

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
Wednesday, March 13, 2013

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Speaker Pro-Tem, Steven Beer: "Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call to order the March 13th, 2013 meeting of the University Faculty Senate. I'd like to remind people in the chamber to kindly turn off or silence cell phones, beepers and so on, and remind you also that there will be no recorder, either visually or audibly of the proceedings, except those done by the people in charge.

When you wish to speak, please raise your hand, be recognized and wait for the microphone to be brought to you. Then rise, state your name and affiliation, and give your points. I'd like to ask also that you have a succinct question and you speak no more than two minutes. And once you ask your question, it's time for another person to ask a question or make a point. So only one question per person at a time.

So I think that's it for the preliminaries. The next item is announcements by the dean of the faculty."

**2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, JOSEPH BURNS**

Dean Burns: "Thank you, Steve. Good day, everybody. We are here for our March meeting. I want to introduce our cheese on the side here. It's a Big Red cheese, produced by the college once more. We are running out of Cornell things, so if you have any cookies at home or good recipes, please bring them in. We'd like to continue this thing, trying to offer items associated with the university or the area, at the least. I guess the next thing is Finger Lakes Wine, huh?

We have a tradition of greeting one another. So we could do that, and do it monthly, lean over and, if you don't recognize anybody, say hey, I'm so-and-so and I'm from such-and-such.

The best part of the job is getting to bang that gavel. I need one at home. So I wanted to just quickly go over the agenda. We really have only two half-hour presentations, a small thing from CAPP coming in as well, and some rather standard sessions, but the two major items are discussion of the strategy for Information Technology, and this is by Ted Dodds, our Chief Information Officer. Ted arrived here about two years ago, a little more than two years ago,

and has been trying to understand the situation technology-wise on campus, has formed some committees and is about to present an information technology strategy. And it's about time. We are a bit behind, as I think he'll tell us, so he's here to get our feedback and for us to bring information to our departments about this information strategy.

Then following that, we will have a discussion by Kent Fuchs, our provost, on MOOCs and the report that has come back from a special faculty committee and his intention on what to do with that report. And that should end the meeting.

At our last meeting, I was chastised for not reporting on my activities over the previous month. I want to try to follow the governance rules and do a better job of that this time, but it will be an imperfect job, I'm sure, and subject to correction the next time. By the time I leave this job, I should have it down.

So there is a batch of items that probably I spent most of my time on in the last month or last few months. First one is the Ho Plaza reports. As you know, we talked about the one coming back from the president last month. And we had a presentation from the president and a very heated discussion, or active discussion, at any rate.

My own interactions have been with various faculty members and senate members over the Ho Plaza reports. I have spoken to the UFC about them, certainly spoken to Jim Mingle, the university counsel, and set up the committee that I was asked to do by the senate itself, and have spoken to that committee several times and also made presentations to the university assemblies about the president's report and the discordance between the code of conduct and the way that permitting is done, perhaps.

Then we had a discussion of MOOCs over the course of the last six months or so. And in that arena, I have participated in the faculty committee that reported to Kent. I helped him choose the committee, and participated in it myself. As you know, our first faculty forum was involved with MOOCs, and so we have had a presentation there.

Then, subsequently, I brought that report to the UFC, sent it on to the Education Policy Committee and sent it on to Tom Cleland's Academic Programs and Policies for their recommendations and interpretations of that document. And I attended all those meetings and I also interacted with the trustees on this issue.

Faculty governance. Certainly Kent and the president and myself have had discussions about faculty governance, and I'm trying to come up with an idea on how we might discuss faculty governance, perhaps even as soon as our next senate meeting.

This job, as I've learned, entails more meetings than I had ever imagined. I think I've beaten my record for an academic year by many-fold already. Some of the items that have come in front of me involve faculty appeals, appeals of tenure decisions, and appeals about departmental decisions on sabbatical leaves. One of the surprising things to me, and totally out of the ordinary -- and I want to emphasize this -- I have had brought to me so far eight academic misconduct cases. The previous dean, or so he tells me, had three in four years. I have had eight in six months. I hope that stops. Please stop it.

And then I even get involved in weather forecasts, when we had problems with Hurricane Sandy and so forth. I was up at 3:00 in the morning on that committee. So I could go on and on, and my wife can tell you that. So anyway, that's what I have been doing over my last few months in this position.

That's the end of my remarks. I wanted to remind you that there was supposed to be no extra assigned work during the spring break. You're not supposed to be burdening your students. And then, in case I forget at the end of the day, I would also like at this time to wish you a terrific break."

Speaker Beer: "Thanks very much, Dean Burns. I should mention, we do have one Good and Welfare speaker, who will raise a question and perhaps entertain discussion on behalf of the Association of Professors Emeriti at the end. So at this point, we're going to hear a report from the University Faculty Committee by professor David Delchamps."

### **3. REMARKS BY UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE MEMBER DAVID DELCHAMPS**

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "Some of this is going to be stuff that Joe touched upon when he was talking about what he was doing, because we work closely with him. First of all, every month, ten days before the senate meeting, we meet to set the senate meeting agenda. That's something we do every month.

And we also meet twice a semester pretty much, with the president, and four times a semester with the provost. And those meetings are pursuant to the

recommendations of the 2007 Report on Faculty Governance. And we also meet, by the way, twice a year with the executive committee board of trustees. That's going to happen two weeks from today. I missed the one in the fall. Those are things we do on a regular basis.

Let me just give you a few examples of things we have considered with our meeting with the provost. The provost sometimes brings things to us; sometimes we bring things to him. One of the things we talked about was the report of the Task Force on Internationalization, and that was one of the ones that he had brought to us.

Another one that we talked about -- and this is one of the ones we brought up with him -- was the report on enhancing faculty diversity from the provost fellow Zellman Warhaft from a year or two ago. He filled us in on the university-wide initiatives announced last February.

We've also talked about something that arose a couple years ago in the wake of the Africana situation and the termination of the Department of Education, and also the NYC thing; and that is we had a subcommittee working with John Siliciano on what faculty consultation entails in broad terms. And that kind of fizzled a bit, and we are trying to nudge that back into action. So that's one of the things we are trying to do with the central administration.

And at our meetings with the president last fall, the first one dealt largely with campus climate issues in the wake of the stream of sexual assaults and things he was thinking about doing with that. The second one was shortly after the Ho Plaza incident and we spent most of the time talking with him about that and what he planned to do in response to that.

Now, at our agenda-setting meeting in December, we had a quite lengthy discussion about the Ho Plaza incident and what we thought appropriate faculty responses would be. There was a lot of difference of opinion in the committee. It was a really good discussion. And the result of that, as you probably remember, was the faculty senate meeting in December. We had two motions. We had one motion from the UFC, one motion from the group of faculty members. We passed them both, and the rest is history. I'll have more to say about that in a moment.

