

A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

Interim Speaker, Charles Walcott: "I'd like to call the meeting to order. I never used my little mallet. It's 4:31, so we're a minute behind already. We have one Good and Welfare speaker at the end, so we will have an extra ten minutes or so for discussion. I remind the body that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and please turn off your cell phones.

"I suggest, and I will give you more details as we get closer to it, that we have a maximum speaking time of two minutes to allow more people to have discussion. And we begin, then, with consent items. The first is the approval of minutes from the [11/13/13](#) senate meeting, which I assume everybody has read carefully. The test will come at the end of today's session.

"And the second is the [Nominations and Elections Committee report](#), and these matters are to be brought for vote by consent, unless somebody has asked to -- and nobody has asked, so I ask for a show of hands of those who approve the minutes and the Nominations and Elections report. All in favor? Anybody opposed?

"I would say it carries unanimously. So we now go on to important things. Dean Burns, your report?"

2. [REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY](#)

Joseph Burns: "Thanks, Charlie. So welcome. I hope you all had stimulating semesters so far. It looks like we've got a pretty large attendance, larger than normal, and I'm sure that's due to my exhortations to get more faculty participation.

"It's possible that it's actually got something to do with the resolution, which does deal with one of the most important issues of our time. And I suppose that's a reasonable, good reason, but anyway, it's great that you all are here.

"We started a tradition, which may seem weird for those who are new, for people to introduce themselves to one another, if you see anyone within your little sphere of six or eight, to say hey, I'm so-and-so, and I come from this department.

“Very good. It's great fun. We also have a tradition of bringing in foods from Cornell, to try to, again, show what is done at this university, but we decided to break with that tradition today and just bring in straight sugar. It's that time of year. So we do have little labels from Cornell on the covers, and that's going to be fun. So that's our introductions.

“I wanted to mention a little bit about this online survey that we had as part of this resolution, since there's been so much interest. And this is something I have been wanting to do for some time. On Monday afternoon, I suggested that if people wanted to make comments, they could write onto our web site and they would be posted.

“And as of now, we have about 40 very, very thoughtful comments, lots of people from the Atkinson Center, folks from the finance area, people from Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, people involved in ethics and so forth, just terrific to see; junior faculty, post-docs, chaired professors. And the comments, most of them are just very, very thoughtful. I'm just so proud of what people have accomplished here. It's just great.

“We're going to keep that slide up for a little bit. It's possible that at the end of the day today you'll say oh, gee, I learned something, and I'd like to share that with the rest of the community. I think that would be terrific to do, and so please continue to keep that rolling. And you have more free time -- it's a little slow during the break -- sign in. And in that light, we think we will continue to do this.

“The next topic that will be coming in front of the senate, I hope, at the February meeting will be a discussion of the report from the Distance Learning Committee about MOOCs and so forth. And that should have great interest, and so we'll probably do the same process there. And in that light, please let me know or let Karen Lucas in the office know how we could do that better. We've learned a few things already; but if you have suggestions, please let us know.

“So now I'd like to tell you a little bit about the activities of some of the committees. CAPP, the first here, had two items. They voted without dissent to initiate a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering, and you'll hear more about that in the Good and Welfare today.

“They also voted to bring to the senate a joint degree between the Johnson School and Tsinghua University, two-year degree, and that normally would have been

presented as a consent item. Unfortunately, because of the calendar, these did not make it to CAPP in time for CAPP to bring them to the UFC for me to put them on the agenda a week early.

“So these are not on the agenda, but we have a process that I hope that I will bring them to the UFC and ask the UFC if they will act, instead of the senate, in order to keep this thing moving along. Both of them, again, passed the CAPP and passed the appropriate bodies unanimously -- or without dissent. I shouldn't say unanimously. One vote was missing.

“Financial Policy Committee has been very busy the last month. They have done this, considered at great depth the resolution that you will see today. They were not able to reach a conclusion and bring a motion or a resolution for it. They had a split committee, but you've seen some of their comments.

“They interacted with the Chief Investment Officer and also the proposers of the resolution to try to get some common feeling about what was important there, and I think the resolution before you is a much better resolution because of those interactions.

“Unfortunately, the chair of the committee is in Vienna, so he is not able to make a presentation today. And the president and the provost, who often attend these meetings, are in New York with the chief investment officer, talking to the board of trustees. So they are also not here to make statements.

“The Financial Policy Committee continues to look at issues of the new budget model, and they will continue to make more meetings, because they think it's an important topic, and there are the beginnings of a resolution coming out of them. They will be meeting on Monday to discuss the start-up New York program.

“This is a program by Governor Andrew Cuomo to have tax-free zones around universities, and Cornell intends to submit something toward that. And the state legislation, the rules for that require that after the university puts forward its proposal, that there be a 30-day waiting period before that proposal is looked at by the State.

“And during that period, the faculty senate, the local unions, the local employees all have the opportunity to look at it and comment on that proposal. And so we will be meeting on Monday in order to consider that.

“The Educational Policy Committee has also been active, but there will be a presentation following mine of their activity, so I don't say anything. And the Distance Learning Committee, this committee concerned with MOOCs, has been active and is writing a report, which we hope to develop and finalize over the holiday break and bring it to the UFC, to the Educational Policy Committee, and to CAPP, the Academic Programs and Policies Committee, in January, and then bring it to you, not for a vote, because it's just a report that's written by a committee, but for comments and to make sure that we're getting it right in that report of the committee.

“And I think I have a couple of minutes left. So if there are questions or comments on this or any other activities that I know about and Day Hall, please let me know. Or space. I know a lot more about space than I do Day Hall. Okay.”

Speaker Walcott: “We have a report from the Educational Policy Committee. David?”

3. REPORT FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Professor David Delchamps, Computer and Electrical Engineering, and Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee: “I'm David Delchamps, I'm EPC Chair this year, and first I just wanted to show you who we are. It's a great group of people, and we've had five well-attended meetings this semester. And Joe and Mike Fontaine have been at all of our meetings.

“If you look at that list, you will see there are a lot of very dedicated and highly decorated teachers, including two Weiss fellows -- or three, actually, and Ron Harris-Warrick was also the inaugural Menschel distinguished teaching fellow with the Center for Teaching Excellence.

“The one unfortunate thing, it's a little science-heavy, which isn't helped by the fact that Paul Sawyer has been on leave this semester, but he will be back next semester. Unfortunately, we don't have more humanists. I just wanted to tell you briefly about six highlights of what we've talked about this semester, and I'm hoping to take about five minutes to do that.

“I welcome questions here, but if you want to hear any considerable details or back-story or anything on any of these things, please feel free to e-mail me, because I have lots and lots of documentation.

“First thing we talked about this semester was a student assembly resolution they passed last spring they called the inclusive book policy. Essentially they wanted us to encourage faculty more strongly than we have been to do everything we can to reduce the cost to undergraduates, especially of their textbooks.

“For example, can you use an older edition? Do you really need this book that I'm requiring? Or can you maybe rent it for the one month you do need it, that sort of thing. They proposed a bunch of text for the faculty handbook along those lines. We took it and edited it down to be sort of commensurate with the kind of stuff that's already in the faculty handbook, and I think we have arrived at some things that take into account technologies that didn't exist when the text that currently appears in the faculty handbook was written, so that's one thing we took care of.

