

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, November 13, 2002

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior and Associate Dean: "I am the official substitute for the substitute since both Howard Howland and Melissa Hines are out of town. I would like to remind the body that there are no photos or tape recorders allowed during the meeting, and the Speaker asks everyone to please turn off their cell phones, so that they don't interrupt the meeting. We have two Good and Welfare speakers at this time, Kate Whitlock and Richard Burkhauser, so that time in fact will be used. I would like now to call on Provost Martin for remarks and to answer questions.

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST BIDDY MARTIN.

Provost Biddy Martin: "Good afternoon. Thank you very much for having me as usual. I don't have any preliminary remarks in particular, but I would like to give you some good news, which you may already know but you may not. That is that one of our creative writers, the poet Alice Fulton, has just won the Bobbitt Prize, which is a national award for the best poetry book of the year given by the Library of Congress for her collection called *Felt*. It is a major poetry award that was won previously by one other Cornell poet and that was Archie Ammons, as you probably have guessed. I think it would be fabulous if more of us were aware of what's going on in the range of the different parts of the university, and congratulate one another on successes. This is a major prize, which I'm sure you all would want to know about. It is also the case that the governor announced today some NYStar funding for science projects that have promise for economic development in the State of New York, and as part of that award Harold Craighead in the College of Engineering, former interim Dean of Engineering, was awarded \$650,000 for work in Nano-biotechnology. So those are two pieces of good news, awards won by specific individual faculty members, and if any of you or any of your colleagues have won major awards and would like to report on them here during my allotted time, please feel free. I would be glad to take questions on any topic."

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies: "Would you care to define major?"

Provost Martin: "What?"

Professor Edmondson: "Would you care to define major from the Provost's standpoint?"

Provost Martin: "A major award?"

LAUGHTER.

Professor Edmondson: "Just to kick things off. Versus minor."

Provost Martin: "Well, I would actually be pretty dramatic and define virtually any award or form of recognition whatsoever as major. It wouldn't have to carry a monetary prize. It wouldn't have to entail anything other than someone's appreciating the work that someone else does. That to me would be major. And in a context actually right now where nationally, internationally, and in the university times are somewhat difficult, it seems to me there is all the more reason to take note of those forms of recognition that come our way, come in the direction of our community and the individuals in it and to celebrate them. So I'm actually serious when I say that there are other forms of recognition, and we should certainly hear about them. How was that as an answer, Locksley?"

Professor Edmondson: "Very excellent."

Professor Margaret Rossiter, Science and Technology Studies: "How is the search coming for the Dean of the Arts College?"

Provost Martin: "The search for the Dean of the Arts College is going well, and what does that mean? Please define 'well.'"

LAUGHTER.

Provost Martin: "The search committee, which as you know is made up of I think thirteen faculty members from Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from CALS and a dean (other than the dean of the college), in this case Ed Lawler, has reviewed over one hundred external prospects, some of them nominated by faculty here at Cornell and some of them applicants who applied and responded to an ad. We continue that process and have also enlisted the help of an academic search firm to do some of the work of background checks and helping us generate even more names, so I think that qualifies as going well. That is to say that the committee is working hard; we have a lot of interesting and impressive nominees, both internal and external. We don't really expect to have much news beyond that until January or February. I think it would be fair to say – are there any search committee members here? They don't have time to come, but actually they are working very hard. They are a great group."

UNKNOWN: "And the search for the President?"

Provost Martin: “Is that your question? The search for the President as far as anybody knows also seems to be going well. There is a short-list, I am told, a relatively short, short-list. That suggests that we are probably getting close to an appointment and the prediction was, as I reported to this group earlier in the semester, that the new President would be announced by the first of December. It seems now it’s more common to hear that the new President will be announced either in December or January. So interpret that as you will. I think it simply means that it might going slightly more slowly than the search committee originally thought, but not necessarily. It could be any day. I don’t think it will be tomorrow, but other than tomorrow, any day. Any other questions?”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: “Do you have any statements to share, any information about the budgetary process for the statutory colleges given the State budget crisis?”

Provost Martin: “Well, it’s very hard to say. We thought we would hear almost immediately after the governor’s election that there would be budget cuts of quite a magnitude. We haven’t received any information or heard of any decision yet about what kinds of cuts there might be, what cuts SUNY would take, what kind of cut Cornell would take, if any for the year or for the following year. As some of you already know the deans are working in advance on plans to cope with any budget shortfalls that might be created by virtue of the budget cuts that come from SUNY and the state, and workforce planning of course is an item on the agenda for today, so we will discuss that later. What I would say about the budget in general and the economic situation, the financial situation of the university as a whole is that we’re in good financial shape; we’re on good footing. Some of the news for this next year as we go through the budget planning cycle is good and better than we thought it would be in the return of indirect costs of federal money to the university. We believe the financial aid is less than we thought it would be, and in general we are doing quite well. It’s also true that our endowment is down. We don’t know what we’ll do with payout from the endowment. We haven’t yet set tuition rates for next year, but we’re not anticipating either by virtue of keeping the payout what it is now or if there is a slight problem with that, we’re not anticipating requiring colleges to make reductions, and we intend to continue on with faculty and staff salary programs.

“So Cornell is not at this point facing an enormous budget crisis. Actually we are on pretty solid ground. It’s true that if the announced cuts from the state are bigger than what we have anticipated, already imagined, the deans will have to work even harder to balance funds and to make decisions about whether to continue faculty and staff pay increases while also dealing with those reductions.

I think that work force planning is designed to help us all work together to make some rational decisions about trade-offs when they have to be made. I repeat that some of the budgetary news for next year is actually positive and better than we expected, some of it will be less good than we had hoped, particularly on the side of the endowment, but gifts were up again for last year, and so like I've said if you are hearing gloom and doom stories about enormous crises, you are getting a distorted picture. There could well be some need for tightening and rational decisions about the payout. Again, at this point, we don't anticipate dropping our investment in the faculty salary program or a smaller staff salary program. So that should give you some indication that we are not in the midst of a huge crisis."

Professor Walcott: "Thank you very much. Now I recognize Dean Cooke."

2. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE.

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "My remarks will be very brief. You have received this memo. I want to call attention to the fact that the committee (Committee on Intellectual Property) exists, that it is busy at work and that they invite input from you. It deals with copyright and patents and all intellectual properties. They will presumably bring something to this body next semester for us to consider.

I want to warn you that there is a short time line for the closure on Architecture, Art and Planning. You will get another installment today, and hopefully we will come to closure in December. The AAP faculty, votes on December 2. The Academic Programs and Policies Committee meets with the Provost on Tuesday and that same day the Executive Committee meets to set the agenda and distribute the motions, so we have a very short fuse. Mark on your calendar, so that you can reserve some time to prepare for that discussion. We are trying very hard, the committee is, to have the faculty in those affected units to initiate and take the initial position.

Secondly, I am announcing that I will try to assemble some Cornell faculty who are editors or associate editors of scholarly journals. This will occur during independent study on December 9 or 10. So I will survey you to find out who on the faculty has had such experience and seek your advice on a project we are doing."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2002 SENATE MEETING

Professor Walcott: “Thank you very much Dean Cooke. We now move on to the approval of the minutes of the October 9 Faculty Senate Meeting. I assume you have all read them and are ready to pass the spot quiz we have prepared. Hearing no objection, I will declare the minutes to be approved. I will then call once again on Dean Cooke for a report of the Nomination and Elections Committee.”