The two things we've spent the most time on this year are MOOCs and the Ho Plaza incident. Let me just run by you the timeline on the MOOCs, at least from

the UFC standpoint. In September, at the first senate meeting, the provost told us of his intent to form a non-ad hoc faculty committee to look into MOOCs, with no particular mission except to look at the idea of maybe joining a MOOC consortium. He also mentioned that to us at our next UFC meeting, and we had a faculty forum on MOOCs later in the month that Joe had already started the ball rolling on in August. So we were thinking about that -- we wanted to get ahead before the train left the station. We wanted to have faculty weighing in on what they thought on this.

And the provost committee was not something he formed by himself. He and Joe worked together to put that committee together, and Joe was on it. They sent the report to the provost, and the first thing he did with our report is come to UFC and say okay, I have this report. What faculty committees of the senate should look at this report? We decided to send it to CAPP, FABIT and EPC. Some of us weren't sure whether EPC was ready for it, maybe only when the courses offered credit, but we sent it to them anyway. That's what happened with that. And that's where we intersected with the MOOCs timeline. And as far as the Ho Plaza thing goes, early in January, after the senate passed the second resolution calling for a separate faculty committee to investigate the Ho Plaza incident, we met and then had a lot of e-mail traffic in January, because some people were out of the country, out of town, etcetera, while putting together the small faculty committee to do their investigation. The members of that committee are Bill Fry, Margaret Washington and Rich Allmendinger. Early in February, we met with that committee to hear a report from Jim Mingle, University Counsel, and Jane Miller, President Skorton's executive assistant, on their report. They had done the investigation for the president, and we had a good back and forth with them. Then the president reported that report at our last senate meeting.

A couple of other things, kind of less important in a way than those big things: we had a really good faculty forum a couple of weeks ago that Mike Fontaine put together on the future of the university research library, and had good outside speakers. A lot of us made our first visit to Milstein to see that.

Also, on a more general level, we welcome your thoughts on this; we have been trying to figure out ways to get the most out of our senate meetings. So if you have any ideas on smoothing out the discussion, or what kinds of things ought to be happening at the senate meetings, we welcome them. Any questions or discussion about anything?

The Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters, Eric Cheyfitz: "I read in "The Sun" on the 27th that there had already been a decision made to join one of the MOOCs consortiums, and I just want to know if that's true first. Has that decision been made?"

Professor Delchamps: "I think the provost will probably talk about that. I don't know, actually, the answer to that question."

Professor Cheyfitz: "So then I could ask you the follow-up question or ask it now and you can address it."

Speaker Beer: "Can you hold it, since we have to keep to the time of the agenda. Professor has used up his time.

So I trust you have completed your report?"

Professor Delchamps: "Yes."

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Thanks so much. We'll now move to Associate Dean of the Faculty Michael Fontaine for a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

#### **4. REMARKS BY THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL FONTAINE**

Associate Dean Fontaine: "Hi, everybody. We have one new appointment to announce at the top here, Maureen Olson from Arts and Sciences to the Nominations and Elections Committee. Apart from that one appointment, the most important thing to tell you is the elections are going to begin soon for appointments to the UFC, the University Faculty Committee, and to Nominations and Elections, to which some members are appointed and others are elected.

The names are up here. I'll say them in a second, but election will begin -- it goes live on Wednesday, March 27th, so after the break. And it will run through 11:59 p.m. on Monday, April 8th. During that time, you'll be able to vote. In fact, you'll be able to vote from your mobile phone, because the tech people have put together a new app or some device that should make this thing easier.

"Here are the names. These are the candidates for election for the University Faculty Committee. There are two vacancies, and it's for three years for each

term. There's Rosemary Avery from Policy Analysis and Management, there's Kavita Bala from Computer Science, there's David Delchamps from Electrical and Computer Engineering, and there's Clare Fewtrell from Molecular Medicine. Those are for the senator spots on the UFC. The next candidates are for non-senator spots on the UFC, the University Faculty Committee. Again, three vacancies. These are for three-year terms. There's John Eckenrode from College of Human Ecology, Ronald Ehrenberg from Industrial and Labor Relations. There's Emmanuel Giannelis from Material Science and Engineering. There's Isaac Kramnick from Government, and there's Risa Lieberwitz from Labor and Employment Law and ILR.

In the other election there's one vacancy to the Nominations and Elections Committee. There are two candidates. There's Joanne Fortune from Physiology and the Vet School, and there's Thorsten Joachims Computer Science, College of Arts and Sciences. Thank you.

Speaker Beer: "Thanks very much. Our next item is a report from the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Cleland.

**5. [REPORT](#) FROM THOMAS CLELAND, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES**

Assistant Professor Thomas Cleland, Psychology: "Thank you. This is fairly routine and quick. You may recall from previous senate meetings there's a backlog of some programs that have been in existence for some time that were never properly registered with the New York State Department of Education, and we have been going through them systematically, so far approving them. This is one of these. This is a J.D.-Ph.D. joint program between the Sage School of Philosophy and the law school, which has been working since 1980, and there are no complaints with this. Smooth and solid, and we've made this finding accordingly, so on behalf of the senate have approved it and it hopefully will be received with favor in Albany as well.

Are there any questions about this? Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "Thanks so much. We'll move on to the next item, which is strategy for Information Technology, and that will be given by Professor Dodds, the Chief Information Technology Officer. And we'll quickly switch to his slides."

## 6. REPORT FROM THE CHIEF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OFFICER, TED DODDS

Chief Information Officer, Ted Dodds: "This is where there'll be some technical glitch, I guarantee. Can everyone hear me at the back okay? I should be miked up, so I can wander around a little bit. So first of all, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to spend a little bit of time together. I think we have about half an hour. I'm going to assume that clock is actually an hour slow. I don't have an hour and a half. I only have a half hour to speak with you.

Joe asked me to get together with the faculty senate and have a conversation about the process we have been following to develop what I'm told is the university's first-ever campus-wide IT strategic plan, so I want to spend a bit of time telling you about the process, why I thought it was important for Cornell to have an IT strategic plan.

I felt after my first year here that there was a tradition of kind of moving from crisis to crisis, issue to issue, and wouldn't it be nice if we had a little bit more predictability, even in a fairly unpredictable space like IT. So a little bit about why, the process we followed, where we are in that process. And really urge your feedback, comments, expertise, both through questions and so forth today, but also, as Joe mentioned in his introduction, was actually quite spot on, to also ask you to go back and talk to your colleagues in your departments and so on, and in part to just make sure that the plan, which is currently still in a draft state, is as accurate, as timely, as complete as it can be.

