

A Meeting of
the Faculty Senate
Wednesday May 11, 2011

Speaker Steve Beer: "Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the May 2011 meeting of the University Faculty Senate meeting. I would like to remind senators that you should have in your possession a clicker. Only senators should have a clicker, because we vote by clicking. Only senators may vote, but members of the faculty may speak.

"When you speak, please raise your hand and be recognized by the speaker and await for a microphone to be brought to you. And then stand and identify yourself as to name and administrative affiliation, generally department.

"I would like everyone to please turn off or silence your cellular telephone, and there will be no recording, either visually or audibly, of the proceedings at the meeting. So the first item on the agenda is the approval of the April University Faculty Senate meeting minutes.

Associate Dean and Secretary Fred Gouldin: "I am not sure we have a quorum yet."
Speaker Beer: "Well, since no one's calling for it, we'll proceed, in any case. So let's practice with our clickers –"

(LAUGHTER)

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM [MARCH 9, 2011](#) AND [APRIL 13, 2011](#)
FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

Speaker Beer: "On the approval of the minutes. The first thing to do is turn it on. Now the idea is you click the A button to approve the minutes, you click the B button to not approve the minutes, and you click the C button to abstain from the minutes or approval of them. And we'll give you a few more seconds to get your votes in; I should say your clicks in.

"Okay, at this point, it seems that the vote has just about stabilized, and we'll display it. All clicks in? There we are, all right.

"Here are the results. The vast majority of senators voting have approved the minutes. So I believe that we can proceed to the next item on the agenda, which is a report from the Library Board by Professor Mary Beth Norton.

"Oh, I'm sorry. We now have to consider the March meeting of the University Faculty Senate minutes. Let's see if I can clear that. Well, it will probably take too long to do that, so all those approving the March minutes, please raise your right hand. Those who object to approving the March minutes, please raise your right hands. Those who abstain from considering the March minutes -- one abstention, but the vast majority has approved the March minutes, so we'll now proceed with the report from the University Library Board, Professor Mary Beth Norton."

2. [LIBRARY BOARD RESOLUTION](#)

Professor Mary Beth Norton: "Okay, I'm glad to be here today to present this resolution from the University Library Board. You have a -- everybody got a copy of it. There were additional copies and handouts up here for people. If you didn't pick them up, I would appreciate if you did, because I will refer to them.

"The resolution that you have before you has the unanimous support of the Library Board, and I should point out all colleges are represented on the Library Board. I think that to some extent the resolution is self-explanatory, and I assume you have all read it, so I want to highlight a couple things.

"In addition, I want to announce that we have with us today John Saylor, Associate University Librarian for Collection Development, and he's here to answer any specific questions that might arise about details that I don't have numbers for.

"The concern that the Library Board has is specifically about the library's acquisitions budget. We point out this budget covers the acquisitions of both print and digital material. At the last meeting in the minutes you just approved, I know the provost spoke about the importance of recognizing the importance of collection development, and that's indeed what the Library Board resolution does.

"The two handouts that are up front, one shows the declining position of Cornell with our peer groups in terms of the overall library acquisition budget from 2007 to 2010. We went from 11th to 18th at a time when the University Strategic Plan says that our goal should be to be within the top 10. So we weren't even in the top 10 when we started. Now we are even lower than the top 10, to put it mildly.

"And the other one shows the expenses or the cost of just twelve contracts we have with publishers for digital and print outputs of those publishers; the expected increase for this coming year, which is up by almost \$250,000, so that even if the library acquisitions budget is held flat for this coming year, it is in effect a decrease and would lead to

cancellations of some journal subscriptions. Most of these are journal subscriptions and most of them are in the sciences, and this is of deep concern to the Library Board.

“As I said earlier, the university's goal in the strategic plan is return the library to its position in the top 10. To do that, the library estimates it will take an added \$2 million in the acquisitions budget. The library surveyed our peer universities as to what they are intending to do for the coming year; discovered that 15 universities plan increases, one will hold acquisitions flat, and only four plan decreases, and two of those are in states that are in dire financial states. They are both state universities in states with very difficult problems; that is Michigan and Texas.

“I want to stress, and the part of the resolution that points to another point that the provost made at the last meeting, which was that we are expecting many new hires in the university over the next decade; he pointed out that 800 to 900 of the current faculty, including myself, will not be here in a decade because they will have retired or left. I will retire at some point within that ten-year period, and we think it's extremely important the library have the resources to not just help to attract those new hires, but also to retain them over the long run. It's going to do us no good if we hire them but they leave because they don't get the adequate support they need.

“So the Library Board therefore strongly encourages your favorable vote on the resolution. I'm happy to answer any questions or, if there are ones I can't answer, I will turn it to John Saylor.”

***WHEREAS**, consistent with our founders' vision, the library system, both physical and virtual, is the heart of the university; and*

***WHEREAS** the strength of the library system is equally important for all Cornell colleges, regardless of whether their students and faculty rely primarily on print or on digital materials; and*

Whereas the library system will only become more important in years to come as the repository of more traditional forms of knowledge and the institution for developing new forms of knowledge and scholarship in the 21st century; and

***WHEREAS** both the hiring and the long term retention of new faculty in the coming years will depend crucially on making provisions for adequate library resources to support their work; and Whereas pursuant with the University strategic plan, the Cornell University Library Strategic Plan (2011-2015) sets as its first objective “Return the Library to its position among the top ten academic institutions in the Association of Research Libraries in terms of collection support”; and*

***WHEREAS** our overall level of support for the Library has already dropped vis-à-vis those peer institutions; and*

***WHEREAS** insufficient university support of annual expenditures for library materials relative to our peers has precipitated this decline.*

***THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the university administration through its annual allocations and the development office through its fund raising to provide sufficient funding to the university library system in order to maintain and enhance the physical collection and increase access to digital resources to meet these goals.*

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the administration establish a funding structure that recognizes the integrity of the collection development budget and the integrity of the library operating budget, and which sets funding allocations such that we remain competitive with our peers among the top ten academic institutions in the Association of Research Libraries.*

Speaker Beer: "The resolution by the Library Board as it's before you is now open for debate. And following debate, we will have a vote. Professor Wilson. Wait for a microphone, please."

Professor David Wilson, Department of Microbiology and Genetics, substituting for Nicholson: "I am just curious to know if you had discussions with the administration about this issue and why we were dropping behind, even though we said we have this goal of not dropping behind."

Professor Norton: "We did not. We're just pointing out that the situation is, as we understand it, that the projected budget for the library for next year is flat at best for acquisitions and we are -- we'd like the senate to support the Library Board in its concern for -- obviously that we are not going to meet the strategic goals unless the acquisitions budget is increased."

"I would point out the resolution asks in particular that the integrity of the library acquisitions budget be maintained, by which we mean there be a pot of money that's there for acquisitions, which is not to be used for some other purpose. We think that's absolutely crucial."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman in the checked shirt."

Speaker Beer: "Please identify yourself and stand."

Professor Andre Kessler, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "I was wondering if the need for that money is a result of the budget cuts in the past, and how do the supposedly cost saving reallocations of funds from the small libraries sort of play into that whole game?"

Professor Norton: "Right. Well, yes, the falling behind absolutely results from the last couple of years of budget stringency. There's no question about that. On the issue of the reallocation from the smaller libraries, that is not really a part of the acquisitions budget. That's a part of personnel and other kinds of budgets, so it's not part of acquisitions."

