A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Steve Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to order the December 2009 meeting of the University Faculty Senate. First I would like to remind the people present here to please turn off your cell phones, and there will be no recording of the proceedings, either orally or visually or photographically, except as authorized. And when members of the body speak, please stand and identify yourself by name and your department or other administrative unit. Also please wait for the two people who will have microphones to get to you so that you can speak directly into one of those microphones and everyone in the room can hear your comments.”

“At this point, there are no good and welfare speakers, so our time is a little looser, and we’ll perhaps utilize that in the consideration of the several issues to come before the body at this time.

“So at this point, I’d like to introduce the Professor William Olbricht, who will give a report on behalf of the University Faculty Committee. “

2. UFC REPORT

Professor William Olbricht, Chemical Engineering. “Thank you. My name is Bill Olbricht, Senator from Chemical Engineering and a member of the UFC. This is the UFC’s report. Since last meeting on November 11th, the UFC has met three times. On Thursday, November 19th, the UFC met with Provost Fuchs. Professor Fred Gouldin chaired the meeting, in the absence of Dean Fry. The provost discussed budgetary matters and strategies to realize possible savings from implementation of the findings in the Bain Report over the next two to three years.”

“The UFC and provost also discussed gas drilling in Central New York and the resolution on gas drilling that was tabled at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Provost Fuchs suggested faculty members should take a leading role in organizing and leading campus discussion and forums concerning this important issue.

“The UFC met again Tuesday, December 1st. Members of the UFC and Dean Fry discussed task force reports and various forums that had been held during the previous
two weeks. The UFC was especially concerned by the library task force report and the publication of a separate report from faculty members of the library task force.

“In view of significant differences in the findings contained in these reports, the UFC thought the issues raised in the library task force report should be examined closely before any decisions are made regarding the libraries; therefore, the UFC produced the motion under consideration at today’s faculty senate meeting to delay implementation of the library task force report until the faculty senate has had time to deliberate its findings and alternatives.

“The UFC met again with Provost Fuchs earlier this week. At that meeting, the provost discussed his perspective on the 20 task force reports. He asked for and received comments and questions from UFC committee members and an active and lively discussion ensued.

“In this last report, the UFC indicated it would propose a resolution to the senate to influence the strategic planning process. Since the last senate meeting, it’s become apparent each of the task force reports is distinct and each report raises complex issues that are specific to that report. Therefore, the UFC decided not to propose the general resolution, but instead to consider each task force report individually.

“The committee started with the library task force report, and our resolution concerning that report is on the Senate’s agenda today. UFC again invites your comments on these ideas, and it solicits your proposals for other ways in which the Senate can influence the strategic planning process.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I would now like to call on Professor Linda Nicholson to present a motion.”

3. DISCUSSION ON MARCELLUS SHALE RESOLUTION

Professor Linda Nicholson, Department of Molecular Biology & Genetics: “Thank you. So we have a motion on the table from last month that I would like to leave on the table, and I would like to present a new resolution that addresses that tabled resolution, which I hope you will agree is a much more appropriate resolution.”

“So it is concerning the Marcellus Shale gas drilling issue, and these are the senators, same ones who presented the motion last year -- last month. This is the resolution. The whereases are still very similar, and then the therefore be it resolves are a bit different. “Number 1, we are proposing a moratorium on the leasing of Cornell lands for -- so what we are using here is the term horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and this is
until certain conditions are met. So it’s not an absolute moratorium. It is a wait; let’s make sure we have all the information before we proceed.

“We also are proposing an advisory group that should be constructed. I would like to just make very clear that the role of the senate is to simply express the opinion of the faculty. This is not binding; this is not any sort of requirement of the central administration. We are simply expressing our opinion.

“Before I go into this in detail, I’d like to propose an amendment. It’s a very simple amendment that would replace the term "horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling" with "horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing." So that makes it crystal clear.

“So the next slide is a proposed amendment that I would like to bring forth at this point; and if we could just go to everywhere in the whereass, where this term used to appear, we are replacing it in this first case with "the combined use of horizontal drilling and slick water hydraulic fracturing," to make it very clear. And in subsequent places we are using "horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing."

“WHEREAS, It is estimated that the geologic rock bed known as Marcellus Shale may contain up to several trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil have resulted in a tremendous increase in interest and activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing;

WHEREAS, the natural gas of the Marcellus Shale is not going away (i.e. it is "gas in the bank"), while its rapid extraction via the combined use of horizontal drilling and “slick water” hydraulic fracturing (never before implemented in the state of NY) will require industrial type development that could impact wide areas of land and water; furthermore, EPA studies of the impact of horizontal hydraulic fracture gas drilling are currently underway in areas where this process has a history of use, and DEC regulation of gas drilling in NYS is currently being debated;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton;

WHEREAS, Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources, and quality of life for current and future Cornell faculty, staff and students;

WHEREAS, Cornell University is in a position to take a leadership role on the issue of horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, on
sustainability education, and on research in water management, soil health, animal and human health and medicine;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Cornell Faculty Senate hereby conveys to the executive administration, including President David Skorton, Provost Kent Fuchs, and the Board of Trustees, our opinion that

1. A moratorium should be imposed on the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing until a scientifically informed consensus is reached at federal, state and local levels on the long-term environmental, health, economic and community impacts of this activity, federal and state legislation for adequate regulation of this activity is in place, and the infrastructure is in place to enforce these regulations.

2. An advisory group should be constructed to advise the executive administration on future decisions regarding the leasing of Cornell lands for horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing, and its recommendations should be reported and made widely available to the Cornell community. This group should be composed of experts in areas such as fracture mechanics of shale, watershed and aquifer dynamics, analytical chemistry, environmental protection law and policy, water law and policy, sociology and community development, climate change, climate policy, renewable energy technology, energy economics, geologic faults of New York state, and other subjects as deemed necessary to gain an in-depth understanding of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracture gas drilling, and of alternatives for sustainable energy production. Undergraduate and graduate student representatives should also be included.”

“So it occurs twice in the whereases and I believe twice also in the next slide, in the Number 1 and Number 2. Again, the same substitution, ”horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracturing” in both cases.”

Speaker Beer: “This is a non-substantive amendment; and therefore, it is allowed to be made at this time. So the amendment is now on the floor for discussion. Is there any discussion or questions relative to the change in wording? Seeing none, are you ready for the vote? The gentleman in the –”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “As I read the Number 2 there, I think it’s probably relevant to put in that that group should also have representation from someone who's very well-versed and experienced in oil and gas leasing contracts.”