Joe also mentioned that it might be useful for people just to kind of have a sense of what is IT at Cornell and what is the general shape of things within the IT sphere at the university. So I'm going to start off with that. I will whip through some of these slides fairly quickly. I have a lot of information on them.

You never know. People in the audience, some people are very I don't want too much detail, and some people like a lot of detail. So I tried to provide a balance of that information. So I'll spend a little bit of time talking about the nature and scale and scope of IT at Cornell today.

The first thing I would like to do is introduce this term "IT at Cornell," which we are starting to use increasingly. It's been adopted by the IT community at the university, of which there are about 750 people. If you look through the HR files to see how many people are in the IT job family right across the university, you



will see it looks about like that. And roughly speaking, it's about a 50/50 mixture between the center and the units.

It's probably worthwhile pointing out that the role of Chief Information Officer, which was created new -- I think I'm the first person to hold that title -- has sort of two responsibilities at the university: One is managing directly the Central IT Division of about 300 or so people.

And the second is broadly IT strategy for the university, including having the IT directors in the various distributed colleges and units co-report from their direct line relationship to their dean or vice president and into my office. So what that has helped us do is create much more of a community orientation around IT and a lot less of the center versus everyone else sort of thing that's been the history, not just at this university, but just about everywhere else that I can think of. It's about \$100 million per year annual expenditures. Most likely this does not include much of any of the research IT expenditures.

This just gives you an idea of the scope and scale of the infrastructure. We have a large network, a lot of wireless activity. As you can see, 39,000 to 40,000 people, 103,000 devices, and about 20,000 to 25,000 concurrent wireless devices using the network at any given time, 9.5 million hits per day on our web site.

So when, as we experienced yesterday, some of those web sites don't function properly, everybody notices it. It's just a kind of a day-to-day thing, where these IT utilities like the web sites and e-mail are so important.

You may know we just concluded a project to move away from our on-campus Microsoft Exchange for faculty and students. We're now using a cloud-based product called Office 365 from Microsoft. That project's complete. All our students are using GMail. There's a couple hundred thousand or half a million student-created Google Docs out there in Google space, about 83,000 alumni using an e-mail forwarding system for their cornell.edu address.

And the bottom two stats are kind of interesting, because 2 million incoming e-mail messages each day, 70% of which are either spam or virus and just never get distributed to anybody. And so that gives you an idea of the kind of activity that happens on a day-to-day basis.

This kind of funky map is one that I thought would give you an illustration of the research network infrastructure, to which Cornell is attached. So all of these

big lines are various either Internet 2 or National Land Derailer, these are the national conglomerates that are principally made up of University members, of which Cornell is one in both of those areas. Then you can see across North America, across the Atlantic and across the Pacific, just all the band width, all the capacity that we have. And this is continually evolving, changing, improving, getting faster and more throughput.

I thought you might find this of some interest. You may have heard of, over the last two years, the move towards virtual infrastructure. So used to be the case that -- again, at Cornell and elsewhere, that people in units, where it's the center or elsewhere, would have a small number of servers that a person would support, maybe under their desk sometimes people say. Well, turns out that those devices are doing nothing about 90% to 95% of the time they are plugged in. What virtual infrastructure has allowed us to do, and all the college units have taken advantage of this hugely, as you can see by the growth in the number of what's called virtual machines over the last couple of years, is consolidate a lot of that infrastructure into a smaller, kind of hardware footprint that makes all of those systems much more efficient, and it lowers the operating cost for the units that are using this service.

So if there were IT directors from some of the colleges here in the audience, and I don't know if there are, but I think you would find they would be the first to testify to the fact that this new kind of virtual approach to infrastructure, which we're doing in a lot of different ways, not just with servers and so on, is not only a time saver, it's a money safer for them too.

They can put their scarce IT funds and people into work of even higher value than supporting all these servers. And there's somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,300 virtual machines today. That number will continue to climb.

A little more on the stats. I'm sure in the back it is hard to read these numbers, but if someone asked you before this presentation how many software applications does Cornell run, well, I can tell you, depending on how you characterize them and determine that, the definition, there's somewhere around 1,100.

These two slides kind of show you the software applications that are supported and operated by academic units -- that's on the left-hand side -- and those that are supported and operated by the administrative organizations, which is on the right-hand side.

We did a little project a year or so ago, where we went around to all the units, did an inventory of systems that people were running, and have identified from that the possibility of being able to consolidate some number of those systems into a smaller footprint, again, to lower the operating costs and make it a little easier for units to manage their IT dollars. So there's lots of activity going on in that space.

IT at Cornell is a community -- this, of course, is an organizational chart, not a community chart, but I thought I would start with it. And you can see that the way that the Central Division is organized, this area here, the old CIT organization really has three divisions that are responsible for the delivery of services: Applications and software, infrastructure and support.

In here, in what we call the CIO's office, are groups that do things like planning and program management to make sure what we are doing by way of IT projects and initiatives are well-planned, well-thought-through, have the right level of stakeholder engagement and so on; a small academic technologies group, which I'm hoping to be able to invest more in as we do more and more online learning. And then we've got things like IT security, IT policy and so on.

Where the community comes in is in this little circle here, the IT service groups, which is sort of shorthand way of describing the IT leaders in all of your academic units. So this would be at the college or school level. And those are the individuals that I mentioned before, co-reporting to my office and to their respective dean or vice president, and they meet on a regular basis with my associate CIO Steve Schuster, who's really their go-to person. They have an hour to an hour-and-a-half meeting every week, and if there's any threat that that meeting will not be held, they demand that it be held, because I think that group is really functioning very, very well as a team and as advisors into the Central Division, the groups that are putting together new services and support, but also as a group that is increasingly collaborating together to get things done unit-to-unit.

This is not all of IT at Cornell, but I thought I would show you the general high-level breakdown of the Central Division's operating budget, about \$54 million per year. I'll show you what it used to be, versus what it is today. I don't know how well you can see at the back, but I mentioned academic technologies. Roughly speaking, at \$2.6 million, about 5% of the total central expenditure on IT. And I want you to remember that 5% figure for a slide I'm going to show you in a couple minutes.

Then we have the applications division, which does a lot of the administrative systems that people love to hate sometimes, but they're there to deploy those systems. And of course you are probably aware, at least I hope you are aware that in the next couple of weeks we'll be rolling out the first cloud-based major administrative system in the form of Workday for Human Resources and Payroll.