4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Dean Cooke: “I will give a traditionally brief report on behalf of the Associate Dean who is occupied otherwise and cannot make the motion to adopt this. Here are two pages of people who have been nominated, and we present these for your approval.”

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee November 13, 2002

Faculty Committee to Advise the Provost on All Tenure Decisions (FACTA)

Biodun Jeyifo, A&S

Nominations and Elections Committee

John Hopcroft, Engr.

Ileen Devault, ILR

Geoffrey Sharp, Vet.

University Committee on Human Subjects

Stephen Mount, Community Member

ASSEMBLIES

University Assembly

Shelley Feldman, CALS

Melissa Hines, A&S

Board on University Health Services

Sandra Bem, A&S

David Feldshuh, A&S

Andrea Parrot, CHE

Financial Aid Review Committee

Thomas Owens, CALS

University Review Board

Mandayam Parthasarathy, CALS

University Benefits Committee

Alan McAdams, JGSM

Professor Walcott: “Thank you very much, Dean Cooke. Can I have unanimous consent please to approve the report? Hearing no objection, I assume that I have that. I would now like to call on Jennifer Gerner, Professor of Policy Analysis and Management and Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, and Professor Buzz Spector, Chair of the Department of Art, to comment on the college’s Realignment Review.”

5. REPORT ON COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, ART AND PLANNING REALIGNMENT REVIEW

Professor Jennifer Gerner, Policy Analysis and Management and Chair of CAPP: “I am just going to briefly tell you that the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has been working on this. We have done what we can do and it’s in the hands of Architecture, Art and Planning, and Buzz will say something about that in a minute. But the important thing I want to say is that we did ask the Provost, because of the tight time frame, to assure us we are having enough time to comment. I thought I would read to you a paragraph in her response to that. She says, ‘If the administration finds it necessary to recommend major organizational change in the status of the college, we will be willing to delay the recommendation to the trustees to allow for additional discussion by the Faculty Senate.’ So that reassures us that we will have sufficient time to talk about this.”

Professor Buzz Spector, Chair Department of Art and Chair of the AAP Committee on Realignment: “I want to thank the Provost for offering that understanding, because it makes our process among the faculty and staff on the Realignment Committee, it makes it doable. We have been meeting regularly as a committee to discuss a wide range of issues concerning our shared fate in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning. I think one of the things mandated by the President and the Provost in their initial challenge to our College was that we demonstrate collegiality and come to grips with our future. I think that to the degree that mainly the realignment proposal was a function of shall we say problems with collegiality and a lack of empathy, certainly our sense of shared responsibility for our College and its identity on this campus has brought us together with a willingness to work. I wouldn’t say that the meetings of the committee have been conflict free. I would say that they have been civil, and that a great deal of information has been shared and passed around, and that the outlines of several models of structural change are under study on our timetable.

We feel we can come up with a comprehensive outline of options we are considering for the structure of the College and deal also with complete seriousness and as much objectivity as can be mustered, to communicate our sense of the standing of the College and its programs in relation to other parts of the university. Having said that I'm ready to entertain questions."

Professor Walcott: "Are there any questions?"

Professor Joseph Ballantyne. Electrical and Computer Engineering: "Is it a foregone conclusion that the College will be disbanded?"

Professor Spector: "That's not the feeling we have reached in our meetings. There is strong support among many of my colleagues for preserving the College, but that a case needs to be articulated in terms that faculty are willing to sign off on within the parameters of their disciplines and within their willingness to accept the college structure as a viable means of developing curricula and solving pedagogical questions."

Professor Manfred Lindau, Applied Engineering and Physics: Nationally the Architectural program is the highest ranked . . . so I was wondering if I could get some information relative to enrollments.

Professor Spector: "Well, I think that the proposal of the President and the Provost was not specifically about criticizing the academic stature of the college as a whole or the achievements of its three departments within their disciplines. Teaching and research are only part of what happens in a college. The rest is of it is about the use of resources, personnel, and services. There are some issues we need to address to make a better and more efficient administrative structure for the College at that level. I know that the aspirations of the departments of the College are to positions of prestige and stature in their disciplines. I think you can construe our mission first of all as to share with the University the value of our individual departments, and secondly to analyze the value of the College to us. We believe that these two terms must remain linked as long as we proceed in our current structure as representatives of a College."

Professor Steven Beer, Plant Pathology: "I believe one of the administrative concerns was the apparent lack of integration of the undergraduate curriculum of the three units of the College. In your meetings has that concern been addressed, and is there any agreement that there should be more integration among the three units?"

Professor Spector: "We have a consensus that there could be more integration among the three AAP departments and that there is some flexibility in curricula

that would make this interaction effective. However, when you talk of two professional degree programs [Architecture and Art] with standing in separate disciplines, there's a relatively low ceiling for studio interaction which generates benefits for both programs. The three AAP departments are willing to share certain forms of seminar or discussion courses. Considerable energy has been put into developing models for seminars on issues connecting across the disciplines, but these proposals probably do not amount to more than ten or fifteen percent of the total credit hours in our separate curricula. The details of an integrated curriculum can be worked out through our Academic Policies Committee, which is the College's version of a Curriculum Committee."

Professor Jonathan Ochshorn, Architecture: "I noticed on one of the overheads that there was a projected December 2 vote in our College. I am wondering . . . I guess the short question is what are we voting on? Is it the intention that your committee is going to make a recommendation or is CAPP going to bring the College a plan to us or are you planning to present a number of options in which case it's not clear what the vote would be?"

Professor Spector: "What we are going to try to do by November 25th is make available to everybody among our colleagues the options we are hammering out such as disbanding the College and moving its three departments to other Cornell Colleges or administratively restructuring the College. I think the vote would be to prioritize from among a slate of models rather than to ask for consensus on one, and if that prioritization is clearly enough supportive of a particular option, then it seems we have spoken on behalf of the Realignment Committee filling in the gaps. That, I think, is the approach of the Committee. We will submit brief summaries of the options to our colleagues to study before we are polled. The only place I can guarantee a discussion will be at the College Faculty meeting on December 3rd. It will be with an eye towards using that week to get more suggestions, and to debate wording, structure, and different formulations of the models we have developed, not to add new models to the discussion."

Professor Walcott: "Are there any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. I would now like to call on Carolyn Ainslie, Vice President for Planning and Budget to talk to us about Work Force Planning."

6. OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF WORK FORCE PLANNING AND NEXT STEPS

Carolyn Ainslie, Vice President for Planning and Budget: "Good afternoon. Every time I talk about this subject my asthma gets triggered. I don't know whether it's the topic or the time of the day or whatever. I was asked to come

today to share with you where we are on university wide planning process around work force. It is an ongoing planning process. I don't have a specific recommendation here for you today. It is ongoing and in fact we're really just in the stage where we are about to develop specific implementations on this. I have ten minutes and I'm going to go through a couple of overheads (Appendix 1), and then I would welcome your questions.