Speaker Beer: “The discussion and debate should be strictly on the amendment. The substitution of the blue font –”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Oh, I'm sorry.”
Speaker Beer: “So are you ready to vote on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment as proposed by Senator Nicholson, signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? It passed. Would you like to speak to it?”

Professor Nicholson: “I think there’s been a lot of discussion already. There was a forum hosted by Earth and Atmospheric Science Department last week. I think everybody has had ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with this issue, so I would like to just simply turn it over for discussion.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we will have discussion. And again, people who wish to make comments, any member of the university faculty may do so. Please wait for the arrival of the ladies with the roving microphones, and stand and identify yourself by name and department or other administrative unit. The gentleman in the light blue shirt.”

Professor Robert Howarth. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: “Thank you. Bob Howarth, from the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. I want to speak in favor of the resolution. Briefly, I'm a biology chemist, aquatic ecologist. I work largely on water quality issues. I have worked on oil and gas, water quality issues for 33 years, served on a National Academy of Sciences panel on the environmental effects of oil and gas development.”

“I have also worked with the State of New York a lot in water quality and I represent the governor on the Chesapeake Bay Program, so I worked closely with the Department of Environmental Conservation, and the impact statement produced by the DEC in this case is really sub-standard, in my opinion, compared to most impact statements I have seen. It's clearly a rush job, it does not adequately consider many, many issues.

“Let me just throw out one. There's a compound listed in the impact statement, 4-nitroquinoline oxide, an extremely hazardous substance. The impact statement says it's there, they have seen it in every sample. They have looked for it in Pennsylvania. It's a mutagenic substance, present in milligrams per liter concentrations, which are six orders of magnitude more than one would consider hazardous.

“Nothing is said about why this is a terrible idea. It's just there. I have talked with experts on the analysis of this compound, and most people think it's a mistake. They probably can't have measured it at all, and probably that nasty compound isn't there;
something else is instead. But I raise it as an issue of lack of considerations been given to date. The fact this incredible mutagenic compound could be listed as there when it probably isn't and without comment about what this means is a shockingly poor analysis, so there clearly needs to be more analysis of what the impacts are.

“For those of you that don't know, oil and gas drilling at the moment in the United States is totally exempt from The Clean Water Act, The Clean Air Act and other environmental regulation. That’s been true since 2005, and that alone would be reason to not move forward with the drilling. So I applaud the faculty who proposed this. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution? The gentleman in red.”

Professor Larry Cathles, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: “Yes, I'm Larry Cathles, a member of the Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Department, and I speak fairly much as a consensus of our department. We don't have strong feelings against the language of the resolutions themselves, but we feel it would be a disservice to Cornell to adopt this resolution because of the background material, which will be implicitly supported by a positive vote.”

“This background material fails to mention any of the environmental energy or economic benefits of the Marcellus Shale in their major. The methane that the Marcellus contains is an important contributor to transition fuel to sustainable sources of energy. And the Marcellus is an important part of the New York State energy plan.

“The citations in the background material did not include a single refereed report, nor links to web sites of neutral organizations, such as the Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Paleontological Research Institute, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Department of Energy, much less links to the arguments of the proponents in industry.

“And the language in the supporting material is intemperate and misleading. There are many benefits to horizontal drilling. For example, one horizontal well is the equivalent of about five vertical wells. Each time you drill through the shallow subsurface, you encounter risks of encountering unexpected gas pockets. This is really the main risk of drilling. Once you get the well in place and drilling from a single site, means you only encounter that risk once, rather than many times, if you drilled the equivalent number of vertical wells.
“And the hydrofracking from horizontal well need only fracture a thin shale bed, rather than -- vertically, rather than a shale bed much more extensively horizontally. So we feel that the language in the supporting material will deprive Cornell of its opportunity to serve as an unbiased referee in this very, very important area, and we think it would be unwise to adapt it. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Is there another member of the body, who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution? The lady in the second row.”

Professor Cynthia Bowman, Law School: “I'm Cynthia Grant Bowman, the Dorothea Clarke Professor of Law. The past semester I have been co-teaching a water law clinic with Keith Porter, who is the former director of the New York State Water Resources Institute at Cornell and an expert on groundwater. Our students have now been studying the issues involved in drilling in the Marcellus Shale for more than a year, and we've also perused the draft supplemental generic environmental impact statement, which was released for comment by the State Department of Environmental Conservation.”

“Today I mailed off the water clinic’s comments on that statement, along with recommendations for ways in which it could be improved, right here. We have 23 very specific recommendations, and they involve major issues. The document, as it stands, is seriously flawed in a number of ways. I could go on and on about them, but I won't; and even if it were not flawed, even if it presented a perfect way of protecting the environment in Upstate New York, it involves the Department of Environmental Conservation taking upon itself at least 187 -- my students counted them -- new tasks that it says in its chapter on mitigation, Chapter 7, are necessary in order to monitor the drilling so as to make it safe for the environment in this part of the country.

“The Department of Environmental Conservation of New York State doesn't have the resources to do that. It has about 17 employees and three field investigators. As you know, the state budget is not particularly well-suited to expanding regulatory capacity at this time.

“In short, I think Cornell should think long and hard about leasing any lands for gas drilling, and should begin to play a leadership role on this issue. Thanks.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak in opposition? The gentleman on the aisle.”
Professor Larry Brown: “My name is Larry Brown, Chair of the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. My opinions are mine alone. I agree it is a flawed document, but it is not a regulation; it is a draft that’s been put out for comment and a draft that’s been receiving comment. To make decisions about what the final document will look like and whether it will be up to snuff or not seems to me as premature.”

“Secondly, I think Cornell does need to take a leadership position, but it needs to take a leadership position for the world, not for Ithaca. If we aren't going to use natural gas, what are we going to use? What are the impacts of the alternatives? Are they worse for us in Ithaca? If they aren't worse for us in Ithaca, who are they worse for? Somebody will pay the price. It will be either be a natural gas from somewhere else, most likely, nuclear, coal, which is worse than gas in many respects; and if we don't want to pay that price locally, will it wind up in the laps of the people in Bangladesh in terms of increased greenhouse gases, increased global warming and sea level rise?

“So if you are going to frame this issue, it simply shouldn't be put in terms of not in my back yard. Thank you.”

Speaker Steve Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolution? The gentleman in the black vest.”

Professor Ted Clark: “Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. I’m one of the co-sponsors of the resolution, and I just want to address the two comments made in opposition.”