Then we have a support division that has support for the network desktop support service desk, all sorts of things, a lot of interactivity here between the central support division and the support staff that you have within your colleges and units; and then the infrastructure division that really runs that kind of hard-core back office stuff like those servers, the network and all the things I mentioned before. This is that thin layer of people for IT security and policy, and then my office and facilities and that sort of stuff.

So that's what that operating budget looks like. It's worth just noting -- and I'm sure every one of the colleges and units represented in this room have the same kind of graph that they could show, but I think it's just worth looking over the last number of years at their relative reduction in overall expenditures within the central group.

The interesting thing to me, I think, is that's happening at the same time as a lot more services are being delivered, because of this consolidation effect that I mentioned. So I think it's reasonable to assert that the Central Division is getting increasingly efficient, and one of the reasons why it's getting increasingly efficient is because of the availability of these cloud services like Office 365 for e-mail and calendaring. So that gives you a sense of how that funding has progressed over the last while.

This is it for head count over the last four or five years, where there's been a reduction of, roughly speaking, 25% of the staff that were in the Central IT Division, including vacant positions in all those graphs, relative to today, from just over 400 to just under 300 is about the numbers. So you can see the expenditure reductions hit on the staff pretty hard, and I know because I have been involved in a lot of those reductions.

So all of this brings me to the question: why do we need an IT strategic plan? And I think it's because of the fact that there have been all of these changes in IT at Cornell over the last number of years going back to the reimagine initiatives

and, of course, the fiscal challenges of 2008-2009, and the old saying, without a plan, any road will do.

I just felt that now is about the right time, having dealt with a lot of down-sizing, as you can see in the Central Division, I think building up -- and this is not me. This is the community kind of coming together, working much more collaboratively between the Central Division and unit-to-unit, that wouldn't it make sense in this cacophony of noise that we hear around IT, wouldn't it make a lot of sense for us to have a high-level plan that's not prescriptive, it's not meant to be a recipe book, it's meant to be very high-level.

I know that Joe was going to try and make it available to -- I hope everyone who has an interest in having read it has had a chance to do so; but if not, I'm happy to follow up more individually. So this is kind of the breakdown of how the plan is structured. There are six categories that we've put together. They're pretty straightforward, but I want to start off with the most important category of all, which is people.

It's worth noting that this plan, which took about a year, 12, 13 months of meetings, consultation, focus groups, big events, small events, so on, has been developed not by the technology staff of the university, but by the people who use the technology that those staff deploy.

So I hope that if you have had a chance to read it, you will have seen in the language that it's all about what do we want IT to do in service to the academic mission of the university. So we have a chapter, section on the student experience, learning technologies, research, obviously. And then down here, enterprise systems, big information systems, IT career framework, because I think we have a lot of work that we can do with our staff to sort of re-skill and retool the IT workforce at Cornell, given the rapidity of change in the IT environment, and then making sure that services are excellent.

Each one of those sections was developed by its own little working group, with the exception of research, which I'll tell you about, which followed a slightly different path. And in that group of six sections, you will find 24 objectives and 100-odd initiatives.

One of our first orders of business, once we get a good level of feedback from the community, which is underway right now, is to begin to set some priorities and what do we do first and what's dependent on something else and that type of thing, because you can't really call a list of objectives and a list of initiatives a

plan until you begin to kind of put it into how you actually go about implementing it.

This is a very abbreviated summary of how we have gone about putting the plan together. Started a little over a year ago. I put together a small senior advisory group with several deans, vice provosts, vice presidents, I met with them monthly. Usually we'd cancel a meeting, we'd meet probably quarterly, and their job was just to advise on the process, are we reaching out to people enough, are we talking to the right people, what are we missing in terms of the quality and comprehensiveness of the plan.

Then we created, as I mentioned, for all of those sections of the plan, their own individual advisor group. So there was one on the experience, one on learning technologies. Some of those will remain on as active advisory committees after the plan has been completed, and some of them were specific, special purpose, solely for the plan itself.

Then we had meetings with FABIT, the Faculty Advisory Board for IT. I just saw Paul Velleman come in, the chair of FABIT, so he can speak to that as well. I mentioned that we didn't do a specific advisory group for research, and that's because I spoke to Bob Buhrman about this probably about a year ago and he said, you know, the diversity and richness of the research mission at Cornell is so great that trying to get a single committee together that's going to be able to really put something that they'll all agree on together is unlikely.

So what I did was use that as an excuse to do something I wanted to do anyway, and that is just phone up a number of researchers, I think probably about 20 in all, so not as comprehensive perhaps as getting all of them, but about 20 individuals and groups. And I just scheduled one-hour meetings with them over the course of the summer and fall.

It was a great way to get to know faculty on campus. Inspiring, it's interesting and exciting. And out of that, we kind of distilled the section of the plan on research; we had a question of the week that ran on the web site and so on. We had an on-campus conference on September 11th, of all days, but we had an all-day campus conference, to which I think something in the neighborhood of 300 people, including 50 faculty, attended.

Then on the 7th of February, a little over a month or so ago, I sent out to the deans, vice president, vice provost and so on a draft copy, what I would sort of

think of as being the penultimate draft version of the strategic plan for review, of which this meeting and your collective feedback is part.

I just want -- how am I doing for time?"

Speaker Beer: "You have eight minutes."

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "I'm going to wrap this up by just saying one of the things that is very important to me and the reason I wanted you to think about that statistic about academic technologies is today, our IT expenditure, if you think of that big pie chart as a dollar, 90 cents out of every dollar we spend on IT goes to things that are important. All this stuff down here is really important. We can't run the university without it, but it doesn't make Cornell special. It doesn't differentiate us from our competitors and our peers. And only 5% to 10% -- I think I'm being generous when I say 10% -- are spent on academic technologies, analytic mobility, things I think can differentiate the university.

One of my goals is to get beyond 50/50 if possible, but what we're doing actively right now, I can give some examples, if you want to hear them, is we are reallocating resources within the Central Division out of the utility service provision -- this is what the outsourcing e-mail allows us to do -- into academic technology, so we could provide more support to you, who want to use technology to support teaching and learning, your community engagement activities and so forth.

I am going to stop now and take questions."

Speaker Beer: "Great. Are there any questions for Vice President Dodds? Or comments? The lady near the front. Could you wait for a microphone, please."

Professor Christine Shoemaker, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I know when I go back and talk to our faculty about this meeting and they hear that you have come, one of the questions is going to be how about cloud computing for them, like they have their own computers and all their multiple computers and everything. What are they supposed to be doing in terms of getting stuff off their own computers onto a cloud? What kind of service should they be using? Is that supposed to be a departmental machine or is the university providing something like that? Not just e-mail, but everything, all your stuff."

