

A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2012

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Steve Beer: "Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the November 14, 2012 meeting of the University Faculty Senate. I'd like to remind everyone here present to please turn off or silence anything that's likely to interrupt the proceedings, like a cell phone, a pager and so on; and I'd like to also remind everyone here that there will be no recording of our proceedings, either visually or audibly, other than by this microphone.

"And I'm speaking loudly this afternoon, because the PA system is not operative; and therefore, everyone who wants to be heard in this chamber today has to speak loudly. And before you speak, please be recognized, and then stand and loudly announce your name and affiliation.

"Now, all senators and senators only should have picked up a clicker, because we have several items that require clicking to indicate your approval or disapproval of the issue. We have no Good and Welfare speakers, so the extra eleven minutes may be devoted to other issues of the program. So at this time, Dean of the Faculty Joe Burns has some announcements, which he's going to make very loudly."

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM DEAN OF FACULTY AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dean Joe Burns, Dean of Faculty: "I grew up in a very large family. If you didn't speak loudly, you didn't eat, so I will speak loudly, I hope. I'd like to welcome you all to this November meeting. I hope this will be a meeting that's somewhat more leisurely than the last meeting was which was, I thought, a little hurried.

"We have started, and maybe we'll stop soon, but we are still in this role where we have this tradition, two meetings old, where you should look around, see if there's someone around you who you don't know, introduce yourself, so we get a little better feeling for the group that we're all part of, one faculty, even though we may be up there or over here. So please do so.

"Okay. So I'd like to just, as I have been doing, just go through the agenda a little bit, so you have an idea in advance of what's coming up. We will start off with

the usual report from Nominations and Elections, and then we'll have, I hope, the approval of the minutes of the last meeting.

“And then we have one resolution. The resolution concerns an amendment to the eCornell agreement, an agreement that was passed by the senate a dozen years ago. And as we have a slight amendment to that, and it could almost be viewed as bookkeeping, but at the time a dozen years ago, this was quite controversial, and I thought we should bring it back to the senate, to be sure that the faculty is on board with these new distance learning approaches as we approach the era of distance learning and MOOCs.

“So we'll have an opportunity to discuss this. This is coming from the UFC, presented by David Delchamps, distinguished member of the UFC. We'll have a brief report on one of the programs that will be using, if we approve the amendment, will be using eCornell in order for online courses that have been developed by the ILR School.

“And then finally on the agenda, I've asked Mary Opperman to come from -- she's the Vice President for Human Resources, to just tell us all about what her office does. She and I have been talking over the last few months, and we feel that the faculty and the HR staff could and should be working more together, more closely together, in order to try to improve faculty lives and the lives of the staff, and I think that we could more effectively speak to one another.

“And so this is the start of that dialogue, I hope, and I hope you'll view her attendance in that light. So let's get on with it. We have Michael Fontaine to do the Nominations and Elections.”

Speaker Beer: “The Associate Dean of the Faculty Michael Fontaine will give us a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee.

3. [REPORT](#) FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Associate Dean Michael Fontaine: “Good afternoon, everyone. We have 13 new appointees to --”

Speaker Beer: “I wasn't sure who was going to do that.”

Dean Burns: “Almost forgot the most important part of this, to introduce the new Weiss Fellows for this year. They have just been announced two weeks ago,

and I wanted to tell you a little bit about them. This is one of the real pleasant things that my job has, and I almost missed out on it.

“So we have Sheila Hemami from the College of Engineering, a professor of electrical engineering, and her research area's in the transmission of visual information, and is fairly mathematical. She's been here at the university for 18 years or so.

“And she always had a profound influence on education at Cornell, both by working with individual students, but as well as in reforming the curriculum within the Engineering College and the Electrical Engineering Department in particular, and she's made major efforts to advance the position of women in the field of engineering, and especially on the CU Advance Grant in the NSF. She's been a leader in that, so that's terrific.

“Our next winner is David Lipsky from Industrial and Labor Relations. David is the Easterbrook professor of dispute resolution, so if we need help later in the meeting, we can get his efficient help. He is a previous dean of ILR, for quite an extended term in the late '90s and early part of this millennium.

“And I went online to just look at some of the student comments, and they are just unbelievable. You know, "Made my Cornell and my IL experience totally." And there was a series of them that mentioned in the same sentence -- and this is hard to believe -- "world expert, fine teacher, and a gentleman." I mean, brought tears to my eyes, and probably to David's as well. Or laughs.

“And the last is, but not least, is Karl Niklas from the CALS, the Liberty Hyde Professor of Plant Biology. Again, just a renowned scientist and author of several texts, major works in his own field, but he cares very deeply about teaching. Again, quotes from the students: "Wonderful teacher and passionate lecturer, very caring of students. Niklas will stop lecturing next week. I will feel really sad." That's a real tribute.

“So I would -- I know Dave is here. Is Sheila or Karl in the audience? Well, Dave, why don't you stand up and take applause for all three of them.”
(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Now Associate Dean of the Faculty Michael Fontaine.”

Associate Dean Fontaine: "All right. Good afternoon, everybody. Briefly, we have 13 new appointees. They are up on the slides here, so you can -- I think we have power, too -- so Sean Nicholson on Benefits Committee, Jonathan Culler on the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments; Larry Blume for chair of Financial Policies Committee.

"On FABIT, Informational Technologies, Faculty Advisory Board, Andy Ruina from Engineering and Christopher Way from Arts and Sciences. For the Professor-at-Large Selection Committee, Richard Swedberg of Arts and Sciences.

"And then for University ROTC Relations, there's Mark Psiaki, Chair, College of Engineering; Charles Aquadro from Arts and Sciences, and Jeffrey Varner from Engineering. The Faculty Committee on Program Review, two new members: Geoffrey Coates from Arts and Sciences and Melissa Hines, Arts and Sciences. Lastly, on the University Hearing and Review Board, we have Durba Ghosh, College of Arts and Sciences, and Angela Cornell, Law School.

"And I'm going to take this opportunity briefly to ask you, if you have colleagues who want to get involved more on some of these committees, do please get in touch, because it's not always easy finding people, and we tend to ask the same people over and over, probably that includes a lot of you already. So do let me know or someone else on the Nominations and Elections Committee know if you have good suggestions. Thank you."

NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT NOVEMBER 14, 2012

Benefits Committee (UBC)

Sean Nicholson, College of Human Ecology

FACTA Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA)

Jonathan Culler, College of Arts & Sciences

Financial Policies Committee (FPC)

Lawrence Blume, **Chair**, College of Arts & Sciences

Information Technologies Faculty Advisory Board (FABIT)

Andy Ruina, College of Engineering
Christopher Way, College of Arts & Sciences

Professor-at-Large Selection Committee

Richard Swedberg, College of Arts & Sciences

University-ROTC-Relationships Committee (URRC)

Mark Psiaki, **Chair**, College of Engineering
Charles Aquadro, College of Arts & Sciences
Jeffrey Varner, College of Engineering

Faculty Committee on Program Review

Geoffrey Coates, College of Arts & Sciences
Melissa Hines, College of Arts & Sciences

University Hearing and Review Board

Durba Ghosh, College of Arts & Sciences
Angela Cornell, Law School

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. It now appears that the PA system, at least this microphone, is operational. Are the roving microphones operational?"

David Kingsley, CIT: "Yes."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 10, 2012 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: "Good. Thank you. So the next item is the approval of the minutes of the October University Faculty Senate meeting. Any additions or corrections to those minutes? Seeing none, now it's time to practice clicking, so please turn on your clicker.

"Okay, so now I believe the clicking apparatus is operational, and the idea is you click A to approve the minutes, you click B to not approve the minutes, and you click C to abstain from action on the approval of the minutes."

Audience: "It is not working."

Speaker Beer: "Sometimes it's very convenient to have a few extra minutes for the agenda."

"Okay, now A to approve -- not registering yet.

"Let's assume you have an additional 15 seconds for clicking, and then we'll view the results in five seconds. Congratulations. The body has overwhelmingly approved the minutes of the October meeting.

(LAUGHTER)

"If only all issues were decided so easily. Okay, so now we have the first real order of business or important order of business, the consideration of a resolution offered by the University Faculty Committee, and David Delchamps will present that resolution. We will have questions and discussion, and then voting on it by clicker.""

5. UFC RESOLUTION ON AN AMENDMENT TO THE ECORNEL AGREEMENT

UFC Resolution on an Amendment to the eCornell Agreement

WHEREAS *the Faculty Senate Resolution of December 13, 2000, endorsed an agreement (dated 11/14/00) between Cornell University and Tower Innovative Learning Solutions (TILS), Inc., a New York State business corporation (for which Cornell is the sole shareholder and which is licensed to do business as "eCornell"); and*

WHEREAS *the aforementioned resolution carried a proviso that "The Senate should be informed of any future change of status... [including] ...the expansion of the entity's programs..."; and*

WHEREAS *the Rationale of the aforementioned resolution also mentions that "The current version of the agreement prohibits eCornell from offering courses that could receive Cornell credit"; and*

WHEREAS *many commercial and educational entities are marketing, producing and distributing online courses; and*

WHEREAS Cornell University and TILS would like to amend the overarching agreement so that eCornell can compete with other online vendors; and

WHEREAS the proposed amendment does not authorize eCornell to offer its own for-credit courses or degrees but only allows the provision of its services to existing academic units that are already authorized to offer online course credit; and

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following amendment to the overarching agreement between Cornell University and Tower Innovative Learning Solutions, Inc.:*

“University will retain eCornell on a non-exclusive basis to provide services in connection with credit-bearing distance learning courses as provided in a separate Administrative Support Services Agreement.”

11/14/2012

David Delchamps, Senator, Electrical & Computer Engineering: “Too bad I don't get to use my acting voice to speak loudly. Anyway, do we have a motion, the whereases and all that stuff? Okay, because I will refer a couple of those. “So where did this motion come from? Back in 2000, we, the faculty, or we, Cornell and eCornell, signed what we call an overarching agreement about the relationship between eCornell and Cornell. And you know, I don't want to go into the details of that.

“ECornell is actually a private company that Cornell owns most of, whatever, but part of that overarching agreement was that eCornell was forbidden from participating in online educational activities that resulted in Cornell credits being granted to people, either students in residence or other people.

“And we also, the senate also passed a kind of a rider to that later on in the fall semester of 2010, that said that we expect that things are going to change over the years and we invite eCornell and Cornell to come to us with possible amendments to this overarching agreement, including but not limited to perhaps allowing eCornell to participate in educational endeavors that offer Cornell credits.

“Well, as the years went by, eCornell went humming along, offering courses not for Cornell credit, developing working relations with colleges, notably ILR School, and everyone was living happily. In 2010, the provost convened a

committee chaired by Harry Katz -- I think they called it the eCornell task force -- to sort of reassess the overarching agreement we signed back in 2000 and see what, if any, amendments we might want to introduce.

“And they came up with a few ideas; one of which was, indeed, allowing eCornell to participate in activities that offered credit for online education to Cornell people, Cornell students and others. As you know, in the ensuing years, from 2000 until 2010, a lot has happened in the online education world.

“And at Cornell, people have been offering four credit courses online through other providers. Not eCornell. eCornell's not allowed to do that, but other providers are. And for example, in my department, there's a BEE class, Biological Environmental Engineering class that our students in ECR routinely take for credit. It's online only, something like Engineering Sustainable World. There are a lot of courses in ILR offered for credit online through other providers.

“And if you look at the 2012-2013 winter session menus, it lists no fewer than 18 credit courses offered online, including some work horses like Intro Microeconomics, Intro Macroeconomics, Intro Political Philosophy, things like that. So meanwhile, everybody else is allowed to play, but eCornell isn't.

“Now, the purpose of this motion essentially is not just to level the playing field, but to let eCornell onto the playing field for the first time, as a competitor, as an online education provider, who's allowed to participate in online educational endeavors that result in Cornell credits for people. That's the gist of the motion.

“Why now? Why are we doing it today? Well, not only because that task force recommended it a short time ago and, in fact, it was kind of on our radar last year, but I don't know why it never came up -- okay, that's one reason.

“Another reason is that ILR is proposing a new degree, a new master professional studies degree that Tom Cleland from the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies is going to talk to you about after I'm done with this, and that degree is going to feature a blended experience for students, including some online, for credit and some in-person stuff at Cornell, and it's actually going to result in a degree, not just credit.

“So the thing is, ILR over the years has developed a really tight working relationship with eCornell, and some of the courses in this MPS program are

already offered not for credit with eCornell. So it would be really smooth and easy to be able to have eCornell continue this wonderful relationship with ILR, or at least compete for the right to do so, and this amendment that we're proposing would take care of that. And as you can see, there's the usual list of whereases.

"By the way, Committee on Academic Program Policies not only considers the ILR degree, but also talked about this amendment that hopefully the senate will pass, which would enable that degree to proceed smoothly.

"So there's one thing I wanted to allude to here. The second one, it says, "Whereas the aforementioned resolution carried a proviso the senate should be informed of any change of status." That kind of sounds like all we need to do is hear about it; but there's actually another clause in that proviso that university counsel's office has interpreted it to say indeed the senate does have approval authority over these kind of amendments.