“Another thing we did, we work with the registrar's office to change the rules, such as they were -- they were more suggestions than rules -- about when final grades are due at the end of semesters. The rules in the faculty handbook pegged the due dates for final grades to the occurrences of final exams for individual courses.

“And we thought that in this modern age where everyone uploads their grades, they're not feeding sheets of paper for people to hand enter, there's no real reason for the grades to be dribbling in that way. The due date for grades should be pegged to when they're actually needed.

“And so you've gotten an e-mail already from Joe the last couple of weeks, I think, and I've gotten it also from my college registrar and I've gotten it from my department undergraduate office that final grades for this semester are due December 24th.

“Final grades for the spring are going to be due some day in May for everybody. And there's a little bit of a blip there for seniors who are graduating versus people who aren't graduating in the spring; but anyway, that was another thing we worked on.

“We also talked with the registrar about some upcoming changes in the way they're going to be scheduling final exams for people. The new academic calendar, which surprisingly I learned today some of our conscientious faculty members in our department claim they have never heard about it, but the fact of

the matter is that next spring and next fall, we will be phasing in the new academic calendar.

“So for example, classes start on a Wednesday this spring, and there's a two-day break in February, that sort of thing; but one of the consequences of the new calendar was that we have a slightly shorter final exam period, slightly by a couple of exam slots. It's not really significantly shorter, but the registrars thought well, that might be a good opportunity to figure out a better way to optimize final exam schedules; that in the past, they had set final exam times to minimize conflicts based on when courses met, but there are more sophisticated algorithms available that set final exam times based on actual student enrollments in classes.

“In other words, if Student A is enrolled in these three courses, we minimize the probability that she will have a conflict, and that's overall. Anyway, they're going to come to us, the registrars are going to come to us; that is to say Educational Policy Committee, in February and present several scenarios, results of what would happen if they used this algorithm or that, for our commentary. And that's going to be fun to look at, I think, be interesting what comes up with that.

“We also met with Laura Brown, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and Mary-Lynn Cummings, the director of space planning, who told us about a new policy they're developing on the allocation of instructional space; for example, make sure a class with 300 people gets a room with at least 350 seats. Make sure a tiny seminar isn't rattling around in here, make sure that you don't get scheduled -- if you're an architecture professor, you don't get a class in Riley-Robb Hall, that sort of thing, but also things like meeting times.

“Surprisingly to me, at least, because our department is rigid about this, around the university there's a variety of violations occurring of the standard meeting time schedules. People get a 9:05 to 9:55 slot, and the first day of school they announce instead of meeting Monday, Wednesday, Friday 9:05 to 9:55, we'll meet Monday, Wednesday 9:05 to 10:20. And thereby, they eat up a piece of someone else's time slot. So students have a hard time scheduling classes for that reason.

“So thing A, they are going to start clamping down on that, start enforcing the official meeting time chart, and they might change it a little bit. We're going to comment on that to them, and others are welcome to comment on that. For

example, maybe add a couple more two 75-minute lecture slots Monday, Wednesday. That's one thing.

“Other thing, and this, I think, is slightly more consequential, even though it's not going to cause big changes, they're going to ask every college to shoot for targets as to what percentage of classes have their meeting time starting in this slot versus this slot, like they don't -- for example, you don't want to have everybody Tuesday, Thursday, 10:10 or Tuesday, Thursday, 11:40.

“You want to have some people -- so they have this chart that has percentage of - - they want to meet at certain times and they'll have every college look at that and report and try to twist people's arms into evening it out the way they want it. And really, this is all about optimizing the use of our instructional space, and they're basing this policy on a study by an outside group that came in and surveyed and whatever.

“Okay, last two things. We talked about the meaning of a credit hour; how uniformly is that applied. In the courses of study, there's actually a description of what is a credit hour, and it's pretty much what you might think, but rumor has it that in certain places around the university, it's not uniformly applied, that there are four credit classes that meet for one hour a week and only require five hours of reading; I don't know.

“So we're trying to gather information, more than anything else, I think. We're not going to try to legislate this. We want to get anecdotal evidence, and please talk to your person on the EPC, if there's someone there, or e-mail me, if you have any stories to relate having to do with what is a credit hour and how uniformly is it applied.

“And finally, we've talked a little bit about MOOCs. As Joe mentioned in his report, we're going to be seeing the Distance Learning Committee report, as is the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies. We're going to have a look at it. That report is going to send some things to us to talk about and perhaps legislate on, and it also might not send some things to us that we would like to talk about or legislate on. That's going to be part of our discussion.

“There's some things that -- really the EPC is about our program, our students, that sort of thing. It's not about outreach kind of activities, but there are serious issues that attend MOOCs, and I want to mention two of them. Both involve educational resources.

“Issue number one, the Center for Teacher Excellence, fully half of its staff is working now full-time on MOOCs, on edX MOOCs, under our contract with edX, and that has chopped down considerably the amount of CTE activity here for our faculty to improve our educational delivery.

“Thing number two, local to departments, this is a story from my own department. One of our stellar teachers was scheduled to teach a popular senior class next spring that a lot of my advisees and others were planning to take; and lo and behold, he got a MOOC grant to turn his first-year course into a MOOC and, in order to implement that, he got teaching relief.

“Therefore, he's not teaching the course next spring. Only other faculty member that can teach that course is on sabbatical; therefore, it's not being offered till the fall. Ergo, seniors don't get to take it. So a consequence, an educational consequence of MOOCs. That's an example of such a thing.

“Anyway, we're going to be talking about that some more in the future. And I've probably gone longer than my five minutes, and I don't know how much time I have for questions here. Another five minutes? Good. Anyone have questions or comments or --

Professor Michael Thompson, Engineering: “ Just wondering if the committee is looking at all the issues of grade inflation and grade parity across the colleges?”

Professor Delchamps: “We're not, but you just reminded me of something I forgot to mention that we did talk about at my behest, which is this whole business about median grades and whether they appear on transcripts or they appear online.

“Those of you that have been around a while know this has a long and tortuous history. And right now, the policy is that median grades for each individual course of a certain minimum enrollment appear on people's transcripts, but they don't appear online, so students can't research what the median grades are in classes and decide on courses on that basis.

“We talked at length about this for a couple of meetings, and we decided for now to leave it the way it is. And I can give you lots of details on that, if you want, but no, we haven't talked about grade inflation. We haven't talked about, say, a

Princeton type of policy, where departments are supposed to target 35% or fewer As, that kind of thing.

“We haven't talked about that at all. Do you think we should? This is the kind of -- EPC is always open to suggestions to things that are in our purview to talk about that we haven't thought of, so please. Do you think we should?”

“Okay. Maybe we can e-mail back and forth, and I can take your comments to the group.”

4. PRESENTATION OF A RESOLUTION ON CORNELL INVESTMENT AND DIVESTMENT STRATEGIES FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE – SEE DIALOGUE REGARDING RESOLUTION

Professor Brian Chabot, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: “So thank you, Charlie. I wish to begin with a quote from David Skorton, which is ‘The inequalities of society and climate change are the two biggest challenges we face in the world today.’ The 38 sponsors of this [resolution](#) agree, and these two issues are connected, because it is the poor of the earth, whether it be poor individuals or poor communities or poor countries that are being the most affected by the changing climate.

