract colleges, it's largely the same model, but not entirely, because state appropriations, as I mentioned, went to the provost, and the provost would then decide how to allocate these funds to the for-contract colleges.

“Typically, the allocation was incremented or decremented based on the change in the total level of state appropriations, but the provost had the authority and he/she exercised that authority at different times to move the allocation across the four colleges.

“Also, utilities and maintenance costs were paid centrally on behalf of the contract colleges. The colleges did not see their utility bill and did not pay it directly. The way they operated, they had a greater level of awareness than the general purpose colleges, but the fact is they did not pay that bill, they did not control that bill and could not influence or think about it.

“They also participated in the distribution of revenue associated with undergraduate cross-college teaching, where there was some movement of money for teaching that occurred for students taking classes out of their college of enrollment.

“The biggest change, though, is for the general purpose colleges, Architecture Art & Planning, Arts and Sciences and Engineering. Resources such as tuition for undergraduates, tuition for graduate research doctorates, student tuition, a significant portion of investment income all was received directly by the center/Provost and then was allocated back out to the colleges in no prescribed manner other than largely incrementing historic levels. Additionally, the F&A recoveries, overhead recoveries on research, came to the provost and became a resource within what we call the general purpose budget.

“The provost would use all of these fund received centrally to pay the financial aid bill for those colleges, pay utilities, facilities costs, and to pay those colleges' share of university overhead.

“After all those expenses were paid, the provost would then make an appropriation out to the colleges. If you were a dean in Architecture, Arts and Planning, Arts and Sciences or Engineering, you saw one lump sum, a number you really didn't understand what the variables that went into that were.

“You got your one lump sum, and then you managed your college accordingly. The challenge for senior leadership of the university to think about how to

manage difficult financial issues when you have a different level of understanding amongst the leaders of what the variables are, what the pressures are, what the opportunities are and how to incent those across three different models created many problems. Lack of a common understanding and a common basis for discussing and deciding how to move forward.

“That's a large part of the impetus for changing to the new budget model, so we could understand these issues and manage going forward.

“Under the new budget model as shown in the simple overview illustration, you can see that there are fewer resources that are coming to the provost. The significant exception is undergraduate tuition as this is received centrally and then redistributed based on a predetermined methodology. The other elements of doctoral tuition, investment income, overhead recoveries, all now get distributed to the colleges in which those revenues are earned.

“Related expenses, including utilities, building care, space, maintenance costs are billed directly to units based on a methodology common to all units. I keep mentioning those because they are a significant part of our operation, and they are a fixed cost. We can now develop a common understanding of these costs and the underlying cost drivers and we can work to manage and contain these costs more effectively in the future.

“Those costs are now billed out directly to the colleges, as are the costs of central administration, the overhead costs. Everyone shares in those costs on common metrics, and so there's now a common understanding across that.

“Lastly, the university support pool tuition tax, which is set at a 10% tax on all tuition including undergraduate and professional master's tuition. Ten percent of that comes to the provost, and the provost uses that as part of the University Support Pool. As stated earlier, the University Support Pool is now being used to stabilize the budget model implementation largely, but it's there long-term to enable investment and priorities of the university.

“Right now there's also a provost allocation that distributes resources to all units to help stabilize finances through the model implementation. Over time the level of provost allocation for most units will decrease significantly, but some level of allocation will likely remain for a few units. This model is not designed that every college has got to make it on their own financially and, if they don't, they

are in trouble. There is room for judgment and allocation from the provost to invest where necessary.

“The undergraduate tuition pool is the most significant change in the model. And in my mind, it was the enabler that allowed us to go to a single model. The challenge for our university is that state law requires that resources associated with the contract colleges need to be managed separately, but the university tuition pool provides a mechanism to meet this requirement while still treating all student tuition in a single common manner.

“To get to a single budget model, there had to be a solution that bridged the need to manage the contract colleges in a discrete manner yet still under a single budget model and the undergraduate tuition pool is just that. What happens in the undergraduate tuition pool is that all tuition charged to students, at whatever rate that might be, goes into the tuition pool that's held by the provost.

“You should be aware there's a difference between the resident rate charged to students in the contract colleges, and the New York state resident rate has a very discounted tuition rate. There's a true-up that occurs in this by taking state appropriation money equivalent to the resident rate differential before the appropriation is distributed to the colleges and it is put in the tuition pool.

“What's created in the tuition pool is that all students are now valued the same, whether you're a resident student or a nonresident student. The monies get distributed with all students carrying the same value.

“The tuition distribution is based on two major factors; that being the college of enrollment and the college of teaching. There's analysis that looks at both credit hours taught, where they're taught and courses taught. The money moves, 60% of it moves based on college of teaching, and 40% based on college of enrollment.

“Financial aid expense is distributed proportionally with tuition, so it does not matter by college, whether your students are more or less needy. It's socialized through this model.

“That's the major changes in the budget model, and hopefully provides an overview. I'm glad to take questions.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. We have time for questions. Professor Brown, please wait for the microphone.”

Professor Brown: "I get questions about this -- I have been sort of confused by it - one question, quick, then an observation. So are all students going to pay the same tuition, or will the state college students still be paying a lower tuition?"

Vice President Streeter: "There's no change in tuition rate for students. Same tuition policy. The resident rate is heavily discounted. No plan to change that."

Professor Brown: "The other question I have, this is something I recall at a previous institution helping to work on to try to sort out; and that is you are taking the state tuition, the state money, putting it in a pool and giving it back to the state colleges according to credit hours; is that correct?"

Vice President Streeter: "It goes into the tuition pool, then it gets distributed on college enrollment, credit hours, and course enrollment, a combination."

Professor Brown: "The problem that we see in that, in our department also, and I think probably Chemistry Department and some of the others, is that the amount of credits granted per faculty effort, the amount of credits granted per contact hour varies a lot between colleges.

"When I teach a four-credit class, I generally give three lectures. I will be there for maybe two or three lab sections. So we're talking 9 to 12 contact hours in which I'm teaching. And for that, the students get four credits. That's cool.

"Under your system, the allocation of funds for something like that would be proportional to those credits. There are courses in English and some other departments that get four credits for two contact hours, which that's a prerogative of the college, how they give out credits.

"It didn't matter before, but if you do it by credit hours rather than contact hours, you are going to be undervaluing labs, studios, all of these things. And we do not have in the state colleges -- we have to meet a standard, Carnegie unit standard. We can't inflate the value of our contact hours, whereas other colleges do have that option.

"Our students do as much reading and writing. We meet with them in person and by e-mail, day and night. So there's no real -- what I'm saying is, have you considered standardizing the amount of credits granted per contact hour across

the colleges, if you are going to use that as the metric for paying the colleges for their teaching. And if you're not going to do that, why?"

Vice President Streeter: "It's a great question. The metrics, actually consist of course enrollments as well as credit hours, looks at a combination, because of this concern on a lack of total standardization on that issue. It's something I think we've got to monitor as we go forward.

"We will be setting up a group that's going to be responsible for considering changes to the budget model going forward. The initial implementation of it attempted to accommodate that by looking at a mixed metric around the teaching element of it, so it wasn't just solely credit hour dependent; but I do understand your concern.

"I think that was recognized, as the model was developed; but it's one of those issues I think we've got to continue to watch and adjust, if necessary."

Professor Amanda Rodewald, Department of Natural Resources and the Lab of Ornithology: "So right now it seems that the main or the sole way that colleges are able to earn revenue with this model is through teaching.

"I'm wondering, for some of the colleges, particularly in the contract colleges, where there are many more faculty who have extension appointments that would seem to put those units at a big disadvantage; I'm not sure how extension or perhaps even higher appointments from research are valued appropriately in this system."

Vice President Streeter: "For the contract colleges, I would point to the allocation of state appropriations, which does provide support to the contract colleges and has largely been there historically both to support lower tuition rate; but also to support the public service element, extension elements that exist, the land grant elements, as it relates to New York State within the contract colleges.

"I think the state appropriation fills that land grant funding role, and that continues to reside largely in the contract colleges. It's the net effect of about \$25 million of about \$130 million going into the tuition pool. The majority of that remains there and I believe recognizes that effort.

"Changes over time; you're right. The change over time and the opportunity for growth is driven off of the tuition rate, people. There's not something built in there for that effort."

Professor David Delchamps, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I'm the chair of the Educational Policy Committee. I want to address the credit hour question. We have actually talked about this and the fact the new budget model might give a perverse incentive for people to inflate their credit hours, et cetera. There is actually, in the courses of study, a university-wide definition of what constitutes a credit hour.

"There's also acknowledgment on the part of the Arts and Sciences representatives on the EPC that some of the Arts and Sciences courses feature inflated credit hours, vis-a-vis that definition, not just against yours or mine in Engineering.

"And I think that we haven't figured out what to do about that exactly, but I think what's probably going to end up happening is this gets passed down to college level educational policy committees to deal with; because clearly, the university's central committee can't look at every single course and say hmm, how much work do they do. Is that worth a credit; but we have thought of it.

"I just want to let you know we have recognized this mechanism has sort of a perverse incentive toward credit hour inflation."

Professor Thomas Björkman, Department of Horticulture: "So I want to address also for the research and extension expenses, that really it's a very serious problem. And the focus group we had for the CALS strategic plan that I was in, that was the number one question that we have no opportunity for the college to increase the funds to pay for research and extension faculty time.

"When you are in that position, you can raise all the grant revenue you want. It doesn't help the college one bit. It ends up being an expense to the college, because you need a lot of space and stuff. So for the college to continue to have research and extension, there's a part of its mission.

"And I think that would be central to Cornell's identity. We need a mechanism to have revenue generation -- the state allocation comes nowhere close to meeting our current and future demand for research and extension. We need another ability to raise revenue."

Vice President Streeter: "It's a great point. I acknowledge that. I want to point out -- I agree with the point there isn't a mechanism there. There wasn't one in the old model either because this budget model doesn't change the total resources in any way relative to what was received under the old model.

The model in the past has been that growth in this area relied upon state appropriations increases to provide that incremental growth. With state appropriations being flat in recent years, no growth has occurred. I fully acknowledge that's a challenge. I don't think there's anything we can do in the budget model that changes that. I think we just have to figure out how to address that and how to perhaps draw more resources; but I would tend to separate it from a model issue, because we are not changing the resource input in any way by changing the campus budget model."

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Department of Biomedical Sciences: "So I'm curious that I didn't see anything about changes in research cost structure, particularly indirect costs. I mean, they are coming into the university; used to be quite a bit of money. Now they are very low.

"So are there no changes in how those are either obtained or distributed, the salary recoveries? It's quite a bit of money, and I didn't see it on your report."

Vice President Streeter: "Let me separate the two, if I could, salary recovery from overhead recovery, the F&A rate, facilities and overhead rate. The new model does have significant changes in F&A distribution, the facilities and overhead, so what you charge against your grants and what we recover.

"There has been some significant change on that, as it relates particularly to the general purpose colleges, Architecture, Arts and Planning, Arts and Engineering. Those F&A monies, when there was recovery against your grants from those three colleges, came to the center, and the center used it to pay the associated facilities costs and administrative costs related to that grant activity for the former General Purpose colleges. That happened without visibility to the faculty, without visibility to the deans and those colleges. It happened in the center.

"That no longer happens in the center. F&A recoveries go out to the colleges, as do all the expenses. For the Tub colleges and the contract colleges, they

historically have received the F&A recoveries directly and have historically paid their bill directly, so not as much change there.

“The one additional change that I would call out on that, for faculty who have grants with a full federal indirect cost rate, carrying the full federal cost rate, 2% of the recoveries go directly to you to support unallowable expenses. That was a change that happened campus-wide.

“The second question around salary recovery remains a local issue. Salary recovery if a faculty member charges a portion of their salary to the grant, and there's some budget relief from either the state appropriation or the other unrestricted money supporting that salary, that remains a budgetary decision within the college. How that is handled varies by colleges, but it remains within the college.”

Professor Kenneth Birman, Department of Computer Science: “I'm curious about two things. Computer Science is in CIS, and I'm curious whether that's a college. We also, in CIS, do a lot of teaching jointly from people from other units. You have indicated that teaching revenue comes to the college. How does that work?”

Vice President Streeter: “Yeah, it's a great point. I thought of that, as I put this together. I tried to err on the side of simplicity. CIS changed in this budget model, where they do now receive a portion of undergraduate tuition very explicitly based on the level of teaching that's happening. They don't have a college of enrollment portion, but they do receive undergraduate tuition on the same metric as all of the other colleges, the teaching metric that I talked about.

“CIS receives that directly, but also now is receiving a share of overhead, university overhead, facilities cost. They play in this model in the same way, except they don't get that piece of enrollment.”

Professor Birman: “We advise our students quite a lot, and I would have assumed that the enrollment portion was associated with advising costs and related costs. So these are now going to other units, although we are advising?”

Vice President Streeter: “Just make sure I heard it correctly. You were asking about whether you're advising the students and whether that affects –”

Professor Birman: "Well, Computer Science has 600 majors, as of right now. If the college of enrollment funds are supposed to in part cover advising, as you have just described it, that money goes to Arts and Engineering, not to CIS."

Vice President Streeter: "Yes, that's correct."

Professor Miller: "Like a number of other departments in Arts and Sciences, the Humanities and Social Sciences, we don't get a lot from revenue streams such as appropriations, grants. We are not a big magnet for donations. I think we play a special role for students throughout Cornell, as do many other departments."

"So I guess this is a question of should we worry? Will we have to depend, as perhaps we have all along, on the kindness of the provost and the dean to make up for the drawbacks that I have described? Are the terms of that kindness going to change in the budget model?"

"And I guess also, a quantitative question, is tuition so much more important than the other revenue streams that we basically shouldn't worry, because it's a tuition story?"

Vice President Streeter: "I'm not sure I understood your last question. So correct me if I don't answer everything. The budget model designed the university support pool element of it, which is money the provost collects and then can reinvest in priorities; and also the provost allocation, which I believe will always exist, to some extent, to support colleges and programs where we hold it of value."

"This model is not intended to create financially driven decision-making exclusively. There's room here for that redistribution that needs to occur. Every college is not going to stand on its own financially in this model in the same level, and there's an element of it that allows that redistribution to occur."

"To your second question of should you worry, I don't think any differently than you should have worried before. There's challenges for the university financially, and I think how we deal with the old model versus new model, it's just a different methodology, but I don't think our values change around that. I think the model allows enough room for the values to win the day on it."

Professor Miller: "Could you just give us an idea of scale? It sounds as if a central allocation, you said, is still going to play an extremely important role,

what's in relation to other processes of allocation, which will be more driven by a formula. I don't mean to criticize -- a way of rationalizing things. How big is central allocation and readjustment in terms of university-wide priority going to be? Is it going to be much less important than it was before? Where do things stand in terms of relative scale?"

Vice President Streeter: "Yeah, I'm not dodging it. Just trying to think of how to actually explain it. I'm not recalling the numbers well. The scale of your appropriation before, I will say a number that I'm not confident with, so I'm not going to say it.

"A significant portion is now coming through the tuition model for Arts and Sciences. It is on the scale of \$26 million, on that scale that comes from a tuition-driven element. Then a piece coming from the provost is probably in the range of \$60 million, something in that range. I honestly don't remember. It's a smaller portion, but not insignificant.

"Kent, if I say anything in here, please chime in, if I've got something way off from what you're thinking."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We have time for one last question."

Unidentified Speaker: "Kind of on the same subject. So as I understand it, it goes into a common pool, and it's distributed according to teaching and enrollment, that sort of thing. So this will replace the accessory charges, accessory instruction funds. That won't be necessary anymore, because that would be like double dipping."

Vice President Streeter: "Yes, exactly. The accessory instruction, for those who don't know, it was a methodology that moved money between units for cross-college teaching. Now the distribution of the university -- undergraduate tuition, as described, replaces that."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Provost Fuchs, did you want to say something? We are at the end of our time.

"The last item on the agenda is Good and Welfare. And Professor Chabot has an item he wishes to bring forward."

6. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Brian Chabot, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology:
“Thank you. My purpose is to encourage the faculty senate to examine carefully this new initiative on Engaged Cornell that was announced Monday. I have been teaching engagement courses for about five years, and I personally support this approach to education as enriching the capabilities of our students. However, I do have some concerns about how this is happening to us.

“For those of you who have missed the press conference on Monday and the various announcements, the intent of this initiative is to transform the educational experience at Cornell. This is to transform the experience for undergraduates and for faculty.

“So every student is supposed to be taking at least one community-engaged learning course. We have relatively few at the moment. Hundreds of faculty will be asked to teach these courses and will be trained to do so. And every department is expected to be part of this program, so the departments will be transformed in their approach to education.

“At one time, faculty were in charge of the educational programs of the university. I'm not sure that a press conference is the right way to go about announcing to us what our lives in the future will be, so I would ask us to look carefully at the process by which this has come about and what the details of the initiative are.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We do have time for one or two questions or comments on this issue. Professor Cheyfitz.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, Department of English, and the American Indian Program: “The point is well-taken. This was the point of the faculty forum to discuss how decisions are being made here that affect educational policy, Article 13 of the bylaws of the university that says the senate is supposed to be consulted before the fact on educational policy, and here we go again with an educational policy that's being presented by fiat. Money comes in, drives the agenda, and the senate hearing about it after the fact.

“So the question is when's this going to stop. When's the senate actually going to stand up and say you can't be doing these things without consulting us first, unless you just want to forget the bylaws? And the administration, seems to me, until we have this committee from the UFC on educational policy, has defined educational policy as narrowly as possible, so that it doesn't include things like

the partnerships with Technion or Qatar or this sort of agenda, which all of which are clearly educational policy. They involve teaching, research. That's educational policy.

"So what's educational policy now for the faculty at Cornell? Writing your syllabus? Is that what it's become? Is that what it's been narrowed down to? These are important questions, and they are just being blown by us as fast as possible."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Burns."

Dean Burns: "I certainly agree with you, Eric, that a press conference does not make educational policy, and I don't think it has made educational policy. Nothing has come in front of the Educational Policy Committee. I don't see any courses that have been approved to satisfy what was said in the press conference.

"So I think we need to get our facts straight and understand what's going on before we say this is awful. It may be awful, but let's find out what it is and let's get the appropriate rules."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Those projects and programs should come before the senate in what's supposed to be our consultative reason for being and discussed, and then it should be decided if we want to accept \$50 million, I think, to start, to do a program or project.

"This is reversing the process. The money's come in, something is going to be done in the realm of educational policy, and then it comes, at what point I don't know, before the senate to do what exactly; I'm not sure. We are talking about consulting before the fact on the kinds of programs we want at Cornell. That's all."

Dean Burns: "I think consultation is very important. I also have a very full day, and most of us do. If you want to offer your services to alumni affairs, all of their donations --"

Professor Cheyfitz: "I'm making a simple point. We meet once a month. Before this was decided, it could have been presented to us as an educational program that was being thought about, and we could get the senate's feedback before the administration makes decisions. I mean, what are we sitting here for?"

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor from the Vet School, did you want to make a comment? Sorry. Okay.

"Professor Lieberwitz."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Yeah, I think what happens sometimes is things get announced and we say well, did I miss something? Because we are all busy. So the point is not that we're all busy, so somebody else should take care of it; but rather than looking at this example as something that well, of course, alumni affairs should take care of it, and then we will decide what to do with the money.

"I think the point is that we made in our faculty governance review report in 2007 that many things that are educational policy have been siphoned off into so-called nonacademic offices. So this is a very important moment. I'm really glad that this was raised. It's a really important moment for us to say that money shouldn't be driving our decisions when the money is brought in and welcomed by somebody other than the faculty. So I think we should really welcome this as a moment to deal with something that's on the table now."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We have three minutes left. Professor Chabot, and then Professor Miller."

Professor Chabot: "Just a quick point. I'm learning all of this from the press releases and the 30-minute video on the web site, so I'm not an expert here, but we have been working with the Einhorn Foundation for at least two or three years on some pilot grants. Somebody – Susan Murphy was one person, but others also wrote a proposal to the Einhorn Foundation with the details of what this program is. So it isn't just a one-way gift sort of thing. It was something that was intentionally developed by the university administration and by the foundation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Miller."

Professor Miller: "This is entirely about what to do after the fact, not about process of reaching decisions, so I don't necessarily disagree. My understanding of the scale of this great commitment to engagement makes me agree with Professor Chabot, that it raises large questions, and some of them questions of principle.

"I engage my money and my activity in, broadly speaking, political activities, which I would be very reluctant to have students get credit for. On the other hand, the thought that engagement has to take the form of apolitical activities is troubling for me. Cornell is in Ithaca, which has very special, important, but in some ways limited potential for community engagement. Given the scale of the commitment, what should that mean and does that mean that acceptable engagement would involve over-commitment.

"I think the senate -- if I understand these problems; perhaps I'm just confused -- they look like problems that the senate should discuss as a whole, as a genuinely deliberative body. Perhaps not; just in two-minute sound bites that there are questions of principle that are too important for passive acceptance of what a committee decides, even if it means sitting for half an hour and listening to a faculty committee. I'm a philosopher, so perhaps I'm exaggerating the problems at principle; but if I'm not, may suggest a need for us to take an initiative in genuine deliberation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We have reached 6:00. Without objection, the meeting will stand adjourned."

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)