“You know, this issue, for me, is certainly one that I recognize the importance of this resource and, in considering the resolution, we heard all kinds of comments, many of which were incendiary comments about why drilling should not occur; but many of us, I think, recognize the worth and value of this resource and the importance of this resource. So we didn't just, you know, react to this as a knee-jerk opposition to this particular source of energy.

“So the bottom line is that I think we’re voting on the resolution, and the resolution is fairly unbiased. I don't think we’re voting on anything else. I think we’re just voting on this resolution, regardless of the background statement or anything like that, so I think people should consider the resolution and not anything that anyone else has said or what's in the background necessarily.”
Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Before we hear from the next speaker, I’d like to ask, are there any questions of information that the mover and her colleagues might clarify? The lady in white.”

Ellen Harrison, Sr. Extension Associate, retired from Crop and Soil Science. “There’s been discussion about -- I think Larry, you mentioned, and perhaps both of you Larrys mentioned that natural gas is a good transition fuel. I am unaware of any good documentation about the full life cycle analysis of greenhouse gas and natural gas development from the shale. I have heard that if you take fugitive emissions into account, both from transmission lines and also from the fluids that will come up, which will have methane in them, that in fact, the equation doesn't come out with natural gas through this source looking so good. I'm not asking for an opinion, because I don't have an --.”

Speaker Beer: “Senator Nicholson, would you kindly clarify?”

Ellen Harrison: “Exactly. Thank you.”

Professor Nicholson: “I have the same information that you do, Ellen. I don't know of a thorough analysis that has been done, and I might ask Larry Brown to comment. He's raising his hand.”

Professor Brown: “The fact is, the argument is, there is no mention of this debate in the resolution or in the background material. And if we are going to compare life cycles of natural gas, we should compare it against nuclear, coal and the other alternative energies as well. We need to have a fair basis for these decisions, and we have to have a fair measurement of this.

“And these impacts go beyond Ithaca. It's the lack of recognition that these issues exist, which is our main concern, not necessarily an argument over the facts of one particular aspect of the drilling.”

Professor Nicholson: “May I address that? So Larry, I was hoping you would give me feedback on the document. I was waiting for that, and I'm a little disappointed that it's coming up now and it didn't come up before this was --.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other points of information -- not debate, but information? Senator Cohn.”
Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “My understanding of this is it is rather procedural in nature. The resolution, as I read it, is procedural and not really substantive, as far as taking a position on these matters that have been raised. Could you comment on that?”

Professor Nicholson: “I think that's a good point. It's just -- basically, the first part is simply to wait until we have more information, so it's a let's wait and see. And the second part is let's form a committee of experts. Absolutely. That's a good take on it.

“We’re not taking a position gas drilling is bad. I think their concern primarily, the two Larry’s, is with the background information and not the resolution itself.”

Speaker Beer: “So now we'll switch back to debate, and we'll hear from someone who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution. There's a gentleman on the far right.”

“Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences.”

Speaker Beer: “Can you kindly stand?”

Professor Kay: “Yes, I am in the process.”

[LAUGHTER]

Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: “I would like to address the word "consensus." And this is directly out of the resolution, and the consensus is supposed to be reached at the federal, state and local levels, and it's -- practically speaking, I'm wondering whether the drafters of this resolution have considered that it's easy to negate something; just one person can say the consensus is off. It seems to me very strong to require that, so I'll just make that point.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a speaker in favor of the resolutions? The lady in the third row.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders: “I want to address the NIMBY argument.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you identify yourself.”

Professor Sanders: “Sorry. Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department, Senator. I want to address the NIMBY argument, which I see coming up again and again. I think it's the last refuge of those who want to drill and often who have an economic interest in doing so. The companies are bringing this up a lot, trying to make us feel guilty,
because we don’t want to suffer these conditions, but presumably we want other people to. And that’s really a false argument, I think.”

“It ignores -- it assumes that we have to go on consuming the same amount of fossil fuel; that we can’t use conservation in a country that uses twice as much energy per capita as almost any other country besides Canada, that we can’t go to alternatives--solar and wind and sources that don’t poison the land forever, as this undoubtedly will do.

“Once we get to the point we have to recognize what’s going to happen, what’s happened in other areas, then our motives are impugned, but this completely ignores the alternatives and assumes a continued increase in fossil fuel consumption. And that’s just really wrong.

“If everybody said NIMBY, if everybody said no, you can’t poison this beautiful area; no, you can’t destroy my property values; no, you can’t destroy my water; no, you can’t poison the air around me, if everybody did that, then energy companies, and other companies that would come forward would find a better way for us to have a high standard of living without poisoning our earth.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another person who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution? Gentleman in the fourth row.”

Professor Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: “Ephrahim Garcia, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I don’t live in Ithaca. And when I drive home and when I live in a couple of places in Cortland, there’s a lot of economic depression out there. You know, Upstate New York has been in economic depression for decades, so the downturn we’ve recently had hasn’t even affected most of these small towns in Upstate New York, because they have been in a depression. You can’t go anywhere from the bottom. There’s no place left to go.”

“Ithaca Journal recently was quoted as saying this could create as many as 20,000 jobs. I don’t think we should drill, if we are going to poison our water and if we can’t drill responsibly; but on the other hand, I think what we should have is a balanced view of the idea of drilling.

“And if wells do become poison, the question is how often does that happen? What’s the probability that drilling may go awry and we may end up poisoning water locally? So I want to hear more of a balanced view.
“I actually think that the second part of this proposal is completely on the money, that we should have an advisory group and we should listen to this. I'm really concerned when this proposal was put forth by simply members of the biology community and not enough people from geology or Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. It seemed like a really unbalanced view that mostly biologists were going to come with a decision to say this isn't going to hurt biology.

“So I'm sort of concerned that we haven't been presented a balanced view on the subject and that we should. And so I actually move -- I would like to put forth a motion that we strike -- is that out of order?”

Speaker Beer: “Substantive amendments have to be presented to the body 24 hours before the meeting.”

Professor Garcia: “I want to do an addendum to the amendment. Hold on. I just want to make -- so even a -- okay. I just want to strike the first part.”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “That's quite substantive.”

Professor Garcia: “You know, we've practiced parliamentary procedure in our department, but I'm still missing something.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Well, we've had quite a debate, and it seems we are reaching our time limit for consideration of this issue. Are we ready for the vote?”

“Does anyone wish to call a question on the motion? Okay, question's been called. All in favor of voting on the resolution say aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? "Nay? We'll proceed to vote on the resolution, as you see presented on the screen, as amended. The amendment deals with adopting the blue-colored font in preference to these stricken red fonts. All those in favor of adopting the amendment, signify by sighing "aye.”

