1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Pro-Tem, Steven Beer: “Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate for the 2012-2013 academic year. I'd first like to remind people to please turn off cell phones or other things that might disturb the deliberations of the body, and also to remind people that there will be no recording, either audio or visual recording of the proceedings here, except that authorized by the associate dean of the faculty.

“There will be periods when members of the body may speak; and if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. The speaker will recognize you. And when that happens, please stand and identify yourself as to name and department or other administrative unit. And then please speak concisely, no more than two minutes, and we will proceed that way so that members of the body who wish to speak have an opportunity to do so. Any member of the faculty may speak; however, only senators may vote. The Good and Welfare section of the agenda, which comes last, is a time when members of the faculty may address the senate on any issue. Good and Welfare speakers must inform the speaker prior to the beginning of the meeting that he or she wishes to speak. I have heard from no one; therefore, there are an extra 15 minutes which may be devoted to other aspects of the agenda today.

I'd like to make one announcement, and that is Professor Emeritus Peter Stein has agreed to serve again as parliamentarian to the senate, so we're very happy that Peter is doing that for the third or fourth successive year. And now I'm very happy to call on dean of the faculty Joe Burns to formally open the meeting.”

2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Professor Joseph Burns, The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy, and Dean of the Faculty: “(picking up a gavel) I guess I’ve got to hit one of these or something. Now it's officially open. I'm Joe Burns. I want to welcome everyone. I want to welcome the new senators especially. The returning senators, we are glad you’re back. We really need your experience, and welcome to any other faculty, and administrators.

“We are very pleased Kent Fuchs is with us for an extended time to tell us about some activities over the summer and answer questions the faculty might have. So let me go
through and quickly review what the agenda looks like. You can see it here. There are a couple routine matters.

“After I speak, there's a report from Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, but just notification of some of their actions over the summer, and then the responses from the provost. I believe the meeting will be fairly leisurely. I may run a little long here, but I haven't taught for a semester, so I've got a little extra in me. And then we will perhaps even end a bit early, I hope.

So if we could go on to the rest of this, I would appreciate it. We've already accomplished the first item on the list here. I'd also like to spend a little bit of time introducing some of the staff, expressing my appreciations to some people, and then the staff told me that I should tell you something about my own background, so you know my weaknesses and any strengths I might have. And so I'll do that. I'll tell you something about what I spent my time on over the summer. I've started on a couple of initiatives that I'd like to inform you of and also get some feedback on; and then as time permits, perhaps we'll have some time for comments and questions and talk a little bit about the future activities.

“Among the introductions I'd like to make are of the staff of the dean of the faculty's office, and we have Mike Fontaine. Would you please stand up, Mike? Mike is from Classics, and you will see he's helped me out already. As you'll see later on, he's an associate professor and doing a terrific job in his position as associate dean.

“Next we have Karen Lucas, who is the person who actually knows things in the dean of the faculty office. Karen, whereabouts are you? Way in the back? She's been there through most of Bill Fry's term, and so she knows the rules and regulations and gets things done very, very efficiently.

“We've just been joined by Andrea Smith, who was unfortunately not able to be here today, and she takes care of all the assignments, the meeting dates and so forth. So that's a very valuable addition.

“Cindy Robinson is in charge of the emeritus professors and will be assisting us at this meeting. And then lastly, Penny Dietrich from the A.D. White office has joined our staff and moved over from the dean of the graduate school. That whole program moved under the dean of the faculty. And that's the end of the staff; but they're very, very terrific.

“And I will be introducing myself. I'd like to start a new tradition here, though, and do something a little weird. You know, we all come to this from our laboratories and desks and so forth, and then leave this building and go back to those places, might even go home; but frequently, we don't know who else is here. And so, if you look around you,
most of you are sitting in seats that are surrounded by eight other seats. And I'll bet
two out of three, you don't know everybody in those eight seats. So say hello to a
neighbor that you don't know and tell them who you are and where you're from.

“Okay. You people are terrific, I'll tell you. Congratulations. We're going to do that at
each of the current meetings, and who knows? Maybe by the end of the semester we'll
be doing hugs and things like that as well. See how that works out.

So let me tell you a bit about my personal background, my own introduction. I'm
trained as a naval architect, and I came here literally 50 years ago, probably to the week,
I would bet, as a graduate student. And I hate to admit that, but it's the truth. I was a
graduate student in a little department called Theoretical and Applied Mechanics,
which was merged a couple years back into Mechanical Engineering. That department
was a department of sort of engineering science and applied mathematics. We had a
very heavy teaching load of undergraduate courses in applied math and physics and
engineering sciences. So I know something about teaching large lectures for that
reason. And I have essentially stayed here since that time. I have taken ten leaves -- I
mean, how can you stay in Ithaca for 50 years without taking some leaves -- all of them
off campus, and many of them abroad.

“My research has morphed into astronomy, astronomical dynamics, how things move
in the solar system. I'm on a couple of space missions -- I'm not personally, but part of
my brain is there -- and so trying to interpret the data that come back from space
missions.

“I have served in the usual range of administrative responsibilities, director of graduate
studies, department chair. I had a stint of four and a half years as vice provost for
Research and Physical Sciences and Engineering at the start of this decade for about
four and a half years.

“I have strong ties to the university. Two of my brothers graduated from here. I have a
son who graduated from here, a wife and, if I have any pets, I'll take them up to the vet
college.

I am not only interested in science, but at a very fundamental level, also public policy. I
have been involved in issues of space policy, written op-eds in "The Times" and things
like the "Space Daily News." And a few years back, I ran an exhibit in the Johnson
Museum of Images from Saturn. And that's gone to ten museums, probably has been
seen by a couple million people down in New York, largely middle school kids waiting
in line, so not sure how much they absorb; but anyway, that's who I am.

“So what did I spend my summer on? I spent my summer trying to learn what this job
was about, trying to learn a little more about the university. I have spent an hour with,
I think, every vice president, every vice provost, every dean, and others, just going around trying to learn something about the job and how Cornell works. And it's been fascinating. I met very incredible people who love this place and will do a lot for it. I also spent some time talking individually and in small groups to the UFC members, to the chairs of a couple of the committees that seemed to be the most relevant at this time, and interacted a lot, as Bill Fry can tell you, with him getting help from him big-time.

