

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

Interim Speaker, Charles Walcott, Professor Emeritus, Neurobiology and Behavior and University Ombudsman: "According to my watch, it's two minutes after the time; but since we don't have any Good and Welfare speakers, I think it will all work out reasonably well.

"I need to remind the body that no photos or recording devices or programs are allowed during the meeting, and please turn off your cell phone, tablets, computers and other noise-making devices. Remind the body that senators have priority in speaking, and that only senators or their alternates may vote.

"I ask everybody to identify themselves and their department when they speak, and there are microphones set up in the aisles, rather than have them passed around. So you're going to have to get up and go to a microphone, rather than wait for it to come to you.

"I suggest that we limit maximum speaking time to two minutes to allow for more speakers. And as I said, there are at the moment no Good and Welfare speakers; and therefore, no minutes have been allocated to them.

"We begin with three consent items: First off, the approval of [the November 11th, 2015](#) minutes, as distributed; the proposal for the [College of Architecture, Art and Planning to use professor of the practice](#); and the [Johnson Graduate School of Management dual degree program](#). So these are consent items. Do I hear any objections to any of these items?

"Seeing no objections, I take it that they have been approved by the body, and we can now proceed to Mike Fontaine, Associate Dean of the University Faculty. Mike?

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

Michael Fontaine, Associate Dean of the University Faculty and Professor, Classics Departments: "Hi, everybody. Joe Burns is out ill again today, so I'm filling in as best I can. And what we're going to do today is a little bit of a change from what we have done in the recent past. This comes as a request from the UFC.

"So today we are trying to allow for as much open microphone time as we can, so this is our chance, rather your chance to weigh in, raise any topics, the ones, for example, we suggested in the agenda we distributed, or for other issues or any relevant topic that comes to mind.

"The first presentation is one that we have been talking about. Barb Knuth is here, the dean of the grad school, to talk about two important issues. We posted the documents on the dean of faculty web site and notified you. I hope you're going to have a lot of feedback for her, questions, opinions, advice on financial aid for students.

"The UFC met with the provost Monday, just this past Monday afternoon. He called the meeting. It was his agenda, and he called the meeting to announce to us the creation of the new business school at Cornell. This may be news to some of you, because there still hasn't been a general announcement from the administration that Cornell is creating a business school.

"The provost has met separately, as I understand it, with the three schools that are affected directly by this: The Hotel School, the Dyson School and the Johnson School. There was an article that went up on "The Cornell Sun," the electronic edition; probably you saw it. There's some spirited comments underneath.

"So at that meeting with the provost on Monday, the provost told us he has initiated or he would like to initiate an open-ended process to seek advice from faculty on how to organize the academic and the educational structures of the new school, how to arrange departments, faculty status and so forth.

"We had a very spirited debate, as you may imagine, covered the full range of reactions. Some of us felt the decision to create the school was a matter of educational policy or impacted educational policy and that the provost therefore should have consulted the faculty senate before making the announcement, or the decision, rather.

"Other people in the room felt that the creation of the structure itself was within the purview of the higher administration, but agreed that any structures within these affected schools are indeed educational policy and would like the senate to be involved, at least in a consulting fashion, so that they'll ask advice especially from people around the university that we may not be aware will be affected by the creation of this school.

"This is a topic that you may want to discuss today in our meeting, so I asked the provost to come and take questions from us; but his schedule didn't permit it, so I believe he has asked Chris Barrett to come. And there he is. So Chris is the director of the Dyson School. He's to become the new deputy dean of the school. As with Barb, I hope you will have lots of feedback, question, opinions, advice and so forth.

"First up on our agenda, we'll hear from Professor Bensel, with an item he considers important. You recall it was presented as a Good and Welfare item last time with Matt Evangelista, who I believe couldn't make it today. I don't see him in the room.

"So I'll just conclude this meeting by wishing everybody a restful break for the winter, urge you to consider next semester's election for new dean of the faculty - - again, that's Joe's job -- a new associate dean of the faculty -- my job -- a faculty trustee, and we're also going to need new members of the UFC and the Nominations and Elections Committee. I will have the elections probably in the third week of March, if the technology permits it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Walcott: "You have five minutes."

3. PRESENTATION BY PROFESSOR RICHARD BENSEL

So you all should have a five-page summary of my presentation. If you do not, raise your hand and we'll get you one. So I distributed this summary today to you because in distributing it online, the dean of faculty office censored the last three pages, refused to post them. This refusal bothers me, for a number of reasons, so I'm going to take a few minutes, a few seconds, a few sentences to say why.

"Most importantly, the Dean of Faculty should never censor communications between senators. The foundation of the university should be the free and open exchange of opinions and ideas, even those with which we disagree.

"The second reason this bothers me, the material that the office censored is directly relevant to the topic under discussion today. It makes no sense to debate a topic without some sense of how a solution is to be implemented. This is true, even if we disagree with the suggested solution.

"Moreover, when the Dean of Faculty distributed my presentation, they did not tell you that they had censored it. Because they did not tell you that they had

censored it, it misrepresented the communication that I sent you. I see that as a violation of my own integrity, as a senator, my own rights, my own privilege as professor, my own role in the university.

“Unless it comes up in discussion, that's all I had to say on this. You have the summary. The two basic questions that I think the session should address, they are on the sheet: What might be the implications of the provost's initiative for education policy at Cornell? The second question is, how in this case can we improve the participation of the faculty senate in carrying out our responsibilities for advising the central administration with respect to education policy?

“There are three parts to the handout. The first one, which was posted, deals with an interpretation of the provost's initiative; highly speculative, necessarily so, because the provost won't tell us what is going on with it.

“On the other hand, what we do know from that initiative is that it's extremely important to education policy on the Ithaca campus and, in particular, it's extremely important to the future of liberal education at Cornell.

“The second part of the handout suggests that the best way to proceed would be to ask the provost to come back and answer questions and engage in discussion with us on the provost's initiative and on the budget matters that are so seriously implicated in our ability to carry out our educational responsibilities at the university.

“And the third and last part gives you some of the questions we might ask the Provost in that discussion. Since you have the summary before you and since my purpose here today is only to launch this debate, I'm not trying to control it or railroad it or anything else. If the questions and the statements and the text are provocative enough, then we'll have a good discussion. And I'll end there, unless there are questions.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you very much. Is there discussion?”

Professor Jerry Stedinger, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering: “I wonder if we should ask for a reaction from the dean of the faculty's office as to what happened. There is no note there that something's been omitted.”

Associate Dean Fontaine: “Sure. That was my decision. We got the e-mail yesterday. You could call it censorship. I'm not sure I'd agree. The first two

pages dealt with the item you wanted to raise. The rest is your interpretation of how the UFC committee operates. I just didn't think it was relevant.