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "I think there are probably two categories, to oversimplify. I would say there's research and all other. What we're trying to do deliberately is anything that's in that sort of utility side that -- including things they might operate themselves, to push more and more and more of that into the cloud, or at least get aggregation of scale economies on premises like we have done with virtual infrastructure.

When it comes to research, and this was one of the questions I asked every researcher I spoke to this summer and fall is do you think that there are offerings out there in the cloud, through Amazon and other companies that offer high-performance computing and storage and so forth. There's a lot of activity at the national level in bringing very attractive agreements from companies like Amazon, Google and Microsoft, which has its own flavor of this at a price point that's very, very affordable to the university.

We also have Dave Lifka's group, the Center for Advanced Computing, that has its own kind of brand of red cloud, which is also high-performance computing and storage. And I'll tell you, Dave's division gets enormous accolades from every researcher I spoke to who knows, even those people who don't use it. There's no one simple answer to the question cloud or not cloud, but I think that the choices are becoming more and more attractive. The question around research is also how you translate the funding model for a cloud service that tends to be at the university level with the allocation of a cost for a specific research project.

We have been talking to people about that, but that's probably going to be one of the things that we want to resolve as part of the implementation of the strategic plan. I hope I answered your question.

Professor Brian Chabot, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "You have a very impressive, very ambitious plan based on reading earlier today. Do you have a timeline as to when this is going to be accomplished, or will it be a timeline?"

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "The question of timeline is a bit of a range. It's very difficult to think about anything in the IT world in a concrete way five years out, but I think the date range that we gave to the plan was 2013 to 2017. But I think to your point more specifically, the first thing we need to do as we begin to kind of finalize the comment period on the plan, and we are beginning to start to think about this, is how do we identify the first things that we need to do, because they'll have the biggest impact; or perhaps by doing those things, it



will make it way easier to do something else that might be even more important than the -- so that's going to be working through some of those governance groups that I mentioned before. FABIT will be part of those conversations; the deans probably will want to weigh in on some of those things. So without overwhelming people with too much IT too much of the time or a whole lot of detail, that's my goal. And then it may be that there's some pieces of the plan that we look at in two years' time and say you know what, that was so 2013. We're not going to do that anymore.

Trying to keep the plan up-to-date and current I think is an exercise I'd like to see happen maybe every two years, and with that would also come maybe a progress report out to the community to say what have you done in the last 12 to 24 months, vis-a-vis the plans and goals you set back two years ago. So those are the kinds of public outreach and accountability metrics that I think are going to be really important, but I'm going to be thinking in terms of that plan being my guidance for the next couple of years."

Speaker Beer: "Any other questions or comments? We have several minutes."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Do you have a couple of specific examples of advances in academic technologies?"

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "Specific examples in advances in academic technologies. Here's an example: As a result of moving from an on-campus e-mail and calendaring system, Exchange, and moving from that version of Exchange to the one that Microsoft offers in the cloud, which looks pretty much exactly the same when you use Outlook -- love it or hate it, most people use Outlook -- so the good news that it's no worse. The bad news is it's no better; but as a result of that, we have three or four people, three really, strong technical people that have been running that infrastructure for the last number of years, and I don't need them to do that anymore, but they're also really good technical people, so we're going to redeploy them or use them to sort of shuffle other staff around. And we're going to reduce the number of individuals that are in the service delivery division, which that was, and move those positions into academic technology.

In anticipation of there being more demand for technical and planning and other support for online learning, whether it's blended learning, whether it's MOOCs that Kent is going to talk about, or something else, we will begin to build capacity so we can shift that pie the way I showed it, without necessarily always

going cap in hand, saying the only way we could do more with academic technologies is if you give us more money. We may eventually get to that point as a university, but I think right now, reallocating some of our utilities is a good way to go."

Speaker Beer: "Any other questions? Professor Stein."

Professor Emeritus, Peter Stein, Physics: "Presumably, Microsoft doesn't do this for free for you. I just wonder how does the cost of putting it on their cloud compare to four good people that you're releasing?"

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "I want to make sure when I say release, I'm not releasing in the sense of letting them go."

Professor Stein: "I mean release from their responsibility."

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "I'm sensitive to that, because over the last two years I had to lay off a lot of people. So the answer to that is we still pay Microsoft the licenses for the number of people who use Exchange and the number of -- I think Outlook is a separate license. So those two sets of licenses, we were paying in the old system, where we ran the infrastructure. We're still paying for those licenses in the new infrastructure, but we don't have any additional cost to Microsoft over and above those licenses. So what happened is the licenses stayed constant. The on-campus people cost can be reallocated to something else, and there's nothing on the cloud side that takes its place.

They're not really doing it for nothing, but they are doing it because they have -- I think I'm right -- in the last six or seven months, they've added 90 million new users to Office 365. So we do things at scale at Cornell that are like 20,000 or so people, but these big companies like Google and Microsoft have just off-the chart scale. And what that means is their cost per thing that they do goes way, way down, and they can make that attractive to us to use. That's kind of the simple economics of the cloud."

Speaker Beer: "Thanks very much."

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "I'd like to move now, also in the technology area, to MOOCs. And Provost Fuchs is going to lead this, along with professor Tardos."

## **7. CORNELL'S PLANS FOR MASSIVE OPEN ONLINE COURSES, MOOCs - REMARKS BY PROVOST KENT FUCHS -**

Provost Fuchs: "Thank you. Eva Tardos is over here, but I thought I would ask her to help with maybe the Q&A, and I'll make some introductory comments. I want to start by building on some of the comments that Ted said or didn't say that I know about that I think are important for you all to know about.

Ted was brought to Cornell very purposefully, to think on behalf of all of us about how we can use information technology more effectively in our core mission of education and scholarship and outreach. And it's our firm belief before Ted came that we just weren't doing that enough. We were making things run, the trains were running on time usually, but we really weren't using technology effectively or as effectively as we could be. So Ted's doing that.

We spend a lot of money, tens of millions of dollars per year on important administrative software, but it's not what really adds value. Much of it does not add value directly to the educational mission or the scholarship that you all are involved in, or in direct outreach, say, for a land grant mission. So we're trying to change that.

Ted was brought on with a mission of making us more effective with a lot fewer people, with a lot smaller budget. So I think in my four and a half years almost as provost, we have shrunk the Central IT organization by 100 people. So that gives you a sense of what we have done to their budget and told them they've got to do the job much better. So that's the challenge Ted faces, but he really is committed. I know from his budget hearings from the past several weeks, including today, that he really wants to focus on how we can use technology to help us in our educational mission. So I would encourage you all to have him come back and, when he reaches out to you in your departments or colleges, accept that invitation.