“Bill, I have to express my appreciation for your patience with me over the summer; always smiling, always calm, always knowledgeable, just incredibly helpful. I'm sure I asked him more questions than he expected, and not quite as many as I needed, but we'll see how that works out. He's done a great job in developing mutual trust between the administration and faculty, and we have a lot to owe to him. So thank you, Bill. And I also thank the staff. They have been doing a terrific job.

"If we can move to the next slide, Steve. Here are some of the things that we're doing a little bit differently now, I guess. We have, in fact, through the efforts of Bill Fry, but particularly Jerry Hass, now have a faculty lunch. And the crucial role here is Kent Fuchs. He has donated very generously to help us keep a very low price for a faculty lunch in the Regent Lounge, the place that the lunch used to be in that's been refurbished. And just for $3.50, you can get all the soups you want -- there will be two each day -- bread and rolls, coffee and tea, cookies on some days; but you have to buy these chips at the Statler desk. And it's started to pick up. This place was full there last Friday when I was there and again on Monday. So you need to get there early. It's open two hours each day, each weekday.

“I also would like to start doing something a little bit different. This is an idea that Bob Cooke had many years ago and we'd like to do it again, namely to have faculty -- it says forums here, but my fellow from the Classics department, Mike, has informed me in Latin it should actually be fora. You could see the power of this duo combination, someone in the classics and someone in the sciences.

"The purpose of this is really to try to get ourselves, the faculty, in a position where we can contribute to the conversation, where we can bring our expertise and our knowledge and our opinions to the administration before we get policies or ideas handed down from the administration and asked to react to them. We want to be part of the conversation a little bit earlier, and I think we've gone a long way toward that during Bill Fry's tenure. The goal is to educate the faculty about academic issues facing Cornell. I hope to have about one of these a semester. I have a few ideas on them, but I certainly welcome suggestions from other members of the faculty. The ones that are in my mind, I think I would like to know more about the status of the New York City campus and the academic issues down there.
“I'd be curious what the faculty thinks the library of the 21st Century should look like, what's publishing going to look like in the 21st Century. What is the climate for students? Academic integrity seems like an issue we ought to be discussing and out in front of.

There are lots of topics, and I'm sure you have probably many more. The plan would be to have online web resources, so there are articles, the opportunity for faculty -- or anyone to contribute to a blog and try and get some discussion going, again, in advance of decisions being made.

"The first of these that I'd like to have, and we're in the process of doing, concerns online education and MOOCs. For those who haven't been following the newspapers and the media, MOOCs stands for Massive Open Online Courses. The archetype was the course on artificial intelligence run in Stanford a year ago that attracted 160,000 students enrolled. Not all of them finished, but a lot of them finished, and this is going to, I believe, revolutionize education.

"We will be having a MOOC discussion that will have a couple of Cornell experts talking about MOOCs and how they may change education, what they mean historically, what their development is. And then we've arranged to have two of the leaders of the two most notable MOOCs, of course, Stanford’s Daphne Koller and edX’s, Anant Agarwal will come in by video and answer a set of questions that we are going to pose to them. There will be some back and forth. And then we'll have a panel of where faculty can contribute and ask questions to the local speakers and some others that I may choose. So that's the framework, and it's an experiment. I hope it works, but I really think that we need to be more active and aggressive as a faculty, and this is a vehicle that will allow us perhaps to do that.

"We've done some work with senate committees, we're trying to look at the charges of the committee -- some of them are out of date, so we want to correct those -- and I hope to be able to bring to you in very short order some editorial changes to the charges of the many committees that come through the dean of the faculty's office. Either Mike or myself will try to attend every committee meeting. We'll probably last until about October 10th doing this, and then we'll give up, but we're going to try.

"One of the things in looking through the list of committees, I thought that it might be valuable -- and I'll discuss it with the UFC and certainly would like to hear comments from the community as well -- I'd like to introduce a work/life committee, something that would deal with issues that make the climate for faculty or could make the climate for faculty better, and they run the gamut from salaries, parking, benefits, child care, and faculty clubs. The goal would be to try to have at least one person on that committee who is an expert on one set of opinions on a topic, so that the vice presidents would also have an opportunity to interact and provide a sounding board. These people
would provide a sounding board for the administration, and we could also have an avenue into the administration with faculty opinions. That's a goal, as I said, that one of the other changes in the committees is the fact that the A.D. White program is now going to be run out of the dean of the faculty office, just because it seemed to make more sense. Nothing meant by that.

“Let's see if we could go back maybe to the preceding slide. It's not critical. What are we thinking of doing in the future? I don't have any agenda really. I think I would like to see the senate and the faculty as a whole to become more activists, but not obstructionists. I hope that we'll all be team players in this and contribute our intellect, but not our anger, and I think that we have an opportunity now. Some of the financial woes have backed off a little bit, so we may have an opportunity to deal with issues more than, say, the past few years when everything was centered around finance. I seek your help in doing that job.

“And I think that's it. If there are any comments or questions, probably there'll be time at the end of the meeting to take those.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks very much, Dean Burns. So now we have the first issue that the senate has to decide on for the academic year, and that is we have to consider the minutes of the May 2012 meeting. Presumably everyone has read them word for word. Are there any objections to accepting the minutes as distributed?

“Seeing none, I'll declare the minutes of the May 2012 faculty senate meeting approved unanimously or without objection.

”The next issue is the important report from the Nomination and Elections Committee. Associate Dean of the Faculty, Michael Fontaine will give that report.

3. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS REPORT
Associate Professor of Classics and Associate Dean of the Faculty, Michael Fontaine: “Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. There's a fairly extensive report for nominations and elections. There are 47 appointments that we made across 17 committees. And since there's only three minutes, I'm not going to read each and every name out, but I will draw your attention to the various committees that we have filled and just how many people on each.