"And so we thought it was a really good idea to bring it here and present it to you and get a vote on it. So all the rest of it is pretty much just legal -- the actual wording of the amendment is something we didn't touch, because that was between -- I don't know who the entities were that put that together, but it's legal, contractual kind of writing, and that's why it reads the way it does. It is this: University will retain Cornell on a non-exclusive basis.

"And that's all I have to say. I'd be happy to answer any questions, if people have. John? Oh, I forgot the speaker's supposed to --"

Speaker Beer: "The microphone is now operational, Vice Provost."

John Siliciano, Senior Vice Provost: I have been running point for this in the provost's office. David's presentation was excellent. Just wanted to add a little more context. This was, I think, had gone all the way through both committees in the UFC a year or two ago, and it simply didn't make it onto the senate agenda because of other items, then it came to the end of the year. And so we are bringing it forward again.

"Just a bit of historical context, when the senate had concerns twelve years ago, what it was worried about was that eCornell itself would go into the business of granting credit or the business of offering degrees, and the senate completely justifiably was concerned that it was not part of the Cornell academic structure,

and it therefore should not be -- that's the origin of this prohibition, that it's not an academic unit.

"The current resolution is here out of an abundance of caution, and we wanted to bring it for you, so that you understood that we are not trying in any way to get around that prohibition. It's still in full force. eCornell cannot be in the business of offering its own credit or offering degrees.

"What this allows instead is for eCornell to get around what was really an unintended consequence of the language of the original resolution. This allows it simply to provide its basic services, and you can see that it's actually on the next page, but it allows it to provide its marketing, production, support services to academic units that already can do this, already can provide online for credit instruction, so that it can compete with all the other commercial providers that are already being used.

"If we don't amend it, it means that we're not able to use one of the best service providers out there, eCornell, and the money will go somewhere else, other than back to our wholly owned entities. So we're simply trying to undo what was an unintended prohibition. Thanks."

Speaker Beer: "Thanks. Any other questions? The gentleman in the blue."

Professor Carl Franck, Senator, Physics: "Can anyone explain when the university needs to have a relationship with a business like this? What's the threshold for when you need to have this? I mean, I do not quite understand the rationale of why we have to be the shareholder and so forth."

Senator Delchamps: "I don't think it's a "have to" kind of thing. I think back in 2000, there wasn't a whole lot -- Cornell's been kind of diddling around with the idea, had been diddling around with the idea of various distance learning frameworks for a long time, and I actually dug up an old document, a glossy pamphlet from around 1992 called The Cornell Education Network. They even had a nice CEN logo.

"This is pre-Internet, folks. The Cornell courses on TV. That is how we're going to get out there to the masses. Online education was sort of bubbling up at the end of the '90s and around 2000, and we thought hey, it would be nice if we could get into that business.

"And I think the way people thought of it was well, maybe the university doesn't want to quite do it as a university, as an academic entity, but maybe if we have this private company that provides services and content arrangement and delivery systems and all that sort of thing, that we could profit from their profits if we own them, then everything they make goes right into our -- I think that was the thinking of establishing this. And keeping it separate was strategic from a faculty approval standpoint.

"And if you had been in the room back then in 2000, I mean, there was a lot of people who were ready to go to the wall to defend Cornell credits from any kind of online presentation. And that's part of the reason the original agreement was worded so strongly, enjoining eCornell from doing things like that, but I don't think it's so much we had to do this, but it was something that Cornell wanted to get into, somehow or other, and this was a way they did it that didn't sort of pollute our academic instrument."

Speaker Beer: "Any other questions of information? Professor Lieberwitz, yeah, in the center rear."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. "I understand the rationale for the resolution. And in terms of context, it also had to do with the fact that eCornell was a for-profit corporation and there was concern about quality control and not having a for-profit corporation giving courses for credit.

"So it's a long history, as people pointed out, but I find it a little odd to have the senate vote on an administrative support services agreement, when we don't know what that means or what's in it or whether there's anything assuring that content and teaching and anything in the academic realm would be controlled by academic departments, as opposed to eCornell."

Senator Delchamps: "Right there, Risa, is where we were trying to plug that into the motion."

Professor Lieberwitz: "It is in the whereases, but we are not voting on whereases. The senate is voting --"

Senator Delchamps: "But that whereas refers to language in the existing overarching agreement."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Which language?"

Senator Delchamps: "The language that does not authorize, in fact de-authorizes Cornell. I think Joe put that in the motion so that -- just to remind us that that was there already."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Seems like it belongs in the resolution; because otherwise, it's completely unclear and it's still unclear to me what this separate administrative support services agreement is and what's included in it, where you are asking the senate to approve something about retaining eCornell, as provided in a separate administrative support services agreement, but we don't know what that is."

Senator Delchamps: "Frankly, UFC doesn't either, actually. I literally cut and pasted it right off of the contract."

Professor Lieberwitz: "But I think it's odd to vote on something if we don't know what's in it. I mean, call me crazy, but, you know, seems like we should know what the senate is voting on."

Speaker Beer: "David, could I ask a clarifying question? Based on the resolution that the body will be voting on, are we not -- are you not suggesting that the administrative support service agreement is part of the resolution?"

Senator Delchamps: "I can't give a good answer to that, actually. I literally --"

Speaker Beer: "Maybe the vice provost can."

Vice Provost Siliciano: "So I understand the question, Risa, and you don't have the administrative support agreement in front of you. I didn't know how this was going to be presented here. It's a lawyer's document, as was mentioned. It's about ten pages long; it's a technical amendment to the underlying eCornell agreement, which is many more pages long."

"I can testify from memory -- and obviously, there's a credibility issue -- but what it does emphatically is make clear that all content issues belong entirely to the academic side and eCornell has no authority over content grading, evaluation, all of the things that are within the normal scope of the faculty in terms of education. And then it lists what eCornell does, which is marketing, production, all the management things."

"It may be useful -- is Chris Proulx here? Chris is the director of eCornell, and maybe you could speak more directly to that division. Again, I know I'm orally reporting, but it is an agreement that, if it was up there, would be very clear that it is maintaining this critical distinction between the obligation of the academic side to maintain all the pedagogical aspects of online delivery, and eCornell is quite simply a service provider. It is one of the available providers to do what the units are already using to put -- so maybe, Chris, you could say more."

Chris Proulx, Director of eCornell: "Thank you, John. I think the description is accurate. I would also add one other element, which also is not in front of you; but in the original overarching agreement, there's another clause that specifically says eCornell cannot provide academic credit.

"So that clause is not being amended by what you have in front of you, so we're simply removing this kind of unintended consequence. The agreement is very much, I would say, essentially it is an agreement that outlines the role of the university, which is to provide content, quality assurance, faculty oversight and so on, and our role to provide the sort of administrative services that go with that.

"It requires then still, for any program that's going to occur as a result of that agreement -- so if you were to also approve the ILR project, we would then have to do a separate agreement with ILR that would make very specific the services that ILR actually wanted to use us for in that particular case.

"So it's very much a framework agreement that simply outlines the kind of key roles, which is then subject to a separate agreement between a particular unit and eCornell, which is true in the noncredit side as well. So then those agreements require approval of the university counsel, which would be able to review it over the overarching agreement.

"So I believe with university counsel being sensitive to making sure that we were really just changing this small additional piece, which speaks to allowing us to sort of compete on a non-exclusive basis."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, are we ready for debate? Or are there still questions of information? Okay, I assume we are ready for debate. And Professor Howland."

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Cornell Association for Professors Emeriti (CAPE). "It seems to me that we understand what the motion should have said,

and I think what we need is to have the motion say that. I don't think it's a big deal to take what we've heard and put it into words and bring it back to us, unless there's something terribly urgent about having to do it today. That's my thought."

Speaker Beer: "So I think the question that's raised is whether the wording of the resolution is sufficient at this point, and whether -- if the resolution is amended to include more specifically that wording, whether that's a substantive amendment or it's a clarifying amendment.

"And the rules of the senate require that substantive amendments must be distributed before -- I believe a day before the senate meeting, so the speaker could rule on the -- on whether or not a proposed rewording would be substantive or not. Or the body could decide, or the UFC, if appropriate, could withdraw the resolution until the December meeting. And I will ask the presenter to please decide which the UFC would like to do."

Senator Delchamps: "Well, I haven't heard an amendment, so I can't pass judgment on its substantivity, if that's a word."

Emeritus Howland: "Point of order. I didn't make a --"

Senator Delchamps: "Can I make a plea in return? I'm wondering what you would like to see. And you said what has been said needs to be said, and I'm wondering that what has been said isn't there that is important?"

Speaker Beer: "Could you speak into the microphone, Professor Howland?"

Emeritus Howland: "Howard Howland again. I don't think I can rehash the assurances that we've gotten, but I think you have heard what those assurances were. And all I'm asking is, along with Professor Lieberwitz, that those be put into the motion."

Senator Delchamps: "Okay, my response to that is the following: The existing overarching agreement contains all that language, as does the ten-page legal document referred to as the administrative support services agreement. In the motion, we have a whereas that reminds us that that wording exists in existing stuff; and therefore, I think it's sufficient the way it is. That's my personal opinion."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Lieberwitz."

Professor Lieberwitz: "It seems to me this is a substantive amendment, and it's important substance. It is not an issue of trusting or believing what anybody says. It's just that this says a separate administrative support services agreement. It doesn't say as agreed on a particular date. We don't have any specificity. We just know it is a separate agreement.

"And so it seems that if we are to do this correctly, if the senate is to do it correctly, it should know what's in the separate agreement. I mean, the thing of it's a lawyers' agreement; I'm a lawyer, so it being a lawyer's agreement doesn't impress me one way or the other.

"I think that we can all read it, so maybe we should have the agreement available to everybody as an appendix, and something in there that refers to a particular agreement that the senate is being asked to approve. Otherwise, I just don't think people can really vote with full knowledge."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Cleland, in the front, please."

6. REPORT FROM ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE (CAPP)

Professor Thomas Cleland, Psychology and Chair, Academic Programs and Policies Committee: "So we looked at this in some detail, along with the ILR program, and I think in some ways we are getting attracted by things that aren't really at the level this body should be addressing.

"At present, as a whole, as a university, we are a lot more comfortable with distance learning, including distance learning for credit than we were in 2000. And as was pointed out, there are already several individual course-specific administrative support agreements with a number of different private corporations to deliver Cornell credit online, none of which are eCornell because of this historical point of order in the original document.

"So the text at the bottom here is simply saying that it already implicitly says university will retain these other six companies on a non-exclusive basis to provide services to connection with credit-bearing distance learning, et cetera; for historical reasons that were not intentional at the time, eCornell is specifically excluded from that list, although it is really just another one of these corporations, with a special rider that should be a positive that's it's owned by us.

“So in other words, nothing new is going to happen in terms of dissemination of Cornell credits that isn't already happening via corporations not owned by Cornell. So nothing new is happening, and these administrative support services agreements are the technical details that are determined individually for each proposed course to be delivered by a department or a field via one of these service providers, including -- well, not yet including eCornell.

“So I think that in some ways, it's a really small detail, although an important one, because it relied on a previous senate resolution. I don't think it has the moral magnitude that we are ascribing to it right now.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, so it seems we are in the debate mode at this point. And the gentlewoman in the purple, near the rear.”

Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Biomedical Sciences, Veterinary Medicine and Senator:
“So I'm not ready to vote on this. I don't know what I'm voting on. I'm willing to vote on the part that says that -- which is in the whereas, that it can offer your own for-credit courses or degrees that we already have now, but that's not what we are voting on. We are voting on the bottom three sentences, which don't say that.

“So I'm not a lawyer, but I think I can read the administrative support services agreement. I would like to see a date there, I would like to see something specific, so we know what document we are voting on; but we need to see it or you need to change this so that we can vote on one specific thing that we all agree on. I think the UFC bears responsibility for that, and I think they should do it.”

Speaker Beer: “Professor Stein, please.”

Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics. “I have been sitting and listening to this debate, and I don't have a side in it, but it does seem to me that what I've heard is certain concerns that people have, and then reassurances that those concerns are unwarranted.

“And I think that the quickest way to dispose of this -- and I would have done it, if I had the power to do it -- would simply be to refer it back to committee, asking them to, in light of the issues that have been raised here, to return a month from now with a document which addresses them.

“And if more than half the people have those concerns, then they could vote yes. And if more than half the people think that it's clear and the reassurances are all that's required, then they can vote against it, and then one can have a vote; but as I say, I can't move that.”

Speaker Beer: “Just as an aside, a senator may move that. Gentleman near the rear. Would you please rise and identify yourself.”

Professor Ronald Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior and Senator: “Just a little concerned, because I'm not quite sure what's going on here. I think people are afraid of loss of control of the process in terms of how we actually present online courses at Cornell; but in reality, the discussion around this is suggested that we've already lost control of it.

“In other words, if I start a company tomorrow, I can come to Cornell, and without any real sort of presentation to the faculty in how it should be done, strike a deal, contract with a unit on campus. This particular process probably gives you more control than ever, and all it's basically saying at this point is they should be allowed to offer online courses for credit.

“I think the key issue would be is there anything in the agreement that exists between the university and eCornell that gives us the ability in the future to re-examine the contracts that are put together by eCornell and, if you actually have a better opportunity, go in and influence that process, you should want this to be your exclusive provider of content at Cornell; because with these other independent companies, you have less impact on the process itself.

“You may actually end up with less of an influence on the process of how Cornell actually deals with this particular enterprise, because it is an enterprise. And I think maybe what we are really starting to suggest or talking about is actually doing a closer examination of the process and whether or not we want these independent companies to be involved. And that's a completely different issue than the one we are dealing with here.

“We could vote on this and then ask to re-examine whether or not we really want these non-Cornell affiliated enterprises to be dealing with this. In terms of income for the university, it might make sense to make eCornell the exclusive provider of online content.

“So I think, from what I can see and hear, this is a relatively minor point that actually illuminates much broader, important questions that we should probably be trying to examine in the future.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a member of the body that wishes to address the issue? The gentleman in the front, in the black sweater.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English, American Indian Program and Senator: “It seems to me that aside for the moment that the real debate or anxiety -- maybe I'm wrong -- is the horse is already out of the barn about distance learning and that the debate that, as far as I know -- I have been here ten years -- never took place about whether Cornell would support distance learning in general.

“Apparently it's been decided department by department, so there you go. I mean, that on the face of it seems to me, given the fact that distance learning is already happening, expresses to me what the parameters of control are.

“I wouldn't mind seeing the administrative support services agreement either, and I can understand people's concerns about that; but seems to me, the major debate -- and it's coming up again with MOOCs, and for which we need a real debate, I hope, not just PR, which seems to me what we've had so far about MOOCs. So that's what I wanted to say.”

Speaker Beer: “Gentlewoman near the aisle, two-thirds of the way back, please.”

Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine, Senator and a member of the UFC. “I basically agree with what both Risa and Vicky Meyers-Wallen said. We spent, as UFC members, a huge amount of time discussing this motion that we didn't really know what it was.

“We obtained the reassurances that we have and, as a result of that, I think are convinced that motion should be approved; however, as I think it's clearly been stated, the motion doesn't say what we are all prepared to agree with. It's in the whereases.

“So I think that had we had all those reassurances before we had our discussion, we'd have had a much shorter meeting, and I think that would have been true here also. And I certainly would like to see a motion that states what we'd like to do rather than that we agree with some agreement that none of us have actually seen.”

Speaker Beer: "If the speaker could make a comment, I think it's in order now either to consider the question or to consider an alternative motion, as our time is fleeting. The gentleman in the front."

Professor Larry McCrea, Asian Studies and Senator: "Seems to me there's two separate issues here. One is the content of the administrative support services agreement, which we're not voting on. Even if we read it, we still wouldn't be voting on it.

"Presumably, two years or five years down the road, if whoever is in charge of forming the agreement decided to renegotiate the agreement, it could be done and they wouldn't have to come to us for a vote. Seems to me, at least what I felt, the anxiety was, is what's in that second whereas there some people feel should be part of the motion.

"Now, you said this is already implicit in what was decided before, and that's just reminding us. Perhaps, if it's acceptable to make what I would take to be a clarifying amendment, simply remove the content of that whereas into the text of the actual motion, which should be clarifying what's already the case, according to what you have said. So if I can move that, I'll move that."

Speaker Beer: "So you are moving to amend the resolution by including the --"

Senator McCrea: "In the text of the resolution, it should say the proposed amendment does not authorize eCornell to offer its own credit courses or degrees, et cetera. Simply move that from the whereas to the main body of the resolution."

Speaker Beer: "Okay. Is that the understanding -- is the proposed amendment understood by the body?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Point of order. That's not legal, I think. You need -- make a substantive amendment."

Speaker Beer: "I believe the gentleman is offering what he considers a non-substantive amendment."

Senator McCrea: "We have been told that's simply reminding us of what is already the case and would continue to be the case, even if we approve this motion; which if so, I think it should be a clarifying amendment. We simply

reaffirm the principle that already holds that eCornell cannot offer its own courses and can only offer services to Cornell departments that are already entitled to offer credit courses.”

Speaker Beer: “Since our parliamentarian is present, I’ll ask the parliamentarian to please opine on the substantive nature or non-substantive nature of the proposed amendment before it’s considered.”

Emeritus Stein: “Yeah, that’s always a tricky point. (LAUGHTER)

“It certainly sounds to me like it’s substantive. Many people argue that it isn’t substantive because they know what’s in another document, but it does seem to me that it’s a substantive amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. The speaker will accept the parliamentarians ruling; and therefore, the amendment is not in order. And so what’s the alternative? The body can overrule the speaker’s decision, or a senator can move to table the issue or refer it back to the committee. So since Professor Howland raised this, I’ll ask him to speak to it again.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “I move it be referred to committee.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. Motion has been made to refer it back to the University Faculty Committee. There a second?”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.”

Speaker Beer: Several seconds. All those in favor, raise your right hand. Opposed? The speaker sees more hands in favor of referring it to committee than being opposed. So therefore, University Faculty Committee has something else to do, in case it didn’t have enough.

“So now, technically, we should go to the next issue, but since this motion has been referred back to the committee, I’ll ask Professor Cleland, who’s chair of the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies, whether he wishes to present his motion on behalf of the committee or not at this point.”

Professor Cleland: “It is a report -- it would make more sense to be --”

Speaker Beer: "Okay, so we will proceed with the motion from the Committee of Academic Programs and Policies, but we will not vote on it, because the enabling legislation has not been passed."

7. [REPORT](#) ON ILR BLENDED MPS DEGREE IN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Professor Cleland: "Thanks, Steve. So this is actually not a motion. It is a CAPP report. This has actually already gone, as it's been hanging on the eCornell issue a bit, this motion by itself has actually already gone through the trustees.

"The idea is if the eCornell does -- I don't know this for sure. I should refer it to ILR -- but if the eCornell thing does not pass, then this will take place via another vendor, which is administratively complicated, but obviously would be the way to go. So by itself, this is a new Executive Master of Professional Studies in Human Resources proposed by the Industrial Labor Relations.

"So CAPP has approved it. I will tell you a little bit about it, because it relates to the ongoing eCornell debate. It's an interesting blend of on-site and distance learning components to serve the interests and needs of a class of people who are working professionals in industry who want to go back to school to retain credentials for higher levels of human resource management in their career; but because they're still working, they don't get to just come work for a semester at Cornell.

"This program actually blends a small number -- three at this point -- of week-long intensive on-campus learning elements, coupled with background source material, delivered via distance learning. The proposal is to do it through eCornell, because as referred to earlier, it uses class components that are currently supplied via the eCornell vendor for noncredit-related issues, but that's the detail.

"As far as the program goes, CAPP has no concerns with it and has approved it and, as I mentioned, so have the trustees. What remains contingent upon the eCornell issue is what vendor will be used to physically deliver the distance learning component to the computers of the students. Any questions?"

Speaker Beer: "Right. We have several minutes that can be used for questions and discussions relative to the resolution, which will be formally presented at some other time."

Professor Cleland: "There is no resolution. This is --"

Speaker Beer: "Approval. Right."

Professor Cleland: "Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "Well, you do have one questioner."

Professor Lieberwitz: "It's me again. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. This is not about the program per se, because there isn't that much about it.

"I know about the program, of course, but it seems to me that one of things that the prior discussion raised was that regardless of the vendor that might be used to help deliver the content on a technical level, that it might be a very good idea, perhaps through the UFC or some other committee, to actually look to see what are the agreements that exist with other vendors and are the kinds of protections that we heard are in this agreement that, I guess, the faculty will see, are those kinds of protections built into other vendors' agreements as well.

"Because whether this MPS program is done through eCornell or someone else, seems those are substantive protections that will go to quality control of courses, make sure they are offered by academics, that academics teach them as opposed to people who teach noncredit courses for eCornell or another vendor.

"I mean, all those kinds of thing that go into a committee like CAPP approving a blending program like this. So I don't know if you all talked about that, but seems like it's not just, as people pointed out, just eCornell now. It is a question of if we use vendors to deliver material, are we writing in protections that deal with academic freedom and academic control by the academic faculty."

Professor Cleland: "My entire engagement with this has been predicated on the idea that the eCornell and the other distance learning vendors are essentially the AV guys, except in a larger and broader scale. To my knowledge, none of the distance learning credit courses offered by Cornell are offered by any units other than academic departments, and it's simply a mode of delivery.

"If there's any counterexample, I would like to hear about it, but my understanding is it's never been a question of a vendor overstepping their bounds and branding something they cook up in their own basement as a Cornell course or any other sort of breach of the academic technical divide."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I am not saying they have. I'm just saying our discussion has raised, I think, a relevant point to say whether its eCornell or somebody else, and we have agreements with them, that probably building into those agreements -- maybe it's already in there. I don't know, but it might be a good idea for us to know that agreements with vendors, in fact, make that line very clear."

Professor Cleland: "Seeing as eCornell will come up again, maybe it's wise for administration and counsel to provide just some of that information to the senate. That is not my business, but I'll just echo what you said."

Speaker Beer: "Any other questions? The two gentlemen on the aisle, one after the other."

Professor Gregory Poe, Dyson School of Management and Senator: "Is my understanding correct that this is the first degree program? Is that different, or am I completely --"

Professor Cleland: "No, I don't believe so."

Professor Poe: "Johnson School has a degree program?"

Professor Cleland: "Yeah, that came through us -- sorry. We learned about that. That was actually before my time, but it was one of the examples, yeah. I have seen it post hoc, yeah."

Professor Richard Miller, Philosophy and Senator: "This isn't at all a challenge, and not really a question, but just request. I think what's emerging is that many of us really don't know about the world of online resources and possibilities at Cornell. Some of us know a great deal. Some of us are like me, a lot of us are like me and don't know anything.

"So we both don't know what to worry about, but we also don't know what to think about taking advantage of. I think the work the committees have done is terrific and the forum on MOOCs was terrific, but the senate is the place where people from many departments are forced to go to once a month, and also we bring back what we hear to departments throughout Cornell.

"So my suggestion is that it would be very positive if there were to be a half hour or even 40 minutes set aside to briefly present the actual situation of online

learning resources and programs at Cornell. We can then voice our worries and also our hopes and that might be a good way of informing future discussions.”
Speaker Beer: “Okay, thank you. I think we have to move on to the next item on the agenda. Thank you very much, Professor Cleland.

“So now we have the Vice President for Human Resources to address the issue of faculty work life, and I believe Vice President Opperman has a presentation, and then we'll entertain some discussion.”

8. CONVERSATION ABOUT [FACULTY WORK-LIFE](#)

Mary George Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources: “For those of you who haven't noticed, it is actually not 2013.

(LAUGHTER)

“That is what happens when you put your presentations together in the middle of the night. This one?”

Speaker Beer: “Both of them.”

Vice President Opperman: “I thought that was the light. So I don't have anything that starts with "whereas," and I was kind of hoping we could use the clickers for something, but I guess it's -- and I was hoping to maybe smash this gavel at 6:00. I don't think so. So I won't do that either, but thank you very much for having me.

“I appreciate the fact that Joe asked me to come here. We were talking about the fact that too often I think the Division of Human Resources is thought of as a service provider primarily for staff, and we have actually a lot more staff than faculty on the campus. So maybe that's mostly a volume thing, but I know a lot of you, and we're there to provide services to you as well.

“So we thought we'd start this conversation off -- I really need to get away from the fact that I wrote 2013 there, but I can't do it her.

“So I thought we'd go quickly through roles, talk about some of the things in my unit and remind you a bit about our roles, and then move on to some of the services we provide, some of the things we are thinking about and worried about, and then talk just a little bit about some of the things the staff are thinking about as well, and then open it up for questions.

“So in the division, we used to be the Division of Human Resources; and then in 2009, it was a little boring, and so we became the Division of Human Resources and Safety Services. So just a quick reminder of what that is; we have inclusion and workforce diversity within that unit, we do affirmative action diversity, and we also do work in family.

“Many of you know Linda Croll Howell over there. She is the EA representative. She is one of the individuals, professionals in that area. Then there is the broad area of Human Resources. There is a whole lot of departments in there. I'm not going to go through those, but the ones that you all might know the most is big area of benefits.

“Talk a little bit about benefits later, but many of you know that we actually run two different sets of benefits at Cornell. We have the benefits that are run through and supported by the State, and those are for the contract colleges, people on the contract side; and then we have what we call the private or endowed side or private side benefits, and we'll talk a little bit about those as well.

“And then we have an area called academic personnel policy that we run, and that's all the policies that support our faculty and academic non-professorial staff, as well as some other departments. Then in my division as well, probably a good thing to know, is the Cornell University Police Department. By the way, we do not have parking, in case you were wondering. (LAUGHTER)

“And the area of Environmental Health and Safety and Emergency Services, but I don't close so not inclement weather either, also important to know. My partner is the Senior Vice Provost John Siliciano. I realized that you hear a lot from him here.

“John and I work together in partnership on a whole lot of issues related to academic human resources; and together, we also work with Yael Levitte, who is up here, the associate vice provost for faculty development and diversity. Yael has been instrumental in the advanced program, and is now working with John on a number of issues.

“In the broad area of faculty work life, there's really a whole life cycle of issues that we are focused on. We often stop at the first or child care issues, and there are a lot of issues in there. We'll talk about some of what we've learned from the faculty survey; but moving on, there are also the issues around elder care,

spousal and partner care, what we call care of self, and that broad area, retirement and financial planning and postretirement needs.

“In the 2010 faculty work life survey -- I hope you can see this -- these were the stressors that the faculty told us about, those who responded. And you can see in here that household responsibilities were a large stress. Child care certainly was as well, but care of relatives, I thought, was interesting.

“A high stress area for people, in part because care of relatives is often a distance need, so people are dealing with the care of relatives, often they are not here, and a growing area of concern for people is in the whole area of personal finances and retirement planning.

“I call your attention to the last one as well: Ithaca as a place to live. Embedded in that and something we saw in individual comments as well is for people who come here single, and what it's like to be here without a family. Not always an easy place to be.

“And then we took a look at benchmarks, and this is actually a two-page document. Did you have one of those fancy -- yeah. This is Cornell. So this is a benchmark, and there's actually another page to it, but these are some of the work life support programs that we and other universities support, and you can see along the top the adoption assistance, child care centers, baby-sitting support.

“Reading along the top, you can see what we have and what others have as well. And if you look -- you know, we did pretty well. There was this one gap area, dependent travel grant, and you can see actually so do most of the others as well. These are recruitment and retention issues for most of our competitors as well, and so our one gap area was the issue of faculty dependent care travel fund.

“And so I'm pleased to announce with Yael's help, we announced in 2011 a new program, the Faculty Dependent Care Travel Fund, and that is just a little bit of help. It is not a lot of money, but its help for faculty when they travel and they are bringing a dependent with them. And this has gotten such positive feedback.

“Like I said, it's really not a lot of money, but it's just that little bit of extra, if you are bringing a dependent with you. So already, as you can see, about 24 hits on that program. So we feel like we're competitive with our peers, helping out people in these areas that need them; but we still have some areas of needs, and this is actually just the start of this list.

“If we had more time to talk -- and maybe we will at the discussion -- this is just the start, and you can add to this list. As we do renewal and as we talk to faculty and academic non-professionals around the campus, we have areas we still have to work on, and so dual career couples is and will always remain a stress on this campus.

“We have very talented couples that come to our community, and they both want and deserve the careers that they planned for. And that's not always as easy as we wish it would be. Then, as I mentioned, faculty who come here single, without partners, this can sometimes be an isolating place, and how they create a meaningful environment for themselves. Maybe they want a partner, maybe they don't, but how they create a meaningful life for themselves here without a partner.

“The issue of off-hour department meetings and obligations, this issue came up in the faculty survey. Faculty survey showed that over 48% of the faculty said that the timing of department functions was a real source of stress.

“We often associate this only with the issue of child care, but it isn't only an issue of child care. People have elder care needs or caring for others outside of their timing. If there's timing after 5:00 of departmental responsibilities, it causes real stress for people, and so this issue remains one that I think needs conversation.

“Then there's the whole issue of the fact we have lots of programs and we just are not effective at telling people what they are. I'm always surprised that people don't know about our preretirement planning programs, where we just are not effective at getting the word out, and so we just have to do a better job of that. We have programs; people aren't aware of them.

“Then finally, we have a growing number of people who solved the issues about dual careers, multi-careers and families by commuting. And it's not easy sometimes to commute from here. And while the bus is great, the bus is not perfect. And so it's fine if you happen to be commuting to New York and you don't mind a bus, but there are a lot of other places people go, and so we do have the issue of commuting couples and families. So that issue remains one that is a source of stress.

“Just some quick issues around health care and this is just on the endowed health program, and I'm going to go quickly through these, but they really fall under the whole rubric of what's going on and what about ObamaCare anyway. We've

done well in the endowed plans of planning for and getting the whole issue of preventive health into your program.

“So our Cornell Program for Healthy Living actually is in line with ObamaCare and predates the national healthcare reform, so we're in line for what we need to do, and you can see that. I could do an ad for Cornell Program for Healthy Living, but I won't, but I do want to call to your attention one thing: Effective January 2013, the flexible spending account for medical, used to be able to set aside \$6,500. One of the changes in national health reform is that you can only now set aside \$2,500.

“And it's an important thing to know as you plan. That's a change in health reform. So now it's down to \$2,500, as of January. It's an important thing to know.

“We are working with the local providers on something called clinical integration. That's part of national health reform. It's something that providers across the country are working on, and that's a way of trying to look holistically at all of our health. It's part of prevention, and we are hoping that will not only give better care, but give it in a more efficient way.

“So our providers have started to talk to us about how to help do that, and we've made an investment in the local provider community to try to help that. And we're working with University Benefits Committee. You saw your new faculty representative to that on retiree plans.

“And then, because it was boring and there weren't enough changes, the government recently changed the Department of Labor and the ERISA rules, the rules governing plans. The regulations, back after Enron really, were tightened up around what the level of scrutiny employers are required to give to the investment choices they allow employers to offer.

“So we've always taken the position that we want to allow a lot of choice in our retirement. And I actually have been proud about that. You should be able to choose whatever you want. So we've got a lot on the private side, a lot of choices, and we just open them up and let you pick. I actually think that's great.

“Unfortunately, the government doesn't think that's great anymore and have now put employers in the position of having to narrow those choices and select for employees what windows they are allowed into and due diligence to whether

or not the retirement choices are responsible choices. Not something I would have done, and this is where you all kind of scare me a little bit, because I don't really want to make those decisions.

“So we are getting some help, and one of the people who are helping us a lot is Professor Hass from the Johnson School. And he's gotten together a faculty advisory committee. We are going very slowly in this. We are way behind some of the other universities that have tightened down their choices and put together a brokerage window already.

“We just feel that we need to take our time and do this deliberately before we make any decisions. So to me, just feels kind of intrusive, if you want to know the truth, but we don't have a choice. We have to do it, so we're just going slowly, but we're working our way through it.

“So very quickly, I thought it would be important to talk to you a little bit about the staff engagement survey. I don't know how many of you had a chance to read anything about it, but in the fall of 2011, the president commissioned a survey of our staff.

“You will remember that by the fall of 2011, the staff had been through quite a bit. We began down-sizing our staff in 2009, after the financial decline, and it was a very difficult time. I will tell you we're down almost 900 positions across the campus, almost 900 staff positions. I know you know, because you have told me you know.

“It has been difficult for all of you as well. You feel it in the service you receive and you are great advocates for the staff that you know and who you are supportive of, but it's been very hard on the staff as well.

“So 67% of them completed the survey. That's a complete completion rate. 1,734 of them wrote additional comments. I read them all. 80% of them were either satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their jobs. I thought that was incredible. By the way, that did not mean they were happy. They were satisfied with their jobs.

“And so what we learned was about 63% felt they could manage their workload after the down-sizing, and about 56% thought they had enough time to do a high-quality job. Only 50% thought workload was distributed evenly, and less than 50% thought that Cornell recognized the contribution of staff. 37% thought

there were opportunities for promotion, 36% thought things were done fairly across the campus, and 35% said they had a way to give supervisors feedback.

“So you can see that we have a lot of room for improvement as it relates to the people that support all of you. And I share all of that with you because the staff are incredibly important to how things get done on the campus. There are many fewer of them than there used to be, and we're trying very hard to respond to all this in an era where there isn't really money to respond to a lot of these issues.

“And so how we, as a community, respond to one another sometimes is the next best thing. It doesn't replace money, but it helps. So with that as a backdrop, I'll take questions, but can they not be as hard as the ones you gave everybody else?”

Speaker Beer: “All right. Some time for questions. The gentleman in the red shirt.”

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics and Senator: “Hi. Yuval Grossman from Physics. I'm really happy you come, because I think it's very important that we talk to each other. And one thing that I was trying -- I have several issue that I thought could be of great; I was trying to see how do I do. I talked to Bill Fry and, well, I don't really know. I talked to Joe, and he said, "Oh, I don't really know.”

“So one thing I think is crucial is to be very clear that if we have some idea and suggestions, how do we communicate? I don't know if there's going to be some open time we have to come to benefit and talk or some committee or something. So that's, I think, the main thing that we have a lot of idea that can really help. So that's my main point.

“Then I want to talk about few of the things that I was hoping that we can get. And one thing that I think, you know, we talked a lot about when our kids were young, but they grow up, and now my kids are older. And one thing that my kids are doing, they try to take courses at Cornell.

“And I was thinking that it would be actually -- it wouldn't cost any money for Cornell if my son takes Intro to Micro with another 400 students. It doesn't cost Cornell anything to have him there; but for me, sorry, it's \$3,000.

"I can't afford it, but he'd just come and sit at Cornell, and he doesn't have to get a credit or something; but something to have, you know, our teenage -- and again, it's a source of helping us to have them come and sit in some of -- I'm not talking about expensive courses. Talking about the big courses that nobody would notice him. And he would be quiet, I promise, okay?"

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: "Would you respond?"

Vice President Opperman: "Joe and I talked about courses for -- on available basis, courses for children of faculty and staff, and also courses for spouses."

Senator Grossman: "That would be great. And I hope it can be done, and hopefully it's not something that would require a lot of money out of Cornell.

"The other thing that I was a little bit -- and I don't know, I personally felt sometimes you go places and within Cornell, student pay less than faculty. Sometimes it's because the student pays their fees and it's of course like in the -- sometimes just Cornell subsidize differently student versus faculty.

"And for example, that has to do with going to swim. If I want to swim, I have to pay -- and now I think it will be changed by next year, but if I climb on the climbing wall, if you are a student, it's \$7. Faculty, you have to pay \$12. And I think if we can somehow make sure that as long as everything that's subsidized by Cornell, we get the same treatment, the faculty, would make me and any of us feel a little better."

Vice President Opperman: "Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Like to comment on that second question?"

Vice President Opperman: "I don't honestly know if those are also subsidized with their fee, their student fee."

Speaker Beer: "The gentlewoman in the red jacket."

Professor Valerie Hans, Law School and Senator: "I was disappointed when US Airways canceled the flights to New York. There's the New Jersey option that probably many of us have gone on. It's much less efficient, and I just want to put

in a plea for whatever limited ability to influence the local airlines, that lots of faculty would love to see that flight back."

Vice President Opperman: "Yeah, I agree. I was really disappointed, too, and the Newark flight is actually -- by the time you try to get in to Penn Station or, for heaven's sakes, if you try to take a cab, it's ridiculously expensive, yeah."

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman in the front row, the associate dean."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "I speak for a lot of people with young kids. I know you dealt with child care, but it would be a major help if anything could be done to have a sick room, to bring a sick child in, especially with dual career couples."

"I didn't see the stressor number, but you can put it pretty high up there, especially those -- I teach at 8:40 in the morning. Probably a lot of people do. Anything that could be done, especially if it's already at the Cornell child care center."

Vice President Opperman: "Yeah, that's actually a gap area."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "And it doesn't have to be free, right. I'm perfectly willing to pay for the care."

Vice President Opperman: "Thank you. You're right. We don't have that and, I agree, that is a gap."

Speaker Beer: "Any further comments or questions? Professor Cheyfitz."

Senator Cheyfitz: "Just two quick ones. There was talk at one point of a D.C. flight out of Tompkins County. What happened to that?"

Vice President Opperman: "Did you want to do the second one?"

Senator Cheyfitz: "Second one's simpler. That was pretty simple. Those statistics, I take it, are available online?"

Vice President Opperman: "Yeah, the staff survey is available online."

Senator Cheyfitz: "And you would just go to Human Resource, and it would appear as a link?"

Vice President Opperman: "It is on the Institutional Research and Planning site."

Senator Cheyfitz: "Okay, thanks. So the airport deal."

Vice President Opperman: "So the airport, my understanding of the way the airport explained this to us was that they were hoping to trade the LaGuardia spot for a D.C. spot. That's how come we lost the spot. I think they did trade it. I just don't think they gave it to us. (LAUGHTER)

"So I think US Air did get a D.C. spot. We didn't get the D.C. spot. So you know, I do think the conversations are continuing, but so far, yeah. We looked, by the way, at the idea of trying to do a bus to D.C. It's just too far to go on a bus."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Mary, thanks for coming and presenting this. I think it's really helpful. One thing I wanted to emphasize in general, but also came out in your statistics, is the issue of the need to have greater diversity in the faculty.

"Of course, because there was a statistic up there in terms of satisfaction with living in Ithaca or something like that, which showed quite a significant difference with minority faculty. And so seems to me that's as important as all the other issues that we were talking about, and of course I know you agree with that, but I think it should be highlighted, because that number did really leap out."

Vice President Opperman: "Yes, absolutely. And that is true in the staff as well. I mean, there's a whole frame of this data that's very compelling. When you look at our statistics on minority staff and faculty and the -- nervous about running late -- our statistics here, until we get a critical mass, we are going to continue to suffer with issues around satisfaction.

"We need to work together to increase our diversity numbers and composition. And in order to retain our diverse faculty and staff, we need to pay attention to our climate. You know, we do a decent job of bringing people in, and then we don't keep them, and so we have to be cognizant of the climate that we create for people who are new here.

"And we have to be cognizant of why people don't stay. And I know that's a very simplistic statement to a very complex issue, but you are right. The satisfaction numbers are lower."

Speaker Beer: "Any further comments? Okay, thank you very much, Vice President Opperman.

(APPLAUSE)

"Seems we have reached the end of the agenda, so we can actually adjourn a couple minutes early. Thank you. Oh, I'd like to recognize the service of our technical assistant, David."

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)