"I don't think the Dean of Faculty web site is the marketplace for any senator to post any ideas he or she has about matters related to policy, so I distributed the parts I consider relevant, and here you are with the rest. I certainly did not mean censorship in any moral or political sense. I just was trying to keep to things that are relevant."

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

Professor Richard Bense, Department of Government: "Censorship is a really problematic topic. We can almost always devise reasons for suppressing text that we do not want others to hear or read. To say, as I was told only on one line -- it came from Karen. It didn't come from Michael or anybody else -- it said this is not relevant. Read the text. It is you that decides whether or not that text is relevant.

"I introduced it by saying that what we do about this, the most likely thing to do, et cetera, but it is not the dean of faculty to decide. What you should hear from me or any other senator is not up to the dean of faculty to decide. We decide that."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, Department of English, and American Indian Program: "This is the larger context. I'm sure you folks here in the spring will remember, but I think it's worth laying out. As you know, last spring, the senate passed a [resolution](#), obviously relates to Richard's piece, which stated in its final clause, therefore, it is the will of the faculty senate that from this point forward, the administration comply with Article 13, Section 2 and the principles of cooperation and consultation between the president and the faculty senate.

"Article 13 makes it clear that matters of educational policy, quote, which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit or are general in nature, end of quote, are required to be brought before the university faculty for discussion and comment before they are decided upon by the administration. And Article 10 of the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty -- OPUF is the acronym -- delegates these university faculty functions to the faculty senate as the representative body of the university faculty.

“The [resolution](#), also listed a wide range of programs and actions instituted by the administration without senate review that it considered to be examples of educational policy. Our purpose was not to roll those back, but to point to what educational policy means. It was everything from MOOCs to Qatar, to Technion to Engaged Cornell to the budget.

“There was an understanding between the administration and the senate that any [resolution](#), passed by the senate requires an administration response within 30 days. Because when the senate passed the [resolution](#), the university was in transition between the Skorton and the Garrett administrations, it was reasonable to assume that the senate would not get a response to the [resolution](#), until the current semester was underway; but although the current semester is over, the senate has had no response to the [resolution](#).

“Further, the Governance Committee established by the UFC in conjunction with the administration to respond to the resolution has not responded, and it would appear that its work has not been productive, at least we haven't heard from them.

“In the meantime, the administration has been implementing educational policy as defined in Article 13, Section 2, without bringing such policy before the senate, in clear violation of that article and the senate resolution on that article. I refer her to grants going to curriculum innovation involving the Ithaca and the Tech campuses -- Richard's point -- and to the creation of a college of business, just announced.

“The question then is how is the senate going to respond, or is it going to respond to this violation of its prerogatives, as elaborated in the bylaws of the university and agreements made with the university stemming from Article 13, Section 2, in agreements made with the senate stemming from Article 13, Section 2, which are all listed in the [resolution](#), we passed, all of those agreements.

“My suggestion is that if the administration does not respond promptly to the [resolution](#), on Article 13, and I would suggest that promptly be defined as the first week of classes in the spring semester 2016, that a senate vote of no confidence in or censure of the administration is in order.

“And finally, if the senate does not respond to this situation, I suggest it will in effect have ceded its prerogatives as defined in Article 13, Section 2 and

subsequent agreements to the administration and will de facto have ceased to exist as the representative body of the university faculty."

Speaker Walcott: "Comments? John?"

Sr. Vice Provost, John Siliciano: "I'm not here to speak on behalf of President Garrett or Provost Kotlikoff, but I would point out, Eric, actually they did respond formally to the resolution of last year. I think was a month, month and a half ago. There was a full [response](#) to the dean of faculty's office, so they have responded to that."

Professor Cheyfitz: "We had no discussion. And what was their response?"

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: "So if it didn't come to you, that was a function of the Dean of Faculty's office, not our office."

Professor Cheyfitz: "A dysfunction."

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: "It's posted, like all responses are posted."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Should have come to the senate for discussion. You know, you're picking semantics."

Professor Siliciano: "Eric, that's not accurate. You just accused the President, and the Provost of not responding. They, in fact, responded along the normal -- in any event, as I recall, and I can't verbatim, they did say it was important consideration, that they were responding, that they didn't necessarily agree with the interpretation of some senators, of what the Article 13 grant of jurisdiction means, and that they would continue to engage in this and that they would work with the committee that's been constituted."

"So I just want to clarify the record. Again, I don't represent their view on the underlying issue."

Speaker Walcott: "Are there other comments? Is there any further discussion? Yes, sir. "

Professor Chris Schaffer, Department of Biomedical Engineering and member of the University Faculty Committee: "I just wanted to speak, just focusing on the

specifics of this particular grant proposal problem, which triggered this discussion.

“I agree very much that we need to have a robust discussion with the university administration to carefully define our overlapping areas of responsibility between the faculty senate, between the faculty and the colleges and between the administration, so we can find ways to move forward positively.

“And I look forward to the comments or the ideas that come out of the currently configured governance committee to address that, but coming back to this specific initiative on planning grants for the cross-campus programs between Ithaca and Cornell Tech, my understanding is this was funded directly by funds that are controlled by President Garrett, sort of a president's initiative fund.

“I would like to think that the president of the university should have some wiggle room to be able to find and to support small initiatives that the president believes should be priorities to the university. I don't think the existence of a grant program that could support some of the best ideas that come from our faculty to improve educational collaborations between the new campus in New York City and Ithaca, I don't think having a grant program that allows people to try to develop ideas is setting educational policy. It's giving people an opportunity to develop and refine ideas.

“I think if there's any cross-campus educational program that emerges from these grant programs that would like to be formally started, that that will have to come before the senate, and we will have to debate and determine whether or not that educational program is something that makes sense for the university. Similarly, what could come out of this is just an innovative class that sits within a department or a college, in which case I don't believe it's the purview of the senate.

“So I would just like to say, I feel like we should be happy with the idea that our president is supporting the best ideas that come from our faculty to help improve education and find ways to move forward productively together, rather than quipping incessantly and fighting turf wars about who gets to make what decision. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Are there additional comments? We're going to have to move along pretty quickly, because we're almost out of time.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: "I was just wanting to follow up on Chris's comments to point out at the bottom of the memo from Provost Kotlikoff and the planning grants, that's under discussion. It says further note that the currently planned degree programs for Cornell Tech are; and then there's a list of programs including cross-college kinds of programs. And it would seem essential that those come to the senate.

"I would certainly hope that the administration plans on doing that, but the wording of currently planned degree programs indicates that they are farther along than programs that should come before the senate. So I certainly hope that the administration corrects that."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you. I think we need to move along to the next item. It's my pleasure to introduce Barbara Knuth, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School."