"Why are we doing this and why are we have we framed it in the way we have? Some of the things that Biddy introduced at the beginning of the session when you asked about the budget – we are not in a financial crisis, but we do see, looking ahead, that first of all you all have great ideas, lots of programs, lots of things and for us to be able to provide the resources to enable that in the long term, we need to figure out a way of how to do that, to sustain that in the long term, within a balanced operating budget. We also want to do things in ways that are more effective, that are more agile and responsive, as we are doing more things and you all are doing more things that are interdisciplinary across the college, the existing structures aren't as flexible to accommodate.

"Where do we want to be when we are done in terms of our support and administrative structures around this? When it comes to the support needs for you all and other programs and activities we want to run that effectively but also at the lowest cost. As given that we are multiple funded and we rely on lots of folks to provide resources, whether it's students for tuition, or gifts from our alumni and friends, or the federal or state government, we need to be exemplary stewards of those resources. We need to make sure that we are doing it in a way, that we are looking actually at using those resources to deliver those programs. As I mentioned earlier, we want to be able to be responsive to needs. Ideas come on a regular basis here and our ability to generate the resources comes a little bit more slowly. We also want to ensure in all of this that the staff work is reasonable, that it is rewarding, and it's highly valued. So in no way is this intended to be something to suggest that staff are somehow of less importance. As you all know, they are very important to assisting you all with your research activities, supporting the instructional activities and also the public service mission.

"So how do we approach this? I was lucky enough to be named Chair of this committee about a year ago. I raised my hand and volunteered, but it really has become a very important part of what I do. The Committee includes three deans, Phil Lewis from Arts and Sciences, Susan Henry, from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Bob Swieringa from the Johnson Graduate School of Management, Vice President Inge Reichenbach, Vice Provost Walter Cohen and myself. We are advisory, however, to the President and Provost and to the administration. We spent the first couple of months trying to figure out how to

approach what we are doing here in terms of administrative and support structures. We decided to approach this by function, as shown here on this chart of the major planning components, because our experience in the past was when we try to do things more efficiently by visiting an organization is that we made different decisions in different places. Then we end up with what we have right now. Someone places value; its resources are financed. Someone decided OK we are going to respond to this unit. It was very inconsistent. This is really how work gets done. It's not a reorganization; it's really looking at what drives the work in each of these base administrative and support issues. We have scheduled these reviews over a period of the next year. We actually started some of them a year ago. We haven't built any implementation plans.

"I want to share with you some preliminary findings from having studied Human Resources in advance. Our committee didn't study those. We actually had another committee, it included faculty, other deans and administrators around the campus. It has had a lot of variations. So where are we with Human Resources and Finance? We first did a survey about what are the kinds of work and activities that are out there. We reviewed policies; we had a review of some of the surveys that we had, and this is what came out of that review. We also compared it to some external benchmarks, both at other universities and other corporations. Right now, we have on campus (and part of this probably evolved over time of uncoordinated structures, different approaches, different types of organizations) 425 FTEs that perform human resources and financial transactions. What does that mean? Let's suppose that after we have made a decision that we are going to hire someone or we are going to issue a new grant. To make that happen, to move the paper that actually implements those things happening, we have 425. Against any benchmark, any way you want to do the math, that is much more than we need to have as part of the process. "

"We also had a very high error rate. In human resources alone, we tracked it over this period. We had a 65% error rate. What does that mean? It means that when make a decision to hire the research technician in your lab, by the time we get that person appointed, we actually initiate the paperwork and all the compliances that come with hiring, 65% of those required re-work. Half of it emanated from units and half of it emanated from this process and it varies by unit, but sometimes there are 15 steps along the way to get something accomplished in terms of hiring the person that you wanted. Obviously, we all agree that 65% is not something that we would accept. We also observed quite a bit of varied and inconsistent practices around hiring, inconsistent practices of interpretation around policies. Some of it came close to being against the law. It wasn't for bad intentions or anything like that, but a lot of it was just that our communication wasn't good and we didn't have good structure to support it. A lot of it is that we really don't have university-wide training effort for many of

these things. And lastly, we don't have sufficient institutional assessment and management of compliance risk. What does that mean? It has to do with if we don't comply with certain things, that we could lose our funding. Most recently, we have had an NSF audit, and they had a lot of issues with how we track and manage our funds and actually the first finding came back that put at risk us receiving any of our NSF funding, given how we attempted to organize our financial processes. This is something that obviously causes us to pause and think about what if the framework that is most appropriate.

"We have recommended a framework for human resources and finance to try to address the things that I just shared with you. Again, it was an over simplification, because many of us have spent hours working with folks and going through some of this. The recommendation is to consolidate the transaction processing for HR and finance at college/unit level to improve transaction practices and policy interpretation and implementation. To do that is to bring about a more consistent approach and interpretation of the policies. It's also to allow us to get systems implemented there. In doing so, we attempt to reduce some staff. That is based again on a very high level benchmark, and along with that comes some clarification of goals and responsibilities [of who is going to do what in this] process. Again, some of this is already taking place on campus in this way, so this is nothing new. In fact some of the units and colleges are already operating this way. In other cases, it will be a change. To clarify the goals and responsibilities for the human resources area, most people think that's the case where it's important for us not to mistakes. Also the senior administrators in your colleges have the responsibility for the financial transactions and actually determine compliance for college/unit accountability. The department business administrators have accountability to Senior administrators for financial management. We also recommend that we consolidate the general training resources to support staff training and development campus-wide to try to focus on providing better training and to address the weaknesses that we saw earlier.

"What happens next? What happens to you and how does it your department? I can't tell you how it affects your department right now, because we haven't dealt with implementation of this. The implementation plans for the compliance of HR will be developed college by college, unit by unit, in partnership with a committee from Human Resources and finance and will work with the planning team taking into account what the college structure is today, (some of them already have this in place) and taking into account size, scale, geography and the mission of the unit. We also are working on documenting roles and responsibilities, because one of the things we found during this review is this lack of clarity – who really is responsible. When there are 15 people who sign off on a transaction, if something goes wrong with it, when you go back and ask

them, they didn't think that they were actually approving the transaction, they thought they were getting information about the transaction that was important to them. So that is one of the things—we hope to reduce the number of steps and clarify in signing off on a transaction that yes, you have some responsibility that you are actually authorizing that transaction take place. We have done a lot of work on policies. Policies drive work. Some of the policies that we have are outdated. One of the things we are doing is making a list of policies that actually generate those transactions that we saw, because the only way this will be effective is to really evaluate the work and make sure that we're spreading the work that we have added. We have a list of about 10 policies that we have started on. We are also looking at things like the thresholds for documentation. We are also working on technology tools to facilitate the transaction processing regarding our efforts underway to do direct deposit, some types of reimbursements, on-line web forms for certain kinds of things that we need to provide along the way to facilitate this process.

“In summary – so what will be different when we are done? Right now the focus is on human resources and finance. When we start student, alumni and facilities, the methodologies probably won't be as focused on transactions, but in human resources we need to. A lot of the work is really moving the paper to implement the decisions that you all make. We do expect that once we are done with human resources and finance that we'll spend less effort on that transaction process and that we will eliminate some of the redundant and unnecessary work. Because right now, there are things that are done two or three times and checked in multiple places and so hopefully we will have fewer staff doing some of that. There are varied responsibilities. In some cases, the work is shifted to the center, to the college. In some cases the college is the center. It's not as if there is one direction this is moving. It depends on the work and where the decision is, we are trying to get the transaction process focused on where the decision gets made. We have a commitment to measure how we are doing on this. We are going to keep track of these efforts, in terms of the time it takes to get things done, and that will be part of the service agreement that is made when services are being provided by someone outside your local area. The attempt is to reallocate financial resources from support activities to institutional mission activities. In all of this we hope and it's something that is very important to the staff, that they will get a greater sense of job satisfaction, because right now a lot of the job satisfaction is figuring out how to move in a labyrinth of activities, how to move that 15 step thing along the way to get the real work accomplished. Part of this is for those streamlined processes, and with that I think I've used my ten minutes. I would love to answer questions. And maybe Biddy wants to help me. I don't know.”