I'm here to report on something that's been occurring for almost two years around the country, since 2011, and it's called in the papers and by our colleagues elsewhere as MOOCs, Massive Open Online Courses. We first encountered the opportunities for participating in MOOCs with other universities in the fall of 2011.

The first encounter was a call from John Hennessy, the president of Stanford, asking us to accept the invitation that was going to come from a Stanford faculty

member at that time to join a consortium that they were going to help lead in 2011. We decided at that point not to join a consortium. We felt it was just too early to join an organization for which we didn't understand the technology or the mission or the opportunities. That was 2011.

In 2012, the landscape changed a lot. In the spring of 2011, Harvard and MIT announced the second consortia. The first one became what's now called Coursera. And in the spring of 2012, just a year ago, Harvard and MIT announced they were forming another consortia called edX, and they would be inviting other universities to join with them. In that spring, we again decided not to join. We had invitations from both of them again, repeated invitations, as well as to a third consortia called Udacity, formed by a former Stanford professor, Sebastian Thrun. We decided to again stand by the side and watch.

However, during that time, about 85% of all of our peers joined one of those two consortia. I think the last standouts of your favorite top 20 universities would probably be Yale and Cornell and probably some third university, depending on who your favorites are, but almost all of the others have now joined. We decided, after repeated requests by faculty, department chairs and others that we ought to revisit the decision not to step up and join. So that resulted in the faculty senate having the forum that you all heard about, many of you participated in, Eva Tardos creating -- chairing a committee that Joe and I formed, and numerous other meetings throughout the fall. And in the meantime, those two consortium, both edX and also Coursera have flourished in the sense of other units joining them this past fall.

In the meantime, I continue to get requests for the university to participate, because we are standing to the side and watching what's happening. So let me make some comments about what I think is different now with online education, and then I'll come back to MOOCs and come back to our decision to join. We have not joined anybody yet, but -- and as I have told now a number of groups, we plan to join and we plan to join soon.

So what's different? And this is something that I think Eva and others that have looked into this can describe more eloquently, but let me give you my impressions. As all of us know, online education's been around for a long time. Cornell's been doing it for decades, multiple, multiple decades. ECornell is one example, but we were doing it way before that.

There are a number of things different this time. This is what I think most of us would agree on: One is that the current movement is around open courses, so

anybody can sign up, anybody can participate, take the course, no matter where you are in the world. So they're open. The second is that they're very specifically targeted to massive audiences; tens of thousands, sometimes hundreds of thousands of students taking the course in real time. And that changes everything. When you have a worldwide audience and when you have 10,000 or 1,000 or 100,000 students, there is a lot of social learning that goes on. There is a different way that you can present the material in segments, in addition to your normal lectures. The pedagogy changes. And those two concepts, just the openness and the large audiences are pretty significant.

The third difference is the consortia. We could offer MOOCs, and we're offering MOOCs. There are faculty now -- you may have read, our faculty that are working with Google, a number of our faculty working with Google and putting up a MOOC through others doing it through eCornell. But there's something different about participating in a consortium, where you have another 10 to 40 universities you are working as a faculty member and sharing best practices, sharing a platform that you are using, sharing the visibility, sharing the news and the press, and having a portal where students can enter a common portal. So the consortium is quite different.

And the other part of that that's distinctive is that these are our best peers. They really are. Where both the faculty that are leading these consortia, as well as the university. So it's not an initiative where we have doubts about the quality of the institutions that are involved in this. And the next is that these initiatives are really faculty-led. So it's not at these other universities. It is not being driven by trustees wanting to generate revenue; it is not being driven by alumni or others or the administration or deans or provosts or others. It is led by the faculty.

Now, there are a number of policy issues that will be faced, I believe, going forward, when you look at issues of conflict of commitment, particularly, and conflict of interest. After I speak, I think Joe's going to say something about that. There's work to be done by all universities in that area around online education, and I think there's work to be done by us as well, as we think as faculty about having our colleagues participate in courses that are open, maybe used by other universities for credit possibly, if we put our courses online and they're open. So there are a number of -- and really interesting, important policy issues for all of us. So I think the question is if this is being faculty-led and this has all these advantages, why is the provost involved? And the interest is very, very simple -- or the response is. You have to have a university sign up if you're going to participate in one of these consortiums. As our own faculty discovered, when

they've contacted Coursera or edX, you can't just offer a course. A university has to be a member of the consortia.

So after six, seven months of discussions with lots of committees, as well as department chairs and deans, it's become quite clear to me that there's very little downside in joining a consortia and a lot of opportunity for our faculty. The faculty can participate. There are no requirements to participate, but it allows those that are interested to have the possibility of being part of a consortia and putting your course up and teaching a course of 10,000 to 100,000 students and learning from that experiment.

There are a lot of decisions to be made once we decide which of these consortiums we are going to join, how we implement participation. Do we at the center provide funds, resources to facilitate this? Our intention is to do that, to partner with Ted Dodds in having some resources. I need to discuss it with the dean, because I like them to have some skin in the game in terms of resources.

And then there needs to be a process for selecting which courses can be available. We won't have the ability to put all our courses up, so there needs to be some sort of a faculty committee that will decide which courses. And those are issues that I welcome input, and we'll ask Joe and the senate to help us figure out. So Joe, do you want to say anything about policy, or should I take questions now?

Dean Burns: "I think as we started to discuss this, there are various policy issues that many of you have raised, issues of intellectual property, who owns a MOOC, if there is a MOOC, who gets the money if there is any money to be made in this game. What about time commitment? Can you just go off and do whatever you want to do? These are policy issues that the faculty ought to weigh in on. And I think there should be a committee of the faculty, maybe a special committee, maybe there's some of our standing committees that can look at this, but that's one area in which I think we need to set up some structure, so we can decide the directions Cornell ought to go in.

Then there is, if anyone has read these reports, there's a faculty committee supposedly to select which MOOCs will be offered, which courses, who will give them, who will get funding. And that, again, should be a faculty committee, but how do we set that up?

These are decisions which I think we should make in the very near future, so that we can get started on this, perhaps as soon as next fall. I welcome your input

and I certainly will be going to the UFC in very short order, asking for some sort of movement in this direction.”

Speaker Beer: “Do you have Professor Tardos available?”