On Academic Freedom, there's three new appointments, and two for Academic Programs and Policies Committee. On Athletics and Physical Education, there's two new appointments. Benefits Committee, one; University Committee on Conflicts, one; Educational Policy Committee, one. Then on FABIT, the Information Technology Faculty Advisory Board, there's three; four on the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments. There's one new chair for the Financial Policies Committee, and
six new members of the Institutional Biosafety Committee. We have seven new members of the Institutional Review Board for Human Participants, one new member for the Lectures Committee, one new chair for the Library Board, two new members of the Local Advisory Council, three new members of the Sexual Harassment Co-investigators, two for the University Faculty Committee, and we have seven new members as of this morning for the University Hearing Board.

“I’d like to thank Nominations and Elections for helping us identify people willing to serve on these committees and, of course, especially thank those of you who have also agreed to do all this work. Thank you.”

NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT
September 12, 2012

Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty (AFPS)
Ron Kline, College of Engineering
Sharon Tennyson, College of Human Ecology
Peter Stein, Emeritus, College of Arts & Sciences

Academic Programs and Policies Committee (CAPP)
Ann Hajek, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Fred Schneider, Engineering

Athletics and Physical Education, (FACAPE)
Frank Rossi, Chair, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Dexter Kozen, College of Engineering (replacing Patrick Wright)

Benefits Committee (UBC)
William White, Chair

University Committee on Conflicts (UCC)
Ken Birman, Engineering

Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
Charles McCormick, Chair, College of Human Ecology

Information Technologies Faculty Advisory Board (FABIT)
Paul Velleman, Chair, ILR
Richard Feldman, College of Arts & Sciences
Jenny Sabin, College of Architecture, Art & Planning

Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA)
Angela Douglas, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Zellman Warhaft, College of Engineering
Steve Winans, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Mariana Wolfner, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences

**Financial Policies Committee (FPC)**
*Tom DiCiccio, Chair, ILR*

**Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)**
*Craig Altier, Chair, College of Veterinary Medicine*
Marc Fuchs, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Douglas Knipple, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Helene Marquis, College of Veterinary Medicine
Keith Perry (one year term), College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Randall Renshaw, College of Veterinary Medicine

**Institutional Review Board for Human Participants (IRB)**
*Carol Devine, Chair, College of Human Ecology*
Gary Evans, College of Human Ecology
David Just, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Michael Jones-Correa, College of Arts & Sciences
Hirokazu Miyazaki, College of Arts & Sciences
Qi Wang, College of Human Ecology
Elaine Wethington, College of Human Ecology

**Lectures Committee**
*Jane Wang, College of Engineering*

**Library Board**
*Nerissa Russell, Chair, College of Arts & Sciences*

**Local Advisory Council**
*Cliff Pollock, College of Engineering*
Holger Sondermann, College of Veterinary Medicine

**Sexual Harassment Co-Investigators**
*Richard Allmendinger, College of Engineering*
Amy Newman, Hotel School
Cindy Van Es, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
Kelly Zamudio, College of Arts & Sciences

**University Faculty Committee**
*Andre Kessler, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences*
Shawkat Toorawa, College of Arts & Sciences

**University Hearing Board**
Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Michael. It would be appropriate for the body to accept the report. All those in favor of accepting the report as presented, please say aye.”

(AYES)

Speaker Beer: “Opposed, nay?

“Abstentions?

“The report is accepted. So now we move on to report by the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, with its chair, Thom Cleland.”

4. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Thomas Cleland: “Thank you, Steve. Good to be back. Welcome. I just have a couple of housekeeping issues that we took care of in the very late spring and most recently. The first is a matter of approval of some dual degree programs. And again, I will mention specifically that CAPP, and by extension the senate’s mandate, is to review those programs that span multiple colleges. So we’re not looking at all dual degree programs, but those that extend in the first case between the College of Human Ecology and the graduate school; and in the second case, between the Johnson and the Industrial Labor Relations.

“The unusual thing with these is that this is really housekeeping. Both of these programs already exist. We are reviewing them retroactively because they didn't get -- at their inception, they and a few other programs that don't span multiple colleges didn't get properly vetted or submitted to New York State for approval, so we are going through the process retroactively. There is nothing to object about in these proposals. They are working well and their basis is sound; I recommend them to you, and CAPP has approved them without controversy.

“The second item actually pertains to the same issue. Owing to a sort of mission creep arising from the memo, CAPP has been in the habit of reviewing certain issues that are actually entirely within the Graduate School. This is sort of a mission creep because our
mandate is to take care of things that fall between or extend across multiple colleges. We were entirely redundant with the Graduate School in reviewing certain aspects of degree programs (as opposed to new degrees, which always come before us on behalf of the Senate). In agreement with the General Committee at a meeting we had last spring, we solidified and formalized this, so we are no longer going to be reviewing issues that are already taken care of perfectly adequately by the General Committee. If there are any objections to this, please let me know, but otherwise, this is now CAPP's policy. Thank you. That's it.”

Speaker Beer: “We have time for a question or two for the chair of CAPP, if there are any. You get the prize for clarity. No questions. Thank you.”

Professor Cleland: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “The next item on our agenda is to hear from the provost. And the provost will have a report, and he's also willing to provide time for you to ask questions and for him to provide answers. Thank you.”

5. REMARKS BY THE PROVOST
Provoest Kent Fuchs: “Thank you, Steve. Welcome back, everyone, for the start of the academic year. I'm going to go through a whole bunch of items that many of us worked on over the summer. Some of these we were discussing when I last spoke to you all. I think I spoke at the last senate meeting back in the spring, and some of these decisions have been made. I'll describe them. They have been publicized already. Some are going to be publicized after this meeting. And then others we're going to be working on this fall and maybe into the spring.

“I want to start by thanking Jerry Hass and Joe Burns for something Joe mentioned at the beginning, and that is the faculty lunch that's been implemented. I and others worked on that without as much success, so we have some gratefulness to Jerry and Joe for working on that.

“In addition to that, I wanted to mention what those of you that are in these colleges know about, and that is changes in the academic deans. There are three deans, two academic deans and the university librarian that this week we're telling the faculty and members of those organizations are being reappointed.

“So I met with the library staff today to describe for them the reappointment of Anne Kenney, who is here in the audience. It is on the Cornell web page. I think some of you have seen that. I'm meeting with the College of Human Ecology tomorrow about the reappointment of Alan Mathios. I met with Architecture Art and Planning yesterday. And that announcement of his reappointment is going forward. These are five-year
reappointments. They are in their fifth year, so it will be five years after this year that they will continue.

“There are two dean searches going on that I'm sure, if you are in the relevant units, you know about. We announced the search committee for the Arts and Sciences dean. Ron Seeber, senior vice provost, is chairing that search. And it is a large, very broad search that includes not only members of the faculty, but a faculty member from ILR, a faculty member from CALS, and an outside dean as well.

“Secondly, we have started a search for the dean of Computing and Information Sciences to replace Dan Huttenlocher, who is the new dean of the New York City campus. Senior Vice Provost John Siliciano is chairing that search. For that search, we are using an external search firm. We are not using a search firm for the Arts and Sciences dean search. Sometimes we do, sometimes we don't for these searches. I can describe the difference, if you are interested, as we go forward.

“So let me now go through these bullets that you have up here and just tell you where we are with these different items. I spoke fairly extensively in the last meeting about the new budget model. We had been working on this for approaching three years, so this is not new. There was a task force report that was issued in December 2009 that started this whole process, and we are following most of the principles of that task force report that we shared with you all and that I described back in the late spring. Over the summer, there were 50 members of the staff, people that understand budget details in ways that I don't understand, that took the principles in each of the categories of revenues and each of the categories of expenses, and looked at how to implement those.

”We are now in the process of actually looking at the current budget that we are working under, what's called the FY 2013 budget, and how the new budget model would allocate those expenses and those resources. Our target goal is to implement this new budget model for next year's budget, which means we have to have it in place in the January 2013 time frame.

“One of the big issues that's separate from the new budget model, but very, very important for all of us in this room, is if you remember, there's one remaining piece of our budget that still has a recurring deficit. All of the colleges are balanced, all of the vice president's budgets are balanced, I hope all of your departments are balanced in their budgets and the overall University is balanced, but there's one budget, my budget, called the general purpose budget that is not balanced.

“Last year we spent over $60 million more in my budget that we had in resources, which is leaving a deficit in an account for the next provost, as I say. And secondly, this year, current year, we are projected to spend about $40 million more in that budget. So the question that we are working on -- and it's separate from the budget model, but it is
very important -- is how fast we are going to resolve that budget deficit going forward. I'm arguing that we should do it slowly, basically. It has to be resolved, but slowly, so that we -- we made huge progress.

"We've basically taken $150 million out of recurring expenses in the GP budget and we are down to $40 million. Hopefully it won't affect you all directly, but it is an issue that is of concern to me. This fall, we are working on the remaining important, but detailed issues related to the new budget model, how we distribute these revenues and expenses. Not changing the principles, but looking at implementation details. I will show you what I think is a positive attribute of this budget model when I get to the bullet regarding library petition, because I'm going to show you exactly what the expense is to achieve us going back into the top ten in collections, expenditures, based on ARL rankings and how it would be distributed to our colleges. It is a nice way of showing how the budget model works.

"The second bullet is undergraduate financial aid. That decision is done. We announced it in June and in July. If you recall, this is something we worked on for two years. The first year we looked at evaluating the positive impact of the changes we made in 2008 around student loans, around the grant part of our undergraduate financial aid investment. And we came to the conclusion after that that we were on a trajectory of having an unsustainable investment in undergraduate financial aid. The bottom line is that over the roughly four years I have been provost, the investment has almost doubled. It's gone from little over $100 million to now over $200 million that we are investing in undergraduate financial aid.

"In the second year of working on this issue or this topic we came to a conclusion that we are not changing our fundamental policy. And so in other words, financial aid is still admissions need-blind. Financial aid is need-based, but we moderated some components of the financial aid package program to make it sustainable.

"The result of that is roughly a savings in the current budgets, if it was implemented fully today, that would be a little less than $20 million. It affects no students that are here on campus today, including those that started this fall. It will start with next year's class and be phased in over four years, but it's an important component of having a sustainable investment in financial aid, just as we're working in other areas of the institution.

"Since I saw you all in the spring, this went before the board of trustees and has the strong support of the board of trustees as well, so I was very pleased to get not only a very comprehensive report on this topic, but to get the support of the academic leadership and also the board of trustees for implementing that. I'll be glad to answer questions, but there was a fairly comprehensive news release about that over the
summer. And we consulted with the Financial Policies Committee on this the previous year and engaged many of you in this room.

“The third bullet is actually going to be a major topic in the senate meeting in October, and that is Dan Huttenlocher, the dean of the new campus in New York City. He will be coming to talk to you about the status. Just briefly I want to say that in terms of the time table for implementing that campus, we are on schedule. Over the summer, there was an announcement that Google has donated space for the five years that it takes before we will be able to move into the campus on Roosevelt Island. This is a significant investment on Google's part. It's roughly $10 million they are donating, 20,000 square feet today, and it will go up to almost 60,000 over five years.

“There were other announcements of some staff that were hired, a new faculty member was hired, and also an entrepreneur in residence for that campus. What's occurring right now is faculty are working very intensely on the curriculum for the programs that will be offered there.

“Secondly, Dan Huttenlocher is working with a number of the deans and some of the department chairs on the relationship between the faculty that will be there and the faculty and academic programs that are here. We are creating something quite different than I know of anywhere else. There will not be academic departments in New York City. There are not colleges in New York City. Those faculty have their home here in Ithaca, and their tenure is here in Ithaca, so we are working hard in creating this whole new academic structure that will be part of this new campus.

“That actually comes out of a recommendation from CAPP about a year ago about those faculty appointments. We knew if we won that competition, we'd be working on this model. So that's where we are, and I think Dan will report more on that, and I'll be glad to take questions as well at the end.

“The fourth bullet is the academic calendar. So I'm going to be meeting with the student assembly tomorrow night. You are all welcome to come join me. I'm going to be telling them that I have decided to adopt what the senate approved back in the spring, with a couple modifications. It will be in "The Sun" tomorrow, because after this meeting we are releasing an announcement.

“So there will be a new academic calendar. The first modification is an addition. We are implementing -- the committee did not make a recommendation on that, although it was discussed -- a new university holiday for all employees; not just students or faculty, but for all employees, on Martin Luther King Day. I would love to implement Martin Luther King Day in the spring, but that's the first day of classes, this spring, 2013, so the earliest we could implement it is 2014 spring. So that's part of the changes that we'll be announcing over the next day or two.
“The second is that we are also going to be shifting -- this is more of a technical detail, the start of classes for the fall semester from the relatively late start for two years out of every six years to a week earlier. And the reason for that is we have what we call our recognition ceremony in December. And with what was being discussed at the end of the year last year in the spring, we would have had recognition on December 23rd, and there are a number of international students that just would not have gotten home in time for the holidays. So we are going to start classes -- basically like we had this year for those two years out of every six years -- a little early. I wish we could start later, but it's very similar to what we had this year in terms of starting the academic year.

“The third part of the new academic calendar that's important is the details of scheduling the final exams. Which exams fall on which time has yet to be worked out. And so I will -- I have committed to working with Joe and the faculty senate, to create a little committee that will work with the registrar to provide advice I'm going to tell the student assembly that we'll have some students on that as well about how we schedule exams.

“There are a lot of interesting issues. For example, should we, for the seniors, try to schedule their exams earlier, so they can have a virtual senior week like they do now, or should we let them be spread out, as is being proposed. A lot of details around final exams that the registrar, with some faculty representation, likely some associate deans and some students, will deal with. So that's where we are on the academic calendar. It's basically an adoption of what has been proposed, with some modifications. You will be reading about it in "The Sun" tomorrow and the next day.

“Internationalization. The president wrote a white paper last fall. He announced it at a celebration of Einaudi, I believe in November of last year. That white paper called on us to think about our strategy in this broad area of what he called internationalization. Part of it is how we engage internationally, globally around the world as an institution.

“The second, it is how we should think about our own studies, our classes, our scholarship and how we should be organized and even in specifically what areas should we be working on as a faculty. He also asked that we create a faculty group that would think about this. So we did that in the spring. We created a group of ten faculty that probably in the middle of the spring is being chaired by Alfonso Torres from the Vet College, and has faculty members from the medical school. This was created by Laurie Glimcher, the dean and provost of the Medical School, and myself. And that task force, that group is about to report back in the next few weeks with their recommendations. The president has promised an investment over a fixed period in these initiatives.
“The president called on us to think, for example, about what we might want to require of our students internationally. Should there be some requirement around international experiences for students. We are all anxious to hear back from the faculty. I'm asking Alfonso to report on the recommendations to the academic affairs committee of the board in October. And you may want to hear from that committee as well, but we will be working on those recommendations this fall and probably into the spring as well.

“The next one -- sorry about this long list, but Joe asked me to tell you what I did over the summer. The next one is the school of public policy. Back last fall, I created a task force, a committee that would look at the possibility of creating a school, a new school of public policy. We've got spectacular expertise across this campus and many of our colleges in this broad area of public policy, and the idea is how can we have an even greater profile, how can we be recognized even more than we are for the capabilities, the expertise we already have, and maybe even strengthen that capability both from a perspective of faculty and also the students and the outside world.

“This committee that was chaired by Rosemary Avery, who's here, gave me the report in late December, early January, and we shared it with CAPP. We talked about it with CAPP in the spring and in the summer. I met with and asked for input from a large number of individual faculty, as well as the academic deans. We had several meetings of the relevant deans, and I've decided the following: The task force report recommended that we create a separate school outside of the colleges with connections, obviously, to colleges, but outside of the colleges that would have its own dean.

“I decided that for the time being, that's not something that is viable, that I can't create a separate school with a dean, but I have done something else, and that is that I do want to look at the possibility of creating such a school within one of our colleges. In other words, one of the colleges would have the administrative oversight for that school, but the school would have connections to departments and colleges across the campus that are relevant to public policy.

“I've asked Alan Mathios to chair that group. Rosemary will be on it. There will be a few others from other colleges and schools that will come back with an operational plan about how such a school that would have its administrative oversight within human ecology or that dean would provide the administrative oversight, how that would function. Would it accomplish the goals of the task force report? Is it financially viable? Would it achieve our goals that we have as a university for enhancing our profile? Would it achieve the educational goals that we know that students would like to achieve in this area? I've not yet announced that group, but I have announced the fact that I'm creating it, and it's likely late this fall that either the educational policy committee or CAPP will be discussing that. And also, I'll be discussing it with the academic deans and members of the relevant faculty.
“Okay, MOOCs. Joe's already told you what they mean. You know what they mean. Let me just give you the bottom line here. I believe that we, as an institution, should decide this fall if we are going to join one of these consortiums. Joe has given you the introduction. A few weeks from now, you are going to hear from two principals and two of these competitors, Coursera and edX. There's another called Udacity. There are others that are being formed that we could talk about, and there are several things that are happening in the area of online education that's different than the past. Some of us have online education fatigue, but this is different. What's different is that the best of our peers are participating, number one. Number two, these are consortiums that we have not seen before. And number three, it's being driven by the faculty, not driven by a provost, president or, by the board of trustees.

“So what we have, I believe, is an opportunity, as a faculty, to decide what we want to do in this area. And I will start with this concept of Massive Open Online Courses, because there's something distinctive there about the social learning that takes place. It's not about revenues. I think at best we'd break even. And we are not going to lose money; I can promise you that, but we aren't going to make money at this business, I don't think, but I also believe it should affect -- and this would be my goal -- how many of us teach in class.

“There's this casual phrase about flipping the classroom. And other ways, though, that I think we can use what's happening nationwide, worldwide, to affect us in a positive way here. So what I'm doing, in addition to the fora that Joe will have with you all, is I'm going to create a little group of faculty. I've asked Eva Tardos to chair this, and I'll be part of this as well. And we'll think about how we should be engaged, if there's any official engagement as an institution in one of those consortiums. I think we should make a decision: are we going to join or not join? Since last November, almost a year ago now, we have been asked to join these other groups. And there are others I could tell you about, but we've stood on the sideline on purpose, but now I think it's time to decide.

“I would encourage us to also think about the role that even eCornell might have across our university in a positive sense. Some of our schools and colleges are engaged. Others have dismissed it, and it's not about MOOCs, but it's about online education. So I think it's a great opportunity, and I very much second Joe's proposal, and that is that the faculty should lead this. That's what is happening other places, and I would encourage us to do it, but I would encourage us to work on it this fall.

”My last formal item is the library petition. This is not an official senate resolution, I don't believe, but it was a petition that about a third of the faculty signed, and the petition called on us as a university, faculty, deans, provosts, that it listed to invest in the library collection budget, library collections specifically, so that our investments and collections, our expenditures in the area of collections in libraries would be within the
top ten of other North American university libraries. So what I want to do is show you how you would implement that from a budget perspective. No decision has been made on this, except I have told the university librarian Anne Kenney that I will bring to the deans the slide you are about to see. The deans have not seen this, but -- then we'll make a decision this fall, at least for the 2014 budget, which is next year's budget, FY 2014.

"The estimate is that the other top ten libraries are investing about 5% more per year in collections, increasing their budgets by about 5% per year. We have not been doing that. We have been cutting everybody's budget and we have not protected the library from that. So if the other top ten libraries in the country, in North America, increase their investments and collections by 5% a year, including going forward for the next three years, we would need to invest 10% a year to place us in the top ten in three years from now. And that first 10% increase would need to come a year from now, next fall.

"So just to very simply show you -- many of you sitting in the back can see this, but if budgets are increasing by 3% a year going forward -- they have not been in the past, since I have been provost, but if they do start increasing 3% a year going forward, then the increase is in the collections budget of the library -- not the total library budget. The library has a much larger budget composed of facilities, people, et cetera, but just the collections part would increase by $1.46 million -- let me get my green laser pointer -- which is this number here. This would not put us in the top ten of libraries in North America in terms of collections investments. We would actually fall behind if everybody else -- if the other top universities are investing 5%, but that shows you what the increase would be in the collections budget.

"I'll show you how it gets distributed by college under the new college budget. It says the arts college would be investing $386,000 -- that's not dollars, but thousands of dollars -- and reason for that is the new budget model, we are saying the library's budget, including collections, gets distributed out to the colleges, the provost gets money by taxing colleges. And this would be one of those taxes, and it's proportional to two things: It's proportional to half of the cost. It is distributed by your percent of the faculty you have in your college, and the other half is by the percent of students you have in your college, the other half. So that's how it gets distributed.

"My only purpose here is to show you the discussion we'll be having with the deans later this fall when we begin to think about the FY 14 budget. This is what it would take if we are going to achieve that goal of being in the top ten in investments and collections. We would need, from today, the cumulative increase -- this is not an increase next year, but it's the cumulative increase that would be effective three years from now in FY 2016's budget, would be $5.3 million instead of $1.4 million.
“So in other words, this is roughly a 10% per year increase for three years. This is a 3% increase for three years. And going forward after this, the increase would then drop back down to 5% a year, if the other universities are going up 5% a year. It shows you the difference. Instead of the arts college investing $386,000, it would invest $1.4 million a year, more than it is today; but three years from now. It wouldn't all be effective next fall. It would be roughly one-third of that next fall. Agricultural Life Sciences, $1.1 million; Engineering, $1 million, et cetera. Each of our units is here. That's the nice thing about the budget model it says here is an important topic, something we care deeply about, and here's the cost, so we can make the trade-offs. That's indeed what we will be discussing.

“I want to report on one last thing, and that is in today's "U.S. News and World Report," the never-ending rankings are coming out on universities. And I wanted to show you all two things that as faculty you should take great pride in.

“One of the components of the rankings is academic reputation. And that's a survey of other universities. Typically the presidents and provosts for the universities that are participating get a survey to fill out for the entire university. It also has a component now actually of academic high school counselors, as you'll see in the second slide I'll show you; but there are only five universities in the entire country that ranked higher than us in academic reputation. Only five. And those were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, MIT. So we were Number 6 in academic reputation.

“We bounced around between 10 and 9 over the past years, but now we are at 6. This is, I think, the core metric. Many of the other metrics are things you cannot control. A lot of them are resource-driven, class size, et cetera; but my favorite table in today's "U.S. News and World Report" is high school counselors. And this is an actual table from that. The high school counselors pick, and Cornell is Number 1 in the whole country, because C comes before D --- and all those others. There are eight of us tied for Number 1 in terms of high school counselors, recommendations to students, and it's pretty spectacular. Overall ranking, we have been at 14th or 15th at "U.S. News" for ten years. It's bounced around a little bit, and that hasn't changed; but I think these are pretty special and I wanted to end with that. Thank you, Joe.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Provost Fuchs. There's now lots of time for questions and responses. So any questions, comments for the provost?”

Eric Cheyfitz, the Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters, English: “I wonder if you could recap the financial aid adjustments for undergraduates.

Provost Fuchs: “I will make a mistake if I go through them. I really will. I have the article with me here, Eric, but it is -- I could give you my best shot at it. I saw Barb
Knuth. Barb, are you willing to give a shot at the changes? It's old news, Eric. I mean, this is not something new. You want to do it, Barbara?”

Vice Provost Barbara Knuth, Dean of the Graduate School: “I oversee undergraduate admissions and financial aid. The main change that we're making is with regard to the loan amount that students who come from families between $60,000 and $75,000 annual income will have. Currently they have zero loan in their financial aid package, and they will now have a maximum of $2,500 a year in their loan package. There are some other changes, but that's the major one.”

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “Regarding the MOOCs committee that Eva Tardos is chairing, is there a charge, something like this: Figure out which one of these to join and then we will join it?”

Provost Fuchs: “No. It's really -- I gave that just as a crude way of thinking about what I think we have to think about this fall, but I’d want us to think about what our objectives are before we do that. Our objectives about publicizing Cornell or our objectives of teaching on campus, so we'll start with that.

“This is not a committee meant to subsume online education, because that's a big, broad topic. I do think we have a little opportunity, a window here, where there is a confluence of the best units, a set of consortiums and a little bit of change in technologies. I should mention there's some donor interest, as you might imagine, that might be able to fund this. So I'd like to put together a little group that's complementary to whatever Educational Policies, CAPP or Joe has that helps us think about this. And my objective is to get ahead of the trustees. As you may have read in the press, trustees around the country are beginning to jump on this, and if you read "The Times" Sunday or any other times -- I would like us, as a faculty, to get ahead of that. So I have not yet written the charge, David, and I haven't appointed the committee, and I would welcome your input; but it's a more informal group is the way I'm thinking about it now. I would love for us as a whole faculty, the whole university, to make some decisions this fall about what we want to do in this area. It's kind of my charge to all of us.

Associate Professor John Weiss, History: “I'm interested and welcome the idea of the school of public policy, but I'd like for you to explain a little what the relationship between that school and CIPA will be, the Cornell public affairs, how you envision that.”

Provost Fuchs: “Alan Mathios and this little group that we will create will need to bring forward their version of a proposal; but if you ask me, I would think CIPA would need to be a part of that somehow, not separate in any way, but an important part of it, I would envision. As many of you know, CIPA used to report to the provost's office.
And as part of the changes I made in the provost's office, I asked previously Human Ecology, the administrative oversight of that. And from my point, that is working well; but for now, it still stands kind of by itself, and I would like to have it be part of something bigger.”

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: “You mentioned a number of committees, and you said we are creating them like the MOOCs and public policy. Seems like these are the kind of committees that should be jointly appointed with the Nominations and Elections Committee, and so I couldn't tell if that's what you meant.”

Provost Fuchs: “I think I'd be very willing for that one. That one is one, on the MOOCs, that I think I'd love to have formal representation. The others, the dean searches, that has been brought forward to the senate committee. Which others, Risa, were you thinking about?”

Professor Lieberwitz: “The school of public policy.”

Provost Fuchs: “That one is an operational committee that I've asked to develop an operational plan, and I don't envision that as being one that would be university-wide, because it's more going to be about the budgets and how it would operate functionally based upon the recommendations of the formal task force I created. So that one did have formal representation from the senate; but the new one, which we'll build on that is more operational, and I'd like to keep it small. The other one was quite extensive and formal. I'd like to keep it small and bring forward an operational plan that we could then all discuss.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Okay. I actually just didn't remember with the original committee that that was jointly appointed.”

Provost Fuchs: “Yes, it was.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Great. That seems to me to be really important, because if you say well, reports are going to come out and then they'll go to standing committees of the senate, that the initial agenda-setting is through the first committee; so the more jointly appointed ones we have, the better.”

Provost Fuchs: “Yes. I think the agenda's there. It's that 93-page report that came out, and it's now time for us to make a decision on it. And I think the operational details are important at this point. And that report is on the web site, and it's available to everybody.”
Mary Beth Norton, the Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: “I was the chair of the Library Board, as Kent knows, last year when we produced the petition that a third of the faculty signed. Although I am not the chair anymore, I want to be clear on what the next step is with those figures that you presented to us a few minutes ago.”

Provost Fuchs: “Yes, Mary Beth, the very next step is to decide the decision to be made, not the next step, but the decision to be made is what is the library's budget for FY 2014. That’s it. That’s the next step.

“In terms of getting there, what I’ve committed to doing is having this be a discussion item with the academic deans. And Lee will be there; Anne Kenney will be there, and I’m opening it up to a few others, as you know, Mary Beth.”

Professor Norton: “Will there be representatives from the Library Board? There is a crucial question.”

Provost Fuchs: “Yes. I'm very open to that. Any deans in the room? You just have to think about the strategy, what's the most effective -- I'm quite willing for that to be the case. So again, when it comes to budgets like that, the deans don't vote on it. We don't vote on everybody's budget, but this is the kind of thing where, in addition to you all seeing this and welcoming your input through the petition, now you actually see the numbers and how it would affect your colleges, the dean's engagements, because they have to make the trade-offs, if they make this investment. What do they not do? And so the final decision will have to be the provost, and when we do the budgeting, but I think that is a very healthy discussion now because we can see what the impacts are. It's not this magical GP budget that's somehow magically funding things. It's a very clear allocation of resources and expenses.”

Associate Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Thank you, Dean Fuchs, especially for keeping the budget in balance. I consider myself a very fortunate person, as a parent, as an employee here, have gotten incredible benefits for tuition for our kids; but I also feel a little bit like Obama when he talks about his taxes and what he should be paying. And I'm more interested in your opinion in hearing about a possible tuition bubble in colleges. And so it isn't a question for Cornell, because shopping for colleges made me feel we are in line with our peers, but I wonder if you're feeling that this is something that's happening and, if so, who's explaining it well or who's got the right take on it? I'm just reading editorials in the New York Times.”

Provost Fuchs: “Please be more specific.”

Professor Franck: “I guess it's a social justice thing is what I'm really getting at. And it's not about the mistakes in community colleges and hooking veterans and lousy plans and stuff like that, but it's a -- like when Conant invented the SAT test, he was trying to
make Harvard a place for more than rich kids. And it's a question of is it something we are swinging the wrong way on. It is a big old question; but I wonder if you have an opinion as to who's getting it right, if there was a problem, or who would be a wise person to listen to on this?”

Provost Fuchs: “I'm not sure I have a good answer. Sounds like another fora. I could speak specifically to Cornell and our thinking about the next three, four, five years. And I think beyond that, we can't project much further than that, but I'm very, very comfortable with Cornell's strategy, which is I would describe, even with changes we have made in financial aid, as very aggressive, very strong financial aid.

“We are one of the few institutions in the country, in the world that has need-blind admissions and then commits to meeting the full need of the students within our program and policies, and yet on the other side, has fairly aggressive tuition, both in its absolute amount and also the raises we're projecting in the future. So the aggressive tuition means that those that can afford to pay will pay, and then the financial aid means that those that can't afford yet are deserving, the very best students, will be able to come. They'll have the access. And I'm very comfortable with that policy going forward.

“It is one in which, though, because we don't have a fixed budget for financial aid, it means you have to monitor that investment carefully, monitor what it costs the institution, monitor what the impact is on the yield; in other words, are we getting the students we want? And then thirdly, the impact on the students when they graduate. How much loan they have? And our students have amongst the smallest of loans. Not the smallest. Some of those that were ranked with us, above us in academic reputation, those five other institutions have more aggressive financial aid, but we're in that elite group, and I'm very comfortable with being there. Is there some bubble or something about to occur nationwide; I really can't answer that. I really can't. I could give you my conjecture, but it would be that. And we're pushing hard on fundraising for financial aid. I mean, that's a piece of it, too, that I didn't mention.”