Professor Walcott: “Are there any questions?”

Professor Terence Irwin, Philosophy: When a plan for implementation has been formulated, how long will be left for comment and discussion before the President and Provost decide on whether to accept the plan.

Carolyn Ainslie: "It will vary by unit, again because some of the colleges are at a different points in this process. The planning of the implementation will be over the over the next three to six months. Then the implementation will probably be about a year.

Professor Ronald Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior: *Inaudible*

Carolyn Ainslie: "Five seventy."

Professor Booker: *Inaudible*.

Carolyn Ainslie: "Right. It does create a lot of anxiety. There are a couple of things that we are doing and we are suggestions. We have a number of focus groups with the departmental managers. We have had open sessions with the Employee Assembly. We have been very transparent. This has been a very public planning process. People are somehow thinking that we are done, and we are not. We have quite a long route to go on some of these things. There are some people who are now realizing that this gives them an opportunity. So instead of supervising and dealing with management of pieces of paper and figuring out how to work through this they actually can be more proactive on assisting with some of the grant applications, doing some longer term planning, space kinds of things. It is a anxious time for a lot of folks."

Professor Joseph Laquatra, Design and Environmental Analysis: "First of all, I would like to say that I applaud this effort. Anything that we can do to reduce our transaction costs would benefit everyone involved. But we do have reason to be concerned, since the outcome of this effort will affect how we get our work done. I know that you have held focus groups and town meetings, but based on my recent discussions with faculty and staff, I would describe this issue as one that has a low level of awareness among faculty and one that causes a high level of anxiety among staff. I had hoped to recommend to you that whatever group we have that links the Faculty Senate and Employee Assembly be charged with some responsibility to direct concerns from both groups to administration and to act as a sounding board for administration on this issue. I was surprised to learn, however, that we have no formal link with the Employee Assembly. I don't want to use the word "committee," so I recommend to you that a Task Force on this specific issue be formed with representatives from the Senate and the Assembly. This Task Force could function to direct concerns of faculty and staff to

administration and to work closely with the Vice President on this initiative. Anything we can do to lower the incidence of rumors about this effort will contribute to its effectiveness.”

Carolyn Ainslie: “I am working with the Financial Polices Committee of the Faculty Senate. We have had one meeting, so that would be my point of contact with you all. We are also going to create faculty focus groups. We have a couple of departments who have volunteered to start, because they have been attempting to narrow staff so there are people who are taking some of the responsibility to figure out how to communicate and organize things. Some times we feel like we are not communicating enough and we are looking for ways for us to do that.”

Professor Manfred Lindau, Applied Engineering and Physics: “I am wondering how it will be decided how many positions would be eliminated. How are those decisions made?”

Carolyn Ainslie: “That’s an excellent question. There was a process that we went through when we looked at benchmarks, and as I mentioned to you all we have many more staff in human resources functions than any benchmark or any other institute of higher education. So what we are doing now is going out and working with the different units, at the college and unit level so there is a higher aggregation in working with them to figure out what their opportunities are. In some cases there are some folks who are already thinking about this--they actually think they can do more than what we would suggest. And it will be that in some areas that they are going to do more and in some areas they are going to do less. We put some numbers out there to think about trying to get a new framework around it, so right now this is our target, and it will be massaged and adjusted as we go and work with the individual units. And also a piece of this is coming from the central office so I think in terms of finance they think they can reduce some of their oversight responsibilities and re-work and get it so the responsibility is close to a dozen or fifteen positions they have identified.

Professor Kathleen Whitlock, Molecular Biology and Genetics: The staff in our department is concerned as I am. Our department is weird since it is both Arts and Ag. Can you provide information about how we will be affected? What will happen? I am concerned about the staff morale.”

Carolyn Ainslie: “Those are the types of specifics that we don’t have yet. In some colleges they want to centralize those kinds of things; in other colleges that’s yet to be worked out. There were scenarios that were part of the planning process that suggest they would be centralized in centers across the colleges. As that got worked through (and we had lots of input from folks) that did not get

recommended. Now within the college unit there will be, depending on what college you're in, changes around that, but I can't tell you what those are as of yet. In terms of getting back to the staff morale part of it – one of the reasons we picked human resources first was not because we thought it was the most broken and not because we thought it had the most opportunity for savings, but that human resources as a function is an enabling function and trying to get that in place to help us with the change and working with the staff and actually doing performance planning and all career planning and things like that with individuals so that they can be a very important safety net around this, because this isn't intended to be in any way against the staff. It's actually supposed to be supportive and make their work in some ways more intrinsically rewarding. The other piece about it that's very important in all of this is that we not back off the staff compensation program, and Biddy mentioned that at the beginning. In 1997 our staff were 84% of the market median, and we have been moving it, as we have the faculty pay program, and we are at 96% of the market median for staff, and we have really made an effort on the lower pay bands. So that will also be an important part to continue thinking how to support the staff in terms of compensation."

Professor Alice Pell, Animal Science: "I guess I have a couple of areas of concern. One is maintaining the relationship with support people, particularly on the financial side. I know that there are all sorts of things I don't keep in my head every day that are essential for me to maintain funding. The second thing is - as an example we have a grant, which covers five departments in two colleges with an international contract and a Cornell international component. I don't see how it fits into this thing. No one has been very reassuring that I would get to deal with the same person each time when I deal with this. There are a lot more grants like this out there."

Carolyn Ainslie: "Right. Again, I can't tell you how your college is going to handle this."

Professor Pell: "It's not one college; it's two colleges."

Carolyn Ainslie: "Well, that actually is one of the reasons why the aggregation – and there are lots of schools who have lots of grants. A lot of them have their own stories about it, so we are trying to figure out a way to actually have some kind of way to systematically respond to some of those versus every unit trying to figure out how to jimmy-rig the system to make it work given their particular need. We are working with groups of faculty in these focus groups that are research based, because the research does have, you know, it is very much specific to the individual grant and how to accommodate that. And we have one starting next week, and there will be one after that, so we are trying to collect

that input as well, knowing that a lot of it can also be addressed within your college.”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “I’m surprised no one said this before me, but here’s a word that you may remember called ‘Project 2000.’ I remember paying a lot of attention to that, and a lot of the transparencies that you show say very much the same thing. Although I must say I’m pleased that they are in black and white instead of Power Point presentations with little people cutting red tape with scissors. There was a lot of effort that went into that, where people were saying pretty much all the same thing. They were talking about the complex paper trails, about touch time they called and things that went back, and it was all going to get reduced, and there were benchmarks, and there were focus groups, and there was a lot of talk that people around the campus and a lot of concerns that people have raised around this room where raised at that point, and there were more talks and more discussion. From a casual point of view, the whole thing was a complete failure. You know you can’t only say the software, because there were two parts to it. There was the software, and then there was this big effort called ‘reengineering,’ which was these things you were talking about. I wonder what you learned from the failure of Project 2000, and why this one is going to be different?”