(Ayes)
Unidentified Speaker: “The resolution. We already voted on the amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “I stand corrected. The main motion, which has been amended as indicated, please say aye.”

(Ayes)


[APPLAUSE]

Speaker Beer: “The speaker erred, and I will hear from abstainers. All those who wish to abstain, senators who wish to abstain from the vote, please indicate by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “The minutes should note there were several senators who abstained.

Senator Earle.”

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics. “Just as a point of procedure, I would suggest that when we take important votes of this sort, we do it by a count, rather than by a voice vote.”

Speaker Beer: “Are you calling for a division?”

Professor Earle: “No, I'm not calling for that, but I would like it to be on record than we should consider that for the future.”

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Okay, so we will now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the approval of the minutes of the November 2009 meeting. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the November meeting as distributed, please signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay?"

“The minutes of the November meeting are approved. I would now like to call on Professor Steve Pope; and later, Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano for a budget update.”
Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: “Okay, thank you. So I’m Steve Pope, a senator from Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering and Chair of the Financial Policies Committee. So this presentation will be in two parts. So in the first part, I will give the Financial Policies Committee’s involvement in the budget process for next year and, in the second part, I thought David Harris was going to speak, but I understand John Siliciano is going to speak instead, and he’ll describe the connections between the budget process, the Bain's exercise and the task force reports. And after that, we will be pleased to take questions.”

“Next slide. So on the right-hand side; you will see the membership of the Financial Policies Committee. I’ll just spend a few minutes talking about the committee's work so far. We meet typically every two weeks. We meet with Paul Streeter, who is the interim vice president for Planning and Budget. You may remember Carolyn Ainslie left that position in 2008, and Elmira Magnum will join in February next year as vice president for Planning and Budget.

“So we’ve had very good discussions with Paul through the semester. We’ve had open discussions, in which he shared confidential information with us on essentially all the topics we’ve discussed. We spent four meetings talking about the Budget Model Task Force; and Cathy Dove, along with the co-chairs of that task force, joined us for these meetings. So that was an opportunity for the Financial Policies Committees to have input on that matter.

“With respect to the budget, last week we had a lengthy meeting with Paul, going over the major assumptions going into the budget for next year. In some previous years, this information has been shared with the senate prior to going to the trustees. This is not the case this year, so there's a limit on what I’m able to say here. One other matter we are going to take up next week is one raised in the senate last semester, and that of part-time appointments for faculty.

“So just to give an overview of the budget issues, looking at the current year's budget, this is showing the major components for the revenues, the big items; tuition and fees, sponsored programs, the endowment payout, New York State. Those add up to 79% of the revenues. On the expenditure side, salaries are over 50%; and then financial aid, those two add up to 71%.
“So at our meeting last week, Paul Streeter presented proposals that are going to go to the Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee. I think, as we speak, they will be talking about it. On the three major items that the administration and the trustees really have the most control over, namely the bold items, if we could go back -- so namely the setting of the tuition and fees, the endowment payout and the salaries.

“So we had a two-hour meeting, in which Paul Streeter described the proposals, the rationale for the proposals. There was extensive discussion with the Financial Policies Committee, expressing a range of opinions, and our views were clearly heard.

“Okay, next one, please.

“So the timeline ahead, as I said, at the moment, these major assumptions are being presented to the trustees of the Finance Committee. They will take action in January on those major assumptions; namely, the tuition, the salary improvement program and the endowment payout. And then in March, the budget allocations will go to the colleges and units. This is a little bit later than the normal process, for reasons that John may explain. And then presumably, the final budget will be approved in May.

“Okay? So I will turn it over to John and, after his presentation, we can take questions.”

Vice Provost John Siliciano: “Thanks. Thanks, everybody, for having David Harris here. Unfortunately, David took ill this afternoon and I’m pinch-hitting. I have been handed a script. I understand most of it, but I have to confess I have not been involved in -- we are all involved in this up to our necks, but David has been working more on the Bain part of it, the consulting and some of the budget stuff, so there will be some gaps in my knowledge, but I will do my best. I do have a working knowledge of it.”

“In terms of a budget update, the goal is to address things -- why don’t we move to the next slide. Okay. This is what I gather is one of the reasons that we have been invited here today, is an understandable inconsistency that people are hearing between -- what you have been hearing lately is that it is our hope and expectation to solve a large portion of the remaining budget deficit through administrative cost savings. That is intentioned with the fact the task forces’ reports, the 20 task force reports, which began to come in in October and now have been made public in various ways, do discuss some very significant potential changes in the academic area, such as closing libraries or reducing faculty lines in some units.
“So how do we reconcile this? On the one hand we are saying we are relieved we'll be able to do most of this through administrative, rather than academic side savings, in the fact the task forces are speaking in terms of things that are core academic pursuits.

“There are four reasons for this: One that the task forces were launched in a period before we retained Bain to help us work on the administrative side, and we didn't know the scale or the ways in which we were going to deal with the budget deficit. So at the point at which these committees were charged, these units were charged, we asked them to do something very significant.

“As you recall, at the outset of the crisis, out of necessity, we imposed a 5% budget cut across all units. It was a very crude tool, not strategic, but necessary under the circumstances, knowing that we would need to do more cuts in the future. So part of the initial charge to the task forces was to imagine how they would function and function as well as possible with an additional reduction of up to 10%. So they were asked to imagine moving forward with their overall reduction in the 10% to 7% range.

“Those task forces worked and what they are showing you now is the product of that charge, so they were asked to sort out how you would deal with this if things were that bad, without accounting for the fact at that point, we were going through a separate exercise aimed at identifying savings on the administrative side of the thing.

“So they do speak of things that are quite scary, but have become less necessary, given the fact we have been able to identify substantial administrative savings. I don't know if that's clear; but basically, we've relieved some of that pressure, a very significant amount, through the subsequent work on the administrative side, so some of the things that have been identified in the reports will not be necessary, unless we, in some sense, face really extreme budget pressure, should we have another economic shock.

“The second point is that we do, even with the projected administrative side savings, we do face a budget gap that will need to be closed, and that will likely involve engaging in some of the things identified in the academic task force reports.

“As you recall, the total budget deficit, the annual budget deficit we are facing -- that's opened up underneath -- is in the range of $215 million as an annual budget. In the first year cut, we were able to reduce this by $80 million, so the current figure is $135 million to go. We believe that the reductions and the savings on the administrative side -- and some of this is in non-personnel, like more efficient procurement processes, greater energy savings. Some is in personnel, and that's the one we worry about most -- but we
are projecting that we will be able to get about $90 million in annual savings on this function, which leaves $45 million to go in terms of a number to be involved.