4. PRESENTATION OF (1) UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND (2) UNDERGRADUATE UNDOCUMENTED STUDENT ADMISSION AND FINANCIAL AID – BARBARA KNUTH, SENIOR VICE PROVOST AND DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

"Thank you, Charlie. And thanks for this opportunity to talk with you. What I'm going to be introducing to you and soliciting your comments on, are a couple of topics that are being discussed actively in the [Admissions and Financial Aid Working Group](#). I believe when Provost Kotlikoff talked with you earlier this year, I believe he mentioned a few working groups he was creating. This is one of those. I serve as chair.

"There are a number of faculty members, staff members and one student member, Juliana Batista, president of the student assembly, is also a member of the working group.

"To give you some context, these are issues that relate to undergraduate admissions, undergraduate financial aid; and to set the context, I wanted to share with you from 1998, a board of trustees statement of principles that kind of guides the context that Cornell uses for undergraduate admissions and financial aid currently.

"So I'll read that to you, then I'll share a bit about the two initiatives that we're discussing in the working group. I'll just relate very briefly what other groups

we've already spoken with about those initiatives, and then solicit your comments.

"So the statement of principles from the Cornell University Board of Trustees in 1998: Cornell University makes admissions decisions without regard to the ability of students or parents to pay educational costs. Students who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents and who demonstrate financial need will be assisted in meeting that need through one or more of the following; federal and state grants, employment opportunities, loans, the Cornell Commitment Program, scholarships from endowments and restricted funds and Cornell grants.

"Annual adjustments will be made in self-help and family contribution levels. Cornell will continue its commitment to excellence and diversity in the student population.

"So essentially what this is saying, that Cornell uses need-blind admissions. So at admissions time, we are not aware of financial status of the student or their family. For need-based financial aid, Cornell, in that statement of principles, committed to meeting the full demonstrated need of students, U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

"There is no language in that statement of principles regarding international students; but what Cornell has done and has done for quite a number of years, is for international students, we also meet need-blind admissions, need-based financial aid, meaning we don't give merit scholarships. We based all financial aid on need, but for international students, we have a very defined financial aid budget.

"So even though there are international students who are admitted, who clearly have demonstrated need according to our institutional formula, we do not award financial aid to all of those students who are admitted who have financial need.

"We don't partially award aid either. We award financial aid, full financial aid only to a subset of admitted international students who have need. Other students, international students who have been admitted, who clearly have need, we offer no aid to. Then it's their decision whether they come or not.

"So the two issues that we have been discussing in the working group relate to international undergraduate admissions and relate to how we consider

undocumented students. So undocumented, sometimes called undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, so students who have been in this country for a number of years, some who have been born in this country, but don't have documentation, visa documentation, nor U.S. citizenship permanent residence documentation.

“Currently, with undocumented students, because they don't hold U.S. documentation, thus their definition and category, we do include them in the international student pool. So right now, for admissions, everybody is admitted need-blind; but for the financial aid piece, undocumented students are included in that international aid pool, if you will.

“And so what happens with both international students and undocumented students is at the time of application, they're either admitted or not, and then those students who are admitted have the ability to apply for financial aid.

“Those students who apply for financial aid then are vetted, many in kind of an iterative process. Lots of different people look at them, nominating them for consideration for financial aid. The challenge that we have is that within that lumping of international students and undocumented students, typically undocumented students have a longer time and more challenges pulling together all of the paperwork that is needed because of their situation.

“And so by the time -- typically, by the time, one, they become known to us as undocumented students and secondly, by the time that they are able to pull together all their information, typically it's at the very, very end of the process. And most, if not all of the international financial aid budget, has already been expended. So very few undocumented students end up having financial aid, undergraduate financial aid at Cornell.

“We don't know for sure how many undocumented students there are at Cornell. We believe the number, undergraduates, to be around a dozen to maybe 20; but we don't know that for sure, again, because they don't have to report their undocumented status.

“So the two things that the working group is discussing are, one, with international students, to move from having need-blind admissions for international students to move to need-aware admissions for international students. So that means at the time of admission, a student would need to

indicate if they are applying for financial aid or not. And if they are applying for financial aid, to submit those financial aid documents.

“So at the time of making the admission decision, we would, one, know if they would need aid or not, and how much aid they would need. So that's with international students.

“With undocumented students, the proposal that the working group is considering is to include undocumented students -- and I'll give a caveat in just a minute -- include undocumented students in the domestic U.S. citizen permanent domestic pool; so they would continue to have need-blind admissions and need-based aid, but meeting full need of all admitted students.

“The caveat on that undocumented piece is that the working group is strongly considering what some other schools, Emory University being a recent example, have done with undocumented students, and to say that undocumented students with DACA status, which is Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, which is a federal status made available starting in 2013; so it gives students federal status, defers them from any deportation action or anything like that, gives them an authorization.

“With DACA status, they can also apply for U.S. work authorization, which means that in a financial aid package, just like we do for U.S. citizens, permanent residents, we could, one, assume summer work, summer earnings as part of the contribution education, and we could also assume academic-year work. They would not be eligible for federal work study, for federal loans, federal grants, but they would be eligible, with that work authorization, to work during the academic year in the summer.

“So in discussing these two proposals, we've had a lot of robust discussion in the working group. We've also talked about both of these with the University Faculty Committee and the FPC, Financial Policies Committee. And both of those groups were quite supportive of the international students moving to need-aware admissions.

“With undocumented students, that particular proposal, they were supportive of the discussion moving along. At that time, we didn't have a specific alternative. When we talked with them, we didn't have that specific alternative of undocumented students with DACA status, that being the criterion; but there

did seem to be general support within the UFC and the FPC and the undocumented question as well.

"I also met with the Financial Aid Review Committee of the student assembly. On the undocumented piece, they were strongly in favor of that change, particularly using DACA as the criterion for what constitutes the kind of undocumented student who would be eligible for this. They expressed that their view was this would establish a consistent standard. It would be clear, it would be equitable. So they were very much in favor of that.

"On the international admissions question, changing to need-aware admissions, the Financial Aid Review Committee of the student assembly was less enthusiastic about that. There were some individuals who were negative in terms of their views about that, in the sense that moving to need-aware admissions is likely to exclude some people, some applicants from being admitted. So very clearly, we will have students who indicate that they have need. We will expend our budget, and then students who have need, who have not yet been admitted, will not be admitted.

"Currently, as I said, with need-blind admissions, we are admitting students who have need and were not able to give them aid. We do yield -- meaning some of these students do choose to matriculate -- we do yield those students at about a 25% to 30% rate. Aided international students yielded about an 85% to 90% rate. International students admitted who don't have financial need yield at about a 60% to 65% rate.

"So one of the purposes of moving to a need-aware admissions policy for international undergraduate students is as an enrollment management tool, because we'll be able to more easily predict who is going to say yes or not, so you have more ability to fine tune who is in your actual matriculate pool.

"We also hope that it begins to address some of the problems that we have seen on campus, challenges that students face in being admitted, deciding to come to Cornell University without aid. Sometimes they are able to get other family sources or external grants to come, but other times they truly struggle financially, and so they go knocking on doors or use crowd sourcing or whatever technique they use to try and find the money to be able to be here. So we don't believe that's a healthy situation either.

"Among our peers, we only have four peers who have need-blind admissions for international students, and they have the money to fully meet the need of every international admitted student. That's Harvard, Yale, Princeton and MIT. All of our other peers in the Ivy League and peers out of the Ivy League have moved, and some years ago, to need-aware admissions for international students.

"So I think I'll stop there and take questions. There's a lot more detail in the documents that were on the site, but hopefully that's enough to get you started."

Professor Yuval Grossman, Department of Physics: "So the first question is what to do with people who are actually documented, but not permanent residents, like the H-4 and J-2 visa holders; my first question, if you can answer this one."

Dean Knuth: "Well, if they're visa holders, they're not undocumented."

Professor Grossman: "Right. So I just said one --"

Dean Knuth: "So they would be international students."

Professor Grossman: "As of now, they are international students. So when I arrived to Cornell, and it took me six years until I got my green card, I was an H visa. My kid was an H-4. And by the time that my son got into Cornell, we already got my green card, so it was okay.

"But there's quite a lot of people that come here on a J and H visa, and takes so long until they get their green card and completely documented, pay Social Security, anything, with the idea that eventually most of the H and J holder eventually get a green card. So my feeling is that ideally, they will be treated as a green card holder, but I don't know what the committee is thinking."

Dean Knuth: "Well, the committee is not thinking anything on that. Those who are international students, they would be admitted as international students, receive financial aid as international students. If their citizenship status changes, so they go from international visa-holding to having a green card, U.S. citizen, permanent resident status, then they are able to apply for financial aid in our regular domestic pool."

Professor Grossman: "So I would think that they should be at least treated as undocumented, because actually they come here documented, with the idea of

staying. So my feeling -- and giving [Indiscernible] that would be my suggestion, that people with an H-4 should be included in the..."

Dean Knuth: "Thanks for that comment."

Professor Grossman: "The other comment, looking at the statistics on who got admitted, it was extremely surprising how many athletics from Canada came in. And if you can comment about it. It looks as if -- I don't know. It may be a bold suggestion -- that it's a way for the hockey team to get the player in. I don't know if that's true or not; if you can tell how many of those 34 were hockey players."

Dean Knuth: "Hockey is big in Canada."

Professor Grossman: "So basically, this is a tool for them to recruit? Just asking. I don't know if it's a good or bad. I just think -- I'd like to know. I think it's really bad, but..."

Dean Knuth: "I'm not sure it's a tool. Many hockey players that Cornell recruits are from Canada, and they go through the international financial aid process and international admissions, just like any other international student."

Professor Grossman: "But the fact I just looked, and you see like in five years, from Western Europe, there was seven people from all of Western Europe, non-athletics; compared to 34 from Canada, athletic. So some feel this is not the right balance."

Professor Knuth: "So the statistics you are referring to are those students who receive financial aid. There's many other students, international students who are admitted and who come. The students who receive financial aid internationally, you'll see, if I can pull it out right now, there are a number of countries where the numbers are higher.

"So Canada is one, with 39 total students; Ethiopia, with 13; India, with 36; Kenya, with 31. Most of the other countries -- and there's 40 or 50 countries here. Most of those countries have a total of maybe one to three students, because what we try to do is aim for geographic diversity in how we are expending the international financial aid pool, except for those countries that I mentioned."

Professor Maria Cook, ILR: "I have a question about the undocumented student discussion, particularly looking at a subset of DACA recipients. And I'm just wondering what kind of discussion there's been in the committee about that with regard to the fact that DACA is an executive action program, it's limited. We don't know if it's going to be repeated, and it's currently being held up in the courts right now, so we don't know if there's going to be a future program."

"So one question would be: If you really want to address the issue of undocumented students applying to Cornell, the more comprehensive and future-looking proposal would be to just expand it to undocumented students across the board.

"And there are a number of colleges that do admit undocumented students and don't just refer to DACA. There are all kind of formulas, as your document notices, but there are a number of places, like I think it's Tufts, Pomona, that have more broad admissions of undocumented students."

Dean Knuth: "Thank you. So a couple things to keep in mind. There are different ways of limiting it. NYU, New York University, just recently, I think beginning with this fall of '15, moved to admitting undocumented students to be eligible for financial aid, but limiting it to New York, New York undocumented students, so those who are resident in New York state.

"The reason for thinking about some limitations are, one, for clarity and equity in some ways. Others, to have some budget control over this, because we really don't know how many undocumented students -- if the criteria are very, very broad and open, how many undocumented students would be admitted and then therefore eligible for aid.

"We believe, based on data that we have seen nationally from different groups that work with undocumented individuals, that we believe that for the most part, undocumented individuals would be in the very high-need population. So there is a cost associated with this.

"Remember that undocumented individuals would not be eligible for federal loans, not be eligible for federal grants, not be eligible for federal work study. So most of their financial aid would be Cornell grant aid. So that's where it's important to think about cost.

"What's being held up in the courts is an expansion of DACA, not DACA itself. So DACA continues. I fully recognize we're in the throes of a presidential election, and that could change. And if that changes, then of course we would need to revise this.

"So what we might do in that case is to use the DACA criteria, the eligibility criteria; the number of years that somebody has attended high school in the United States, for example, and use the DACA criteria, but not require DACA status.

"So again, we will need -- and I don't believe there will be support at the various levels of approval for opening this up to any student who calls themselves undocumented. I think we will need to have some criteria, some definition criteria about what type of undocumented student would be eligible to be considered in this way.

"So for now, we're proposing DACA. That's under discussion right now. Some of the working group members have suggested that perhaps accepting state authorization; so for example, there's a Texas Dream Act and a California Dream Act, accepting state authorization as well. That would not give the student the ability to have work authorization, though, in New York State.

"Thank you very much."

5. OPEN DISCUSSION

Speaker Walcott: "We are now going to enter a period of free discussion. So don't go away, Barbara. There may be more questions. This is an opportunity to follow up on topics we've just heard or to discuss anything else that occurs to you. And there are a list of four possibilities here. These are only possibilities.

"I'm going to try and limit, if I can, comments to about two minutes, so there's adequate time for people to ask questions and to respond. Risa?"

Professor Lieberwitz: "There's a lot to talk about in this section, and I may be back, but I wanted to start with Barbara, with your presentation, since you just made it. Why not take the approach now of using the DACA criteria without necessarily DACA status? It seems like you have clarity, and the consistency that you described with actually having DACA status, but not forcing people to fit into that one box.

"And then the other question is you said that your committee has decided to propose already the two options that you talked about with regard to international applicants and with undocumented students. So who are you proposing it to? What is the process that this goes through?

"And this brings us back to the governance issues of isn't this very, very relevant and central to much of educational policy in terms of who we teach, and so where is the faculty senate besides this discussion? Where are we weighing in and how are we weighing in as the senate?"

Dean Knuth: "We did meet with the University Faculty Committee and the faculty, the Financial Policies Committee. I'm here now, seeking your input. No action has been taken. As I described, this is a working group. It's a working group who puts their recommendation forward. The recommendation has been put forward to the Provost.

"The Provost will take that to the -- I understand. This is what I understand to be the intent -- will take a proposal forward to the board of trustees in January. I'm here. He knows that I'm here gathering input from the faculty senate. I will report back to him. He'll read your minutes, I'm sure, about the discussion of this.

"So as I understand what was discussed earlier, faculty senate gives input, faculty senate doesn't make the decision in this case, but you are giving input. And I believe you are giving input now. And I thank you for that.

"In terms of undocumented, why we're considering -- and again, this is the debate and why there is protracted debate about whether state authorization could be a criterion as well; is that the work authorization, because Cornell grant aid would be the only thing available for financial aid, we're talking pretty costly individual per-student cost in terms of providing full financial aid to people, who would not be able to have summer earnings, who would not be able to have academic year work, and also no federal aid of any type. So that's what the thinking is."

Speaker Walcott: "Let's have somebody else..."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Just one quick comment. So what you are saying is not including non-DACA status students, but those who are eligible for it is a financial reason. There's no principled reason for it."

Dean Knuth: "Well, there is a principled reason, two principled reasons: One is the principled reason of financial sustainability of our financial aid programs that we will not be able to continue if we cannot afford them.

"The other reason is that in consulting with groups who work with undocumented students across the country, they have told us, and there's studies that have been done that students who are not seeking DACA status tend to be students who are less well academically prepared, who are in different circumstances, who don't have the academic background likely to be competitive to admissions at Cornell.

"We're hearing a growing number from high school counselors, growing number of community-based organizations who are telling us their students who do have the qualifications to apply to and be admitted to Cornell are eagerly seeking DACA. And so yes, there are likely to be a few who we miss; but for the most part, trying to balance those needs and what we are hearing from a very informed community is leading us into this discussion."

Speaker Walcott: "Thanks, Barb."

Professor Ken Birman, Department of Computer Science: "I'd like to quickly thank Dean Knuth for what I thought was a very enlightened proposal. I missed most of the presentation, but I read the proposal and I think it responds to something I have often heard my advisees express angst about, and I think this is a wonderful initiative and should go forward; but I wanted to react to Risa Lieberwitz's comment about faculty governance.

"During my time in the senate, I have often heard this term used as if it should mean engagement with some subgroup of people who are perhaps an appointed committee or an executive group, and I simply want to say that I feel engagement with the largest group possible is the best form of faculty governance, and that coming to speak to the senate, receiving our comments this way, with all of us involved is very much the mode that I would hope we would interpret faculty governance to operate in. Thank you."

Professor Richard Miller, Department of Philosophy: "I hope that the open discussion that has been given 40 minutes today and also Professor Bensel's intervention are the beginning of a shift on the part of the majority of the University Faculty Committee to more actively help the Senate be a deliberative

body that actively seeks consensus and actively seeks, then, to publicly voice that consensus.

"I would like to mention some of the many worries that can prompt this turn to being a deliberative body, not just an audience to administrators and reports from standing committees, even though I greatly value the time and information that we get from administrators and chairs of standing committees.

"One worry is the situation of the humanities and their future at Cornell. There are danger signs that Cornell's investment in the teaching of humanities is being reduced. Of course, I'm a philosopher; of course, I'd be worried about that. As it becomes clearer what the direction of the administration is in these matters, I think it becomes important that the senate, as the voice of all the faculty at Cornell, weighs in. There's no need to think of this in terms of faculty governance. Interpretations of Proposition 13 don't matter, so far as our desire to be heard is concerned.

"Strenuous initiatives of individual senators led to an investigation of the Ho Plaza incident and the role of campus police, among others. They are going to lead to a report of the interrogation of a student protester. I think that, then, means the University Faculty Committee should put on our agenda discussing what, if anything, we think should be done in response.

"I ask the permission of the body to speak for 30 seconds more.

"I think then it becomes part of the job of the University Faculty Committee to organize discussion in response to this fact-finding of what we, the faculty in Cornell, think should be done or should not be done and if there's a consensus to publicly voice it, even if we don't have legislative authority.

"I devoted much energy, along with other members of the ad hoc Distance Learning Committee, to a process that was supposed to be co-chaired by the Dean of Faculty that wasn't; which in my view involved requiring enormous effort to have the faculty's voice be heard. It was heard in a report, whose recommendations of important measures were not adopted by the administration. There's now an Online Development Committee whose views I do not know. I think it should be part of the job of the UFC to organize a response on the state of distance learning at Cornell.

"There are tactics that would help. One tactic is not having chair-enforced two-minute limits in deliberative phases of our agenda. I appreciate the generosity of the chair this afternoon. I think that it should be institutionalized.

"I think that our deliberations should be open to recording. Often the most we can do is influence public opinion. Why not do it on the basis of an accurate record?

"And I think in our deliberative moments, senators should not have priority. In fact, we should encourage non-senators to attend. It's part of converting us from an audience to a voice of the faculty."

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

Professor Charles Van Loan, Department of Computer Science and member of the University Faculty Committee: "Just a couple of things. I think we should be educators first and lawyers as a last resort. So I support what Dick is sort of saying; we should elevate the level of discussion here.

"In terms of liberal education, just to get back to Richard's presentation, I can't think of a more democratic way to proceed than what the president has done. It's challenging the faculty to come up with novel ideas. I can't think of anything, again, more democratic. New York City is the center of the arts -- arts and humanities center. It would be great to have faculty think outside the box and figure out ways to expand what we do down there.

"And in terms of the senate, I think I'm an advocate of videotaping it and putting it online for everyone to see. I'm in favor of doing away with clickers, where we hide behind that button and not stand up in front of one another and say how we feel. So I think there's an awful lot we can do to democratize things.

"We have all these standing committees. Very few of them post reports on what they have done. Faculty trustees -- I don't know if they're here -- I feel have not really participated in opening the channel between us and the trustees. So I think it's a whole host of things we can do to democratize the process."

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, sir. Two minutes, please."

Professor Bensel: "So Charlie was the person who responded to my request for information on UFC procedures, and I want to thank him for that. He was very

generous, and he did say that he was in favor of videotaping our proceedings. And I think if we did that, we should make them open to the entire university.

"This idea that we -- do we have a recording, then it's written down, worry about if it's right or not, you have to go listen to this thing, I think that's crazy. And not giving it to the university as a whole is a mistake.

"I do want to say one thing. We had a fiscal crisis. It came out of nowhere. It's never been explained to us. I go abroad, I go to our peer institutions, say: We have a fiscal crisis.

"What?"

"The transparency of the central administration is about as close to zero as you can get. This idea that we can send stuff up and somehow be participating in a democratic process, when we hear almost nothing coming down is a mistake. This is something, the budgetary problems, the causes, we should have an explanation of that. We should have an explanation of the relevance of the current budgetary policies to those past problems, we should be able to judge what the impact is going to be on education at Ithaca campus, and so forth and so on.

"I disagree with Charlie. I think the central administration has been remarkably remiss and remarkably opaque in what it has done with the university community, and us too. We're part of that."

Speaker Walcott: "There was another comment. Somebody else? I'm sorry. Yes."

Professor N'dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Studies: "I see, in point number 5 of Richard's documents, reference to many departments concerning mainly humanities and social sciences, that even if they are not legally ineligible, they are de facto not in a favorable situation. That's something that should be of concern to all of us, as an institution.

"And in relation to that, my question to Barbara is among the students who are admitted from the international undergraduate, are the colleges, the admission, is it random across colleges? Or are they concentrated in some colleges, in some - their admission depends on what the major they are likely to choose?

"So these are all indication of what seems to be receiving more importance, both on campus and globally. So if you can respond to that."

Dean Knuth: "Yes, thank you. Undergraduate admissions decisions are made in each of the seven undergraduate colleges. Some are made by -- as I understand it, some are made by faculty committee, some are made more by staff decisions, but each of the seven undergraduate colleges make those admissions decisions. So it's up to the colleges to decide what their priorities are."

"So there's a host of priorities: First generation, socioeconomic diversity, racial, ethnic diversity, geographic diversity, legacies, recruited athletes. There's a whole variety of admissions priorities. So those decisions are made at the level of the college. So I'm not quite sure that I'm answering your question, but I'm not sure if I understand the detail that you're looking for."

Professor Assie-Lumumba: "In terms of the financial aid that is given, yeah, the financial aid. And also in relation to that, of course I'm supportive of reaching out to the international students. So many -- when I travel across the globe, including mostly in Africa, there are many, many bright students who would do very well, if they had the opportunity to study and receive the support, but cannot."

"But thinking ahead of how to support more of them, we want to make sure that, given the restricted amount of money that we always talking about, that we don't forget that there are many underrepresented minorities here who, when some analyses recently show that there's actually a downward mobility, when -- those who thought they had made it and no longer at that middle class level; therefore, many of them are struggling."

"So how do we balance out the reaching the international needs people without neglecting the domestic groups that are still struggling?"

Dean Knuth: "Thank you. I'm sorry. I misunderstood the question about admissions. Financial aid decisions do seek -- as we try to distribute our limited financial aid budget for international students, college diversity also comes into that. So the students who are awarded financial aid are selected so that they're distributed around the university. Some colleges admit to major, some don't. So it's really looking at college-level diversity."

"The notion of middle class and underrepresented students, I think that's a larger question that we could probably talk about at another time. Just to give you an idea, at the undergraduate level, we have 10.2% of our undergraduate enrollment is currently international."

Speaker Walcott: "Chris, I think you were next."

Professor Schaffer: "I wanted to respond briefly to Richard's comments about the need for increased transparency from the administration. I agree, that I think that the decisions that the university makes are going to be better, if more people are involved in helping to formulate good ideas and if there's appropriate forums for people to air concerns and to bring up grievances; but there is also a responsibility on the faculty here, and I think it is very unfair to characterize this administration and the previous administrations as being opaque as regards to the example that was brought up here, the financial crisis."

"Just this semester and in the University Faculty Committee, Provost Kotlikoff spent 45 minutes giving a detailed explanation of the current budget model, the deficit at the center of the university, the plans to deal with it and where they emerged. Just last week or two weeks ago, Dean Collins of the College of Engineering at the college faculty meeting gave a detailed explanation of the College of Engineering budget structure, where their income comes from, what their expenses are, how things are relegated to departments."

"Today, at my department faculty meeting, my department chair, Marjolein van der Meulen, gave a detailed explanation of how our department budget works. This is on top of a detailed explanation from Interim Provost Katz last spring about financial -- about the remaining \$50 million deficit at the center, and this follows previous discussions from the previous provost, all during this time."

"So much of this information is out there, it is available to us. I have never had questions that came up that I was not able to get an answer to when I just asked, but I think asking that it sort of come down and be presented to you on a silver platter is too much. This information has been given to the faculty in many different forms. It is our responsibility to engage with that information, if we're going to be helpful in making good decisions. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "David, I think you were next."

Professor David Delchamps, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I hate to derail this line, maybe come back to it, but since we have Barb here, I figured I'd ask you a question about admissions, because I handle transfer admissions for my department. I have for a number of years, and I used to be able to let anyone in who was over the bar and I was able to enhance the diversity of our undergraduate student body that way and we had some great transfer students.

"Then all of a sudden, I became an admissions officer. They said well, you can only admit N students for a -- why? Oh, that comes from Day Hall. And who does that? Oh, there's a Vice Provost for Enrollment who does that. Okay.

"So I thought fine, that's probably you. I don't know. And then I heard from a friend in the Hotel School that they had sort of -- they, meaning Day Hall, had kind of summarily taken away N freshmen slots from them. They were upset about that, partly because the new budget model gives credit, gives resources to colleges partly on the basis of how many students they have.

"So basically, Day Hall is saying okay, you can't let in these students, and oh, you don't have that many students, so we can't give you resources. So I'm wondering who makes these decisions, how do they get made, all that, if you could just -- then we could get back to this other topic.

"I'm sorry. I'm saying this because you emphasized college autonomy in your previous comments about admissions, about how colleges decide whether we want legacies, whether we want this, whether we want that, and I wanted to communicate to everybody that there is some non-college decision-making that goes into admissions."

Dean Knuth: "So first, I'll make the bold statement that to my knowledge, Day Hall, the building, has never in its life made a decision. It is true that the numbers of students who we admit, and therefore hope to matriculate based on yield modeling, needs to be limited. And one of the reasons why that needs to be limited is because we have a limited stock of housing on campus.

"A decision was made, I believe starting with the 2001 -- 2000 or 2001 entering freshmen, that all first-year students would be housed on north campus. There's a limited number of beds available on north campus. So if we were to say to every college, admit as many freshmen as you would like, it simply wouldn't work.

"So yes, there is a central process for setting numbers. The total number of what's available, slots available, is worked out in combination with housing and with my office, and then we make recommendations -- a team that works with me, including now the Admissions and Financial Aid Working Group. There used to be other structures for that, enrollment strategy groups, various different title things, make recommendations to the provost, and then the provost makes the decision about how that total number is distributed among colleges.

"We went for five years, from 2010 until now, with the same exact number being distributed to colleges. And then, when there was an aim to make an incremental change, a little bit up in one college, a little bit down in another college, that's when deans said hey, you can't take five students away from me; you can't take ten students away from me.

"So that prompts a discussion, then, about just how big can we go. There is no dean who wants fewer students. There's one dean who's pretty satisfied with the amount of students. Every other dean wants more. There are finite limits, so somebody's got to manage that.

"In terms of transfer students, there were no limits, there were no targets. There were no targets that are assigned to colleges up until 2010. And it was in 2010 that we started assigning targets, essentially based on historical patterns. Honestly, in the five years, five and a half now that I have been in this role, we rarely meet those targets for transfer students. And so when it's apparent that colleges are not meeting their target, other colleges have the ability and do come to us and say can we increase our target, because this other school is not meeting their target. And we can make use of those housing slots.

"I will say also, I should say for transfer students currently, there is a board of trustees decision that transfer students -- incoming transfer students -- would be guaranteed on-campus housing. So that, again, puts a limit on the number of students. Does that, I hope..."

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, sir."

Professor Dan Brown, Department of Animal Science: "First I'd like to compliment whoever did it on the form of this meeting. I was hoping that all meetings be like this, and might suggest in the future that the reports from administration be sent electronically and have the people come to answer

questions. Then we'd have more time for that discussion, for deliberation. That might be a new model, but the reason I want to talk is this surprise College of Business.

"This is a disaster on many levels. One is, of course, once again, this snuck in on us. If our faculty trustee or the UFC or the dean of faculty, if they knew about this, I wish they told us a month or two ago, so that we could discuss it more.

"I noticed on the schedule that there's no senate meeting between now and when this proposal will be considered by the trustees, which is a bit of a problem, although there's a solution: With the simple majority of those present, we can suspend the rules, propose resolutions, pass them with all the -- and certainly, with a move like this, with making a proposal public, that without a meeting in between to discuss it, certainly be justified.

"The problem I have with it, like I know anything about business, is we have three fine schools; a Hotel School, Dyson School, Johnson School, very good reputations, operating just fine. What this looks like to the great unwashed up here in agriculture is that they are going to be intercalating another layer of administration between the provost and these fine colleges with good reputations, for no gain.

"To fund a business school dean, we're talking about salaries, perks, benefits, deferred compensation, travel budget, assistants, administrative assistants, assistant deans, associate deans over and above the captains of the three colleges, I can't see how this office will operate with less \$2 million, \$3 million.

"I guess in fellowship or with the humanities departments, my department in agriculture has half the faculty they had when I started. Our facilities are being shut down for lack of \$100,000 here or there, and now Cornell University wants to put in a completely unnecessary dean's office, when we've got fine deans running the colleges now. They could meet with each other and the deans with associated colleges four times a year, make their decisions on budgets and admissions and -- of hiring and firing, without extra cost.

"The trustees' charge is to make sure the land grant fund, the donated fund, state fund, federal funds are spent wisely. And if it's as much a surprise to them as it has been to us, they may not be fully educated on just how wasteful this use of funds would be.

"I think there would be value in passing resolutions to either block this resolution, asking trustees to either block at least our faculty trustee to vote against it or speak against it, or at least table it until we can sort this out and find out if we're blowing yet more millions on administration that could be better used for faculty, for facilities, for scholarships, for all those other things that we can use money for.

"If we are in a financial crisis to the point that we are shutting down facilities all over the -- we are not replacing faculty and we have this luxury proposal to fund yet another administrator, by blocking this or at least discussing it, I think you can improve the morale of the faculty by saying okay, well, here's one unnecessary expense that we did get rid of."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Let me just add to that -- I appreciate the comments. Salaries were frozen in Arts and Sciences last year. Hiring was cut back radically in Arts and Sciences last year. We don't know where we are going in that venue. And what I think the force of what was brought up was, we are not having open discussions about where our money is being spent and what's valuable at Cornell. And that's a problem.

"I also would like to know, and in due respect to John Siliciano, people in the room feel the so-called administration response to a resolution that this senate passed was adequate. Did everybody know that there was a response? I dare say probably, if we stuck up our hands, we'd get a vast majority of people that didn't know that.

"That means there is a dysfunction at various levels, I think at the upper administrative level and I think at the UFC administrative level. The Dean of the Faculty did know that there was a response; we should have heard about that and the senate should have had a chance to respond to it.

"I would say, I thought I heard Dick Miller say that bylaws don't matter or Article 13 doesn't matter. Yes, they do matter. They are part of the constitution of the university. And if we don't abide by them, what we have done is undermine the structure of governance at the university. So it's extremely important that these things be followed out.

"We voted on a specific resolution that has specific content. We deserve a response in 30 days from the administration on that resolution; and we deserve

the right, then, to debate that response and decide what we want to do with it. That's exceptionally important."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Eric, just briefly, there's been a lot of turmoil in the dean of faculty office, you are aware, on a personal level. I am trying to fill in, but understand -- Eric, pardon me, I let you speak. I'm trying to teach two classes and run my regular responsibilities, so you can blame me if the communication is breaking down.

"On the business college, the Dean of Faculty office, meaning me in this regard, I found out Monday, just like the rest of the UFC."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Apparently this response came very early on, when Joe Burns was not ill, in the semester. So I don't accept that. I have to say that. I don't think the senate should accept that as just a personal sort of oversight by Mike Fontaine.

"I think there's a structural problem here, folks. And if we don't understand it as a structural systemic problem, we won't solve it, we won't confront it and we'll be continued to be bypassed by the administration on every important matter of educational policy, as we have been bypassed since the Skorton administration took over.

"I came in 2003. I was recruited to this university. I have an endowed share here, and I have seen it change its direction radically from 2005 on, away from Arts and Sciences in significant ways -- not that everybody isn't important -- and towards a very tech-centered curriculum. That is depriving Arts and Sciences, for example, and I'm sure other college as well, of proper funding."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I think there's a serious problem with governance issues, as Eric and others have talked about. And I'd like to go back specifically to the governance issue about the college, this new business college.

"As you have heard, the UFC heard about it after the decision was made this past Monday. This was clearly an educational policy decision. It clearly dealt with more than one college. It's clear that the bylaws say it should have come to the faculty senate for deliberation. And we should have had a vote, we should have had proposals, a full discussion. We've just now scratched the surface.

"Dan raised some very important issues. It seems to me that the deans of the colleges who are involved all had the responsibility to discuss this with their faculty. As far as I've heard, they did not do that. I can't imagine getting an e-mail; good morning, you are now in a new college, without a discussion by the faculty.

"I mean, I'm shocked by that. And it seems to me -- I'm not affected by it personally. So it seems to me the people in the college should be shocked by it. I think it's shocking not to have it come to the senate for a full discussion and a vote. It's clear that the administration made this choice not to follow that process, because they did not want opposition. That is not the way governance works. Opposition is part of it, debate is part of it.

"So I fully support the idea, if we can do this, through parliamentary procedure, to somehow suspend the rules and to vote on a resolution by the senate to call upon the faculty trustees to suspend any decision on this proposed college of business until such time as the faculty senate has the opportunity to fully deliberate and to vote on this."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Second."

Professor Birman: "I share the concern about this sudden proposal, and I agree this should have been brought to the faculty senate. My concern, though, would be that we, as a senate, have not been clear enough that faculty government and faculty engagement means bringing proposals to the senate for the senate to discuss openly. And it's been too easy for the administration to say, well, we briefed the UFC, we briefed this committee, we briefed that committee.

"So I think what we really need to do here, independent of Risa's proposal, so to make it absolutely clear that the only form of engagement that we will accept are presentations to us; and then, as was suggested earlier, with adequate time for us to rise to the microphone, discuss our views, debate them, vote if it's appropriate to vote, and that this is what we need, an engagement with a broad community. And the administration needs to hear that anything short of that fails the test of faculty governance."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm speaking to the motion that's on the floor for a vote. I think in terms of wording, it could be simple. It could be a sentence, and it's just asking our representative trustees, but also asking all of the trustees to table this for a -- there's no rush to stuff another office administrator into the

university. If that's the best thing, we could do it in a few months, but just ask them, simple, that the University Faculty Senate, which is all trustees to vote to table this motion, at least for three or four months, so that it can be fully discussed on campus.

“And I would amend the motion to include to transmit this directly to the individual trustees on the board of trustees, not pass it through any filters. One-sentence resolution, transmit it directly to all of the trustees. See what they do.”

Parliamentarian, Professor Sam Nelson: It's a bit confusing, because there's two motions now on the floor: The one that Risa put up and then the amended one that you just offered, right?

Parliamentarian, Professor Sam Nelson : “What I would like to do is, first of all, suspend the rules that are going on right now and determine that this is an okay way to proceed with the meeting. We'll have an up/down vote on that. There is a quorum here. Is that correct? It's over 50 people? I counted them earlier. Unless anyone left, I think we have plenty of people.

“So the confusing part is I don't think we're set up to do the clicking way that we normally do, and there are people here that aren't senators in attendance. So my understanding and -- you might explain the procedure at this point.

Associate Dean Fontaine: “What I'm going to do is we'll have a transparent vote. If you vote in favor of suspending the rules, you say aye. If you disagree, you say nay, correct?

“Let's make sure we have exactly the resolution we're voting on. I'm going to call by last name, in the interest of time. Assie-Lumumba.”

Professor Assie-Lumumba: “Yes.”

Associate Dean Fontaine: “Dan Brown”

Professor Brown: “Yes.”

Associate Dean Fontaine: “Vimal Selvaraj.

Professor Selvaraj: “Yes.”

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Yes, in favor? We'll say yes, in favor and no, against. Santiago-Irizarry?"

Professor Santiago-Irizarry: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Harry de Gorter? No longer here. Yes? No?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He left.

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Gregory Page?"

Professor Gregory Page: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Jonathan Ochshorn?"

Professor Ochshorn: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Pardon me. Chris Schaffer."

Professor Schaffer: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Jeffrey Chusid, on behalf of City Regional Planning?"

Professor Chusid: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Jery Stedinger?"

Professor Stedinger: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Jeff Rusten?"

Professor Rusten: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Peter Scrivani?"

Professor Scrivani: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Jonathan Schultz?"

Professor Schultz: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "John Brady."

Professor Brady: "Yes."

Associate Dean Fontaine: "There's a call for transparent votes, yes? Hand vote. There are people in here who aren't senators. And won't be able to tell, but it seems like a majority of the people -- in fact probably everyone will vote yes, so let's just see if there are any objections at this time, and speed it up."

"So just to generally, all those in favor of having the votes to suspend the rules, so we can vote, say aye."

(Ayes.)

Associate Dean Fontaine: "All those against? Okay, so we are suspending the rules. The next resolution exactly, let's hear it again."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "And Risa, if you could take into account the statement that was made after you about a friendly amendment."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Right. Well, maybe this will do it. Resolved that the university trustees suspend consideration of the school of business -- I think it should be table. Resolved that the university trustees table consideration of the school of business until the faculty senate can deliberate on the proposal to create the school of business."

"College, sorry. College. Okay, resolved that the university trustees suspend consideration of creation of the College of Business until the faculty can deliberate on the proposal."

"What did I say? Faculty senate can deliberate on the proposal. How's that? Is that clear?"

"I think that we can vote as the senate, to have the senate -- the idea is that the senate should be able to deliberate. I think it should be broader, but I think that we should vote as the senate to ask the trustees to suspend or table consideration of the proposal, until such time as the senate has a chance to deliberate."

"I think it should be broader, but it seems to me the senate should vote on its own powers."

Parliamentarian, Professor Sam Nelson: "I am a bit concerned, as the parliamentarian, that people that aren't senators will vote. I don't think it's going to be a close vote or anything, but I don't know. So what I would like to ask is just for the purpose of the vote, that observers that aren't voting senators just leave the room for the moment, so there's less confusion about that. And then you can come back in, right after we..."

Professor Lieberwitz: "If we're not a senator, we can just go in the back and not vote."

Parliamentarian Nelson: "But there will be people in the back that will be voting. There will be confusion that way."

Professor Lieberwitz: "How about non-senators go into the corner?"

Associate Dean Fontaine: "If you're still here, looks like you're a senator, right? If not, that's democracy for you. We do have quorum. We have a signed-in quorum. So here we go.

"I'm going to do the vote by voice acclamation first. If you are in favor of the resolution, you say yes. If you are opposed to it, you say no. And if it's close, I will call by name.

"All in favor of the [resolution](#), say yes.

(Yeses.)

Associate Dean Fontaine: "All opposed? So it passes unanimously.

"Okay. You can come back to your seats."

Speaker Walcott: "And that's about the end of the meeting. I think that's all the time we have. Well, thank you all. That's the end of the meeting, and I wish you all a happy break."

(Meeting Adjourned)