“We bring to you a [resolution](#) that has two principal proposals: The first is to advance our target date for climate neutrality to 2035 from its present 2050; and the second is to divest from the 200 companies that hold most of the carbon reserves in the world.

Whereas there is overwhelming evidence that the use of fossil fuels is disrupting the Earth's climate system and acidifying its oceans, and that such disruptions will create significant challenges for Cornell University, the state of New York, the United States, and all countries for the next millennium;

And whereas Cornell has committed to becoming carbon neutral by 2050 and has made significant progress in achieving this goal;

And whereas many other colleges and universities have also committed to achieving this goal, with some having established an even more ambitious goal of eliminating fossil fuel use by 2025;

And whereas reducing the use of fossil fuels will reduce the value of investments in companies holding large fossil fuel reserves;

And whereas Cornell is a leading research and public education institution with significant impact within New York, the United States, and the world;

And whereas the Cornell Student Assembly has passed by an overwhelming majority a resolution calling upon the University to adjust its investment practices to draw further attention to the detrimental effects of fossil fuel use;

Therefore be it resolved that Cornell faculty, responsible university offices and officials should seek a more aggressive reduction in the use of fossil fuels that will achieve carbon neutrality by 2035.

Be it further resolved that Cornell investments in companies producing such fuels be reduced consistent with Cornell's progress towards carbon neutrality so as to achieve full divestment by 2035.

Be it further resolved that this should be done by a schedule that prioritizes divestment from those companies holding the largest fossil fuel reserves;

Be it further resolved that the President of Cornell will submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate describing the progress that the University has made in becoming carbon neutral and divesting from companies holding the largest fossil fuel reserves

“These two issues are related, logically. We cannot hope to achieve climate neutrality by any date, if we are also wanting to continue to encourage companies whose mission is to extract the carbon from the ground. We can't teach our students about climate change and do research on climate change and argue that it's an important issue if we are unwilling to be part of the solution.

“We cannot ask students to be concerned about this, have it as an important issue for their future and for them to be part of the solution, if faculty are not also willing to join their concerns.

“So we have a question here of why do this now. Well, there are three principal reasons, and the first reason is coming on this slide, but it's an example of a whole series of research papers that are coming out -- this one came out last week -- that are with increasing urgency, showing that we need to make changes.

In fact, most of these papers suggest we should have made changes before now, but it's late. We don't have till 2050 to address this issue.

“The second reason to consider it now is we know now that this is causing harm. Whether it be violent storms or prolonged droughts or rising sea levels, we have individuals and creatures on our planet and ecosystems that are being damaged conclusively by the warming climate.

“The third reason is that we can change. Cornell has a plan to achieve climate neutrality. Copenhagen has a plan to achieve climate neutrality by 2020. Two cities in Sweden have already achieved climate neutrality. And Sweden, as a country, is trying to become the first climate-neutral country. They can do that and we can do that, because the technology exists to do that.

“So if we have a problem of known importance and harm being caused and the ability to make change, it becomes our moral responsibility to change. This, for most of us, is primarily a moral and ethical issue.

“And we ask you, as you think about the comments about to be made, why you might not support this [resolution](#). Is it because you think this is something that a single institution cannot affect? The opinion of these two individuals and the life of Nelson Mandela point to a different solution to this.

“Is it because you think that more needs to be done, that we're not offering you enough? Well, yes, we will have to do more, but this is a place to begin the engagement. Is it because you think we should stay in our classrooms and labs and not get involved with a practical solution in the real world? That is not the Cornell University I am part of. It's not the Cornell University Ezra created. We are engaged.

“Is it because you see this as economically challenging or much too difficult to resolve? We have faced similar, difficult situations before. Think about slavery, think about apartheid. These were all viewed as difficult to change, but we managed. We did it. So once you connect with the moral imperative for us to stop harming our planet, you connect with the main reasons why we support this [resolution](#).”

Professor David Shalloway, Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics:

“This [resolution](#) was designed for Cornell to take a leadership role in drawing

attention to hypocrisy of maintaining and expanding fossil fuel reserves in the face of a predictable catastrophe, but to do so at little financial risk.

“It's targeted specifically at the companies that have the biggest financial reasons to resist reductions in fossil fuel burning. There's no constraint on reinvestment in profitable alternatives. It's phased in over 22 years and lined with our progress towards carbon neutrality, and reinvestment in companies that divert their cash from fossil fuel reserves can be used to acknowledge them in the future.

“Unfortunately, these companies are not the ones leading the way towards carbon climate-neutral energy sources. Last year they spent \$647 billion expanding fossil fuel reserves and less than a percent of that in alternative energy development. That's a small amount of the global amount that's being spent.

“The chief investment officer sent you a note, estimating that if we do this, we'll lose millions of dollars; however, his analysis did not characterize this resolution. It appears to be an old analysis that was applied to the student assembly resolution, which is similar in spirit, but quite different in detail.

“Let's look at the numbers. 9% of the long-term investment pool is invested in energy, but two-thirds of this is invested in private partnerships that don't contain the large publicly traded equity companies that we're talking about. It's only 3% would be affected that way, but we're only talking about a subset of that 3%.

“The officer of investment hasn't told us how big that subset is, but we know that 3% is an upper bound, and we're talking about a 22-year phasing period, so the time average is half that. So at most, we're talking about affecting 1.5% of the long-term investment pool.

“To get some idea of what effect this might have on return, we've looked to looking at historically at what would be the effect of divesting from complete oil, gas and consumable market, a subsector of the complete market. That's about 7.6% of the market. It's a huge amount of money.

“On the X axis, what you see is the time of ending of a ten-year analysis period, and the vertical bars show you whether you would have done worse or better by divesting analyzed over that ten-year period. So in some years, you do better. Say, about up to about 2008, you would have done better. Most lately, you

would do a little worse, but in all cases, the variation's about 0.2% by a complete divestment.

“If we combine that with the less than 1.5% fraction that we're talking about, we get that this is going to have an effect, annual effect of less than about 0.04% on our annual return. Actually, income from the long-term investment pool is 13% of our operating budget predicted for next year here in Ithaca, 8.8% across Cornell as a whole.

“So if you multiply that in, in the first year, we're at a 10 to the minus 6th effect on our operating budget. If we look over the complete 22-year period, we have an annual effect of about 10 to the minus 4. Money is just -- it's just a red herring really here. The idea that we can beat the market by overemphasizing investments in energy have failed in the past.

“We've done okay. Our ten-year annualized return's 8.8%, but that's about in line with what we get on retirement things, if we go to Fidelity or Vanguard. It's really no way to predict or beat the stock market. We may make a little, we may lose a little. This is not a major issue.

“There's no time to waste. As Brian said, the climate scientists have already told us that we have to do something quickly; certainly by 2020, at the latest. There's positive feedback effects, melting of the tundra, releasing methane, inertial effects, warming of the oceans that make it imperative that we work now.

“It's time for us to use our research results that we already have and implement them towards real-world solutions. If we do act now, we get the benefit now. Our leadership, as a prestigious Ivy League university, will help motivate grassroots and political action, and that's going to be felt immediately. It's time for Cornell to lead in this activity.

“Jeffrey Bergfalk from the Graduate and Professional Student Association. “
Student Jeffrey Bergfalk: “Thank you. Last March, the GPSA voted to table a variant of the student assembly resolution to divest. The feeling at that time in the GPSA was that we simply didn't know enough to endorse it. I would emphasize, though, that a motion to table a resolution is a motion to continue, and to deepen, not to cease, consideration of it.