Carolyn Ainslie: “That is an excellent question. I think some of the lessons learned from Project 2000 – one, is not assuming that the technology tool is going to do the ‘reengineering.’ So even though we will need technology, we have got to first of all, prioritize the work you want to do and not just pave the cow path for doing it. But one of the lessons learned is that we have got to establish policies and practices and try to deal with those first before we try to solve anything. I think what happened with Project 2000 is, as the system became the driver, we dropped those things along the way. The second thing about it (and again, this is my personal opinion on it) is that we didn’t clarify who was responsible for certain kinds of things. So we kind of looked to the lowest common denominator of how to solve something, and we didn’t clarify that there are people that need to be listened to and where the responsibility was, so there was a lot of lack of clarity around who was providing input. In some cases it was the louder voices that were doing it and not really where the accountability sat in the organization or should sit in the organization. A couple other things about this effort—we are not intending to spend a lot of money to save a lot of money. What we are attempting to do, through our normal processes, and this isn’t just a separate project, we are trying to integrate it with other things we are doing, planning within the colleges and our annual budget process, is try to think about ways that we can position ourselves for the future. And I expect it to be ongoing. This isn’t something that somehow is going to have this short life to it.”

Provost Martin: “Just to add one fine point to that. I, of course, was not in the Provost’s office during Project 2000, but I do remember that we were going to invest \$20 million in order to save money, and in fact that is what the University did. That is the first part; they invested \$20 million. I think that it is not only from a casual perspective that one could deem that a failure, at least in my opinion. Nobody is investing \$20 million. The \$20 million figure that everyone keeps pointing to and saying, ‘Oh. Project 2000,’ this time it’s the target for savings over time not the amount of money we are going to invest in a project which we hope at some other point in the future will save money. That’s a very important difference.”

Dean Cooke: “I think I’m hearing some anxiety from my colleagues. The proper answer was we haven’t decided that yet, the implementation phase comes later. Something that has not been spoken that I hope you will address is will, as these plans take shape, we have a chance to be consulted before they are implemented?”

Carolyn Ainslie: “The college-specific plans?”

Dean Cooke: “At whatever level. Is there a mechanism so that we don’t gum up the works and have to go through a nightmare to straighten out?”

Carolyn Ainslie: “The intention is to bring everything I have to the Financial Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. I’ve shared all . . . ”

Dean Cooke: “Before you implement it?”

Carolyn Ainslie: “Before we implement it, right. So as we get reports over the next couple of months as that committee meets, I will be sharing, as I did at the last meeting, our documents and things that I am getting along the way. One thing about this is that there are other planning efforts going on in the college that aren’t necessarily part of this, so in that sense I’m not going to be bringing all of the individual colleges’ budget planning to this. Our scope in this has to do around the supporting administrative services, so to the extent that it is getting coupled with other things in the colleges, right now I’m not intending on bringing that to the Financial Policies Committee.”

Professor Walcott: Biddy, do you want to comment?”

Provost Martin: “I was just going to say that at least for these first two functions the recommendation is that the implementation be college specific. So, while it is important for Carolyn and the Work Force Planning Team to take things to the

Senate's Financial Policies Committee, I think faculty need to go to your deans to find out what specific mechanisms they are going to use for faculty input in the college itself, because these first two functions, HR and finance, will soon go to the colleges for the college-specific implementation. At that point, I think you can't lay it at Carolyn's feet to seek input from the faculty, if you see what I mean. This now requires college faculty input that's specific.

"There is one other point I want to make about research funding, because I think it's so important. Some staff who are especially good, and many of you will know who they are, because they are known all over the University for being especially good at grant support, some of those staff are actually among those people who have been involved in these discussions and are most excited about the changes. Why? Because the kind of work they actually like doing is the work that supports faculty primarily for their grant and research activity, and they are going to be freed up from doing some of the drudgery of these transaction processes, which most staff now do along with three or four other things. Also bear in mind, when you see the elimination of a certain number of FTEs doing transaction processing that is not necessarily to be equated with the elimination of 70 full-time jobs. We don't know what exactly the relationship would be between eliminating 70 FTE from that and how many jobs that would take away. I think that Carolyn's team has done a remarkable job of making faculty really the driver of what will be needed for these work functions. What kind of work would a faculty actually need to be supported? And things will be organized based on what the faculty tell this group about what you need in the way of support and not in the abstract on the basis of what kinds of cost savings can be realized. That I think is really critical. I think it is also important to talk to staff who say openly that they see a gain in this reorganization of work for them, because the work they are going to be doing is going to be more rewarding than pushing paper around when they are the fourteenth person pushing that same piece of paper."

Professor Walcott: "Thank you Carolyn and Biddy. I would like now to call on Eberhard Bodenschatz, Associate Professor of Physics and Chair of the University Faculty Library Board for a report.

7. REPORT ON CRISIS IN JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Professor Eberhard Bodenschatz, Physics and Chair of the University Faculty Library Board: "Well, it's a real pleasure to be here. I hope you have seen the letter (Appendix 2) that I wrote that came along with the announcement of this meeting. I didn't want to read through this, I just put it up to illustrate a few points. The main thing is that we are really used to a wonderful library. The Cornell Library provides us with seemingly unlimited access to resources. If you

look for a paper, there it is. We find it in the stacks, albeit it's a little hard to find it in the stacks, but somehow we find it.

"The problem is that scientific publishers, especially the for-profit publishers, have realized that this is a wonderful market and they have been realizing this for many, many years. The issue is what does it have to do with our library? What will it do to the resources that we can get from the library in the future? One of the problems is pointed out here — *ScienceDirect* — I think it reflects in general what is going on, but of course Elsevier is a very large publisher. So for example, right now we receive about 1500 titles online. These titles are in the life sciences and physics, all over the sciences, mathematics, and computer science. Right now Cornell is paying, if you just count how much we pay for a click to download a paper, we are paying about \$10 right now per download. So anytime you go to *ScienceDirect*, you click on it, you actually reduce the price per download because we have downloaded yet another paper. So the first paper you download every year is very expensive. The other problem for the library is that Elsevier and other big publishers want a 7% increase per year on these resources. They also make us dependent on those resources, because if you would cancel, let's say, or try to get out of this general subscription of 1500 titles, it turns out if you subscribe individually, it would be more than if you take the package. The Cornell Library has already gone — all these things are negotiated with 15 other institutions. Right now, we already have big bargaining power to do this. For next year, it seems if we stay with that, and the library might have to do this, so no changes for next year, it would add an increase of \$110,000 in the charges that we have to pay to Elsevier. What's clear is that it can't continue like that. We just cannot go on, and what could be done on the side of the library is that we would have to cancel these subscriptions or we could go only online. In other words, there would be no print any more. Right now that would be a slight savings, but later the increases would quickly eat that up again. Another thing is that perhaps we have to go to more with interlibrary loan, which means we would have to wait longer for actually getting the things we need.

"In addition, of course, if you think about it, who is the producer of the information and who is the user of the information? It's like you are building the car, and you also use the car, and somebody puts on a sticker and says, 'I made it.' Because you are the editor; you are the writer of the articles, and you are the person who is going to read the article. So where is the value? In terms of what the big publishers would tell you it's that 'we make the distribution; we make it easy for everybody to come to it.' Well, in the wonderful world of the Internet, it's not so hard anymore if you find your choice is Google, let's say, you use Google to find your articles. In some sense it's not really justified any more to be held hostage by these publishers and one thing we can do as faculty, and this is my main point, is to actually really work on changing this. It would be

wonderful to have this meeting of editors that Dean Cooke discussed. I think we actually can put some pressure on the publishers. We can actually make some changes. There is Dspace. We can actually make at least what we publish at Cornell freely available to the world. That would be an enormous change, and we could do that. So we have some effects of changing this. I'm actually an Elsevier editor so I'm looking at it from above. What I found was that I will actually talk – I was just made a Chair on a journal to make a recommendation to Elsevier of how they should keep the prices down. This is open to questions."

Professor Walcott: "Thank you. Steve Vavasis has asked to be recognized."

Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I just wanted to make a brief response of my own point of view. First, it doesn't go far enough in exposing how scandalous the current situation with respect to journals is. We as a community develop new scientific results, we hand the copyright over to Elsevier and Kluwer just so they can sell them back to us at extortionary prices. These companies certainly deserve criticism for this behavior, but we also deserve even worse criticism for letting ourselves be duped so easily.

Second, the report doesn't go far enough in exploring the dangers that come with the next phase of commercial journal publishing, namely the electronic subscription. Once Cornell signs up for an electronic subscription, we hand over a huge additional amount of power to commercial publishers. Consider that if Cornell later tries to cancel an electronic subscription, not only does the library lose access to future issues, but unlike paper, it also loses access to all past issues. Furthermore, consider the amount of additional power that commercial publishers have over Cornell in the e-world. They could easily concoct a policy in which, if Cornell cancels an e-subscription, then all papers by Cornell authors ever published in the journal are deleted. No such policy exists currently for any journal I am aware of, but there is no legal or technological barrier preventing such a policy from being instituted at any time.

If you think that commercial publishers wouldn't dare, think again. As the librarians can tell you, commercial publishers are not reluctant at all to play hardball with Cornell, and it's time for us to play hardball back. Hardball means organizing real action against journals such as boycotts. For instance, I am currently in a leadership position in the numerical linear algebra community, and I have decided to use my office to organize a boycott of an Elsevier journal called Linear Algebra and its Applications. My brief investigation uncovered the fact that this journal costs Cornell three times as much as a comparable journal from our nonprofit professional society called SIAM. The current report does not go far enough in terms of proposing that Cornell should play rough. I call upon the

library committee to take a much more militant stand on this issue. Identify the journals that are the worst offenders. Identify the faculty at Cornell in leadership positions. And then help us organize effective boycotts. The short-term goal is to lower subscription prices. The long-term goal is to take away the power that commercial publishers have usurped from us over our own science and give the power back to us, perhaps through our professional societies or through web-publishing like Dean Cooke's D-space proposal.

Professor Walcott: “Thank you. Please go ahead.”

Professor Bodenschatz: “I fully agree with you, by the way. We have been taking selective action. For example, in this work that I am in with Elsevier, I have considered stepping down and that the whole editorial board steps down at once, and says that we will make our own journal. Because it's not so hard to find a new journal. If the whole editorial board disappears for Elsevier, that's very threatening for them, because that means all the submissions that come to them have no editor. It will take them about a year to find the right editors again. So we have a lot of power, but we have to really discuss this very wisely. Things like Dspace I think are a really nice way to getting quickly to the problem. The awareness of the faculty is the most important thing here. I think what we really need to do is educate the whole faculty.

Professor Walcott: “Thank you very much. It's time to move on. I would now like to call on Peter Stein, the Senior Faculty-Elected Trustee, who is going to give us a report.”

8. REPORT BY THE SENIOR FACULTY-ELECTED TRUSTEE

Professor Peter Stein, Physics and Senior Faculty-Elected Trustee: “I was elected a faculty trustee about two and a half years ago, and I have been in that position and was elevated last July from junior faculty trustee to senior faculty trustee with the retirement of Bill Fry. It has been our tradition to have the senior faculty trustee report to this body. I was thinking about what I was going to report on, and let me tell you I have listened to a lot of these reports, and it's difficult to report on anything, because there is a vow of confidentiality where you swear that you won't say anything that you heard in a Trustee meeting. So that makes it difficult to report.

“The reports generally are about – that the Trustees are nice people, and they love Cornell, and they are very much committed to it, and they feel very deeply about it. And I agree with all of those things. But I thought I would try to tell you something different. I'm going to tell you three things. One is I'm going to tell you what has happened to the composition of the Board of Trustees over the

past thirty years. Two, I'm going to briefly say what the powers of the Trustees are, and third, I'm going to give you my view of how the Board exercises its powers. I have to start with a disclaimer, which I was actually asked to say that all of this is my own view. It's not official; it doesn't represent the Board of Trustees. It doesn't represent Elizabeth Earle. It only represents me; this is my own observations after two and a half years in this job."

"The composition of the Board of Trustees from 1972 to 2002. From that period of time there have been two trustees that are a little bit anomalous. One is the ex-officio, University President, and the other is ex-familia, Ezra Cornell. You know, these are little bit anomalous, because in a certain sense the major job of the Board of Trustees is to supervise the University President, so it seems odd, at least to me, that the University President should be a member of the Board of Trustees, but that's the way it's organized. I must say it is unusual in this country to have family lineage determine who is on the Board. In 1972 there were sixty-two trustees, those two that I just mentioned and 60 others. You can divide them in categories depending on how you look at it. This is a personal division into categories by me. There were 11 trustees that were selected by the faculty, students and staff in Ithaca. There were nine that were selected by special interests. Special interests are agriculture, labor, and commerce, the Secretary of Education. There were ten that were selected independently by the public in New York, and what that means is that they were appointed by the governor or they were the Speaker of the Assembly or something like that. Ten others were selected by the alumni, and twenty were selected by the Board of Trustees. What is interesting about that, and what was very unusual for a Board of Trustees, is that two-thirds of the trustees were selected by people outside of the board and one-third of the trustees were selected by the board itself.

"Then the trustees in their wisdom (I don't know exactly when it was, but it's not 1987; it was three or four years before that) decided that the Board was too big, that it was too big for operation. So it reduced the size from sixty to forty. In 1987, this is the way the Board was organized. There was a substantial reduction, and I made the categories by the amount that they were reduced, so there was more than a factor of two reductions of people that were selected by the Cornell community. Then approximately the same in the special interests, then less in those that were selected by the public. The alumni were reduced from ten to two, and those selected by the Board of Trustees were reduced from twenty to seventeen.

"That lasted for a number of years, until last year in 2002 the Board in its wisdom decided that there were too few trustees. So now we have sixty-four trustees. The first four groups are the same, but those selected by the Board of Trustees are now thirty-nine instead of seventeen. What this represents is a substantial

change from a Board of Trustees, a majority of whose members were selected by someone other than the trustees, to a Board where two-thirds of them are selected by the Board. By the way, there used to be five faculty trustees, now there are two. The eleven was composed of five faculty trustees, four student trustees and two employee trustees. That made up the eleven, and now that has been reduced to the current make-up. So that's that. You can either say it's a good idea or it's a bad idea. What that depends on is what the trustees do. If you think, well, the major job of the trustees is to raise money, then that's quite a reasonable thing, because the people in the first two-thirds don't have any money, and the other people do have a lot of money."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Stein: "So, what do the trustees do? Well, they make all the major decisions. The trustees decide who will have tenure. They decide who the President will be. They decide who all the deans will be. They decide where money is spent. They decide what the tuitions are going to be. They decide what the faculty raise pool is going to be. They decide all the major appointments. They decide that you are going to be the Provost."

Provost Martin: "No."

Professor Stein: "Yes."

Provost Martin: "They approve decisions."

Professor Stein: "They decide who is right."

LAUGHTER.

Provost Martin: "I defer to my colleague."

Professor Stein: "I think I went through a long list. They decide a lot of important things. OK?"

Provost Martin: "Decide is the crucial verb."

Professor Stein: "Decide is the crucial verb here. At least one of those things that you heard me say you knew wasn't true, namely about tenure appointments, because you know that the trustees don't get together and say, 'I'm going to promote this one and that one,' and so on and so forth. But in fact they decide. They are the decision-makers. In fact, what they do is they approve the decisions that the internal process at Cornell has come up with for tenure appointments.

As a matter of fact, I'm told that no one can remember a time when a) the trustees appointed someone to tenure who didn't come up through the process or b) the trustees did not appoint to tenure someone who did come up through the process. So it's 100%. I voted on this. I really shouldn't be telling you this; I'm breaking a confidence, but what happens is these sheets come across; I check it down like that and pass the sheet in for the tenure appointments. Once I asked the man, 'Does anybody ever cast a negative vote or abstain?' And he said no, not that he could remember."

Provost Martin: "That's the good news."

Professor Stein: "Let me talk about some of the other decisions. Here's the part that is controversial. It is my observation that essentially all of the decisions have that character to them. You heard Biddy just say, well, they didn't appoint her Provost; they approved her appointment to Provost, and that's in fact correct. As a matter of fact, as near as I can tell, from my own observation, there are very few decisions if any that they make on their own initiative. The Board meets four times a year. It's sort of like the Senate. It's roughly the same number of people; they meet roughly the same number of hours per year. That's right. It's four meetings, and these are one and a half hours, and the trustees have four meetings that are three hours, because there are twice as many. So the actual meetings of the planning sessions of the Board of Trustees are roughly the same total time per year as the meetings of the Senate.

"Trustee meetings are almost always free of controversy. One difference between the meetings of the Senate and the meetings of the Board of Trustees is the degree of controversy. In the Senate people raise their hands, make speeches, and have closely divided votes. I've never seen this happen in the Board of Trustees. I spoke to many former faculty trustees and asked if they had contrary experiences. None of them recalled anything being brought to the Board of Trustees that was defeated or even generated more than a few scattered Nays. Votes all tend to be unanimous. The Board of Trustees invariably approves all initiatives the administration brings to them. I'm not sure how to view this mode of behavior. I know a lot of my colleagues think it's good, because we wouldn't want trustees making academic decisions about the University. On the other hand, the essential role of providing oversight and a framework for accountability of the senior administration can only be carried out by the Board of Trustees. From my personal experience, and from the personal experience of the former faculty trustees with whom I have spoken, this role is not currently being effectively performed by the Board. Whether this is in the best interests of Cornell is worth pondering.

Professor Walcott: "Are there any questions?"

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical & Applied Mechanics: “Really what is the function? I was thinking about the selection of the President, which is extremely shrouded in secrecy. The faculty members don’t even know who the last finalists are. One day I will just see the name of the President. Do the trustees play some role in that?”

Professor Stein: “No, the trustees do not play a role in that. They approve. There is a search committee. There are some sixty-four trustees. I imagine there are probably about ten trustees on the search committee would be my guess, something like that. Those ten trustees, of course, are involved in making the decision, but the other fifty-four members of the Board of Trustees know of—well, I can’t say about the other fifty-four. I am a trustee, and I know what you know. In fact, there will be a meeting some time, and that choice will be unanimously approved like every other choice.”

Professor Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel: “I am a former faculty-elected trustee, and while I agree with some of the things that Peter said, I believe that there is another similarity to the Faculty Senate. The impact and the discussions come through the committees. So it is a Board of Trustees committee that selected the current President, selected Frank Rhodes before him, and it will select the next President. So like the Senate, it functions through the committee. Discussions of the committee impact change—through discussion rather than through vote impact administration. It is a subtle thing that you see. It is not a thing to come to a vote. So if it is a question about voting, I agree with Peter. If it is a question about influence and guidance, I think they function more through the committee rather than through the Board as a whole, but we do that also. I believe that CAPP had much more active discussions than we had this afternoon, case in point.”

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Sciences: “I agree that the process is somewhat the same in the committees, but the Senate is definitely a deliberative body and rarely, if ever, votes unanimously on anything. Whereas my understanding of the trustees is just as Peter Stein said, that every single decision made publicly is a unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees. So I guess my question is where are the decisions really made?”

Professor Stein: “Let me respond to that. I don’t entirely agree with what my colleague Kay Obendorf said. I have been on some of those same committees, and I think that in fact, the committee agendas are set by the administration and it’s hard to find something that the administration has brought to a committee which is not approved. There may be some subtle interaction. If there is that, it’s very subtle. I have often wondered where the decisions are made. My guess is

that it's probably a handful of trustees, maybe three, four, five, that are the people that actually interact."

Professor Walcott: "I think I am going to have to call a halt. Biddy would you like to say something?"

Provost Martin: "I think I should say something. While on the face of it some of what Peter has reported is true from his observations, and I know how the large Board meetings work. It is a very large board. Typically, there isn't a lot of controversy or split votes at that level. The notion, however, that the Trustees are a rubber stamp for the administration and don't do supervisory work is completely false. A lot of decision making goes on in committee, and a lot of it goes on in constant, I would have to say, ongoing discussion between administrators and members of the Board of Trustees. One very important decision making group, where there is frequently a lot of discussion, is the Executive Committee of the Trustees. Even by the time things get to the Executive Committee, they have typically been discussed at length and in depth in other committees or directly between members of the administration and groups of trustees. It is not the case that three or four trustees make the decisions. Nor is it the case that they adopt hook, line and sinker whatever comes to them from the administration. Just not true.

"They are the most dedicated group of people that I have ever worked with in my life. And by dedicated I don't just mean that they raise money and give money by the millions, though they do, but also that they spend more time and effort on the supervision of the running of this university than some of them are actually able to spend, as a consequence of their membership on the Board, on their own boards of their own businesses. They are in constant touch with us. I used to get calls from Harold Tanner, the head of the Board of Trustees, at least weekly and sometimes, especially during budget planning periods, much more frequently. Carolyn and I work with the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees on, I would say, not only a regular but a constant basis throughout the budget planning cycle. We don't take to them final decisions that are simply rubber-stamped nor do we simply take from them, whether it's about finance or anything else, what they say as guidance and simply defer to them on these points.

"Frank Rhodes used to say the role of the trustees is to have their noses in and their fingers out. I think for an academic community that's what you want. You want them to be interested; you want them to be curious; you want them to be concerned. You do not want them shaping academic institutions. They don't want to be in that position. When they get into that position of taking a more interventionist role, they are frequently asked to step back or there are

discussions about the roles that the trustees are playing, and I have to say (though I appreciate what Peter observes in these larger meetings, and I'm not at all suggesting that his representation of what goes in those meetings is wrong about the typical meeting) the supervision is very close. The interaction and the working relationships are very close. That's important for you to know. I don't think we need to be fooling with our Board of Trustees right now."

Professor Walcott: "Thank you. Thank you, Peter."

Professor Stein: "I just want to say very briefly that nothing I said was meant to take away from the dedication, the hard work, the contributions that the individual trustees make to Cornell, I hope it wasn't taken in that manner. I was reporting to you what it was I have seen in two and a half years."

Professor Walcott: "We will move on to Good and Welfare."

Professor Kathleen Whitlock, Molecular Biology and Genetics: "I am an at-large Professor lacking in tenure. When I ran for this position, one of the things I wrote in my statement, and I'm amazed that I actually got elected to this position, was that I considered my participation in the ad hoc committee to form a Cornell environmental stewardship council of special importance. It is crucial that we as a society act and act quickly to stem the human activities that will ultimately destabilize our climate, increase our unacceptably high rate of plant and animal species loss, and increase the level of human suffering in our world. To me there is no greater problem facing humanity at this time of our history.

"So to put my actions where my mouth is, I have been working with several student groups on campus, and I wanted to highlight quickly these groups, because what these students would like to do, and I don't know if this is possible, is to ask the support of the Faculty Senate on some resolutions. That will be coming in the future. The first thing is Tree Free Cornell, which is a resolution already passed by the students, to commit Cornell to using 100% recycled paper on campus. Some of you may have heard about this, and some of you may not. Our department had tried it about a year ago; it didn't feed through the copy machine correctly, and now I reassure you that it feeds beautifully through the copy machine. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues have a problem with what we might call the incredible lightness of being, i.e. it's rather thin, but it's perfectly fine for handouts. There will be a workshop tomorrow from 10 to 11 a.m. in Warren Hall, and if you can send someone from your department who does purchasing, they are trying to get Cornell to bulk-purchase recycled paper. This is 100% recycled paper. Cornell, the last I knew, was the biggest user of paper in the State of New York. The U.S. as a country

uses one-third of all the tree products in the world, so that really is a good reason to try and have Cornell commit to 100% recycled paper.

“The second thing the students are doing is something called Wind Energy Now. They are trying to get Cornell to commit to buying into the Fennier Wind Farm, which is up near Syracuse, and they would actually supply five to ten percent of the energy we use here on campus, which I think is 250,000 megawatts a year. As you know, this is the same kind of program. If you look at your power bill, you can buy 100-kilowatt lots for an extra two-fifty fee. So they are trying to get Cornell to buy into this. Already Penn State, the University of Colorado at Boulder and Carnegie Mellon have committed to programs like this. These points came up recently. Cornell held a meeting about three weeks ago, students from other Ivy League schools came here to discuss their programs.

“The final thing the students are doing, and I’m the faculty contact on this, is that we are working to try and make the new Life Sciences Building, which I think you all heard about, the State of New York has committed \$25 million to this ultimately \$110 project, to make it a green and sustainable energy using building. As some of you know, Duffield Hall’s energy use is eight to ten percent. It has increased the overall energy use of the campus by eight to ten percent, and what we are hoping is that the Life Sciences Building won’t be like this. I urge you all to tap into Oberlin College’s web site. They have a beautiful science building. It’s green, sustainable technology. The person who designed it is Professor McDonough, who is an A.D. White Professor-At-Large at Cornell. The students have brought this to the attention, and we are all going to meet Hal Craft next week. So hopefully, Cornell will be put on the map by our Life Sciences Building for a number of reasons. One that it will be a beautiful research building and that it will also be a sustainable energy building. Hopefully, I will have a resolution for you to back in the future.”

Professor Walcott: “Thank you very much. Professor Burkhauser?”

Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis and Management: “I would like to do something unusual. I would like to spend two minutes talking about a controversial issue that occurred at Cornell that our senior administrators handled brilliantly. The issue was the recent vote for unionization of our graduate students. I think they made three very important decisions that were correct in this case and would be correct in many other cases that come up along these lines. First, they had faith in democracy and went ahead with the vote when they didn’t necessarily have to. They could have avoided it through legal means and dealing with lawyers. Two, something that’s not so controversial, because we do this all the time, allowed lots of discussion on the issue, allowed neutral venues in which all parties had a chance to express themselves. And

third, and controversial at the time, the senior administration made a very clear statement of their point of view on the issue, which was controversial, but I think was very effective and even if some of us disagree with that, I think it's very important for the senior leadership to actually articulate what they want from us and give us a chance to make up our minds."

APPLAUSE.

Professor Walcott: "Thank you very much and with that the meeting is adjourned."

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

Dear All:

I write to alert you to an issue that threatens the very basics of research and teaching at Cornell. As you well know, access to scientific journals and publications is the very foundation for research and teaching. In 2003 the Library is facing serious constraints as it struggles to cope with rising subscription rates for journals across the disciplines. A major focus of concern is how to sustain access to *Elsevier's ScienceDirect*, an online collection of over **1500** titles.

The Library's dilemma is an impossible one to resolve. Either it agrees to a three-year contract with Elsevier that prohibits cancellations for that period and raises prices each year by 7%, or the Library cancels vast numbers of Elsevier journals in order to continue to afford them on an annual basis. The Elsevier pricing policy has made cancellation very expensive: in effect, if the Library cancels, the prices of those subscriptions retained increase substantially, thus eliminating much of what has been saved by the cancellation.

Elsevier is also offering a separate option, which would allow the Library to save some money by canceling all of its paper subscriptions and relying on electronic access only. That option is very problematic, however, because (a) paper copies of many Elsevier journals are still used and needed by Cornell scholars and students, (b) it would in effect shift responsibility for maintaining the collection to the publisher, raising questions about future access and preservation, and (c) it would also prohibit cancellations and lock the Library into 7% increases for the next three years.

The other more drastic option of serials cancellations would compromise the amount of information readily available to scholars and students.

For profit publishers are holding universities hostage. Higher education cannot continue to give away its research findings and its peer review contributions and then re-acquire, at price increases triple the CPI, the scholarly literature that is the fruit of its faculty's labors. In the long term, we must create a new means for dissemination and evaluation of our intellectual output, working with scholarly societies and others to achieve a more sensible solution.

We urge you to work with the University Library and senior administrators to expose the deleterious consequences of present publishing patterns and practices on access to information for scholars and researchers. Some universities have conducted successful symposia or retreats with their journal editors, department chairs, review committees, and other influential campus leaders. As a first step, the Library and members of the faculty senate could educate faculty in their departments about the costs of providing access to many of their key information tools. We need to prepare our faculty of the inevitable cancellation of print subscriptions, and the likelihood that some titles now available in paper and electronic form will only be available through interlibrary loan. In

addition the faculty needs to take action in the discussion of emerging alternatives, including the DSpace initiative being launched by Dean Cooke.

Eberhard Bodenschatz
Chair, University Faculty Library Board
November 6, 2002