Provost Fuchs: “She's going to answer the hard questions.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you like to come forward, so you have a microphone available? Okay, so we have approximately 15 minutes for questions and discussion. And let's start with Professor Cheyfitz.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “I want to follow up on the question I asked David Delchamps about. This seems to me to fall within the area of educational policy. We have had a little exchange about that, but I think it does come under the bylaws and it comes under OPUF's general rules for consultation. What I'm wondering about is the senate has not had a chance -- apparently there were reports sitting in committee here, a committee was formed, but the senate has had no chance to debate the pros and cons of joining the consortia in the first instance. So that seems to be a sort of *fait accompli*, which from my perspective, and I hope others, runs against the spirit of shared consultation. Now we're stuck, so to speak, with this *fait accompli*. There are some strong negative critiques of MOOCs out there, having to do with tiered education. And just this morning in the "New York Times," anybody who's looked, the U Cal system, the State is floating the bill because they can't afford to hire faculty, they're saying, to staff courses. They have people that can take enabling courses in the range of the State system, so the bill is to put them on MOOCs.

This impacts negatively -- everybody here knows that -- the job market, which is already depressed. Only 25% of all jobs are now tenure track jobs. That impacts our graduate students, this kind of planning. So it seems to me that to have gone ahead and to have done this without a broad senate debate on these issues runs against the policies of shared governance.

I just wanted to say that. I hope these feelings are shared by others, but seems to me it needed to be stated.”

Provost Fuchs: “Eric, I would disagree about the debate. I would say we had seven months of debate, very public. We have had the two founders, Coursera and edX, speak to the entire faculty back in September, and I've been very public for seven months that I welcome input on this process and on this decision.

Regarding your second point, all we're doing is enabling faculty to have the opportunity. There's no requirement, there's no money. I'm not making money. I would love to break even, but I'm not making money. No dean is going to make money. This is whether the faculty wanted to do this or not. That's all it is."

Professor and Senior Associate Dean Eva Tardos, Cornell Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences: "Can I add a comment? What it will do to the job market for our graduate students or faculty, this is a very interesting point, and I don't know the answer. I don't think anyone really knows what will happen, and it might easily have bad consequences, but these things are happening whether or not we join.

If we don't join, almost all other schools joined. And if you stay out of this move, it won't change the national job market. It will change the position of our students on the job market. So I feel very strongly that despite that you might be right on this movement having possible bad consequences, those consequences are not affected by not joining, and we are doing a lot of damage to our students, to our faculty by not joining.

And if I get the right to criticize Kent, we are acting incredibly slowly. I mean, the senate forum that brought in the two leaders, Coursera and edX, was early in the fall. I don't remember the month. September. The committee had a full report with recommendations to the provost in December before Christmas. Again, I don't remember the date, but it was December. Now we are talking about this in March. We have not joined anything yet, and I'm disheartened to hear the leader of the faculty, the dean of the faculty, tell me that we might start in the fall. I very much hope that we are going to start now, or before the summer. If you want your courses in MOOC in the fall, you are going to have to spend the summer working on it, and I hope this will become possible.

There's a lot of faculty who sending angry e-mails to me, and I think to Kent too, that they wrote to Coursera and they would like to run a course. And Coursera says, please talk to your provost. So people want to do this. And again, there's no must, and no one has to do anything, but I think the university needs to enable the faculty who would like to try this, and despite the possible national bad consequences."

Speaker Beer: "Any other questions or comments? Professor Stein?"



Professor Stein: "I have been dying to ask this question for about six months now. I must be stupid, but I don't get it. It seems to me that there's a dirty little secret we've all had, namely that what we teach more or less you can get it yourself by just reading a book and doing the homework problems, particularly, I think in the scientific disciplines; but on the other hand, people pay huge amounts of money to come and take our education, and of course the big difference is that you get a degree if you take the education. If you don't, you just learn it.

Now, it seems to me that frankly -- I'm not objecting if you are joining. I think it's right. Everybody else is doing it. We ought to do it, but it's like lemmings going to the sea. The first person that offers a degree from online education is going to turn into a financial disaster for everybody else. I don't believe those admissions are going to hold up.

If you can get a Stanford degree for nothing, you're not going to pay whatever it is today, \$60,000, \$70,000 to come to Cornell. I mean surely people have thought about this, but I've never heard that issue discussed. Could you shed some light on it?"

Provost Fuchs: "A number of our peers are actually worried. I'm not worried. A number of our peers are worried about the market. I don't think they should be. That is my personal commentary. I think there are other units and colleges that should be worried, but I do believe the landscape of education -- [Inaudible]"

Professor Delchamps: "One thing I've heard, Peter -- I had the same question for a long time -- is that this sea change in the way things are offered like material, quote, unquote, gets offered will change what happens in the classrooms at universities. It won't be them coming and just taking classes from us. It will be us like sitting around with them and doing other stuff that we don't do now. So that's the kind of response.

And Eric, an example of the job market thing, I read in "New York Times" also that Harvard Business School has stopped teaching Intro Accounting completely because some guy at Brigham Young has such a good Intro Accounting course, they just send their students to take that. So there you go. There's an example of that."

Professor Richard W. Miller, the Wyn and William Y. Hutchinson Professor in Ethics and Public Life and Director of the Program on Ethics and Public Life, Philosophy: "Some of us, maybe especially in the humanities and social sciences, are deeply intrigued, also a little bit scared of this possibility and really don't know whether to try, don't know whether we would want to propose a course to the committee you've described, wouldn't have a clue about what the budget would be. We don't know how much time this takes, how to supplement the, no doubt, inadequate training that we have. So I wonder what facilities we can expect to help us overcome our cluelessness and move beyond being intrigued to knowing whether to try. I, myself, would find a forum not something that would answer this. A really rich web site would answer to this. So maybe this is for the year after the first year, but that's a gap that I hope will be filled."

Professor Tardos: "Let me try to respond to this. There are two questions you're asking. One is a sort of financial one, and the committee we're recommending to the provost and the university to put significant amount of resources, financial resources, and Ted Dodds' organizational resources to actually help; that is to work with the faculty, to help develop courses. eCornell is already doing this in a different scale. They're not usually MOOCs, but smaller scale courses, but they have a fair amount of experience. Later you may be able to find some people around who have gone through this, but I think at the beginning, given the financial limitations, the scale at which we are doing this is smaller.

There will be maybe -- I certainly would love to have, say, five, six courses a semester go up as MOOCs. So in the beginning, I think it would be relatively easy, at least from the e-mails I'm getting, to find faculty who would love to do this. Faculty who are maybe less sure can wait and see how these courses work.

I also should add that a lot of successful MOOCs, a lot of the very visible successful MOOCs are often technology courses. And one of the biggest challenges that all the MOOC companies are currently facing is how to grade 10,000 people who take a course, where multiple choice questions are not okay. If you can run multiple choice questions than it's easy, or if you, like a computer scientist, can make your students write the program, you can test it and see if it runs.