“This is an understanding shared by past and present leadership of the GPSA. Today's resolution, the faculty resolution, goes a very long way towards

addressing our initial concerns. I'll be presenting on it in spring meetings of the GPSA, and I intend to propose it for a vote, so I just want to stress the graduate student interest in this resolution is considerable.

"And I'll turn it over now to David Beavers, who can talk more about support for this resolution campus-wide."

Student David Beavers: "Thank you, Jeff. I'm speaking here as an undergraduate representative. Let me first reemphasize the direct financial impact on the fossil fuel industry is not the point of this endeavor. Divestment is a symbolic action, but is a symbolic action with very real implications.

"Neither is it the point to demonize the industry. We understand the role of fossil fuels in our society today, but a fear of hurting feelings is not a reason to stay silent when the stakes are so high.

"Neither is this a disengaging action. It's actually quite the opposite. A vote to divest is a highly public statement that we demand global carbon intervention. It will spur a conversation this country desperately needs and it will place Cornell, an institution that is pioneering alternatives to fossil fuel business as usual in its research at the forefront of the conversation.

"Furthermore, we must reconcile our finances with our mission. If not, you have to ask yourself what message this sends to students. As young people, we are going to bear the largest burden if the university fails to act today.

"There's been widespread student support for divestment that extends far beyond the usual environmental groups on campus. 25 campus organizations have spoken out in favor of divestment, and over 1,000 petition signatures have been collected. Nationally, divestment is being called for on over 300 college campuses. When history looks back, I hope my fellow Cornelians and I can be proud of the stance Cornell took at this crossroads. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Okay, we come to the discussion. And let me just outline some ground rules, since I suspect there are a lot of people that want to say things. I'm going to try and limit fairly strictly to two minutes. And I know nobody here would like to be anonymous, so please wait for the microphone. So with that, a senator who would like to speak. Right in the center."

Professor David Pizarro, Department of Psychology: "I feel like I have to say this from the get-go. I have no real knowledge about this. It's my first year as a senator. I don't have any -- sounds like a great idea. I believe that climate change is real, I believe that we should act on it.

"I only have one question about whether or not this is -- if the argument is that this is sort of a moral stance that we're taking or -- someone mentioned avoiding hypocrisy. Are there other things that would just be much more of a stance?

"So I just came back from teaching a week of my intro psych course in Doha, Qatar. And the Qatar Foundation funds our program there, and it's my understanding that about 70% of Qatar's revenue is from petroleum products. So I just wanted to put out there. This is not a reason not to do this, but if we are making a moral claim in avoiding hypocrisy, it strikes me that this is a real conversation to be had, that would have substantial impact in terms of sending a message to the world that we are not supporting fossil fuels.

"And again, I say this in all innocence, just trying to get to the nature of the claim, because I really don't have a strong opinion about what we ought to do, but convinced that we ought to do something. It seems as if maybe this is just one very small thing."

Speaker Walcott: "Another comment from a senator? Yes."

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Department of Government: "I would hope that the time comes that Qatar will not be able to find a good university to partner with, if it had a litmus test of fossil fuel support.

"Speaking of past efforts, the South Africa divestment campaign in the '80s was extremely effective. I don't think there's any social scientists who doubt that it played an enormous role. It didn't hurt the universities who divested. It didn't hurt the companies that were there. They found other things to invest in, but it started a conversation, which was very important, and it created a grassroots effort on university campuses.

"And in the U.S., our campuses were among the first really to do that. So I think this can be very effective and, you know, I'm sorry if Qatar has to find something else to do with its investments. I'm not sure that that -- well, never mind. I have had students who worked over there and were extremely critical of the country at large, but that's another story.

“We did not, as a university, our leadership did not support the South Africa divestment movement. It bulldozed the shanties and arrested hundreds of people, and the leadership -- there was an extremely active movement of faculty and students to divest in South Africa. And that was, again, a very important statement from the rest of us.

“The university at large, as leadership, couldn't claim any real participation in this great moral crusade to end apartheid, which happened just a few years later, when Congress, very responsive to social movements, passed, over Reagan's veto, a ban on South Africa investments. And the rest is history.

“We stepped aside from that history, and I hope we don't do the same thing today. I think we have a tremendous moral obligation, as the earlier speaker said, to those who come after us, who will suffer from our rather profligate use of fossil fuel. We owe it to them, we owe it to the poor people in low-lying storm-prone countries right now, who are already suffering from this. I just don't see how we can do anything else without great hypocrisy.”

Speaker Walcott: “I take that as a pro. How about somebody opposed to this [resolution](#)? A senator opposed?”

“Okay. Anybody in favor, another senator in favor?”

Professor N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Studies: “Thank you. A few years ago when Mr. Annan was the secretary general of the United Nations, I was appointed on a committee, the committee on development policy, and there was an issue we'd discuss every year. I served two terms, six years.

“The small islands and the lowlands that have been mentioned is a reality. There are now some people who are claiming their right to move somewhere as climate refugees. These are real issues. Just like nations, there are very powerful nations and great nations, and institutions can also be powerful.

“In this same room, arguments were made recently and in the past that Cornell wants to be among the first few greatest institutions in the world in so many years. Well, being great is not only producing powerful scientists and so on and so on, artists, thinkers, but is also that idea of taking the lead.

“So I am in support for this particular reason, and also I'm from developing countries. Cornell plans to become even more international, so we need to think of those sites and spaces and people with whom we want to do more business. So that global holistic thinking in our action is what I'm in support of.”

Speaker Walcott: “Any further discussion from senators? Okay, how about -- yes. Wait for a microphone, if you would.”

Professor Chris Schaffer, Department of Biomedical Engineering: “Thanks. And I just wanted to talk briefly about some comments that came up on the web-based discussion site and things I've heard from colleagues, who said the university should really focus its mission, focus its activities on research and teaching as that relates to sustainability and climate change.

“And however we fund that, we'll have the greatest impact, if we do more research and education. And I think we can all agree that Cornell has excellent broad-based interdisciplinary, truly 21st Century research and education programs that seek to both create and to promote a more sustainable relationship between our society's energy needs and our planet's resources.

“And Cornell, as we heard, is even committed to running its own operations in a carbon-neutral way by mid-century, but I really feel that these notable achievements and the lofty goals are marred by a 20th Century mind-set that governs the university's investment strategy that's focused exclusively on short- to mid-term returns on investments.

“Listen, just like we cannot teach temperance from a bar stool, we cannot address the problems of climate change and energy security through our own research and teaching activities, while at the same time supporting our university through investments in the fossil fuels that drive the problem. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Right there, front.”

Professor John Weiss, Department of History: “I just have a short question. I was not entirely clear from the presentations or the web site whether one can sort of oppose the resolution from the left; in other words, ask for a strategy that sort of works through divestment over a shorter period than 22 years in these kind of policies, so I'm interested if someone who worked on that can comment on whether those kind of possibilities were considered.”

Speaker Walcott: "Any of you want to address that? Go ahead, David."

Professor Shalloway: "I am a representative from the committee that put the resolution together. There was discussion of this point. One objection we had heard through resolution was that it would be hypocritical for Cornell to divest from fossil fuel while Cornell continued to use fossil fuel.

"Therefore, we decided to tie the two together and to have divestment and our move towards carbon neutrality occur at the same time. And there's a lot of discussion. 2050 is what we've already said we're going to do. 2020 is what the climate scientists say we should do. We split the difference and settled on 2035. That's how we got where we are."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you. Yes, sir."

Professor Dan Krall, Department of Landscape Architecture: "Obviously I support the resolution very much, but I do feel like -- I've never spoken here before, but I feel like the elephant in the room is it will have some kind of financial ramifications on the university.

"And I don't know how small, how large, whether we should believe our investor, but I'm wondering -- I think the bigger question here is who's willing to take a cut in their salary? What students are willing to get less aid? What department is willing to have fewer new faculty hires? Because if there are ramifications from this divestment, where does the money come from?

"It's a little like the discussion going on within our federal government right now. Let's acknowledge those things. This is an easy resolution to vote for, but then how do we deal with those ramifications from that? That's all I'm asking."

Speaker Walcott: "Did you want to make a comment?"

[Many hands go up in support of the impromptu 'vote' to take a salary cut.]

"Okay. Well, I did not ask for this vote.

(LAUGHTER)

"I think we can move to people who are faculty members who are not members of the faculty senate. Would you like to speak? You want to come up here, or do you want a microphone?"

Professor Emeritus Elmer Ewing, Department of Horticulture: "I'm a cosponsor of this resolution, and I consider it to be as important as any position the Cornell faculty has adopted during my 55 years as a faculty member. I say this because I agree with the 97% of climate scientists who say climate change is real and is caused by our increased production of greenhouse gases.

"I believe them when they tell us we are in a danger zone already and that catastrophe looms ahead, unless we take drastic measures. The corporations that lay claim to billions of dollars' worth of fossil fuels oppose any such measures, oppose them because they believe that is the best interest of their stockholders, as they understand their duty.

"Maximizing profit is what matters. To maximize profits, they make huge donations to elect politicians who will vote to protect the future of fossil fuels. Then they lobby to ensure that the legislators do their bidding. Their publicity campaigns assure us that fossil energy is not only necessary, but good, that global climate research is controversial, that many scientists disagree about it and that renewable energy is impractical.

"They tell us it is unfair to subsidize renewable energy. At the same time, they ignore the enormous subsidies that fossil fuels have enjoyed over the years and continue to enjoy. I want a more level playing field. Corporate profits are fine, but not at the sacrifice of our good earth and its people. I believe divestment is appropriate and necessary. I will be proud if my faculty leads by example. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Does any faculty member wish to speak against the resolution? Yes. Peter Stein."

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Department of Physics: "I doubt there's anyone in this room who believes more in the dangers of climate change and the reality of the problem than I do. I believe, and I have said this for years, I think it's the greatest problem we face. I think it's even more important than the problem of how the goods of the world are spread amongst the people, the inequality problem.

“So that's the way I believe, but I somehow am missing the point. I don't understand the connection between this resolution and solving the problem. People talk about the divestment. I remember the divestment movement. I was once a young faculty member sitting in a room like this, arguing about the divestment from South Africa, and argued for it.

“And that succeeded, so that sounds like a good model, but I believe it succeeded not because of divestment, which never really hurt anybody, but because of boycotts, because people stopped buying things from South Africa and threatened to drive the country into financial ruin. That's what happened. And I don't see the connection.

“If I were in the oil companies, I wouldn't worry about whether people bought my stock or not. The thing that we have to think about is how one forces the use -- how one actually takes actions that will lower it. I don't believe this will lower it at all. For instance, if I was thinking of what could I ask Cornell to do, I could ask them to devote a certain amount of their investment into solar panels or something else like that.

“The other thing I think about is it sounds good, but if you ask yourself where, in fact, is the fossil fuels, where are they used? Well, most of the greenhouse gas is made by transportation; cars, airplanes, buses. That's where it goes. The second is electricity.

“Those are the problems. And unless you can figure out a way to generate electricity or make the use of electricity less or figure out a way to avoid transportation, then you are doing absolutely nothing for the problem.

“Another thing I thought of, I have read in several places that if you want what has to happen in the most immediate future, what has to happen, if the whole thing doesn't go down the drain, is to figure out how to get China off of coal and into natural gas. That is the basic problem. And if you drive the natural gas companies out of business, that's not going to help that at all.

“I think one should think very carefully about making this and believing that one is going to achieve the goal that you're searching for by divesting from this and what other actions you might take, consider, which would have a much more direct effect on what the real problem is.”

Unidentified Speaker: "I'd like to address the important question that Professor Stein raised. It seems to me that we're faced with a situation in which the international conversation, that's the only conversation that could seriously ensure against suffering of scores, even hundreds of millions of people, through the effects of global climate change by the end of this century is in a coma.

"That's a conversation about imposing costs through carbon tax or through the imposition of permits for release of greenhouse gases, that if they're serious, have to be imposed by major emitters, by national governments and, given international politics, have to be imposed by an international agreement.

"The serious conversation about ensuring ten scores, hundreds of millions of people in the generation of the children against disasters, it's now in a deep sleep, and it's not just a matter of a Republican party that doesn't believe in science and doesn't want government to do anything.

"The Obama Administration consistently engages in China-bashing, rather than in constructive change in international negotiations, even though the per capita emissions of the United States are four times the per capita emissions of China.

"This divestment will have no economic impact in itself. It's a symbolic action to wake up an international conversation that's needed. It's meant to have political impact by making a statement that involves some risks of some costs on the part of an institution that people listen to. I think the political process has to be revived from its coma, and this is a responsible way to do it."

Professor Robert Howarth, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology:
"I'm an earth system scientist. My very first job after I got my Ph.D. in '79 was to teach an interdepartmental course with Harvard, Yale and Woods Hole on climate change. In the time since then, the earth has warmed by seven-tenths of a degree.

"If you looked at the Intergovernmental Panel on the Climate Change report, the fifth Synthesis which came out this September, there's an increasing urgency there that we all feel. What's causing climate change? Well, many things; but overwhelmingly, it's the burning of fossil fuels and emission of methane associated with that.

"To contradict Professor Stein, the number one use of fossil fuels is for heating, and that's a low-hanging fruit in terms of reducing it. Reducing methane

emissions is critical. The United Nations is now saying that if we don't reduce methane emissions now, that in 15 to 35 years from now, we will warm the planet by an additional 1.5 to 2 degrees Celsius.

“And at that point, we run a very high risk -- these are the words of the IPCC -- of feedbacks in the climate system and run-away global warming. So we need to act now to reduce both methane, which is natural gas, and carbon dioxide. We need to rid ourselves of fossil fuels. It can be done.

“Mark Jacobson of Stanford and I and several colleagues published a peer-reviewed paper in the spring laying out a plan for the whole state of New York to be completely free of fossil fuels by 2030, using technologies that are commercially available in the world today and in a way that's cost-effective.

“By cost-effective, we mean that currently 4,000 people die prematurely in the state of New York every year from air pollution from fossil fuels, and the cost of completely ridding our state of fossil fuels and moving to renewables on that time frame is, in fact, less than the cost we as a society are paying now for those health costs and deaths. So it's doable. This university should be in the leadership role on it, and I fully support the wonderful resolution as framed. Thank you.”

Professor Robert Strichartz: “Cornell's not alone. The divestment movement is a national movement, and other universities are taking up the subject now or in the near future. We heard recently that Syracuse University's going to take it up, Yale is discussing it, several -- I can't remember all the places.

“You should think of Cornell as being in the vanguard. We are leading this movement, and I ask you not just vote for this measure, but send that e-mail to all your friends at universities all over the country and ask them to bring up this idea at their universities.

“Let's be part of something that's bigger than Cornell that will have a much larger symbolic impact, even if it's only symbolic. If lots and lots of universities are doing this, maybe other non-profits, let's see if we can move this thing forward in a wider context, but let's vote for it today. Thanks.”

Professor Emeritus Richard Schuler, Department of Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: “This is the first senate meeting I've come to since I

retired five years ago, and I applaud the objective of the resolution before the body.

“Bob Howarth educated me 20 years ago about the dangers of global warming, and I think it is admirable that the university is trying to take a leadership role and move forward both in terms of its own operations to reduce the carbon footprint, but also through this action, move forward through the faculty demonstrating a leadership position.

“While I'm troubled about the possible cost to the university through the endowment, nevertheless I'm also reminded that if one takes a purely costless position, it many times has less of an impact on the larger public than it does if you have to bear real cost. And I don't think, for reasons that have at least been sketched out, the cost would be too tremendous.

“What does frustrate me about this resolution are some of the points that Peter Stein points to and I would identify it as the particular instrument. I'd be willing to express my moral support for a divestiture or an investment policy, if I thought it would move the companies and the society in the direction we'd like to see it move into, but I think just divesting from those companies that hold the largest amount of carbon, I don't see where that drives us.

“It's symbolic, but the real problem is the amount of carbon we consume and the need for the production of energy using devices that are based on renewable resources. And so it seems to me a more pointed instrument that focused on investment policies targeted on those companies might be far more successful, particularly if this became part of a broader national swell of guiding investment interest.

“If we divest, what are all the carbon-holding companies to do? They might eventually sell, but then what are the alternative companies going to do? And it seems to me it hasn't gotten us to the point we want, which is to reduce the use and the reliance on carbon-based fuels and energy and, more importantly, to encourage the development and production and use of renewable-based products.

“And so I think a far more selective kind of instrument would be much preferable than having us bear a cost with no potential reward, other than a symbolic victory. Thank you.”

Professor Richard Allmendinger, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "Let me say at the outset that I have no financial connections, research agreements or consulting arrangements with any energy companies, save what might be buried in my TIAA-CREF portfolio, but let's be frank.

"This discussion is about tactics. It is not a referendum on climate change, much as some would like to make it so. I'm deeply concerned about anthropogenic climate change and teach about it in my courses, but I believe this resolution is not just a poor tactic, but a counterproductive one for three fundamental reasons.

"First, while it's clear that anthropogenic climate change is occurring, what to do about it has many shades of gray. As educators who value the marketplace of ideas, we should highlight those shades of gray and not mislead our students that meaningful solutions to anything this complicated are either easy or simple.

"Second, the resolution demonizes just the companies and organizations that need to be involved in any effective solution to the climate and energy crisis. I would much prefer the approach of constructive engagement as championed by The Nature Conservancy and The Environmental Defense Fund.

"And third, and perhaps touching on the ethical issue, this resolution barely acknowledges the faculty's own complicity in global warming as consumers of fossil fuels, nor the role that the faculty must play in helping Cornell to achieve carbon neutrality, especially on an accelerated time table.

"The university already carries significant debt from past projects to reduce its carbon footprint which have been very successful, and a more concrete suggestion from the faculty would be to advocate not only for a nationwide carbon tax, but to insist that Cornell levy its own carbon tax on all faculty travel and commuting. We cannot expect our institution's companies or politicians to hold to a higher standard than we set for ourselves. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Comments? One down front here."

Professor Linda Nicholson, Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics: "So I'm one of the cosponsors of this resolution. I feel very strongly that we have to use every tool in our pocket right now. It is critical. Climate change has a very long time constant.

“The free market economy is highly responsive on a very short time scale, so we have to have foresight, we have to act in ways that will adjust our valuation of carbon and will impact the economy in a way that is meaningful on the time scale that we need to.

“To address Rick's last comment about holding faculty responsible, there is a movement in our surrounding counties, the town of Danby, the town of Caroline, they have collectively engaged in solar installation of solar systems on people's homes.

“I live in the town of Ithaca, and in 2010, I put in a 5-kilowatt system across my backyard, with great expense. It's much cheaper now, but I felt so strongly I went ahead with it. I also have a 32 collector that supplements my hot water. I live within two miles of the university, and I walk as much as I can.

“So I take it very seriously, as an individual, and I think that this resolution will raise awareness. I think that is an important aspect of this; that it raises awareness within our community, and it also hopefully will raise awareness with these companies to say no, we can no longer continue treating carbon in the ground as a cheap resource for energy.

“And my standard of living, I have to say, is quite nice, with my solar panels and domestic hot water. I think that we're not going to threaten our standard of living by acting in an ethical way. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Does anybody want to speak against the resolution at this point? Okay. We are going to make sure that everybody has a chance, before we come back for the second round. Go ahead.”

Professor Michael Fontaine, Department of Classics: “I am also the associate dean of the faculty, but I'm not speaking in that capacity. I think the carbon neutrality thing is a fantastic idea. I'm not sure what message -- and I agree it's symbolic -- the divestment is sending. It's like divesting from food companies because Americans are overweight. These are the suppliers.

“I hear the idea that reducing consumption, taxing ourselves, that seems to me the non-hypocritical way to achieve the goal that that resolution is trying to achieve.”

Speaker Walcott: "Comments from anybody who hasn't spoken yet? In the back."

Professor Michael Thompson, Department of Materials Science: "I want to kind of parallel these comments. I wished this had come forward as two separate resolutions. The concept of accelerating Cornell's approach to carbon neutrality by 15 years is fabulous.

"The second does seem very much like a symbolic statement to a group that we are not going to dramatically impact, and rather we could have the action of acting locally. You look around the university. We talk about energy alternatives, but in fact, this university could make a true impact by going to energy conservation and reduction of energy that we use, not just in travel and on personal, but on every office and every statement that we see around here, these rooms that are warm and these lights that are excessively used.

"The university could make a much stronger statement by pushing that and making a real effort to achieve that in 2020, 2035, whatever time we can push forward."

Speaker Walcott: "Microphone's coming on the other side of you. Thank you."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department and American Indian Program: "First of all, let me say that no one just said survival. I've heard ethics, I've heard morals, but this is a matter of survival. And we won't be around to have ethics or morals if climate change keeps going at the pace it's going.

"Second of all, I wouldn't underestimate the power of the symbolic. I'm from a literature department, and we're invested in that, and it has had historically profound effects. So I think the symbolic gesture is important.

"And third of all, a lot of these differences are not mutually exclusive. We can divest, we can turn to our own personal uses of energy in the way we operate personally, we can do all of these things. So they do not exclude divestment, which I think is a strong symbolic gesture that Cornell University could make. It would be heard, and so that is important in and of itself and does not preclude any of the other suggestions that we've heard today."

Speaker Walcott: "In the very, very far back."

Professor Greg Page, Department of Art, in Architecture, Art and Planning: “ Just listening to all the comments, I think it's going to hurt, it's going to really hurt, like everything else, like this debt has taken place hurts. All of what's been said, a lot of what has to happen, I think, is on a personal basis, whether China reduces their situation and other places to reduce their situations on the international and national basis.

“Personally, I support the resolution whole-heartedly. I think alternative energies have not been given the kind of support that they deserve and perhaps even could have to raise their position as the energy sources of the world.

“To help perhaps facilitate that, the divestment aspect spearheaded on by the universities, by individuals, can also help, I think, on a national level, to encourage national leaders and international leaders to help begin to see where this is a major issue and a major aspect of what can begin to change, because what we're talking about, it goes far beyond a lot of things.

“I mean, it deals with us as individuals, as human beings, how we want to live and what we want to do for our future. So I think it's a serious consideration. I would like to just go back and say again, the divestment aspect, and I think about what can perhaps happen with the energy companies that are doing fossil fuels.

“It will take another mind-set for them to think about what else they can do, how else they can help the world to reinvent themselves, how do we look at energy in a totally different way. It's another paradigm. It's a paradigm for us to think about, I would say again, as human beings, how we want to exist.

“So it has to start somewhere. The fossil fuel companies are where they are. The world is where it is. It's in a bad situation. We all know that and I think a lot of us would agree with that. It has to start in terms of the change somewhere. I think this is an interesting and good aspect of that change.

“And again, I will point out, I think the change in the thought about how energy exists is what -- and I will say it again, I don't think alternative energies have been given enough support and enough funding and enough type of attention on an international level to actually take their place.”

Speaker Walcott: “Is there anybody --”

Professor Delchamps: "I have a question. I feel like rain on a parade asking this question, but say we pass this resolution. It's not binding on anybody, correct? For example, President Skorton decided one day that he didn't want to invest in companies doing business in Darfur anymore and he basically told A.J. Edwards get rid of all our investments there. He can make that decision, but essentially we can't. Is that correct? I'm not sure."

Speaker Walcott: "Mr. Dean?"

"Over here. Professor Booker, sir."

Professor Ronald Booker, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior: "I see this as a symbolic gesture, as many others have commented on, but I think it's actually -- I guess the only thing I really feel a little uneasy about is what is the followup.

"And everyone's sort of made comments about how it's important that we pursue activities that are sustainable, and I'm wondering to what extent we can -- there really are two components to this: One is making, having a sustainable net zero campus by a certain date, divesting from funds at a certain rate that actually matches that, but is there a possibility of actually adding something that takes the funds that would have been used for investment and used them for sustainable energy projects?

"And also, another thing that doesn't happen very well on this campus -- I visited another campus recently, and everywhere around campus they advertise the fact that they were sustainable, and you don't really see it that much at Cornell. There was a sign that actually talked about how much energy they got from solar panels and wind and things of that sort.

"And to be honest, I wouldn't mind paying a carbon tax as a faculty member. That's another thing we could consider. What would happen if we all paid \$5 or \$10 or \$20 a year as employees of this campus to try to come up with ways to make this campus, this community -- because this is really a community effort. We can't just look at campus. We have to look at Ithaca and all the surrounding communities in an effort to encourage them to become more sustainable in terms of how we use energy.

"So from my point of view, I just see this as a beginning step. This is going to get more press than if Cornell invested \$1 million in sustainable projects; however,

it's important that when that press release is received by the various news agencies, that Cornell and any other institution that's trying to implement this policy talk about what they're going to do to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels.

"We are first and foremost an educational institution, and just saying we're going to divest isn't enough. We actually have to show and demonstrate to others how it is possible to obtain the goal. And I think that, to me, is the only thing that's really missing from this. It's a statement, but we're not showing how to get the job done at this point. And hopefully, that will happen through follow-up. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "I think we have time for one more comment."

Professor Elizabeth Sanders: "We have to think about politics here, and I think this discussion about symbolic action and -- just a bunch of red herrings flying around. It's about politics. It is about demonstrating grassroots commitment to this issue.

"In 2009, the House passed the carbon tax. We were in the middle of a deep recession. We are coming out of it now. It's about the creation of the grassroots movement. The apartheid movement started on university campuses. We could be at the forefront. It's a message to our politicians.

"Presidents and their secretaries are typically moving away -- towards something more positive -- we need to push President Obama, we need to have a movement of universities of students. He's especially sensitive to young people. Our students are certainly with us. They are much stronger than we are, but that's what this is about.

"It's about moving the political system, getting Obama to negotiate a strong climate change pact. China will do it, if we'll do it. China is way ahead of us in renewables, and much lower than us in fossil fuel consumption, so that's what we're doing here. We're making a movement. We're not just taking some idle symbolic gesture."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you. I think this is what -- all we can do for debate at this time. Do you have something?"

Unidentified Speaker: "Call for a roll call vote."

Speaker Walcott: "A roll call vote. How about we do the clicker vote? That, I guess, does not do for a --"

Unidentified Speaker: "The reason I'm recommending this is because at the dean's request that senators -- roll call vote has the purpose of allowing the departments to know how their senators --"

Unidentified Speaker: "I second the motion for roll call."

Speaker Walcott: "Moved and seconded. Can I just have a quick show of hands in favor of roll call? Opposed?"

"I would say the opposed wins.

"Then how should we proceed?"

[1] Associate Dean of the Faculty, Michael Fontaine: "Okay, so I'm going to go down the list. When I call your name, please say it loudly and clearly, "aye" or "nay." Aye means you support the [resolution](#).

[In response to a call from the audience for the resolution to be displayed on Powerpoint for the duration of the vote] "I'm sorry. People are -- sure. I'm not going to touch the computer myself, but I think we should. Aye means you are in favor of the resolution, you want it to pass. Nay means you oppose the resolution, you do not want it to pass.

"Okay, so everybody take maybe another 30 seconds to read it over, just to make sure you know what we're voting on, please."

Speaker Walcott: "Point of information.

"I did not count. I simply looked at the general preponderance, and the -- Mr. Dean, help me."

[1] Note from the Associate Dean of Faculty Michael Fontaine, February 10, 2014.

The transcript above is incomplete and may cause confusion. When Speaker Walcott declared the majority opposed, some audience members murmured disagreement (this was not captured by the audio tape). They thought the vote was actually either in favor of a roll call vote, or too close to decide. Dean Burns disagrees, writing "My recollection is that there was a distinct minority (maybe 20-30%) in favor

of the roll call but, as stated, in my mind that was plenty enough.” At any rate, as the transcript shows, Dean Burns’ decision to ask for a roll call vote rendered the issue moot.

Dean Joseph Burns: "I have looked at various other organizations, and frequently, if there's a 10% interest in a roll call vote, there will be one. And I checked with the parliamentarian, who said that, in fact, he thought if there were only one person who wanted a roll call vote, there should be one. So I'm deciding that we will go forward with a roll call vote."

Speaker Walcott: "It certainly was more than 10%."

Unidentified Speaker: "Yes. Much more."

Speaker Walcott: "Okay. Next slide."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Okay, I'm going to begin calling names."

"Lindsay Anderson: Aye.

N'Dri Assie-Lumumba: Aye.

Rosemary Avery: Abstain.

Kavita Bala: Nay.

Dan Barbash: Aye.

Chris Barrett: Nay.

Nina Bassuk: Nay.

Erica Behling-Kelly: Aye.

Yuri Berest: Aye.

Ron Booker: Aye.

Bruno Bosteels: Aye.

Tom Brenna: Nay.

Daniel Buckley: Aye.

Brian Chabot: Aye.

Eric Cheyfitz: Aye.

Ray Craib: Aye.

Brian Danforth: Aye.

Paul Dawson: Nay.

David Delchamps: Aye.

Melanie Dreyer-Lude: Aye.

Clare Fewtrell: Aye.

Carl Franck: Aye.

Ephraim Garcia: Nay.

Roger Gilbert: Aye.

George Hay: Nay.

Andrew Hicks: Aye.

Peter Hinkle: Aye.

Andre Kessler: Aye.
Dan Krall: Aye.
Van Dyk Lewis: Nay.
Rui Hai Liu: Aye
Marla Lujan: Aye.
Bonnie MacDougall: Aye.
Eugene Madsen: Aye.
Kathryn March: Aye.
Robert Masson: Abstain.
Lawrence McCrea: Aye.
Vicki Meyers-Wallen: Aye.
Richard Miller: Aye.
Ron Minor: Nay.
Lauren Monroe: Aye.
Linda Nicholson: Aye.
Phillip Nicholson: Aye.
Jeff Niederdeppe: Aye.
Gregory Page: Aye.
Bill Philpot: Aye.
David Pizarro: Aye.
Lars Rudstam: Aye.
Jeff Rusten: Nay.
Elizabeth Sanders: Aye.
Chris Schaffer: Aye.
Vimal Selvaraj: Nay.
Elke Siegel: Aye.
William Sonnenstuhl: Aye.
Michael Thompson: Nay.
Michael Tomlan: Aye.
Charlie Van Loan: Aye.
Joseph Wakshlag: Aye.
John Weiss: Aye
Michael Weiss: Aye.
Michael Tony: Nay.

Associate Dean Fontaine: "That's everyone on the sign-in sheet. Are there any senators here, voting senators whose name I didn't call? Okay. Give me a minute to tabulate them."

Speaker Walcott: "May I beg indulgence? We have one Good and Welfare speaker for five minutes. Are you willing to stay for five more minutes? Because I messed up the timing. I had not realized that we would have the roll call, so would our speaker for biomedical please come."

5. GOOD AND WELFARE SPEAKER: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING

Professor Larry Bonassar, Department of Biomedical Engineering: "I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the dean and speaker for letting me take some Good and Welfare time to tell you something we're very excited about in our department.

"So our department has spent several years in this process of developing an undergraduate program that we've recently discussed with our colleagues in the College of Engineering, and I wanted to accomplish a couple things very quickly. One is to tell you about the motivation behind this program and to tell you what we hope it will accomplish, and then fill you in on the timeline of the progress of this proposal.

"So there are three things that we think are motivating the development of an undergraduate bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering at Cornell at this time. One is clearly student demand, so we are very lucky. I wish I could tell you that we timed this this way, but just this semester that we are unveiling this program, there were two major media outlets, "U.S. News and World Report" and CNN that both came out with related studies talking about how biomedical engineering, in their estimation, was the top major for students who were interested in employment.

"So whether or not we believe these agencies as an arbiter of the truth or not, we know that people read them and that students read them and parents read them. And this is coupled with the fact that we are, unlike on the last resolution, we are not proposing something that would put us in the vanguard. In fact, just the opposite.

"The vast majority of our peer institutions have such programs. Whether we look at top engineering universities, whether we look at the other Ivies, when we look at the big ten plus, which is a peer group that the college of engineering values, essentially 90% or greater of our peer institutions have such programs. And in fact, we are very much playing catch up in this regard.

“And lastly, we think, particularly in the fields of engineering, traditional fields of engineering, where women and underrepresented minorities make up a relatively small fraction of both students and practitioners, that consistently, nationally, that both women and underrepresented minorities make up a larger fraction of biomedical engineering programs, and we think this is a way to diversify the college.

“So we can look very briefly at the objectives of the program. Biomedical engineering is somewhat unusual. It actually places its students in a wide variety of positions after graduation. There's a fair fraction that go to medical school, as well as to direct industrial practice and other education. And that is a very broad and, we think, very valuable program for the college and university.

“Additionally, biomedical engineering program is related to many priorities, both at the college and university, connecting with the medical school. We think there are opportunities with the tech campus. It's been also widely reported that the National Bureau of Labor Statistics has cited a significant deficit in the number of biomedical engineers that are needed in this country and the ones that are produced.

“If you look at the NLBS report, we need about 16,000 more biomedical engineers by the end of this decade. That exceeds the combined graduating class of the top 25 programs by about a factor of 2, not taking into account that only a third of them go into direct practice. So there's a national need for this kind of program. And again, we think that this will enhance the diversity.

“Here we are. Here's the reality. We've spent a significant amount of time formulating this program. What is off to the left on this slide is about the year and a half that we've invested in drafting the program. Over the course of the past semester, we have done quite a bit to socialize the program, as our dean calls it.

“We've presented this to the directors and chairs. We've presented it to the college's Common Curriculum Governing Board. We have presented it to six departments, which includes Biological and Environmental Engineering, which is not in our college. It's in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. We have taken input from all of these departments and included them into the proposal.

"The proposal, as it currently stands, was sent to the dean of the faculty in late November, in hopes to get it on the agenda for this meeting. Obviously there was a lot on the agenda, and we didn't quite make it. The reason why that's important is that we need the support of the senate or the faculty in general to present this to the board of trustees.

"We had a vote in the College of Engineering about a week ago that was overwhelmingly positive; over 90% in support of the proposal, and less than 4% opposed. And so we are hoping to get to the board of trustees as soon as we can.

"I realize the senate cannot vote today; but if the UFC can vote on the senate's behalf, we can move that to the board of trustees for the January meeting, which would allow us to send this out for external review, as is required by New York State, and we could get this to New York State hopefully in the spring.

"And the goal here is for us to enroll sophomores in the program in 2015. That's the way the college of engineering runs programs. They will be admitted as general engineering students and will affiliate in the fall of 2014.

"If we go to the last slide, the reason why this is somewhat urgent is that if we do not make the board of trustees meeting in January, this slips us back to late March, almost into April, which will put us several months behind and, in fact, endanger our ability to potentially roll this out in 2015, if New York State does not act quickly.

"So the purpose of this was to inform the senate of this. I realize that we're already over time, but I'm happy to take questions either in public or private."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you so much."

Dean Burns: "I'd like to just make two additional comments. The first concerns the timeline. It isn't that this was displaced by the importance of the topic that we discussed. It was just the November 24th, those of you who have calendars realize that's a Sunday, Sunday before Thanksgiving.

"So I got this on Monday, and we set our agenda the following Monday with Thanksgiving in between, so it just never got -- and it had to go to the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies, so ain't going to make it. Didn't make it, but we're enthusiastic. CAPP voted unanimously for it, as I say.

“And the other thing is, as we've already heard, the senate should vote on this in order to approve a new degree, but the UFC has the ability, when the senate is not in session, to act on matters, and so I will bring this to the UFC. Thank you. Everybody have a terrific holiday.

“We needed 45 for a quorum. We had 46 ayes, 13 nays and two abstentions. Have a great holiday still. Bye-bye.

(APPLAUSE)