“In all likelihood, that number will be less. That is a conservative estimate. Things have gone better in terms of our thinking about the endowment payout and the market performance than we have expected, so the number will be less; but we still have a number to solve for. So the second point is we will need to consider things on the academic side that help address the remaining budget deficit.

“Third issue is that the goal of this whole process -- and it's a huge unwieldy process, 20 task force reports, the examination of administrative spending, the launch of a strategic process going forward -- has two components: One is to balance the budget. That's the sort of hard edge, but the second is one that, I think that's been widely embraced, to use this difficult time as an opportunity to rethink a number of questions about where we are going, how we are focused, how we can best discharge our academic mission.

“And so the task forces, along with proposed budget savings, also proposed things that we would want to think about in ordinary times; about our alignment, about our deployment, about our focus of the academic mission, and they appear side-by-side and would continue to appear and they are things we need to think about, even if they have no budget implications, per se.

“I think that ties into the fourth point of this side -- at least I'm intuiting that -- is that when we get through the challenge, we will, for a long time, be in a situation with reduced resources. And so that will keep on the pressure to think very carefully about how we deploy resources. So even within a college, I think it's going to be a constant need to think about whether the college is making the right kind of expenditures for substantive purposes, so we'd want to think about that going forward.

“That's really all I have to say. I'd be happy to respond for questions, if that's appropriate.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions for Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano?

Senator Hoffman. Sorry.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “So I don’t know if you are in a position to comment on how severe the staff changes are likely to be as a result of trying to capture these savings and how much of that's likely to be in things that we actually will consider to be
academic spheres, because some of the staff we really see as pretty tangential to what we are doing and some of the staff is absolutely critical to what we do.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “To respond to Abby’s question, the way I would frame it -- and there may be better ways to frame it -- is that our priority in the budget reduction, our core priority is to protect the academic enterprise, which is teaching, research and our outreach to the world. That’s our goal.”

“So we’re trying to put as much as possible in what you would call nonacademic. And part of your question, I think, is appropriately challenging whether that line is as bright as we sometimes refer to it.

“In that world of -- let’s just call it nonacademic budget cuts, our goal there is the appropriate one of trying to focus those as much as possible on non-personnel savings. That’s in the interest of all of us, is to preserve as much in that sense as possible, but there will be layoffs. It’s a difficult, but in-escapable fact, as we try to do this. We can’t make it all up in the non-personnel savings.

“The degree of the layoffs is not clear at this point. That’s one of the big questions. You will see President Skorton saying openly what we all hope, is that we want to minimize those to the extent possible, for all sorts of obvious reasons.

“To the extent that we need to do layoffs and personnel actions, then we get to the heartier question; are those we need to focus on things as much as possible that don’t affect the academic enterprise. So they would be things in areas that are remote from it, as opposed to areas that are quite integral to how we function academically.

“And we could think of examples of that, but what happens closest to us, we -- that said -- and there are things we would view as nonacademic, maintenance of facilities, really quite essential for us to move forward. Obviously, there’s lots of judgments along the way; but those, I think, are the biases in the way we are trying to think about it.”

Speaker Beer: “Other questions?”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: “I’ve been to a number of these sessions where the budget’s been discussed, and there’s this sort of -- the common theme I hear is that priority to retain on the academic side, research, teaching and outreach to the world. In my annual review, outreach is a separate category from extension, and I very rarely hear extension mentioned as something the university wants to preserve. Could you comment on that?”
Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “I think when we use -- this is how the provost formulates it in terms of what we are trying to protect, is research, teaching, research instruction and outreach. I think that's a broad umbrella, and it includes extension and it includes all the other efforts we make internationally, in terms of the public service education for our students. So I don't think that embeds in it any disqualifications or conclusions around that, in terms of speaking about that.”

“It may be that in looking within a college; for example, within CALS, that the leadership of the college has to make choices about different resource allocations, and those may affect formal extension, as opposed to other forms of outreach. But in terms of this sound bite, which is what our vow is around, it's broadly configured to speak of outreaches, the many ways that Cornell interlaces with the world.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the far, furthest aisle.”

Professor Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management: “Thank you. I realize I'm a little obscure back here. Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management and a member of the Financial Policies Committee. And John, please recognize what I want to say is really not addressed to you personally, but rather as a representative or vehicle to administration. And it's prefaced on the information that's been available to the committee, which indicates that the university is and remains in a very difficult economic situation right now; and it is also very apparent that if the Bain cuts are really not successful, that the budget's still going to need to be balanced and the savings are going to have to come directly or indirectly out of the academic aspects of the university.”

“And yet, when we have discussions about these, President Skorton's discussion on the budget last spring and yours now, there are no numbers. I don't understand how the administration thinks the faculty and the community can grasp and become part of the process of balancing the budget when we see no numbers.

“You know, I think it's clear the administration really needs to get the entire Cornell community on board and re-envision the university and make these Bain cuts succeed; but unless they begin to be open to us about what the situation is, what the plans are, what the expectations are and so on, I really don't see that's going to happen. And I really hope that the university recognizes the importance of being open about these matters and does it really soon and in detail. Thank you.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Thanks. I unfortunately am not in a situation to respond in a sort of robust way, because I have not been on the budget side of this. I have been in
other areas of crisis, but I understand the concern and I share the concern; is that we need to get the savings that we hope out of the projected $90 million. It is the big worry. It is the big hope, but it's also the big worry.”

“We have a remaining gap we’ve already talked about, and we need to figure out how to solve for that, and that will have impact. If we aren't able to get all the administrative savings that we hope, it's going to have an even bigger impact. We agree completely.

“I don't know, again, what information has been produced in terms of hard numbers, in what forums it's been shared in, and I agree with that and I can convey that.”

Speaker Beer: “Still have several minutes for questions. The lady in the third row from the back. Second row from the back? All right.”

Emeritus Professor Peter Stein: “Well, I'm in the the second –“

Speaker Beer:“Kindly pass the microphone to the lady behind you.”

Emeritus Professor Stein: “Oh. Lots of ladies here.”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “We would like to hear from you.”

Emeritus Professor Stein: “Thank you. After grabbing the microphone, I'm speaking out of turn, but I have not -- I must confess, I haven't read a lot of stuff about the reports of the task forces. I haven't gone and read them. I periodically read something in the newspaper, but I imagine that you must have models that predict the future and there are models that predict future of lots of things.”

“There’s something I’m a little confused about. It’s a simple question I have. With what you see at the moment, could you make -- are our people willing to make an estimate of two numbers that I think are rather important; one is, what will the change be, percentage change be, say, in 2015? How many students will there be at Cornell in Ithaca, and how many people will there be working for Cornell at Cornell in Ithaca?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “So with the repeated disclosure that I may not be the right person to ask, I can tell you there’s been enormous amount of study, seven days a week for literally the last year, with many people trying to make these projections, and a lot of it is hard and a lot of it is just estimates."
“In terms of the number of students, here’s what I can say at this point: There was one task force dedicated solely to the question of student enrollment, and the theory there was that one way to solve the budget issue would be to increase the number of students, increase the number of tuitions and so forth.

“They studied that extensively, and their conclusion was that that was a bad idea; that the negative effects of further expanding the undergraduate class at Cornell significantly outweighed the potential savings and, in fact, the potential savings were much smaller than what they would look like. We are already, in some sense, beyond capacity in terms of our residence halls, in terms of our health services. Significantly increasing the undergraduate population without devoting commensurate amount of resources is something that we are unwilling to do.

“So that task force was very clear. The deans and the academic leadership believe this will be something that would hurt Cornell, and we don’t want to do that simply to resolve what is a painful, but limited duration economic crisis. The question on the graduate level is different, and there have been some plans to expand in some units, particularly professional masters programs. Those aren’t as highly regulated. They don’t raise all the same questions in terms of the undergraduate experience, so there would probably be some expansion there.

“We are, in the provost office, requiring that be done in a very thoughtful way, for a variety of reasons that are important. Masters professional programs tend to generate a lot of resources, but they tend also to draw faculty out of things that are more core, undergraduate teaching and research. They are a very mixed bag, and we are not trying to script that, but trying to induce levels of caution. So that’s in terms of the -- I apologize, Peter. I forgot the second part of the question. Can you --.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “So we’ve already, through the staff retirement incentives and through attrition and through layoffs, the staff has been reduced by approximately 700. I think that’s right. Again, I think that’s -- Bill’s nodding. 800 -- 700 from last year. So we have seen, in the overall staff at Cornell, I think including faculty, is around 10,000, so we have seen a significant drop already.”

“Running the Bain numbers and depending on what the amount of that comes out of the personnel as opposed to non-personnel and where they come out, whether -- it depends on who is being laid off and what their salary band is. Anyway you run the
numbers, we are looking at significantly more, not in that magnitude, but we're looking at a more layoffs.

“I think the harder question is what changes will endure in the future. And I think the answer is, at least in the next five-year time frame, given how the budget is going to be constructed going forward and given our need to avoid some of the situations that got us here, we will be a smaller university.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “I wish I could say we have, Peter, but we haven’t. Even the president, who is very motivated to avoid further reductions, will acknowledge that some will be necessary. The math here is imperfect, and -- but it’s unfortunate, I think there will be.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we can take another two or three minutes. The gentleman with his hand raised. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: “Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology. This is a related question to Peter’s. It’s directed to the administration. What’s the likelihood of offering another round of early retirements, staff retirements?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Great question, and I have no idea. Mary Opperman is the vice president for Human Resources. She’s out of town today, but I have not heard discussion of that, but I think there are no tools that have been taken off the table at this point.”

“Well, in terms of the SRI last year, our projections were that somewhere in the 100 to 150 range was what we expected. We got 436, so it was very -- there was a large uptake on that. Whether there’s sort of residual demand is not clear. It was for people over 55. As you move to younger ages, obviously, that would create additional concerns. It is not a cheap thing to do; because obviously, you are investing money on the belief that people will retire earlier than they would otherwise.”

Speaker Beer: “One further question?”

Professor Cohn: “Only if there’s no one else. Just to follow-up on that, it seems to me it would be very useful for the administration to take seriously the possibility of a retirement incentive on the faculty side. It seems to me that we are at a point where for each and every senior faculty retirement we have, if we were able even at a parity basis to make appointments, we would see numerous benefits. We would have huge
financial savings, but we would also able to meet many of our other collective objectives on maintaining and enhancing diversity and also addressing the fact that we have an aging faculty, and I would really call upon the administration to take that very seriously.”

Provost Siliciano: “I appreciate the point in terms of increasing incentives for faculty retirements. I know that is among the things being discussed. I can’t say what stage it’s at. We have talked to the deans about their own ability to facilitate retirements in ways that are informal, but are similar; but in terms of the university-wide program, that’s not something that’s reached any point of sort of solidity.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much.”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Provost Siliciano, we appreciate you filling in at the last moment. I would like to call on Professor Eric Cheyfitz to present a resolution on behalf of the University Faculty Committee concerned with the library task force.”

6. **DISCUSSION ON LIBRARY TASK FORCE RESOLUTION**

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department: “The resolution is generated by -- let’s say a conflict between or an understanding of how the task force report for the library was produced, and significant report coming from the faculty involved with that, that they were not properly consulted. “

“That prompted the UFC to generate this particular resolution; particularly because I think the library is a universal institution here at Cornell and at the core of the academic mission, so that before anything is done with it, we want to make sure that there’s proper procedure in making decisions about its restructuring, to the extent that restructuring is going to take place, and the report does recommend significant restructuring in terms of the closing of libraries.

“So I'll read the resolution. It's up there for everyone to see and -- pardon?

“Well, we need a pointer? I think you could probably follow. It says:”

*Whereas the bylaws of Cornell University recognize the faculty has the function to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college” -- and that’s in Article 2, Section 3 of the bylaws -- “whereas the university libraries are a major component of a Cornell education, in terms teaching and research, and whereas the five faculty members of the library*
task force neither participated in the writing of the task force report, nor were their opinions about the report ever solicited by the members of the task force who wrote it” -- this comes out from reportage coming out of that committee -- and then finally, "The faculty senate recommends the provost delay any implementation of the report until the senate has had time to deliberate its findings and the alternatives at the beginning of the spring semester 2010.”

“There was a minority report as well, issued by two members of that committee. So that’s the resolution.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. We'll have discussion and debate on the resolution. We’ll first hear from someone in support of the resolution. The lady in the multicolored sweater, please.”

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History Department: “I am Mary Beth Norton from the History Department, and I am currently the chair of the Faculty Library Board, which is appointed by this body, or at least by the nominations and elections committee of this body. And I wanted to report on behalf of the library board that we had a long discussion of this resolution and of the circumstances that produced it at our meeting on Monday.”

“I know there's one other member of the library board here at least, because I have seen her in the audience, but I don't know whether other people are here. They may also want to have something to say.

“Those of you who were at the forum on the library task force know that the librarian, Anne Kenney, basically said that in her opinion, we could either maintain the acquisitions level in the library or we could maintain the number of libraries, but we could not do both and that that was the conundrum she faced when presented with the charge to the task force of a significant reduction of library funding, given the current budget constraints.

“I want to say that the library board voted on Monday to support this resolution, that we agree with it, and also to say that the librarian, Anne Kenney, has proposed in her response to the task force the acquisition's budget for the library system be held harmless; in other words, that any cuts that would be made to the libraries would be made through internal review and the possibility of closing or consolidating libraries, some of the individual 18 libraries that exist currently on this campus and all of which take up space and personnel and so forth, and that that's where she thinks most of the pressure should come.
“But she believes -- and this is true from the task force report and this is true from the library board that these decisions need to be made in the context of the strategic planning resulting from the other task force reports; that is, it should not be made in isolation or before other decisions are made about the university’s priorities.

“And that’s one reason why we think this is an excellent idea to delay implementation of any decisions until further decisions have been made, as a result of the Bain report and as a result of the provost and the president’s response to the other task force reports.

“I might also add that those of you who did attend the forum might realize or know very well that there was a lot of upset at the forum, expressed by a number of faculty, especially from the Humanities and the Arts College, about wanting input into decisions being made in the library about priorities in the library system; and as a result of that, there is already in the works a proposal to have a humanities council established basically by the chairs of the humanities departments to offer input into decisions made in the library about such things as acquisitions and the movement of certain books out to the annex and other sorts of things like that. Not to micromanage the library, but to offer input on behalf of the humanities faculty.

“One of the points I want to make today is that the library board is interested in knowing whether members of other disciplines are interested also in establishing similar councils; that is, a social science council and a sciences council that might have similar input into decisions made with respect to the library. That’s not something that the library faculty board understands. We don’t know whether there’s interest, and I thought that the appropriate forum to express this was at the Senate, because there are members from all the different disciplines here.

“So if anyone here from the social sciences or the sciences are interested in the kind of informal thing that is now underway with respect to the humanities and offering liaisons to the library, the library board and the librarian Anne Kenney would be interested in knowing about it. That’s basically what the library board charged me with saying here today. So that’s my comment; that we are fully in favor of this UFC resolution.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a member of the body who wishes to speak in opposition? The gentleman in the gray shirt.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications: “Tarleton Gillespie, Department of Communications. I’m one of the five faculty members that were on the Library Task
Force report, so I want to comment a bit on this resolution and its reflection of how the task force report worked or how the task force met.”

“Two simple points: One is that the resolution, as written, is misleading. It is not as if the writing of this task force report existed separate from consultation with us. We met partially as a group, and then the librarians were tasked with drafting the report that was brought back to us. And that may have been a mistake in terms of timing, which means a lot of the further discussion has now happened in public, rather than what could have continued in the task force space; but we were consulted. A lot of our feedback that happened when that draft arrived was incorporated into the task force report.

“So it’s actually a misrepresentation. There are a number of faculty who don’t love the task force report, and that’s been expressed in the minority report, which has already been delivered to the Provost and to anyone who wants it.

“The second is that having this resolution, I think, would be over-kill. So those of you at the public forum saw the task force report was presented, there was criticism of it. Some of it was helpful, some of it was venomous. There was a whole range of things, but I think the provost saw that clearly. The minority report expresses different opinions. That’s been clear.

“The humanities council that’s been suggested is a terrific idea. That’s already being considered. I like the idea of the other ones. I think that both the suggestions that were made in the task force report, the concerns with them and the variety of opinions about how we might resolve the budget have been made perfectly clear, and my worry is that this body could add to the pile-on that I think has already made its point to have been unnecessary.

“So I think that the task has been accomplished. The report has been written, the criticism has been raised. I don’t know that we can add anything by adding another resolution that says see, I told you so. With all due respect, there was lots of dispute, but I think that’s been clear. So I don’t know that we have anything that we need to add with this. And I’m worried, because it is a misrepresentation, that the risk is that we pile on with something that’s actually flimsy.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolution? Gentleman on the wall, on the far right side.”
Professor Alan McAdams, JGSM. “Alan McAdams, from the Johnson School. We have had a number of luncheon discussions, especially with former librarians, for the Johnson School and the Hotel School, and we think that it is short-sighted, if you do have these new groups being created, that you leave the professional schools out.”

“We have special needs in the professional schools, and they have to do with the access of our students who are facing case assignments weekly and so forth, and they do have heavy interaction with persons in the libraries. And we are told that the people in the Hotel School have the same, and I would imagine it’s true also of the Law School. So I think -- this is another group that has special needs, and they should be taken into account.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another speaker in opposition. The gentleman in the sweater in the center.”

Professor Dan Buckley, Crop & Soil Sciences: “Dan Buckley, Crop and Soil Sciences. So I believe the Provost has laid out a plan for evaluating these task force reports, whereby he's going to have a sort of preliminary report and then that's going to have a public comment period before there's any kind of implementation. I think he's already announced that to this body. If anybody knows differently, I'd like to be corrected.”

“My concern is that having a special sort of statement here, a special resolution opens us up -- now there are 20-some task forces out there. If we were to pass this, do we have to reconsider and pass 20 more resolutions for each one of these task force's reports, many of which controversial things?

“My reason for saying this is I think the provost has laid out a plan, where we all have an ability to feed back, whether it's this body or the rest of faculty, on the comments that are going to be made. These reports are already out there and already getting a lot of feedback. So I think this resolution is largely moot, because the process in place already accounts for this kind of feedback.”

Speaker Beer: “You. Another speaker in favor of the resolution? Gentleman on the aisle in the red sweater.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. It was my understanding, from the remarks at the beginning of the meeting from the UFC chair, that this was the first report that they were going to bring to us and yes, we were actually probably going to
be talking about 20 different things, you know, one at a time, because they were so complicated. That's one thing.”

“The other thing is, in response to Tarleton Gillespie's comment about piling on, when I read about this report in the paper, I thought wow, we have to say back as loud as we can that we don't like what we see. I don't feel guilty at all about piling on this issue.”

Speaker Beer: “Another speaker in opposition? Gentleman close to the front.”

Professor Charles Brittain, Classics: “Charles Brittain, Classics. I think the report was handled so badly that the pushing back has happened. I'm one of the humanities chairs that pushed for humanities chair input, and Anne Kenney has been extremely receptive to that. If there's a problem at the professional schools, you should do the same thing we did, which is get our dean to help and really make a lot of effort to get and to actually pay attention to us, which she did and we have a good plan going.”

“And as I understand it, the library board itself is planning to be a bit more active and they are doing their own sort of repair. So one thing I want to say is something's actually happening. Not that I agree with the way the task force went down, but something actually is happening, so that's one thing.

“The second thing I'd like to say is more general, which is the -- I think it's a mistake to think these task forces are representative at all. The only one I've had anything to do with was the Arts and Sciences one, aside from this.

“It doesn't represent my views. They didn't ask me. None of the recommendations, the ones that I want to do, and I wasn't asked who was going to be on it, so I think to think a couple of faculty being on this board makes a huge difference is completely a mistake, that even the faculty who were on it, they didn't ask me, they didn't ask -- my faculty's around all the time -- no one asked us what happened.

“So I think there's a misunderstanding what the task forces are doing. They don't represent the view of the faculty. They represent some view of somebody, and we've got to hassle them when they come; but this seems to me to encode a mistake as if oh, yeah, we agree with task force. And I don't agree with any of the task forces. It depends on what they say.

“So that's -- I'm not really against this recommendation. I don't think this matters very much because something's happened; but I do think it's important to say it's not as if we all chose these people and we shouldn't take them to be more authoritative than they
are, any of them, just because some faculty signed up to some plan. Who chose the faculty?"

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Another speaker in favor?”

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: “Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior. I think this particular task force report stood out, because the reaction to it was far beyond what any of the other task force reports received, and I think that’s why it came to the attention of the University Faculty Committee.”

“I do think it makes a difference. I do see a difference between an individual chair having a conversation with a librarian and the Senate itself taking a stand and saying look, we think things have happened too fast. There was obviously a disjunction between the faculty and the librarians; and therefore, we want to examine it publicly, before any action’s taken. So I think it’s important we pass the motion.

“Frankly, I have looked at the various aspects of the library’s report, and I simply don’t see the logic of closing more libraries. I do understand why Physics was closed; it had very low user usage, had very high cost, but the ones that would be closed now are largely on the periphery of the campus, they are specialist collections, and their closure would do enormous damage to the -- I think, to the programs of those colleges. So I think this has to be aired in public, and I support the motion.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have time for another opposing view, and then we could consider the possibility of voting on this resolution.”

Professor Martin Hatch, Music: “Martin Hatch, Music. Could you explain what is a timetable for deliberating findings and the mechanism for doing so, and the alternatives? The senate, you have -- the senate has time to deliberate. What do you envision a committee of the senate to come forward and do a separate job?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Well, I haven't thought this through fully. The Provost has a timetable for trying to come to some sort of conclusions.”

“Well, if the Senate does debate it, decides to debate it, that there are some clear recommendations in the report, the closing of libraries being one of them, that could be -- we could offer an alternative report. Just as a minority report was offered, we could offer a report too, an alternative to what is being proposed now, which is the closing of at least half the libraries on campus. And in the report as well, it says they are envisioning having only five libraries finally.”
Professor Hatch: “My question is only who are -- we will discuss which libraries to close as a body, or are you envisioning a separate committee?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “I haven’t thought that through. We’d have to think that through, but I think there should be an open Senate debate, to have some sort of sense, if the Senate approves of what are the substantial recommendations in the report -- and there are major questions here.”

“This is an institution, by the way, unlike the other task force reports that serves the whole university. It’s not a distinct division or unit, and since the bylaws of the University gives faculty control explicitly over this operation, the faculty should take control. That’s another thing that’s raised here.

“And the third thing, why should the budget cuts be applied uniformly to the Library, as they are being applied to separate units when it serves all the units? Perhaps there should be a reduction in budget cuts for the Library.

“And the other thing that needs to be thought of is the fact that the Library has fallen in acquisition rankings from 9th to 19th or 20th in the last six years -- okay, but I say there’s some very specific things that need to be considered.”

Speaker Beer: “So I think we’ll move now to a final speaker in opposition, and then we’ll consider a vote. Is there a speaker in opposition to the resolution? You are going to speak in opposition? Calling a question?”

Professor Cohn: “No. I guess to -- Abby Cohn, Linguistics -- to follow up on what Marty Hatch just said, my understanding is it’s the University Library Board who represents us and if, indeed, the University Library Board, as they have suggested, is in favor of this, it seems to me what we are doing is asking them to continue to deliberate on these matters and then bring it back to the Senate for further decision, because they are the representatives of this body relative to library matters.”

“And so it’s in recognition of the Library Board’s, I understand, consensus, that they support further consideration that I would support this amendment, but not in favor of us, in some vaguer way, pursuing a discussion of this report.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, are we ready to vote on the resolution?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Call the question.”
Speaker Beer: “Question’s been called. All those in favor of voting on the resolution, signify by saying aye.”

(Ayes)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed? Nay. Okay. We’ll vote on the resolution as presented on the screen. All those in favor, signify by standing. All those -- we are going to do a count.”

Dean Fry and Associate Dean Gouldin. I would remind you, only senators are standing now, correct?”

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Beer: “Okay. All those opposed, please stand. Senators opposed, please stand. All those who abstain, please stand. The resolution clearly carries, with how many affirmative votes? 50. And 5 in opposition, and 11 abstained. Thank you very much. We will now move to remarks by Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry.”

7. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean William Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I think all of us have been really, really busy. Everybody I’ve observed and talked with has more than enough to do. Many of us are reading papers, preparing finals, and I can also say that even in the administration, there’s just a fantastic amount happening. I think someone mentioned everybody in the Provost’s office and the President’s office is working 24-7. I think that’s really correct. There’s just a fantastic amount happening.”

“The Provost is actively considering the recommendations from the 20 different task force reports. He is planning, I think, to come public with some tentative opinions in the not too distant future, and I think we’ll all be extremely interested in those opinions. He is listening to faculty comment, certainly as we have heard, about the library report. He’s listening to faculty comment at the forums, the brown bag luncheons and in e-mails. So I think that before the end of this calendar year, there will be some report from the Provost about initial directions.

“One of my pleas about the budget correction, I think a plea from many of you has been for the administration to go slowly in implementing the budget corrections. And I can tell you, because I have observed it, that the administration is under tremendous pressure from the Trustees to go faster, and they have argued fairly successfully to go as slowly as they have. It’s not as slowly as I would like us to go, but it’s certainly a lot
more slowly than some of the trustees would like to go. So the timeline that we are already on is a compromise.

“And I think, Steve, I'll stop with that. If there are questions that I can address, I'd be happy to do that.”

Speaker Beer: “Still have a few minutes. If there are questions for Dean Fry, we can hear them now. Seeing none, an order for -- motion for adjournment would be in order.

All right. All in favor, please leave.”

[LAUGHTER]

Meeting Adjourned 5:55PM.