Professor Emeritus Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: “Just because it's a very large number, the largest, I have a $64 million question, and that was the largest number you mentioned. $64 million was a deficit in your office; is that right?”

Provost Fuchs: “Yes. Would you like my office?”

Professor Howland: “No, thanks. I have a very nice one. But perhaps we should just hear what happened there. $64 million is a lot of money.”

Provost Fuchs: “It's the result of coming out of the economic downturn and us now coming out of that. Remember, we cut payout on our endowment dramatically. I don't
remember the exact number, but something like 25%. That creates a deficit, because we were relying on that payout. The State of New York now is paying us about two-thirds of what they were paying when I started as provost. That creates a deficit, in the financial aid numbers. Financial aid goes up $100 million in three years, that creates a deficit. We're working to adjust and adapt to each of those. So that's it.”

Professor Howland: “So that naturally falls in your office, because you're the…”

Provost Fuchs: “I crudely called it the provost's budget. We affectionately call it the general purpose budget, but that sounds like -- that makes it sound like there's some magic set of revenues, and there's not. Our revenues are our revenues, and the new budget model means they're yours. So it's not like I've been out in Las Vegas. Sorry.”

(LAUGHTER)

Associate Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences: “Your use of the library petition to illustrate the budget model was very enlightening, but also scary. It raises the question of whether there needs to be some thinking about the governance model, a new governance model to go along with the new budgeting model. So clearly using that as the example, if a unitary decision is made one way or the other, the consequences fall unevenly on the units because they have different sizes.

So our founding fathers created bicameral legislature to ensure that any decisions like that would have to be proved not just by the most numerous states, but the senate has two votes per state, and that ensures some protection against either the bigger ones on some occasions or the smaller ones on other occasions. So what thoughts do you have about cushioning the blow for some of these decisions or altering the governance model?”

Provost Fuchs: “Remember, in the new budget model, all components of the university's $2 billion in expenditures and roughly in revenues will be attributed in some fashion like this, either revenues or expenses. And the nice thing about that -- right now, those things happen, but for most of us, we don't know where those revenues go and we don't know how they get spent -- in other words, you can't attach an expenditure in some area to some set of revenues, because for most of them go into this GP budget. And now that changes. And it becomes very transparent and public how that occurs, and so any central services -- and those central services, I put the library there, I put my office there, Human Resources, other areas -- in some cases, they are now paid by colleges. In other cases, they are paid out of the GP budget.

“It is a very convoluted way of doing things. It will be very clear how they're distributed. And so that decision is just part of the new budget model. In other words, the library cost is described half by how many faculty and half by how many students
you have. And those decisions will be finalized this fall; but there are a different set of decisions, and those different set of decisions are should we make an investment—should we grow the collections budget. Five hundred faculty said yes, and I'm showing you now what that would cost. It's all I'm showing you.

“So I met today with two different vice provosts about other investments that would be wonderful educational programs that would benefit the whole institution; one for international students and one for under-represented students. And in the past, that probably— that decision would have been in the provost's office, but now we bring it to the colleges and we talk about that; should we make this, should we do that. At some point, you have to make a decision, but now that discussion will occur just like it is here with the library. I think the bottom line, it forces those discussions, which never would have occurred before, which I think is good. These are not fun decisions, though, because they are trade-offs.”

Professor Emeritus Muawia Barazangi, Earth and Atmospheric Science: “You have not touched on the issue of hiring of new faculty. Would you like to comment, however, on the issue, if you have a simple or a complicated answer, concerning the aging of the faculty?”

Provost Fuchs: “If I would describe probably the most important activity any of us are involved in, either in the last few years or going forward the next few years, it is indeed all of us working to recruit the faculty that are going to come after us. And in fact, our objective is to get them here before we leave. So we've captured this in what we are calling faculty renewal, and the trustees have formally supported this and have committed to raising a lot of money that is not endowment to sustain new positions, but it's to pay for faculty over a period of five years. And that is going phenomenally well. We are now hiring at a rate that is almost similar to the best years of the past, if we tracked the last 50 years, and that was not the case. In 2009, we hired 20 faculty, but we have been bidding that up, so now it's almost close to 80 faculty this past year. So there are budget challenges to be had and it's not clear what the future is, but the last couple of years have been pretty spectacular when I look at each of the schools and colleges, the hires that have been made in this area.

“The challenge with budget reduction is that, as we've faced over the past three years, is that I think the easiest way to balance a budget for an institution is just not to replace faculty. I also think it's the most damaging to an institution, and so there's been this very focused program to raise monies for faculty renewal that will allow us to hire faculty in advance of others retiring. So I'm not sure I can say much more than that, but this has just been the top priority for I know almost every academic leader to focus on this in the midst of having to make a whole bunch of other cuts, which have been tough. So I'm not sure what you are asking. I'm getting older. Is that what you're saying?”
Professor Barazangi: “Clearly, there's a trend of the average age increasing, and, in some instances, dramatically. And that will affect your ability to bring young faculty in at a reasonable rate as you are doing now. If people decided not to retire at 75 and 80, we are in trouble.”

Provost Fuchs: “Then we're in trouble. If you and I don't retire, we are in trouble, because we are hiring these faculty in advance of us retiring. And I guess I'm not concerned about us as faculty staying around forever. I am concerned that we are all going to retire at once and that that will not be good in terms of market or anything else. So if I had a concern, that would be it. It's not the fact that we're -- that I'm getting older. It's the fact that all of us may retire at the same time. And that's what the faculty renewal is all about. If you think it's time for me to retire, just be clear. Just say it.”

Speaker Beer: “Perhaps there may be one final question before the provost retires from the meeting? Seeing none, thank you very much, Provost Fuchs.

The meeting has now come to the Good and Welfare section, where there are no speakers, and so the speaker would like to just make a comment and thank the dean of the faculty for arranging a very effective inaugural meeting. Thank you. The senate stands adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)