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman on the aisle."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: "I'm wondering how much we do need to keep up and raise our standards back up in the top 10."

Professor Norton: "You are questioning whether we need to do that?"

Professor Cheyfitz: "No, no. I'm saying --."

Professor Norton: "\$2 million."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Per year?"

Professor Norton: "Immediately. John is at -- I will turn it over to you."

Speaker Beer: "Kindly wait for a microphone."

Professor Norton: John Saylor from the library. \$2 million for next year. I can't speak about succeeding years."

John Saylor, Library Administration: "If everybody has a chart or access to the chart, we are currently \$2 million below the institution that's in tenth. So it would take \$2 million for us to be in the top 10, to our annual budget."

Professor Cheyfitz: "-- of \$2 million."

John Saylor: "Yeah."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Seems to me completely contradictory. We want to be a top 10 research institution with what appears to be a bottom -- headed toward that bottom 10 library."

Professor Norton: "Thank you, Professor Cheyfitz. The Library Board completely agrees with you. That's why we are bringing the resolution to the senate."

Speaker Beer: "Any comments or debate either for or in opposition to this particular resolution? Professor Stein. Kindly wait for the microphone."

Emeritus Professor Peter Stein, Physics Department: "Used to be a professor of physics. Mary Beth, something I find very puzzling is that no one has discussed this with the administration or at least asked for an explanation of the fact that it seems inconsistent with the goal. I have nothing else to say. It just surprised me; that's all."

Professor Norton: "Well, let me put it this way: The administration received copies of the resolution as it was circulating. Certain members of the administration received copies of the resolution as it was circulated by e-mail among the members of the Library Board as the wording was being developed and did respond to it to some regard, but responded in a way that frankly we weren't real satisfied with."

Speaker Beer: "Senator Cohn."

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "Linguistics. I might comment, some of these issues first came out when the library put together their strategic plan about a year and a half ago, and there was an open forum that a number of us attended. And there were a lot of upset people for a whole variety of reasons, but one of the things that came out at that time was we had already been losing ground relatively to our peers before the budget crunch.

"I and a number of other people have communicated concern to the provost, but I feel that until fairly recently, we were in such difficult financial times that it wasn't realistic to think that the situation could be addressed or rectified; but after the provost's visit last month, where he painted a relatively speaking rosy picture of our financial future, it seems extremely timely that we collectively send a strong message to our understanding of how critical and central the library is and the necessity for adequate funding."

Speaker Beer: "I believe we may be ready for the question. The time is upon us when we should consider the question. So seeing no objection to that, we will now consider

the resolution that's before you on the screen. And I'll start the clicking mechanism, and please click. All senators or alternates should have a clicker. And again, A to approve the resolution before you, B to not approve it, and C to abstain from voting. Senators only.

"Okay, it appears the clicking is now complete, and we'll display the results. The overwhelming majority clicked A, voting in favor of the resolution (40). Several voted not to approve and several voted to abstain (3). I correct myself. One voted against approving the resolution. So the resolution is adopted by the senate.

"Now I'd like to backtrack a bit and announce that following the scheduled items on the agenda, we will have two Good and Welfare speakers; Director of the Africana Center Robert Harris, and Vice Provost for International Relation Alice Pell. That follows the published agenda.

"The next item on the agenda is a resolution by the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and -- Academic Affairs and Professional Status of the Faculty, Professor Jerry Hass to present the resolution. It was presented at the April meeting and it will be discussed at this meeting and voted upon."

3. AFPS TENURE CLOCK AT THE JOHNSON SCHOOL [RESOLUTION](#) - [BACKGROUND](#)

Emeritus Professor Jerry Hass, Chair, Academic Freedom and Professional Status of Faculty Committee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not again read the entire motion. You've seen the whereases where they were presented last time. Let me jump just to the be it resolved, that the faculty senate support a motion to be presented by the provost to the university trustees to amend the bylaws of the university, to incorporate an extension of the maximum appointment for assistant professors at the Johnson Graduate School of Management from six years to eight years of full-time equivalent service.

WHEREAS Article XVI(2)(c) of the Bylaws of Cornell University sets the maximum period of time in service for assistant professors before the university must grant tenure or terminate employment: Assistant Professor – shall be appointed by the President for a term not to exceed four years. The maximum period of service for assistant professors with term appointments shall be six academic years of full-time equivalent service, continued only for reasons which, in the judgment of the President, are temporary.

WHEREAS the majority of the other business schools and universities with which the Johnson School competes for assistant professors have longer terms of service before the decision to grant tenure or terminate employment is made,

***WHEREAS** the Johnson School is significantly hampered in its recruitment and retention of promising assistant professors by being at a competitive disadvantage with regard to the maximum period of service before tenure decisions must be reached,*

***WHEREAS**, following discussions with deans from other Cornell units, the Provost supports the motion because it meets important and highly limiting criteria that make it unlikely that other units will seek a similar extension, namely*

- *Unusual circumstances particular to the unit that render the general time frame problematic,*
- *Demonstrable competitive disadvantage of the existing requirements,*
- *Problem related to the unit as a whole rather than a particular subset of the faculty, and*
- *Lack of other options.*

***WHEREAS** the Johnson School's tenured and untenured faculty unanimously support the motion,*

***WHEREAS** the Committee on the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty has reviewed the request and unanimously agreed to support the motion,*

***BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate support a motion to be presented by the Provost to the University Trustees to amend the Bylaws of the University to incorporate an extension of the maximum appointment for assistant professors at the Johnson Graduate School of Management from six years to eight years of full-time equivalent service.*

"This motion has made its way across the campus, if you will, from deans to the provost's office. The provost asked the Committee of Academic Freedom and Professional Status to review the motion and express its opinion, which was unanimously in favor.

"Most recently, the University Faculty Committee met to discuss it as well. There was no vote taken, but no apparent opposition to it. So I would like to formally make the motion at this time.

"Okay. And rather than me discuss it, Mark Nelson, if you would be willing, please, to spend a couple minutes, and then I'll ask Dean Fry to make a statement -- read the statement from the provost's office."

Associate Dean Mark Nelson, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "Thank you very much. Thanks, Jerry, and thanks to faculty senate for the chance to speak with you today. I just have three slides to remind you of a couple key aspects of this. The first, as Jerry said, the Johnson School is seeking to extend our tenure clock to eight years. It would move from a three-three clock to a four-four clock, with promotion to associate professor with tenure occurring in Year 8.

“In terms of transition, our present junior faculty would have a choice. They could stick with the current three-three clock or transit to the four-four clock. I think its key in understanding this proposal that it's driven by competitive pressures. And to help think of that, this is just this pure comparison that we presented the last time we were here, and what it shows are our key rankings, the "Business Week" Top 10; so it includes that and three or four key peers of the school.

“And what you see, kind of the key column is the far right column that has all the longer, that most of our peer schools have a longer clock than the Johnson School. Three have a clock of nine. NYU recently lengthened to eight; several at seven, and a few at six.

“So some of these are schools that have the same clock as their home institution, their home institution has a longer clock than Cornell. Others are schools that have a different clock from their home institution; they've diverged and have a longer clock, as we are asking for. The key problem from our perspective is we are competing for junior faculty with schools that have a longer clock and that's giving us real trouble attracting and retaining junior faculty, kind of a constant fight.

“Just one other thing, and then I think Bill Fry wants to speak a little bit; just to go over again the process that we've gone through. So we have been working on this for a while, we developed the proposal. The junior faculty unanimously support it. Our senior faculty unanimously support it.

“We went through an ACSB accreditation in 2009, where three deans from other business schools came in, evaluated us; and one of the recommendations was that we extend our tenure clock, that it's creating a competitive problem for us and problem for our junior faculty. The provost, in consultation with other Cornell deans, is supporting our proposal, and AFPS supported the proposal.

“We went in front of the UFC and had a good interaction, answered some questions, and objections weren't raised. John Siliciano wanted to be with us this evening, but had another engagement he couldn't break; so rather than me conveying his remarks, I think Bill, were you going to speak to what John had wanted to convey to you?

“And then it would be great if we could get your feedback and hopefully your support.”

“Dean of Faculty Bill Fry: “John Siliciano could not make it today, and so sends a message. I would like to read his message.

- There is a concern that the different clock for the Johnson School might create pressures for similar changes in other units, creating confusion and excessive complexity in the tenure process, and John says that there are steps to address this concern.
- The provost and deans have carefully considered this issue over a four-year period. The deans have taken this concern seriously and have concluded that the four limiting criteria imposed by the provost's office will prevent any such problems in their units.
- The deans of other units are not experiencing the demonstrated competitive disadvantage the Johnson School faces, and hence there appears to be little or no interest in extending the tenure clock in other units.
- We, being John, the provost's office, contacted the provosts at all our peer schools that have dual clocks; that they all reported there were no problems created by their business schools having a longer clock than the rest of the university.
- The limiting criteria set a very high threshold for any unit seeking such a change, making it extremely unlikely many such changes could occur, and the provost and the deans believe these criteria have been satisfied in the case of the Johnson School.
- The unusual circumstances particular to the unit are that the atypical pedagogical environment in the Johnson School results in too much uncertainty about the change at the six-year point, resulting in unacceptable risks of an incorrect decision in either direction.
- The demonstrable competitive disadvantage is that the significant deviation from the practices of our peer schools, combined with the actual experiences in recruiting and retention, suggest the Johnson School shorter clock creates a clear competitive impairment and the problem relates to the unit as a whole.
- This problem relates to the business schools as a whole, rather than to specific departments or groups of faculty in a unit.
- And finally, there's lack of other options. Other options were considered, such as lower teaching loads, post-doctoral fellowships, extended study leaves, ad hoc clock extensions and the like; but all were found to be ineffective, unaffordable or otherwise problematic.

"And then John stipulates the provost's office will carefully review any future request for clock changes to ensure they comply with these restrictive criteria, and the provost's office will also seek review by and advice from the faculty senate's UFC and AFPS Committee, as well as the faculty senate overall, when considering any request by a unit to extend its tenure clock. These are comments from John Siliciano."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much, Dean Fry, for standing in for the provost. We now have about 20 minutes to consider this resolution, which I'll put before you in just

a moment and to debate it; and then hopefully we'll have a vote after a period of consideration. So any questions or comments? Please raise your hand. Senator Cohn."

Senator Cohn: "Could we go back to the slide that shows the comparison with our peers? So I have to admit being rather confused by the information we are given and the interpretation of this slide. We are told the Johnson School is special and we are told the provost has approved this because of the unusual circumstances particular to the unit that render the general time frame problematic.

"When we look at the last column here, we see indeed most of our peers have a longer time clock for the business school, but when we look at the third column, we see most of our peers also have the same number of years for the tenure clock for across the institution. And so I base this on a slightly earlier version of this slide, but there are six places that have a longer clock, which is exactly the same as their other clock. There are three places that have the same clock we do, which also have the same length of time; so in fact there are only five institutions or just a third of your sample that have a longer clock for the business school than they have for the rest of the institution.

"Now, in addition with the proposed two-year hike, rather than a one-year hike, we only would be with Harvard and Chicago having a two-year greater discrepancy, so I have to say I'm confused by this. Seems most of our peer institutions, the problem seem to be commensurate across the university. I am not compelled it isn't commensurate here.

"I can understand the point made maybe there's a competitive disadvantage faced by the business school and not faced by other units, but I would comment as somebody who's on the so-called humanities model, where we teach two courses every semester that we struggle very hard to meet a six-year deadline, and so I find this to be a slippery slope and one that I'm quite concerned about."

Speaker Beer: "Speaker interprets this as a question on the data presented and would appreciate it if the Johnson School could clarify."

Associate Dean Nelson: "Pleased to respond. From our perspective, the competitive circumstance that we face is just dealing with other business schools. So the relation of our clock to Cornell's clock and to their clock to their university's clock is less important to us, frankly. So -- yeah. If I could -- "

Senator Cohn: "Go ahead."

Associate Dean Nelson: "But you got up really fast, so I was impressed. When we are thinking about a circumstance where we are trying to hire junior faculty or we're trying to keep them, either before they feel like they run out of time with us and go to another school or when they are going through a tenure process where they are being evaluated at other schools that on average have a longer clock, we feel we are at a severe competitive disadvantage.

"I just did a three-year hitch as associate dean hiring junior faculty, and it was a constant issue. So we're feeling the competitive situation keenly and to us, frankly, the thing that matters the most is our relationship to other B Schools.

"In terms of six, seven, eight and nine, one question is why, if the mode here is seven, why we are not asking for seven? Why we are not asking for eight. And the basic point here is two-fold. First off, this trend has been moving to longer clocks, so NYU just moved to an eight-year clock. A couple others did move to seven; but Stanford, with a seven-year clock, is interested in moving to a longer clock.

"So we are concerned going through all this and just moving a year isn't getting us as far as we are trying to get, particularly because we don't think that one year is likely to be enough to help us in the competitive situation we are running into from a teaching perspective. So we are thinking a two-year move is going to be more conducive to solving the problem we are trying to solve."

Speaker Cohn: "So I certainly understand that from your point of view the issue of competing with other business schools is the one of paramount importance; but as a member of the faculty senate, the University Faculty Senate, my job is to consider the broader issue of how it impacts on the institution more generally, and those data to me speak to the fact that most of our peer institutions have the same tenure clock for their business school and for their other units, and that they do not have dual systems. So I'm not yet compelled for the argument that we as an institution, not as a college, should move toward a dual-tenure system."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Are there any other points of information, as opposed to debate at this point?"

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: "The first item about the unusual pedagogical circumstances, I really would like a little more elaboration on what that is. Again, people in my department work very hard to teach courses every semester, have all the other usual obligations; and I wondered if somebody got an offer from another institution, could you not then move early tenure and wouldn't that help

you to respond to the competitive pressure rather than create what obviously is getting to be sort of a slippery slope in favor of longer and longer terms before tenure for business schools?"

Associate Dean Nelson: "So I heard kind of two questions. The first was in thinking about our pedagogical environment -- John Siliciano's terms -- what is he really saying there? And second, could the Johnson School move proactively to prevent junior faculty from leaving if they've got an offer from another school to keep them.

"So first off, in no way am I claiming that people in other units don't work really hard and have challenging environments and all that. That's not what this is about. We are trying to deal with our general situation. In terms of the pedagogical environment, if you look at that data and ask why are business schools kind of moving to these longer clocks, I believe personally that a real driver here is the clientele of students that we're facing.

"So in our residential program here, for example, average student is 27 and they have five years of work experience. And we have executive MBA programs where our average student is 35 years old and has twelve years of work experience. And this is typically work experience that's relevant to the topics they are being taught.

"And so we have this mismatch between the age and maturity and experience level and, to some extent, the expectations of the student; and a rookie faculty member, who was maybe 27 and has spent the last five years doing really well in a Ph.D. program, but doesn't have all that background. And that mismatch is just endemic to the field, and it creates some pretty -- I'd argue somewhat unique teaching pressure early on, because they have to gear up on practice-oriented material to a really high degree.

"And again, I'm not saying other teaching environments aren't very challenging. It's just what this means is the junior faculty member during their first year or two is spending an awful lot of effort just cranking up on this institutional background, and we can't figure out a way to get out of the rookie market or to pay them to just do research and not have this teaching pressure. And so that's what has us moving in this direction.

"In terms of instead sort of keeping with the same clock and then waiting until someone gets an offer and moving proactively, the problem is a two-fold on that. So first off, one challenge is getting them in the door to begin with. So they are choosing between a job offer with us and a job offer from a peer that has a longer clock.

“Again, this is on the table all the time. We are talking about it during the hiring process. We might not get them in the door. Second, another window that we run into where we lose people is sort of at Year 4. Frankly, they don't have a tenurable record. Rather they've got a pipeline with a lot of interesting stuff that's just sort of getting done and starting through the review process. They're prepped up and their teaching is going well, so the job offer they're getting from someone else isn't a tenured offer. It's an offer from a clock restart.

“And so they move to that other institution and we're not willing to take the risk at that four-year point to give them a tenured offer, just like our competition isn't. So we're in the position where we're training people and putting them in a very good position, and then our competition can come and snag us up. So that's why I don't feel like the sort of proactive heading them off at Year 4 solves our problem.”

Emeritus Professor Hass: “I would just add, we have done that. We have made offers or promoting the tenure in the fourth or fifth year, but that's truly an extraordinary situation, and usually they had a very good record coming in prior to that; often in industry for several years before they turned back to academia.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. I think we have about ten minutes left for debate, so could we have expressions of support and rejection at this point? The gentlewoman in the green.”

Professor Mary Tabacchi, Hotel School: “Quick question for you. Does this mean that you think other schools will not follow suit and ask for more years? I understand the B Schools issues, but does this not mean that other schools will ask if they could do the same thing, so next year we could have a whole bunch of other resolutions here to deal with? And I just want to think forward on that.”

Speaker Beer: “Could you give a very brief answer?”

Associate Dean Nelson: “Certainly. So this is really through the provost's office, what I heard the Vice Provost Siliciano say to AFPS and UFC, the other units have not been expressing a lot of interest in doing this; but that to the extent that any unit wanted to do this, that the provost would be trying to apply these relatively restrictive criteria to determine whether or not the provost's office thought that made sense.

“So his reaction was that they haven't had a lot of units wanting to do this, that they anticipated applying a similar process, but he doesn't think he'll have much of this happening.”

Professor Tabacchi: "If I could respond quickly, at the end of our faculty meeting today, I heard our dean say that -- in the Hotel School, that he might follow suit and make a similar request. So this is FYI. Don't shoot the messenger, okay; but this is just FYI."

Trustee Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis and Management. "I chair a multi-disciplinary department that has both economists and sociologists in it. In an environment where the university is trying to build one Cornell, one -- more unity and looking much more actively at cross-college initiatives such as business at Cornell, economics initiatives, here you are going to have a situation now where every one of the economists in my department is going to ask for exactly the same thing; because they are hiring into these two units, they come from the same disciplines and treated differentially across colleges.

"I know the Johnson School likes to think you have specific constraints. We all face these constraints. They all come out not knowing how to teach, and have got very active undergraduates they have to hone up on in terms of institutional issues. These are generic issues across campus. So you can communicate with John Siliciano, the minute this passes, Policy Analysis and Management will probably put a request through for the same thing."

Speaker Beer: "Is there a member of the faculty who wishes to speak in support of the resolution? Professor Stein. Or should I say professor emeritus Stein.

Professor Emeritus Stein: "Thank you. Yes, I'm the second from the bottom on that list there. I am on this committee and I voted for it. When I first heard the proposal, I was skeptical. I raised the same kind of questions that you all have raised; but after listening to it for a while and thinking about it, you know, why six? Why not eight? Why not four? Who knows? Six is our standard, and we live with that. The paths by which people create research careers seem to be so different in the sciences and the humanities.

"It is a little bit surprising to me that six years works out to be the right time in both places, but it seems to. And the question doesn't arise. In the end, the argument that swayed me was that these people say that because of their special teaching environment, where they are teaching people who are older and experienced and critical, that it just takes two years longer to develop a research program and that you can't judge people at the end of six years.

"Now, I can't independently verify that's true; but on the other hand, one of their reviewers suggested that they do it, they did bring us data that said that all of their peers in business schools in fact had this longer clock. And so for me, that was enough, and I decided they knew their business better than I did."

Speaker Beer: "Is there another member of the faculty who wishes to speak in opposition? Seeing no other --"

Trustee Avery: "I want to clarify I'm not speaking against the extension of the tenure clock. All I'm saying is don't restrict it to the Johnson School."

Speaker Beer: "But the resolution deals with the Johnson School."

Trustee Avery: "I understand that, but I'm saying if you want to understand what the opposition is, the opposition is not to an extension of the tenure clock. It's restricting it only to one college and the fairness across colleges."

Speaker Beer: "With all due respect, the motion before us pertains only to the Johnson School. And if we reach the point when we click on this resolution, it will be precisely what is before us at this time. One moment, please. The gentlewoman in the yellow."

Unidentified Speaker: "Thank you. So in my field of studies, this is not unusual for people come up for faculty to have five or six years of post-docs. Otherwise, they would not be competitive. So why is it not possible for your faculty to have -- to acquire experience as teaching experience as a post-doc to take a position?"

Associate Dean Nelson: "Post-docs in business schools are very atypical; so in the source disciplines that we work in, when I'm thinking about our functioning areas, accounting, finance, marketing, ops, I mean none of these would typically have a post-doc. And what you run into is then if we try to create unilaterally a post-doc circumstance where someone comes in for a couple years and does a post-doc with us and then either we're kind of dangling in front of them the idea of hiring them into a tenure track position or they move on to someone else, it's just counter-normative to the field. And so if they can choose between having a post-doc with us and having a longer-clock position with someone else, we don't think we have a shot at them."

Emeritus Professor Hass: "I can't think of any campaign we looked at in the last ten years that set one of the alternatives I have as post-doc. They just don't exist. We occasionally see a post-doc coming from a European University, but that's the only place."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, we have about two or three minutes for further debate. Any other questions?"

Professor Cheyfitz: "It is not an argument one way or the other, but seems to me the issue you want focused on is the issue of competition and losing faculty; so I think you people around the room need to think about that in relationship to their own fields. Is this in relationship to tenure clocks a problem for other units?"

"As far as I know, it's not a problem in my unit, which is English, but I think that's the point you want to make. I'm on the UFC, and one of the questions I raised when you were there was is this competitive problem also could be the cause of simply people wanting to go to other business schools, Harvard, etc.; and that I think we left up in the air in a certain kind of way. So that's the points I wanted to make. But I do think the issue seems to be the issue of competition."

Speaker Beer: "15-second comment."

Emeritus Professor Hass: "So first off, I agree completely. The issue is competition. Some of what we have been doing is sort of making explanations for that, but it doesn't change the competitive environment as it is. I think it's really critical that sometimes when we're seeing someone switch to a school that has a different clock, they are going to a school that's high reputation.

"Sometimes when looking at faculty that we are losing, they are moving to a shorter clock school, six-year clock school, but they are a school of lower reputation, where it will be easier to get tenure under that. So there's no way for me to prove why any one person is making the choice they are making, but they are certainly talking about it a lot in the process."

Speaker Beer: "The clock is ticking. Gentleman in the blue in the second row."

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: "What's the meaning of the last -- of full-time equivalent service?"

Emeritus Professor Hass: "In the amendments, someone for example has to take a leave for medical reasons or something like that, then it's just might not be calendar years, but full-time equivalent, if they're part-time or off for a semester or whatever it might be."

Professor Calderone: "It is not an option for --"

Emeritus Professor Hass: "No. It would be something like maternity leave or family leave, something like that."

Speaker Beer: "Are we ready for the question? Because the clock has ticked on consideration of this motion. Ready for the question?"

"Okay, so seeing no objection, get your clickers ready. Please click A if you approve the resolution before you, click B if you're in opposition to it, click C if you wish to abstain from voting.

"Anyone require more time to click? Seeing none, we'll display it. So the vote is 33 in favor, 13 in opposition, no abstentions. So the resolution is approved by quite a majority, and the effect of the resolution is to forward the University Faculty Senate's approval on up the line.

"So the next issue deals with a resolution by the Educational Policy Committee to remove median grades from publication, and Professor McCormick will present that resolution on behalf of the committee."

4. EPC RESOLUTION TO REMOVE MEDIAN GRADES FROM THE WEB

Professor Charles McCormick, Division of Nutritional Sciences: "Thank you very much. I'm Charlie McCormick, a freshman member of the Educational Policy Committee for the university. I have four slides I'd like to present to you, to present this proposal of resolution, and if we can get that.

"The first two slides are really background to what the senate passed in 1996. It was a resolution to publish the median grades on the transcripts, as well as publish the median grades for Cornell courses. The resolution we bring -- or the proposal we bring this afternoon is to reconsider the second of those, and I had a slide after that. No, I had a set of slides I was going to present, but I may not. It's okay -- here.

"This is the resolution that was passed in 1996 concerning median grades. The first one has to do with transcripts and grade reports, that the median grade will appear on transcripts. That apparently will happen either this year or last year. I don't know. It's taken some time for that to happen. That's not the issue I bring before you today, however.

"The second one is this second part of this resolution, says the office of the registrar to publish at the end of each semester a list of median grades and enrollments of all undergraduate courses with ten or more students. This is now available. Anyone anywhere can access the median grades for Cornell courses.

"I was going to demonstrate how we could do that, but I won't do that. I think it would be technically a little difficult, but all you have to do is type and google Cornell, and you can search median grades right in a window in the first hit that comes in Google and you can see all the median grades of all courses at Cornell since 1997, I believe.

"And so I guess the next slide has to do -- this was the rationale behind this, and it really had to do with students will get a more accurate idea of their performance and they will be assured that the users of the transcripts will have a better idea of how their performance was in that course if the median grade shows up on their transcript. That was the rationale.

"The other part of that I found sort of interesting, it says more accurate recognition of performance may encourage students to take courses in which median grades are relatively low. And this is probably the issue that we've sort of uncovered, if we can have the next slide.

"There was a publication by the Johnson School published to the community in 2007. This then was published in a peer-reviewed journal in 2009. It says Great Information and Inflation, the Cornell Experiment. And I just -- I'm not an expert in analyzing the data in this paper, but there were two figures that caught my attention I wanted to present to you as some evidence that there may indeed be an influence of publishing the median grades of our courses.

"So this paper, we want to focus really on the first hypothesis; the availability of online grade information will lead to increased enrollment in leniently graded courses. So this was sort of the hypothesis they addressed.

"This is a piece of information I found helpful; at least we know that our students are contacting or someone is contacting this web site on a regular basis, and what you are looking at are hits. These are hits on this web site from fall 2002 to 2004. And the blue indicate the add/drop pre-enrollment periods.

(LAUGHTER)

"And what we -- I think what they seem to notice or at least what I seem to notice, we see big hits. At least we know the students are contacting this information, so it's not sitting there and not being used. That's the point. I think they did a survey in 2004 in which they surveyed the students how many knew about the site, how many had access to the site, and about 60% of the students actually knew about the site; but I'm sure that's risen in the last seven years or so, because I hear constantly comments about that.

"And this is the final slide. I have a conclusion at the end of this. This is a projection of the percentage. These are percentage numbers over here of courses with median grade in the A range. So if we look at just all the courses -- actually, this is Arts and Sciences, by the way, the courses in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

"This is a fraction of courses with median grade, and you can see how it's tracked, this particular figure was presented in at least -- I saw it in some publication a number of years ago when it came out. What we see down here is a prediction. This dotted line is a prediction, based on the data acquired in the period from 1990 to 1997, I think.

"And so what this shows is the fraction of students enrolling in courses with a median grade of A, and what you notice is the prediction is shown here. And what this is is the actual enrollment in those courses. And what the authors have pointed out is that in this period, the prediction and the actual seem to correspond pretty closely, but there was a period out here -- and they said it was around 1998 or 1997 -- in which these two curves diverge.

"I remember when I first saw this, I considered this pretty -- at least as far as I was concerned, pretty compelling evidence that publishing the median grades by the registrar for our courses at Cornell is having an impact on grade inflation. And so I did personally a 180-degree turn on the issue of publishing the median grades, and that's basically the proposal we bring forth this afternoon, and that is to discontinue publishing the median grades by the registrar.

"And so one more slide and I'm done. This is sort of the conclusion of this paper, was that the provision of grades information online induced students to select leniently graded courses to opt out of courses they would have selected, absent consideration of grades. This was taken directly out of their paper. So with that, I'm pretty much done.

Speaker Beer: "And we'll return to the resolution."

Professor McCormick: "Yes."

WHEREAS public publishing of the median grades for all courses on the Cornell website is used by students to select courses that give high grades, and,

WHEREAS this practice is contributing to grade inflation at Cornell,

WHEREAS the practice of posting median grades on the web is being exploited by

external websites to match median grades to specific professors allowing students to choose those courses or sections with higher median grades (see www.aptsstudents.com),

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that Cornell will cease the public publishing of median grades of Cornell courses (thus removing them from the Cornell website), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that median grades of Cornell courses continue to be recorded by the Registrar and made available to persons with need to know (Deans, Department Chairs, etc., and persons needing the data for scholarly research, with decisions to be made by the appropriate Dean).

Speaker Beer: "Okay, so the resolution is open first for points of information. The gentleman in the first row. Wait for the microphone, please."

Professor McCormick: "I would like to emphasize, we are not proposing to remove median grades from the transcripts. Just proposing to remove the publication of the grades."

Professor Robert Harris, Africana Studies: "That is my question. I was here in 1996 when we discussed this. This was an issue as to whether or not there was grade inflation. We had information showing that the median grades at Cornell were lower than some of our so-called peer institutions, and I don't know why this whole matter of publishing median grades was passed; but it's still going to be within the student grapevine as to what the median grade is, whether you publish it or not, as long as it's on the transcript. So why continue to put them on the transcript?"

"Secondly, we are supposed to be concerned about student pressure, academic pressure at Cornell, so why are we putting median grades on the transcript?"

Professor McCormick: "That is a good question -- we are not addressing repealing that part of the resolution. What we are objecting to or what -- there was unanimous opinion if we do not publish the grades, we are hoping maybe the grapevine doesn't work as well as having public access to our median grade. And by the way, I mean public. Everyone in the planet has access to our median grade. I was going to demonstrate some -- one of the pages on our -- but I didn't, so I apologize."

"I didn't address your question directly. We are not proposing to remove them from the transcript -- that's going to be a separate issue."

Speaker Beer: "Any other strict points of information before we -- Professor Cohn, then Professor Stein. Information questions only."

Senator Cohn: "I am wondering whether the EPC does intend to address the second issue and bring it to the senate for discussion."

Professor McCormick: "As far as I'm aware, we are going to do that."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Professor Stein."

Emeritus Professor Stein: "Yeah, I have a lot of information. I was one of the people who were most strongly in favor of this when it was passed in 1997. And I won't give you the argument, but I'm unconvinced by the data you showed. The idea --."

Speaker Beer: "Do you have a point of information?"

Emeritus Professor Stein: "Yeah, I have a point of information, just a point I want to make."

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: "I am going to have to consult with the parliamentarian, to see if --"

Emeritus Professor Stein: "All right."

Speaker Beer: "We will have debate following the informational questions."

Professor Emeritus Stein: "Okay."

Speaker Beer: "Anyone else with a question, point of information? Gentleman in the --"

Professor Kessler: "I am wondering what the peer institutions actually do. Do they publish their grades too? And if so, could we expect then kind of a negative feedback from that decision, meaning that students may choose based on the grades they get in that particular institution rather than in that particular course? You know what I mean?"

Professor McCormick: "No."

Professor Kessler: "So the idea, I have a lot of students that go primarily for the good grades because they then get into med school. If you choose your institution based on the median grades, you may actually easier get into med school."

Professor McCormick: "I got you. I'm not -- I honestly can't tell you other universities, whether they publish their median grades or not. I know other universities are certainly trying to tackle the issue of grade inflation. Princeton, I think, set up a limit of 30% A's on their courses, so I can't really speak to that. Others of you all probably know much more about it than I do."

Speaker Beer: "Fine. Let's proceed with debate. Is there a speaker who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution?"

Professor Sanders: "I think my department is in favor of this. Our median grade apparently is considerably lower than others. It's about a B, sometimes a B plus. It was shocking recently to go over the applications of our best students in the department for the honors program and to see how high grades were in courses outside the government department.

"I am not going to mention names and embarrass anybody, but there are courses on this campus with 40 or 50 people in them where the median grade is A plus. There are a lot of courses in the hundreds where the median grade is A, and that seems to me really absurd. I think we've just let this go to a ridiculous degree and we need to get back to some kind of reality testing, or we'll just totally corrupt what we are trying to do here."

Speaker Beer: "A speaker in opposition? Gentleman in the red."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "To tell you the truth, I haven't decided whether I'm voting for or against, but I think I will vote against. Therefore, I figured I was allowed to respond to that request. Elizabeth, seems to me if you want the median grades to go down, you want to keep publishing the grades, because that will shame the faculty into lowering their grades. I think that was part of original rationale.

"Hang on, Peter. Truth in grading. Now, I voted against it then because I was a little worried that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. A little information out there is a dangerous thing, and the evidence for that are the twelve or so years we went when we had them on the web and didn't have them on the transcripts. I find the data convincing."

Speaker Beer: "Speaker in favor?"

Professor Delchamps: "I am sorry. I have a couple more things to say. Is that okay?"

Speaker Beer: "Okay, but briefly."

Professor Delchamps: "Yes, I'll try. So the data were out there on the web for a while and not on the transcripts. Now they're on both, starting fall '08. Now we want to take them off the web and leave them on the transcripts. I still think we have the little knowledge is a dangerous thing problem. Say a transcript consumer looks at a transcript, an A student going through the program takes all these small seminar courses as a senior, gets all As. The median grades are all As. That year is meaningless. That's the kind of misuse of a small amount of information. Therefore, I think they should be both places or nowhere."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Professor Stein."

Emeritus Professor Stein: "I am neither for nor against, but I have an argument to make, so I think what David said is absolutely true. The original theory on this was people ought to know -- information knowledge ought to be distributed as widely as possible.

"Let the people who read the transcripts understand what an A means. Let the student who's taking a course understand whether it's hard or easy. Let the student figure out does he want to take an easy course and have the danger of getting an A minus in the course where the A is the median grade.

"The theory in the beginning is that both would happen simultaneously, that they would appear on the transcripts and the students would know what they want. It turns out that it took the university 14 years to figure out how to put them on the transcript. So as a result, we only had the dinner. We didn't have the price that you had to pay to get it, and I think that was really dumb; the idea of putting -- making the information available and not making the student realize somebody else was going to see that same information.

"So because of that, I think the whole analysis is meaningless about student behavior, because students did not know that the information that they had, namely the median grade in the course, was not going to be seen by the person that was reading their transcript. So to me, it seems premature to conclude that in fact if you have them both there, that the behavior of the students will be very different. I can't say whether it will or it won't, but it does seem to me that you could let it go a couple of years and seeing if that curve comes back down again.

"I mean, I think still that you ought to have the median grades given out, because it's insane to give out a number that's supposed to measure something, when a person is looking at it doesn't know what the measurements means. It is like saying here's my height. My height is 3 whoomps. And someone says what's a whoomp? I don't know. It doesn't mean anything.

"So that's why it was important to do that, so everybody would know how students compare to comparable students at Cornell. So I just wonder if it wouldn't make sense to wait a while and see if the fact that they appear on the transcript does in fact moderate this demand for an easy course."

Speaker Beer: "Okay. We reached the conclusion of the time allotted to this resolution. In fact, we have gone over. Are you ready for the question? Or shall we carry it over to next academic year? Ready for the question?"

"Okay. So the issue before you, the resolution before you is at the bottom of the screen, so I will attempt to start the clicking process. And all those in favor of the resolution, please click A. Those in opposition, click B; those abstaining, click C.

"All clicks in? Give you a few more seconds.

"The resolution passes by a vote of 33 to 13, with one abstention. So we'll move on to a report from the Financial Policies Committee by Professor Ron Ehrenberg."

5. FINANCIAL POLICY COMMITTEE [REPORT](#)

Professor Ron Ehrenberg, ILR: "This is a report of the Financial Policies Committee. Here's the list of committee members this year. One member of the committee, Bill Lesser, actually has I think resigned, but the committee has been an inactive committee.

"The committee was inactive in the fall of 2010, primarily because no one would agree to be chair because the committee members who were present in the spring of 2010 -- and I wasn't one of them because I was recovering from surgery in Albany -- they felt that they weren't sufficiently involved in the process that was leading to the reform of the budgetary model.

"And they asked me to be chair, but I didn't want to be chair because I had been chair in the past and I think the faculty committee should rotate chairs, we should not have faculty members who were perpetual chairs, but Dean Fry was very persistent in discussing the issue of faculty involvement with the provost, and the provost agreed to give it another try. And so Dean Fry put the hammer on me and I agreed to be chair.

“We began to meet regularly with Vice President Elmira Mangum. This semester has primarily been a learning experience for committee members being brought up to date on issues relating to proposed changes in the budget model and other issues.

“And one of the first things we learned, which surprised us because we had been led to believe that everything was going to happen quickly and by early in 2011 there would be a new budgetary model, is that in fact there are no proposals really that were far enough along even for the Financial Policies Committee to react to them. And it is my hope that with increased faculty expertise on these issues next year the committee will play a more active role in discussions.

“Next slide. So the committee met seven times this semester. The first meeting with Vice President Mangum -- and Elmira has been really good in terms of trying to provide us the information that we need and involve us in the discussions. She laid out the assumption that were behind the actual budget proposals for the upcoming academic year, which she was about to present to the board of trustees the week later.

“And after the meeting, we received a number of confidential documents, and it is important to emphasize that a lot of the information that the committee members receive is confidential and we are not at liberty to share it with the rest of the faculty. We received a large number of documents which indicated the progress to date in administrative discussions about the budget model.

“At our next meeting in February, Elmira outlined the range of issues that the administration was considering. And there are so many different ones connected with the budget model that the faculty members on the committee decided we had to focus on those things which we thought were most directly of importance to faculty; and those issues were what was going to happen to undergraduate and graduate tuition and what was going to happen to facilities and administration charges, the things that used to be called indirect costs in external research grants.

“And the committee members also expressed an interest in learning more about the capital budgeting process, which is an expression that faculty committees about budget models have often made.

“So next slide, please. At the second meeting in February, we met with Vice President Mangum again and with Tom Cole, the director of capital planning at the university. We learned about the capital planning process and how it had been modified in response to the financial crisis and the errors that had been made by the university; and we learned about how financing has been drastically limited unless there's substantial

evidence of financing. And also, the administration and the trustees are focusing more on making sure that when they put new buildings up, there also are concrete plans on how the operations and maintenance of the buildings are going to be funded.

“The committee very reluctantly concluded there's a very small role that the Financial Policies Committee could actually play in the process, because most of these projects are driven by operating units, be they colleges or student and academic services, and these are the units that have to make the case and sort of say what the budgetary plan is; but we were concerned what about university-wide faculty projects that the faculty as a whole are concerned about.

“So hypothetically, Dean Stein has left the faculty club, and the answer is the key drivers in this process are the president and the provost. And so if there are issues that are of interest to the university faculty, the faculty senate and the dean of the faculty has to interact with the president and the provost to get this on the agenda.

“In March we met with two vice provosts, Barbara Knuth and Laura Brown. And this is sort of a good point to remind you that most of the -- all of the vice provosts are us, they are representatives of us, and they actually share the same values which we have. And Barbara and Laura talked to us about undergraduate and graduate tuition issues.

“They emphasized there were no decisions that had been made for us to react to other than the fact that the provost wants all of the colleges to be treated symmetrically in whatever budget model arises, and both vice presidents really emphasized to us points that they had been making in administrative decisions, that core educational principles should be the key things that guide the type of model that comes out and that careful consideration should be given to unintended consequence.

“At the end of March -- I should say that Elmira Mangum meets with us regularly. So next slide. We met with Elmira, who again stressed that no firm decisions have been made regarding tuition allocations.

“And committee members stressed a number of points to her, which in fact was the exact thinking of the administration, that whatever model emerges and needs to be clearly articulated, transparent, easy to understand and provide freedom for students to take classes wherever educationally it makes sense to them. The committee also felt that any change in the model should be one that is phased in gradually to give the colleges time to plan, and that is the administration viewpoint also.

“In April, we met with another one of us, Senior Vice Provost Bob Berman, to discuss issues relating to facilities and administration costs and sponsored research grants. And there are a lot of these issues, but the major point that Bob made to us is that he is trying his hardest to make sure any reform of the process does no harm to our wonderful research enterprise.

“And then April 26, we met with Vice President Joanne DeStefano, who showed us the financial indicators which the administration now provides to the board of trustees each meeting to give them a sense of how the university is doing, and Elmira provided us with an update on financial projections that she had recently presented to the board of trustees on what is happening to the university.

“And the budget forecasts are much more optimistic than they were last year at this time, but she also emphasized to us that there are two key variables that are going to influence whether or not we actually make it to financial equilibrium, and that is that she even promised savings from the redesign initiative and getting a handle on exploding financial aid costs.

“And she stressed to us that faculty will need to help achieve the promised savings from the redesign initiative and there was a lot of pushback, especially from scientists who were on our committee, who explained that the redesign in areas such as purchasing are putting extraordinary time pressures on faculty. And so what appears to be a financial savings to the university actually is having adverse effect on educational, in this case, research outcomes.

“The final slide is we're lucky we have a dean of the faculty who's achieved an extraordinary working relationship with the provost. So Bill has been working with the provost, and the committee now will meet with them. There are two dates we are considering to get a sense from him of how the budget model discussion is proceeding, because you always like to hear from the person in charge. And we also want to find out from him how the committee can be of use to him in the upcoming year.

“Then finally, I will meet after these discussions, after getting input from other committee members, in June or July with Vice Provost Mangum to sketch out with her the timing of the issues that the committee will discuss next year. There are sets of issues which this committee historically has discussed, such as what should the faculty salary pool be, which faculty have had no input in in recent years, and we would like to get back. So that is my report, Mr. Speaker.”

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much for your extensive report. And unfortunately, we are a bit behind, but we're ready to move ahead to a report from the Educational Policy Committee by Kathryn Gleason."

6. UNIVERSITY FACULTY REPORT

Professor Kathryn Gleason, Landscape Architecture: "I am Kathryn Gleason from Landscape Architecture. This is actually the University Faculty Committee report. Good afternoon. This is the first report from the University Faculty Committee in a couple of sessions and, during that time, in addition to our monthly meetings to establish the agenda for our senate meetings; we've met with the board of trustees and also with the provost in this time.

"A group of UFC members met with the board of trustees in March, joined by faculty trustee members Rosemary Avery and Nelson Hairston. It is always interesting at these meetings to share the faculty perspective with the trustees. That's an important part of just the general purpose of the meetings, and this meeting was no exception.

"Also, Bill Fry was able to correct an observation from the fall meeting that only 20% of our seniors were graduating into jobs and that maybe the curriculum needed to be altered. Turned out this was an incorrect statistic and new statistics were provided on the data for the senior class. So not nearly as dire.

"We were glad to hear that the trustees were very knowledgeable about the issue of rankings and seeing that many of our unique advantages as an institution may not have been captured in the metrics used in some of the popular rankings at Cornell.

"Peter Meinig raised the issue of undergraduate advising, which the trustees perceived to be a problem in at least some of the colleges. Number of us are on the Student Experience Committee, where that's also being addressed in other ways. The progress of Reimagining Cornell has been of interest in these discussions, and also one we raised with the provost.

"Generally, progress has been characterized to us as being somewhat slow. Regarding cross-college initiatives, he brought us up-to-date on the Cornell Council for Arts and also suggested that we hear from Kent Kleinman, dean of Art, Architecture and Planning, who's also heading up the CCA at the moment. He spoke with us at our last meeting and put forward his vision that the CCA would be oriented toward larger projects, perhaps on an annual theme, one that would make Cornell more visible in the arts.

"We also inquired about the progress of the idea of a college of design that was discussed in the Reimagining process, and Kent Kleinman indicated that forging the necessary alliances was going more slowly than he had hoped, but that both he and the provost stand behind the intentions of the college's initial report for the Reimagining process.

"Those were some of the main highlights, other than the weekly working issues of our committee. I'm completing my own term on the University Faculty Committee and would like to express my appreciation to Bill Fry for a very interesting term of service and hope many of you will consider this opportunity as well."

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Thank you very much for your report. Before we go to Dean Fry's report, I ask the senate's indulgence to please stay a few minutes late. We've had so many important issues to consider this afternoon at this, the last meeting of the academic year. And so please stay a few minutes past our usual adjournment time. Dean Fry."

7. DEAN OF FACULTY [REPORT](#)

Dean Bill Fry, Dean of Faculty: "Thank you, Steve. I will also try to be very brief. Primarily what I want to do today is express my appreciation for the senate. I think this senate has done a lot of really effective work this year.

"Some of you may believe that the administration doesn't take the senate seriously, but I have to say the administration does take the senate seriously. What happens here makes a difference. You may not always see it immediately, but it does have really significant impact.

"What I wanted to do was also to express an appreciation to a group of faculty who have agreed to meet to see what can the university faculty do concerning the student experience at Cornell. This group is Vicki Caron, Ted Clark, Abby Cohn, David Delchamps, Kathryn Gleason, David Gries, Bruce Levitt and Shawkat Toorawa.

"Some of the issues we've discussed are the definition of a credit across the university; advising, what you hear quite a bit about; the diverse causes of stress for students; different grading practices across the university; department responses to the provost's requests for information; and the kind of aids to faculty to help with the student experience.

"I think we've had many accomplishments. We passed several resolutions concerning academic integrity. It is a very big issue. We are going to be involved in that for the next several months and years. The resolution on the child care center; I think even though not all the recommendations were adopted by the administration that report, that resolution had a very significant effect on the administration. We passed several resolutions concerning the student experience, work over break last spring, resolution on advising, and right now there's a small group working on consultation, what actually does consultation mean between the faculty and the administration.

"So I do believe one of the goals for this group is to be a credible voice of the faculty, and I think that in fact the senate has accomplished that this year. So you should congratulate yourselves. That is my report."

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Thank you very much, Dean Fry. We will now move on to the Good and Welfare session, with some remarks by Director Robert Harris."

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Robert Harris: "Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the faculty senate on behalf of the Africana Studies and Research Center. I prepared my remarks for brevity and hopefully to be able to take questions. I will leave my comments on the table afterwards.

"I would like to clear up several misleading statements the provost made in his presentation to the faculty senate at its meeting on April 13th, 2011. First, by what account does he claim the Africana Center is not a Top 5 program? Is he confusing programs, departments and centers? We have testimony printed in "The Cornell Sun" of March 10, 2011, from distinguished faculty and Africana studies at Berkeley, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Virginia, among others, that the Africana Center is a flagship in the field of Africana studies.

"Moreover, the presidents of two major organizations in the discipline, the National Council for Black Studies and the Association for Study of African-American Life and History, which by the way is the oldest professional organization in the field -- it was founded in 1915 -- they have affirmed the leading status of the Africana Center.

"The editors of five major journals in the field, including two of the oldest; that is "The Journal of African-American History," founded in 1916, and "The Journal of Negro Education," founded in 1932, have called on the president and the provost to rescind the decision to move the Africana Center into the College of Arts and Sciences. More than

2,000 individuals nationally and internationally have signed a petition to preserve the current structure of the Africana Center.

“Second, the provost cites the 2005 external review that supposedly refers to the Africana center as an administrative anomaly, but so is Cornell University, a private university that's also a land grant institution for the State of New York. Moreover, our colleagues in the field of Africana studies see the Africana Center's administrative uniqueness as a strength.

“There was a purposeful, innovative and unique approach to the Africana Center when it was established in 1969, as outlined in James Turner's letter of appointment as a founding director. The Ford Foundation report on the Africana Center in 2000 referred to the Africana Center as one of the leading such units in the country and referenced the Africana Center's report directly to the provost as but one indication of its institutional independence. The other strength cited is the ability to hire and promote faculty and maintain a relatively stable curriculum.

“Third, the provost claims he discussed proposed administrative change extensively with the past director, the current director and the deputy provost. I met with Provost Fuchs and the deputy provost when he offered me the position as director of the Africana Center for a five-year term. We discussed goals, but there was no mention of proposed administrative change.

“We agreed that I would report directly to the provost with an indirect report to the vice provost for international relations. If the provost was considering an administrative change for some time, why didn't he share that information with me at the time of my appointment as director? Why the deception?

“When the provost later raised concerns about the ability of his office to administer the Africana Center, I suggested ways in which he could be relieved, the direct oversight being folded into the College of Arts and Sciences. When he told me he plans to move the Africana Center into the college, I served currently at the request of his colleagues, but will no longer serve in the position after June 30th.

“Provost Fuchs asked for a meeting with the Africana Center in late November 2010, at which he planned to discuss his decision. He asked me not to inform my colleagues about his decision. Out of respect for my provost, a respect that is fading fast, I did not do so. The faculty was rightly concerned about the agenda for the meeting, and I wrote to him to that effect.

"The provost replied, and I quote, "The purpose of the meeting is to discuss my plans for the administrative oversight of Africana." I thought the provost, as he stated, was going to discuss his plans, not proclaim a unilateral decision. Again, why the deception? I could go into other examples of when the provost says discuss, he actually means dictate.

"Finally, we have tried on several occasions to engage the provost in an open dialogue without a predetermined decision hanging over our heads. Optimally, we would like for him to rescind his decision; but in the spirit of engagement and transparency, which is supposed to be the hallmarks of Cornell's new strategic plan, we have requested he at least suspend or table his decision so that we can have a mutually respectful and productive discussion.

"Thus far, he's refused at a minimum to suspend or to lay his decision on the table while we talk, and he takes input. He's publicly stated that a decision as momentous as the restructuring of the Africana Studies Research Center requires deliberate discussion with the faculty over a period of time to probe the academic administrative fiscal governance and pedagogical implication of such a dramatic change.

"We have no document before us, no plan; only the promise of more financial resources over a period of five years. The provost has made it appear that the Africana Center needs to be in a college to develop a doctoral program. We have worked on a proposal for doctoral program over the past three years with consultants from Berkeley, Harvard, Northwestern and the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We have discussed a proposal with the graduate school and only need the provost's approval to move forward with it.

"We need a working paper from the provost explaining his position in detail. We should have a copy of his five-year plan. We ask you to call on the provost to delay his decision for a period of extended consultation, discussion over the next academic year.

I thank you, and I'll place my remarks over here on the table."

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Beer: Thank you. Our second Good and Welfare speaker is Vice Provost Alice Pell, Vice Provost for International Relations.

Vice Provost Alice Pell, Vice Provost for International Relations: "Thank you very much. I want to clarify a couple of things, because I think I've actually worked a lot

with Bob Harris over the last years. There are a couple of issues that I think we really do need to consider.

“Part of the reason there is no five-year plan is that there is a recognition of the need to have consultations. And repeatedly in a variety of different media, whether it's "The Sun," The Chronicle," e-mails, personal conversations, the provost has been extremely clear that he's willing to meet with the faculty or others affected by the decision. He will go into that meeting with an open mind, and he's willing to listen to any input.

“So that the idea that he has not been willing to listen or discuss the issues is something that I know that he's very concerned about in this issue, and it is also a reason why a detailed plan is not forthcoming. There obviously does need to be consultation with the faculty, so thank you. I am aware that we are out of time.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Our time is over, and the senate generally adjourns at 6:00 p.m. We don't have a clock. Maybe next academic year we'll have a clock; but according to the clock, we are several minutes late, so I don't think there's time at this point to discuss the points made by Director Harris and Vice Provost Pell, unless the senate desires to meet again at its overflow meeting time next Wednesday.

“Hearing no groundswell of desire for an additional senate meeting, I think it's appropriate to adjourn for the year. The University Faculty Senate is adjourned.”

Meeting adjourned at 6:15pm.