Multiple MOOC companies or MOOC consortia are working on trying to make it possible to grade things that are textual answers. I hope it's coming. It's an issue they are working on. There are people who are interested and, for example, the Google-based MOOC that Cornell is developing is one of these. It's not a

technology MOOC. There are other issues where the technology is developing, so if you don't want to jump into this, that's perfectly fine. In fact, I think technology is getting better over very short periods of time here. So hopefully soon enough, it will be relatively easy and there will be more experience around."

Speaker Beer: "Other questions or points? The gentleman in the third row."

Associate Professor Paul Velleman, Social Statistics: "I think part of the answer to Peter is that MOOCs are international, and I see not so much the opportunity to offer Cornell courses to other students who might otherwise be coming here, but the opportunity for us to teach students in India, in China, in Africa -- and I think that is legitimately part of Cornell's mission. I think it is more ours than many of our fellow institutions. We do have a mission to teach anybody who could, and I see that as an opportunity there.

The other point I'd make is a lot of people have noted that MOOCs are better for autodidacts. If you could read the book and do the exercises, a MOOC is an enhanced book really, in many ways. Those are the students who are most successful in them, as those students that are most successful when we taught distance learning courses.

I have done that several times over the summer, and the students tend to fall into two groups: Those who can do it and those who simply fail. And a lot of people who sign up for MOOCs end up dropping out and not finishing. So there is that issue as well."

Provost Fuchs: "You heard Dean Katz talk in the fall about resources that are coming to ILR as a result of their work with eCornell, but he's reinvesting back to the educational mission. There have not been resources in the provost's office that could be linked to use of technology to enhance education until the past three years.

We had an agreement with eCornell when it was found that had 5% of the revenues coming back to the Center. And for reasons of the viability of eCornell, that was waived, but in the economic downturn in 2009, we told them they need to be paying their fair share. So in the fall -- in 2009, eCornell contributed \$100,000 to the Center's budget. The next year it had gone up, the next year was a quarter million, half million, this year it's \$1 million that eCornell is putting back in the Center's budget. We have budget challenges at the Center, but I want

to link those revenues back into investing it in -- this is one of those opportunities. So I think Cornell does better with their other resources associated with online learning.

I think the center will try to break even. And by that, actually using those monies to reinvest. Colleges and schools and departments and faculties will have new results, but I think we can identify resources going forward."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Shoemaker, in the second row."

Professor Shoemaker: "My question is at a department level. So if a professor is teaching one of those courses what happens? Do the resources come into the department, so the department can hire somebody to replace that person? Or do they try and teach the original course as the MOOC? How does this all work? And, also graders, and so forth. The departments are not expected to come up with the resources for the graders for these huge courses."

Professor Tardos: "To start, a MOOC that is supposed to be twice as many kids, doesn't get twice as many graders. That's the whole problem in the grading. It has to be something where either the kids grade each other or autograde or something happens on which when you get twice as many kids, you don't need twice as many graders.

I can't actually answer this question until we join one of the MOOCs. So I think the next step is to agree which MOOC we are joining and what is the financial deal we are making with them. The different MOOCs organizations are MOOC consortia, are feeding money back, so there's money to be had here on certificates. Most of the students, especially American students, very much want that piece of paper signed by the professor that they took the course from. Princeton didn't agree to issue about such certificates or denied the faculty the right to issue certificates, and their students are very upset. So I suggest Cornell should agree to all faculty having the right to sign such certificates and we charge something like \$50 to \$100 for one of those certificates. It's some amount of money to be made from this, and we are hoping that we are going to break even on that money, but that money is also supposed to help the consortia develop the platform. So we would feed some of that money back to the consortia, and our agreement is whatever consortia we are joining is critical here, so that we are left with some money that we can feed into T.A.s and departments. The committee recommended that to start this when we don't actually have revenue at all, the provost put in some money, maybe the deans

put in some money, and try to allow the faculty to not teach an extra course. This is instead of one of the courses.

Hopefully once you develop such a thing, running it next year involves more changes. It doesn't involve another set of taping lectures and all that. And then the idea is to try to integrate it with the Cornell course. So to use the taped lectures, do the kind of thing that Dave was mentioning a second ago, try to improve the Cornell cost using these materials, but MIT's pretty successful with this. Other schools are experimenting with this sort of blended learning courses. I very much want Cornell to join MOOCs, so our faculty starts experimenting with this too. The jury's out, how well this will work."

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Well, thank you very much, both Professor Tardos and Provost Fuchs. Provost Fuchs, if you would retain your microphone for a moment, while we have a Good and Welfare speaker, and he is going to ask a question on behalf of the Cornell Committee of Professors Emeriti. Professor Ron Minor, in the fourth row. If you could provide a microphone for Professor Minor."

Emeritus Professor Ronald Minor, Pathology, College of Veterinary Medicine: "Thank you. The executive council of CAPE had a meeting this morning, and the question was raised about what Cornell's policy is on reading e-mails that are on the Cornell network. And Dean Burns didn't know the answer, and so they instructed me to come and ask you and to ask the senate whether they want to initiate a discussion of this policy."

Provost Fuchs: "The frank answer is I don't know. Ted, do you know? So we have a Chief Information Officer. Ted, go ahead."

Chief Information Officer Dodds: "I think what we have seen happen to Harvard in the press recently is that, for a variety of reasons, e-mails were scanned, I think, from resident deans involved with the cheating scandal from last fall. Cornell has a couple of specific policies in place for some time that would prevent any unauthorized access of anyone's e-mail without going through a very strict protocol.

For example, there are three different circumstances I could cite. One is if we get a federal letter, let's say, from Homeland Security. Then that request would result in e-mails being examined without a lot of disclosure, because we're required to do that.

If there's a subpoena, then it has to be authorized -- usually the IT security office can push those requests off; but if necessary, then we would escalate that either to the Vice President of Human Resources, to the provost, or both. So under no circumstances would the technology group or what have you do that without due authority, where a subpoena is required. Those are the two instances where that could occur, and policy is really clear, so that we would be able to avoid the challenges that we've seen Harvard going through in this past couple weeks.

The other instance is if there are requests from departments who might be having some issue and they might make that request. It goes through the same route as the subpoena does."

Speaker Beer: "Is there another point on this issue? Just wait for the microphone, please."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "That's the topic that FABIT will be discussing. It's a week from Monday, I believe, the first Monday we're back. If anybody has issues they really want to raise, please get in touch with me, and I'll see they get on the agenda for that meeting; but that, I think is what we are devoting most of the meeting to, I believe. So we'll also be on top of that that way."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. I trust that the provost and Professor Tardos would be happy to receive additional comments on MOOCs from the faculty by e-mail or any other means of communication. With that, we have reached the hour of adjournment. University Faculty Senate is adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED