

**A MEETING OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 14, 2012**

0. CALL TO ORDER: Speaker Steve Beer:

“Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call to order the University Faculty Senate meeting for March 14th, 2012. I would like to remind members of the body to please turn off all cell phones or silence them and that there will be no video or audio recordings of the proceedings, except those authorized.

“And when members of the body speak, please wait for the roving microphone to get to you before you speak, then stand and identify yourself as to name and academic affiliation. We have one Good and Welfare speaker who will speak during the final five minutes of the agenda; that is 5:55. We have a very full agenda today, and the speaker will endeavor to keep everyone on time.

“So the agenda -- one moment. Unfortunately, we have a smaller screen today, but just squint a little bit. So the first item on the agenda is a report from the Calendar Committee by Professor Jeff Doyle.”

**1. DISCUSSION OF THE POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC
CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

Professor Jeff Doyle, Chair, Calendar Committee: “Thanks, Steve. So I'm going to talk a little bit, very briefly about the calendar. And just so you know, if you haven't looked for it already, it's on your web site, the university faculty web site, with much more than I can say in the nine minutes that we have for this little report and discussion.

“Also, there's information there that essentially explains some of the decisions that we made in putting together these recommendations. And a word on procedure, these are only recommendations tentative at this point. We are actually in a fact-finding period where we are getting feedback from various groups; met yesterday with the university assembly, met with the student assembly, various other people.

“And the calendar web site has an e-mail address that you can send comments to which we're monitoring. The university registrar, Cassie Dembosky, is monitoring that and giving feedback. So please look at that, read those materials and get back to us in various different ways.

“So the calendar process, committee process has been going on now since fall of 2010. The calendar had not been looked at for a very long time prior to that, and so a number

of things are being essentially addressed here, one of which, a major one is student mental health. One of the goals of the Calendar Committee was actually to see if by manipulating the calendar and making changes to it, we could reduce student stress in some way, and this was in the wake of the 2010 spring suicide rash that we had here.

“So the changes after a lot of deliberation, a lot of discussions, the kinds of changes that we're talking about making in the fall semester are fairly minimal. I should mention we're constrained by the number of contact hours that the State of New York mandates, so that we're working within some constraints there.

“In general, maybe a comment to make is that if you pull on any part of the calendar, everything else has to move; and so there are a lot of compromises in here as well, things that we would like to have done, but found we couldn't do, things that turned out not to be good ideas at all and so on.

“So the fall semester will start on a Tuesday, as opposed to a Wednesday, and that brings up a point right away. We'll be meeting next week with folks from the Orientation Committee, because that has major impact on orientation, move-in day and things like that.

“I want to say one other parenthetical thing here: We've also consulted with the Ithaca College registrar, because anything we do with the Cornell calendar that affects things like move-in days for students, things like commencement weekend, that has a big impact on the whole Ithaca community, not just our part of it.

“So classes begin on a Tuesday as opposed to a Wednesday. Labor Day, we didn't touch. That had been decided some time ago, and that is working just fine apparently. The really major change that we're making in the fall is to eliminate the half day on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

“So that's the proposal we have, partially just bowing to the reality of the situation on that day and also just because it doesn't make a lot of sense in a lot of ways to have a half day of classes essentially. So that's one of the major changes.

“The other big change with the fall semester -- and it also is a spring semester change -- is that the exam schedule, the exam and study period schedule had not been looked at and assessed for a very long time, it turns out, and Cornell turns out to have a very generous, a very long study period plus exam period relative to peer institutions.

“There's anecdotal information that this is problematic for even some students, that it's too long a period in some respects, the study period may not be used efficiently and so on. And so what was done was that Cassie's group and the registrar's office looked at different models, different algorithms for producing a better exam schedule; worked with this quite extensively and came up with a system that minimizes bad events -- bad events being defined as things like back-to-back-to-back exams, three exams for students on a given day and so on -- and also tightens up actually getting back to the original intent of how exams were scheduled.

“A lot of things had sort of crept into that schedule over the years; exception days being used by courses on a regular basis and so on. Number of things were changed there, so the big difference in the way the exam schedule be structured is it will not anymore be scheduled by the class meeting time and date anymore, but rather will be worked on in the beginning part of the semester by the registrar's office with input of information of what students are actually enrolled in which classes.

“So enrollment, schedules and all that will be taken into account in this updated, modern algorithm that is replacing what we have been doing in the past. The net result of that is that it condenses the exam and study period in such a way that we now have classes ending on a Friday, and then Saturday and Sunday for the only study period, and then -- in the beginning part of that.

“Monday exams start with three full sessions; Tuesday, three full sessions; Wednesday, three full sessions; Thursday is a study day inserted in the middle of the exam period to break it up and give students a chance to catch their breaths and study for the next round -- next days of exams. Friday there are two exam periods, morning and afternoon; Saturday, one exam period; Sunday, an exam period -- that's a change from the past -- and then a full schedule of exams three periods on Monday and Tuesday; exams ending then on Tuesday evening.

“So this is a condensed version, condensed condensation of the study and exam period, and it allows us then to have, among other things, that half day before Thanksgiving as a holiday. So that's the fall schedule in a nutshell.

“The spring schedule is a more complicated schedule and more changes are proposed there. One of the big things that we did was look into options that would have commencement not be on Memorial Day weekend. We had heard anecdotally there were problems with that; for example, for staff having to volunteer for commencement after not having had any holidays at all since winter break.

“And so we looked at that, but in the end, in consultation with the senior staff, it was decided that -- we were told essentially it was best to leave commencement on Memorial Day weekend. That gives us an anchor to the end of the semester. We started to propose to start the semester after Martin Luther King Day, so in all years we'll respect Martin Luther King Day.

“That gives us the beginning of the semester. There was a lot of discussion whether to start in January early or later and so on; grant-writing came into the mix there, all sorts of other things. So we are starting after Martin Luther King Day in this model.

“And then what that gives us though, now, is some extra days with a condensed exam period, study and exam period that we used in the fall, and then the option of starting the exam period, ending classes either a full week and a half before commencement or just the week before commencement.

“So what that ends up doing is taking it so exams go right up until the Tuesday before commencement, Memorial Day weekend. This condenses the senior week down to three full days of senior days instead. One of the concessions to students is that the registrar feels that she can, using the algorithms they have developed now, actually make it so that most seniors will not have exams on that Monday and Tuesday, and that recreates essentially a senior week for the seniors.

“It also has the advantage of being during a time when undergraduates are still on campus. And there are some issues about that, but that's what the intent is. So this gives us an additional several days now, because of the way the semester is structured, to deploy as mental health days.

“And so we had a couple of different models. You can read about those and the logic behind those, but the model we ended up recommending is to take two of those days and give them as a mental health break, a holiday for Presidents' Day and the Tuesday after Presidents' Day, so that period in there.

“This will help, I think, families with younger children, with school age children, because that aligns with the Ithaca and other school district calendars. The other two days are two additional days we are adding to the beginning of spring break, and that will be a time then -- students like that, because they are traveling, it will be less expensive to travel on Thursday than wait until Saturday and so on. Those are the major changes.”

Speaker Beer: "Let me ask just one question: Are these changes to be implemented, or what's it going to take to implement it?"

Professor Doyle: "So implementation is not in the purview of this committee. We will make recommendations, these or others. We are in the stage now of fact-finding. We'll modify these recommendations, and then they will be presented for discussion and a vote here by this body, because it is your prerogative to approve and recommend these changes.

"After that, it's not my job anymore to figure out how they are going to be implemented. That belongs to other people, and we've discussed this a little bit at the committee. Some of these things would be implemented relatively simply. Others were going to take a little more doing, I think. Cassie Dembosky said the exam schedule could be implemented almost immediately with the change in the algorithm and everything. Other things might be more difficult to do."

Professor Beer: "Okay, Jeff. Thanks so much on behalf of the senate."

Professor Jeff Doyle: "Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "So the next item on our agenda requires voting, so we vote by clickers. So all senators or bona fide senator stand-ins should have a clicker. If you don't, Ms. Lucas has them in the front of the room. Senator McCormick will present the resolution on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee. This microphone is live here."

2. [RESOLUTION](#) TO CANCEL CLASSES ON THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CHARTER DAY (EPC)

Professor Charles McCormick, EPC Committee Member: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm here to propose two resolutions. One has to do with canceling class in 2015 at the sesquicentennial, and the second resolution deals with changing our description of our committee to include a student member. So the first resolution, do we have it?"

"Whereas the university will commemorate the 150th anniversary granting the charter in April 27th, 2015; whereas on that morning, there will be a convocation, including academic procession led by visitors around the world, featuring speeches by President Skorton and the governor of New York and others; whereas these events will involve the university community, including undergraduates and graduates.

“Therefore, we'd like to propose it be resolved that classes be canceled on Monday, April 27th, 2015, from 8:00 in the morning to 1:10 in the afternoon to allow the university community to celebrate this historic event.”

Speaker Beer: “Is there any discussion of the resolution? Are members of the body ready for the vote, then? Okay, I don't see the clickers installed. Question or a point. Wait for the roving microphone, please.”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “Sorry. I didn't mean -- Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies. Why don't we just cancel the whole day of classes? That's not really celebration. That's observance from 8:00 to 1:10, because all the stuff will be going on. Celebration will begin about 1:11, so why not cancel classes the whole day?”

Professor McCormick: “I'm not sure what the discussion was in the whole committee. Yes.”

Professor Glenn Altschuler, American Studies. “I am the chair of the president's commission on the sesquicentennial. The Sesquicentennial Committee asked for cancellation during this period of time because the celebration of the sesquicentennial will be over a weekend. It will commence on Friday. Events will occur on Saturday and Sunday.

“The culminating event will be an academic procession on Monday morning, and we were trying to minimize the requests of the faculty to cancel classes; hence, we limited it to the time of the procession and the subsequent speeches.”

Speaker Beer: “Any further debate? Seeing none, I assume the body's ready for the question. Unfortunately, we're going to have to vote by hand, so all those in favor of the resolution before you on the screen, please raise your right hand. I think a count is hardly necessary. All those opposed, please raise your right hand. Those senators abstaining, please raise your right hand.

“So the speaker sees 52 voting in favor, one voting in opposition and three voting to abstain; therefore, the resolution passes overwhelmingly. Thank you very much. And we'll go to the next matter.”

3. RESOLUTION FROM EPC TO ADD TWO STUDENT MEMBERS OT THE COMMITTEE (EPC)

Professor McCormick: "So our second proposed resolution is change the composition of the Educational Policy Committee to include two students. The rationale behind this includes the fact that currently we have no student members.

"The third whereas has to do with the education -- the student assembly recently passed a resolution recommending that the Educational Policy Committee have a student representative on its committee to ensure the student voice on educational policy issues is heard.

"The last whereas includes the current legislation concerning the constitution and election of the EPC reads as follows: It indicates the Committee on Education consists of nine members of the university faculty appointed by Nominations and Elections Committee for three-year staggered terms.

"In so far as possible, the Nominations and Elections Committee shall ensure that each of the undergraduate schools and colleges are represented. The dean and secretary of the faculty are ex officio members and not counted in determining the number that constitutes a quorum, nor in establishing the existence of a quorum. The chair should be selected by the Nominations and Elections Committee.

"So that's the current reading of the composition of the committee. What we'd like to do is to add what is underlined there, which reads "Two student members, of which at least one shall be an undergraduate with voting privileges, will be selected annually by the staffing committee of the student assembly.

"Reselection of the student for a second term shall be permitted at the discretion of the committee chair. Student members of the committee may on occasion be excluded from certain discussions and from voting on certain issues." So that's what we'd like to propose to include in the description of the Educational Policy Committee."

Speaker Beer: "Questions on the resolution, debate on the resolution?"

"One moment while the amplification is adjusted, and would you kindly identify yourself."

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: "I am strongly opposed to the resolution. I feel it's a shirking of the responsibility of the faculty. The argument is we want to hear a voice of the student. That's certainly important and vital. It would be my assumption that's

been continued all along in the function of this very important committee. I'm very impressed with the authority and the power of this committee, and I think this would be an inappropriate place for student membership."

Professor McCormick: "I'm not sure how to respond, but I think the integrity of the committee, the function of the committee in essence would not change with a student member."

Speaker Beer: "Are there other members of the body who wish to enter into debate? The gentleman in the center."

Professor Andre Kessler, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology: "Do we have some information of how that is handled in other universities? It seems very progressive doing that, but it may come with certain problems attached to it, and so is there some information how peers do deal with that?"

Professor McCormick: "Any comments? I am not personally aware of what our peer institutions have in that context."

Speaker Beer: "Dean Fry?"

Dean Fry: "Yeah, I also am not terribly aware of what institutions do, but I know other senate committees or university faculty committees do have student membership. AFPS, for example, has student membership with some similar language in terms of voting as to when they vote or not."

Speaker Beer: "Further debate? Elizabeth Earle."

Senator Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics: "Can you explain or describe the situations in which the students might be excluded from participating or voting? What did you have in mind?"

Professor McCormick: "I am not 100% sure. The question has to do with when would we might exclude students from voting or participating in the discussion. I am not sure I have any specific instances that I've thought of personally, but I think it was probably thought by the committee as a good idea to at least have that proviso included."

Speaker Beer: "Further debate? Gentleman on the aisle."

Senator David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "Having sat on this committee for a number of years and having chaired it for a number of years, I would say it's okay to have students on it. We did try to get the student voices involved. Various members would bring anecdotes with them.

"The only disadvantage I see are two things: First of all, ramping up the understanding what's going on in the committee. If you're only serving one year as a line item for your resume, I think that will be a little problem. I think if we had terms it would be better, but that constrains it to sophomores and juniors only.

"Second thing is the group deciding who joins the committee. I think what you're going to find is that that student assembly crowd is kind of an in crowd, a bunch of -- not insulting student assembly members who happen to be here, but it's sort of a closed system of campus politics, and I'm just wondering if that's the best group to pick the kid for this committee."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. I think the senate has reached the end of its time allotted for debate, and I trust that the body is ready for the question. All those in favor of the resolution before you on the screen, please raise your right hand. The dean will please count.

"Okay, those opposed to the resolution?

"Those abstaining?

"If I understood the dean correctly, it was 36 in favor, 10 opposed and 10 abstentions. So the resolution carries. Thank you very much, Professor McCormick.

Our next resolution is from the Academic Freedom and Professional Status Committee, and Professor Stein will offer this. I mentioned he will offer it. It will not be voted on today. It's a rather complicated resolution and we will consider it for voting at the April meeting.

4. DISCUSSION OF [RESOLUTION](#) FROM AFPS TO AMEND THEIR ENABLING LEGISLATION (AFPS ORIGINAL [CHARGE](#) FOR MARCH 2012)

Emeritus Professor Peter Stein: "Thank you. I intended to offer it and then pull back my offer, but this is a resolution that's been worked on by the Academic Freedom Committee for more than five years off and on and has finally come to a recommendation to bring to you. It is complicated, it's a little bit hard to understand.

“And when I found out I had eight minutes to describe it, I felt that that was just plain too little; so I'd like to take a shot at describing it. And I think it's important. It makes a fundamental change in the relationship between the committee and the provost, and it really requires that you understand it and think about it a little bit.

“So there are in the front three documents there. There is one that's white and one that is blue and one that's purple. And I recommend that you pick them up on the way out and go through them before the next meeting. The one that is white describes or is the university policy when a professor or an academic member has a grievance and how that grievance is dealt with.

“The one that is blue -- I brought it up here, just in case I would get mixed up -- the blue is the current document that describes how the Academic Freedom hears such a case. And the purple one is the resolution, which describes very briefly why it is that the committee is recommending this, and then the new policy that's being recommended by the committee.

“So first off, the white thing, the grievance policy, there's a university policy which describes how -- let me just say a professor. It has other academic employees in it, but if a person has a grievance, they feel they have been dealt with unfairly, how they can have that grievance heard.

“And it's quite a complicated procedure. They first go through a procedure within their college, and that procedure will end up with the dean of the college making a decision. If they're unhappy with that decision, they can bring it to the university level, to the Academic Freedom Committee, and then the Academic Freedom Committee issues a report.

“We are not talking about the college level procedure. We are talking about the last part of it, or I should say the penultimate part, namely how the Academic Freedom Committee deals with it. I say penultimate because the ultimate part is when the administrator who makes the final decision deals with it, so we're talking about the second last step.

“These cases to come to the committee are neither rare nor common. There may be one a year. Some years there are none, some years there are two. It's something like that, a relatively small number of cases; but when they come, they have to be dealt with. And several Academic Freedom Committees have found the current policy to be lacking.

“And the complaints about the policy are, one, that despite all the words, there is really no set procedure or guidelines, no guidelines for hearing such a grievance. There's already a college level decision made. Does the Academic Freedom Committee then start all over again, does it review what the grievance committee, the decision they came to? Does it review what the dean comes to? What exactly do they do? That's completely undefined in the procedure.

“Secondly, there's no person defined in the procedure for whom they report to. Who exactly do they give their findings to? Do they give it to the college dean, give it to the provost, the president? It's not clear where they give it.

“The third thing is that when the person who receives this procedure makes a ruling, there is essentially no communication defined between that person -- let's call it the provost, because we end up recommending that -- there's no dialogue between the provost and the committee, and no rationale by the provost defining the decision that was made is required. And also there's no time table for the provost to respond to this. So all of these things were considered to be major deficiencies.

“The killer -- well, there was one case that took place half a dozen years ago. I don't want to talk about it, but it was a very contentious case where the committee's recommendation was rejected by the provost. And at that point, the committee decided to look into what was the history of these cases.

“And so we went back and tried to resurrect from the files and from talking to previous chairs of the Academic Freedom Committee what happened to the cases that they had heard. And we came to the conclusion that there was no case on the record or that anyone could remember where the faculty member had prevailed. So essentially every case that was brought to the Academic Freedom Committee, no matter what the Academic Freedom Committee recommended, the final decision was to reject the grievance.

“Now that proves nothing. I mean, maybe they were rejected because they were all faulty, but it did concern us a great deal, that there was no case on record where it had prevailed. So the committee came to the following conclusion: They felt this is a lot of work.

“I personally participated in several of these cases, and in one case that I remember, the committee wrote a 40-page document describing their findings. It was a lot of work. It took most of the year to do by the committee, and the committee ended up feeling there's no point in participating this, because there was no feeling that they had any

evidence whatsoever that this work had made an impact in any way on the final decision.

“So that started this process of looking to see how could we redefine the way it works. And in the purple document is the new procedures, and I would just like to very briefly -- it's sort of a long document also, but there are three different paragraphs which I would like to briefly describe, which are the guts of the proposal. The paragraphs in question are B6, and then little B, little C and little E, three paragraphs.

“So the little B paragraph describes this procedure, this definition of a procedure which I said was looking in the current document. What should the committee do? And the decision was the committee should not make an independent investigation. They should, like an appeals court, they should look at what the previous people had said and evaluate that and, in particular, they ought to focus on the decision that the dean made and to see whether they felt that the dean's decision was justified. So they wouldn't go back and look at the evidence all over again, but they could talk to people if they felt it was necessary; but their focus should be the dean's decision.

“Then the next paragraph, which is C, is the yard stick that they should use when making a decision. Should they, for instance, just substitute their decision for that of the dean? They say no, if we saw the same evidence, we would have decided the other way.

“And we said no, that was not appropriate; that what they really ought to do is to look at the dean's decision and see if the dean's decision was in line with the evidence. If it violated university policy, if it violated college policy and so on and so forth, then they might overrule it or they should overrule it, if they felt there was substantial evidence that that took place; but if they did not find that and the dean's decision was reasonable, given the evidence, then they must find against the person lodging the grievance. That is the standard of proof.

“As you know -- two minutes, okay. I mean, this is not unusual in an appeals procedure. The last one, which is basic, is something that was worked out in a lot of discussion between the Academic Freedom Committee, the provost's office -- in particular John Siliciano that we worked with a lot -- and the university counsel.

“And the feeling was that we would like to see some way that the work of this committee was acknowledged as the thing that the provost looked at when he or she made the decision; however, the university counsel said the provost could not give up his authority to make all the decisions, so the question was how do you find some

intermediate way which allows the provost to make a decision in a particular case and does not give the committee the right to make that decision, because that's basically a provost's decision-making power. That's at least how university counsel saw it.

“So we found a way that I think is good; namely, that we ask the provost, we request that the provost do the following: That when the provost is making a decision, then he or she should look at what the AFPS decided, have a back and forth conversation with them if he doesn't agree with what they've done; and in particular, for him to reverse them, he or she must decide that the committee did not do as they were instructed to do by this policy, namely give the dean the deference that's described here and only overrule the dean when there's substantial evidence the dean had done the things that I said, okay?

“And if they do that, then the provost will agree, will uphold what the committee said. This is not required of the provost. It is a request that's made, and I believe that in the end the provost will find this is the only reasonable thing to do. So I'd like to, if it's possible you could have maybe a minute or two more, would it be possible to ask John Siliciano, the vice provost ---“

Speaker Beer: “Do you have 30 seconds, vice provost?”

Vice Provost Siliciano: “I appreciate being able to work with the committee and particularly Peter, who's just put a huge amount of effort into it. I agree with everything he said. The procedure was unclear, it left a lot of confusion as to what the procedure was, what the standards were, how the provost should interact with the committee.

“We went back and forth over a long period of time, and I think we've come up with a resolution which, as Peter says, gives the provost guidance and the committee guidance. So again, I think it was a good example of working together to something that's a mutually desired outcome, so thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. And thank you, Professor Stein, and thanks for preparing take-homes for us. We'd like to move to the next item on the agenda, and that's a report from the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies by the chair Professor Cleland.”

5. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Thomas Cleland, Chair: "Greetings. We have a report today. These were efforts, both field management changes that were passed through the general community of the graduate school and came to us, and I present them here to you with our recommendations. So there are two.

"The first is that the graduate field of policy analysis and management seeks to merge all of its concentrations to a single one. The details are, as you might expect, a growing mismatch with the distribution of faculty interests and expertise, and a great deal of cross-concentration interest among students. The concentration became more of a handicap than utility, so they suggest merging them all together. CAPP recommends approval of this upon reviewing their application.

"The second is that the fields of international development and the field of international agricultural and rural development, which both offer masters of professional studies degrees, are seeking to merge. They concern many of the same faculty. This is an administrative merger, because both of the separate degrees will continue to be granted; those degrees being MPS in international agricultural and rural development and MPS in international development.

"So there's no real academic impact aside, but administrative adjustments and administrative organization saving a great deal of trouble. The unified graduate field would be termed global development. This isn't something that is up for a vote, unless someone wants to make it a vote; but if there are any questions, I'm happy to address what I can."

Speaker Beer: "We do have time for perhaps one question. Seeing none, thank you very much. And we'll move on to a very brief consideration of the approval of the minutes from the February University Faculty Senate meeting. Any additions or corrections? All those in favor of approving the minutes of the -- is there a question? No.

"All those in favor of approving the minutes of the February 2012 minutes of the University Faculty Senate, raise your right hand, please. All those opposed? Seeing none, all those abstaining? One abstention. Other than that, unanimous approval of the minutes are approved, as had been distributed."

**6. DISCUSSION WITH CANDIDATES FOR DEAN OF FACULTY SEAT
([JOSEPH A. BURNS](#) AND [RISA LIEBERWITZ](#))**

"We will now move to a very, very special session of the University Faculty Committee. Dean Fry has been serving the faculty for a number of years. He will be stepping down at the end of this academic year. And we have two distinguished candidates, Professor Risa Lieberwitz and Professor Joseph Burns. Would the candidates please take a seat at the front of the room. I think I'll even turn on the lights on this occasion.

"We are going to have a rather special scenario. The two candidates, whose dossiers you can see on the university faculty web site, will each have five minutes to present their views on the position and the way they would discharge it, and then we'll start with Professor Burns.

"Then we'll have a 16-minute question and answer session. Members of the body will pose questions to either one or the other candidate or to both candidates. And the speaker will endeavor to balance the questions to the two candidates. Following the 16 minutes of questions and answers, then each candidate will have two minutes to summarize their positions.

"Okay, any questions on procedures? Okay, so Professor Burns, your five minutes have started to click."

Professor Joseph Burns: "I haven't been this nervous since I ran for student council president, and this broken mic doesn't help. Anyway, good afternoon. I received my Ph.D. from Cornell in the mid-'60s, and I've been a faculty member here for over 40 years. I have appointments in two colleges, Engineering and Astronomy, or Arts and Sciences rather.

"My academic research concerns the solar systems exploration. This currently means planning and analyzing spacecraft images of Saturn and its rings. I am active in science outreach and public policy issues. I spent most of my career in the Department of Theoretical Applied Mechanics before the current provost, then dean of engineering, merged us three years ago into Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

"I have taught sophomore courses in fundamental engineering subjects, mathematics, astronomy and physics, as well as graduate courses in dynamics, planetary science and applied math. To my delight, I recently received a college teaching prize. My Cornell service began as a nontenured member of the first university senate.

"I had a term as director of graduate studies and six years as a department chair. A decade ago, I became vice provost for physical sciences and engineering, serving -- that could be surviving -- four and a half years. I have been on the University Lectures Committee or Local Advisory Council, and now the Financial Policies Committee.

"I also lead the Natural Sciences Engineering Subcommittee in planning Cornell's sesquicentennial. I have experienced Cornell also through the eyes of four immediate family members who have degrees from five different colleges. Having been a student, a faculty member, a parent and reluctant administrator here, I feel that I understand Cornell's breadth and value, as well as its strengths and weaknesses.

"Enough of my history. Let's go back to the university's future. During the next few years, Cornell must respond to many challenges, added public scrutiny and expectations for higher education, tightened funding opportunities and the ongoing electronic revolution as it affects our scholarship and our teaching.

"We must compete effectively against our peers to recruit and retain the very best researchers and educators. We must find ways to provide financial aid to a diverse cohort of academically talented undergraduates and to enhance fellowships for doctoral candidates, and we must reinforce our research infrastructure, whether that be a laboratory or a library.

"I believe that Cornell's future success in these endeavors will require mutual respect and much improved communication, collaboration and consultation among faculty, administrators, trustees, staff and students. If elected, I will strive to ensure that these groups are allies of one another, not combatants.

"I accept at times I will confess with some reluctance that universities need administrators to get things done; however, too often perhaps motivated by organizational efficiency, Day Hall has consulted, with quotes, us after decisions were essentially reached.

"In case you need reminding, some examples include departmental mergers and eliminations, New York Tech, library closings, financial aid policies, the dissolution of the faculty club and a reimagining of the campus store. I believe that this is bad policy in the long run.

"The involvement beforehand of smart, knowledgeable faculty who are deeply committed to Cornell will, in my view, yield better solutions and a more engaged faculty. I applaud the fact recently the provost, president and board have increased

access to the deans of the faculty and the UFCs. I believe those interactions should only expand.

“We faculty bear responsibility here as well. When I visited the senate, I have been disappointed by the frequent lack of a quorum. If elected dean, I will seek to enhance faculty participation, and I’m convinced that our colleagues will come as we gain greater faculty responsibilities for governance.

“Consultation is a chicken and egg situation, of course. Faculty will be more engaged as they listen to more, and vice versa. I also feel that we need to get out in front of issues more so than we have, rather than being strictly reactive. We do this active participation in our own scholarship. We can do it in this realm as well.

“Let me provide an example. While I support the New York Tech, I believe that we must ensure the faculty plays the key role in all academic issues there: Appointment, tenure and promotion, the curriculum and all awarding of degrees.

“If given the opportunity to be dean and thus the representative and spokesperson for the faculty, who are after all the lifeblood and soul of the university, I intend to be a constructive and independent voice as meetings with central administrators. I pledge to listen to you, my colleges, and to be a visible and vocal advocate for you. Thank you. Please vote in the next couple of weeks.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Burns. Professor Lieberwitz.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Yes. Is this mic working, or should I use this one? This one's not working either?”

Speaker Beer: “And if you like, you could stand at the podium or you may be seated.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I can stay here. All right, thanks so much. Thank you all for coming out for the meeting of course, but also for the forum. I really appreciate your attending on this very beautiful day, and it's my great pleasure to be here with Professor Burns presenting to you.

“I would like to describe to you in the brief few minutes that I have before we open it up to Qs and As what I would bring to the faculty as dean of faculty, and then also I'd like to highlight for you one of the accomplishments in faculty governance that I'm particularly proud of.

“So first, beginning with what I would bring to the role of dean of faculty; as a professor in the ILR school, I have expertise in employment relations in general, and this has certainly influenced my work in faculty governance and it would continue to inform my work with administrators and with colleagues.

“And not only in terms of faculty governance and those sorts of relationships between the faculty governance institutions and the administrators, but I also believe that my experience and knowledge in employment relations would help me to work well with individual faculty members who need assistance, because of course that is part of the role of the dean of faculty.

“Now, more specifically in terms of the work that I've done that I would bring to this role, I have many years of research and service that have focused on academic freedom and faculty governance. For the last decade, my publications have analyzed the theory and the practice of academic freedom and faculty governance.

“My research and my service in these areas have informed each other, and I have to say that I'm quite proud of this work. It's a central part of who I am, and that's why I do it. It's important to me and I would love to continue to do it in the role of dean of faculty.

“Now, I'd like to move to highlight one accomplishment that I consider particularly important in my faculty governance activities. As you might know, I was the chair of the Faculty Senate Committee to review faculty governance. We produced a 2007 report that I believe was significant for several reasons.

“The 2007 report from our committee explains why the traditional shared governance model of faculty governance is so important to the university. Under the shared governance model, faculty governance bodies and the administration all participate in governing the university. Our report emphasizes that having effective shared governance is essential to maintaining and increasing the quality of the university.

“Shared governance is also essential to promoting the public mission of the university. So of course the point here is that the shared governance model is central to our identity and our function as a university and maintaining our quality.

“Now, academic freedom and faculty governance are closely related in protecting fundamental values of the university, and I just list a few here. Those fundamental values include faculty independence in creating and pursuing their research agendas, faculty autonomy in teaching and research, and creating a shared governance process

that encourages broad discussion, debate and deliberation over university policies and practices.

“All these are essential to maintaining who we are as a university, as a faculty and as an institution that values sometimes heated debate, but always broad debate and discussion. Now, the faculty governance committee report made recommendations for more effective faculty governance.

“And of course you've heard Professor Burns talk about the need for that, and I certainly agree with that. What I'd like to do is to summarize what I consider the essential elements for meaningful faculty governance.

“I think those can be summarized as timing, transparency and true participation. That is, timing, early consultation; transparency, open sharing of information; and true participation, consultation that seeks consensus through discussion, debate and compromise by all parties.

“Now, these elements form the basis for the current discussions that are ongoing between the UFC and the provost to create effective governance procedures. Certainly this is an ongoing issue, and it's one that we've been trying to work at through various committees, various resolutions, and I certainly would welcome the chance to continue in that endeavor, which I certainly consider to be well worth the time and well worth the effort.

“I would like to close in my brief statement here to say I'm honored to be nominated, I would be honored to serve as your dean of faculty. I am deeply committed to the importance of faculty governance. I believe, as I think I've explained, that it's the core, at the core of who we are and why we value the university, and I look forward to your questions and the chance to have a discussion. Thanks so much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you, both candidates. Now it's time for questions and answers from members of the body. Please raise your hand and be recognized, then wait for a roving microphone. Do we have two operating microphones now?”

“We have to keep in mind that we need a microphone for the candidates, an operating one, and so the questioner should stand, identify yourself as to name and academic affiliation and to whom you're directing the question, either to Professor Burns or Professor Lieberwitz or to both. So any questions? The gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor Brian Chabot, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "It is clear both of you share a sincere dedication to the issue of shared faculty governance and all that implies. I'm wondering what else you see to be important issues for the faculty?"

Speaker Beer: "To whom are you directing the question?"

Professor Chabot: "To both."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. So we'll have Professor Lieberwitz respond first."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Oh, did I just get called? Now the mic is working. That's a great question. Certainly that issue of shared governance -- now it's too loud, I think."

Speaker Beer: "No, it's fine."

Professor Lieberwitz: "The issue of shared governance, I think, is central to what so many of us are talking about and what we are so concerned about. And this is not to avoid your question, because I will answer it directly, but I also think that asking the question may not fully address just how many things shared governance touches upon.

"To think about all the issues that go to the core of our academic work, that's part of shared governance of course, and that's where we have the greatest autonomy as a faculty; but there are also many, many issues that aren't obviously at the core of research and teaching that are also part of shared governance, the kind of things that affect student life, housing, student health issues we have talked about. And so there are many, many issues that, of course, we need to address.

"One of the things that's very much on people's minds, of course, and Professor Burns mentioned, were also issues about the New York Tech campus. And so there will be lots of issues that we can anticipate as well as issues we can't anticipate that will be part of this governance issue; but in terms of other kinds of things that I think are really important for the future is, as I mentioned in my presentation, there are many ways in which the dean of faculty does things that are visible as well as not visible.

"And some of those have to do with working with committees as well as working with individual faculty members at times that they need assistance. And coming from my background in terms of ILR and working with advocacy and working with people in employment situations, that's one of the functions that I would really relish doing is helping individuals when they have different issues that come up in various ways."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Professor Burns."

Professor Burns: "That's great. It is a good question. I think there are several things the dean of the faculty should be involved in. I think one is getting the faculty itself more involved in the operation of the university. I think we've been the -- the senior faculty have been delinquent, to be quite frank, and need to be more involved, so we're participating more in the direction of the university."

"I think that we have to work to solve problems -- and maybe that's shared governance -- but solve problems of the facilities that we have, the sorts of monies that are available for us. We need to, as Professor Lieberwitz said, we need to be able to develop respect among the various communities. That's very important."

"I think that the faculty need to respect the staff and the staff need to respect the faculty. We all would work better if that were true. We need to be more involved in interactions with the board of trustees than we are at present. I think that the joys I have had of meeting engaged members of the board of trustees should be shared by lots of faculty members. I think we'll be more impressed by who's paying our salary. I guess that's it."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, thank you. Another question. The gentleman in the plaid."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "You both mentioned participation of the faculty in those processes in a very active way, and you both mentioned that you want to kind of support that active participation. So where do you see the mechanisms -- again, a question to both of you -- what are the mechanisms whereby you increase participation? Not only presence in the faculty senate, but also active participation and discussions and so on."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Burns first."

Professor Burns: "I think that part of that comes down to respect and also effectiveness. We are in a situation where if the faculty members realize positions are listened to, they will be more participatory."

"I think if we are able to start some forum or dean's discussions, something like that on particular issues, trying to see what the administration is about to bring to us so that we can come back immediately with a response, know the issues before we are presented with something and ask to respond by next Tuesday. I think that would be important"

and, again, would engage the faculty. And if it's really terrible, I make a mean salad, so we'll have big salads."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Lieberwitz."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Thanks for the question. That, of course, is an issue that we've been struggling with for a long time; how do we increase participation. Certainly I agree with Professor Burns when he said that the more effective we are in having an influence in our interactions with the administration and in shared governance, the more people will want to participate; but we have to figure how to break out of a vicious cycle that discourages people from participating because they feel that we don't have effective faculty governance.

"This is one of the reasons I think that the work that the committee to review faculty governance was so important and the continuing work that the UFC is doing in negotiating with the provost's office to try to create protocols and procedures that we can expect to be followed is so important to have an institutionalized system of governance processes where we know that people will follow certain steps in an institutionalized, expected, standardized way; so that when issues come up that are of interest to the faculty, we know that the governance process will begin early, that we will be well-informed about the issues, and that we can expect that all parties will in good faith sit down to try to reach consensus, as opposed to simply a situation of being informed about issues or events that will take place.

"How do we make that happen? I think we make that happen first by continuing in these efforts to create these sort of institutionalized processes. The default mechanism needs to be that when an issue comes up of policy and practice that's of interest to the faculty, that we all can know and expect that those institutionalized processes will be followed. And I think essential to that is one of the things I said, which is fully informed interactions for governance.

"I think that one issue that we really need to confront is an overuse of the term "confidential." I think that we should shift back to a norm that is one of more openness as opposed to either secrecy or confidentiality, because it makes it impossible to participate meaningfully, unless we share information. That's what a university is supposed to do. We are supposed to have open debate about issues.

"The other thing I would just mention, and then I'll be done with this response, is I also think it's very important for us to see what's happening at the local level. How healthy is faculty governance in colleges? Because it may be if we want to build a culture of

participation, what we need to do is to inform ourselves about whether departments and colleges are experiencing active participation in governance or whether we can work together to do that at the university and sort of local level.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Are there further questions for the candidates? Professor Sanders. One moment. Wait for the microphone, please.

“For your general information, these proceedings are being recorded and they will be available on the web at some point. Okay. Please stand, identify yourself and tell us to whom you are directing the question. “

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: I would like to hear both responses. I have the impression, but I could be wrong, because I haven't studied it in detail, that the faculty here are very disempowered, that we have very little power over anything.

“Decision after decision, we could go through the whole list of them, department mergers, land use, building use, financial control, the Technion campus, just many, many things in which there was no consultation whatever and we were simply told these things would happen; the code of conduct being another one that really went against even our charter.

“I wonder if both of you have any knowledge of other campuses and any particular model; Harvard, for example, where the faculty senate seems to have a lot more power than we do. Are there other places where the faculty is more influential in critical decision-making that you would see as a model for us?”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, thank you. Professor Lieberwitz first, please.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Okay, thanks very much for that question. I think that when we look at other universities and, for example, when certain news stories come out and we say that university, there really was something that happened with the faculty, as you pointed out, at Harvard, had influence on various issues. I think that what we should look at are what are the elements that make that happen. I think that's what you're pointing to.

“Before actually addressing those elements, I think it's worth saying that there are national trends. And in the review that we did on the Faculty Governance Review Committee, one of the things that we pointed out was that there are national trends where shared governance has generally been identified as being in trouble, that the sort

of power that one has come to expect from a shared governance model seemed to be a bit on the wane.

“And there may be various reasons for that, which we don't have time to discuss now fully, but certainly that notion of not sufficiently shared information and announcement of decisions being made without consultation is at the heart of faculty governance being on the wane.

“In other universities, there may be different reasons, but it's a national trend; but I think that perhaps the most useful way I could answer your question is to say are there examples of effective faculty governance here. And when there have been effective faculty governance measures, what has been important about it.

“And I would point out eCornell as an issue, which might be surprising for some people, because the issue of eCornell began as a conflict between the faculty senate and the administration; because with eCornell initially, the administration did make an announcement to the UFC that the administration plan of simply go forward with the recommendation for eCornell as a for-profit institution with courses for credit and to recommend that to the board of trustees.

“Well, the faculty senate responded with a lot of debate and resolution about that, saying we believe that we should be part of this discussion, regardless of the pros and the cons of the eCornell. Before we know what the pros and cons are, we need to be fully engaged in the discussion.

“And there was a collective agreement in the senate that this was important. And I think that the administration, because of that collective agreement, responded and eCornell was adopted in ways that had non-credit courses and emphasized maintaining faculty autonomy over course content, because that was one of the concerns. That, of course, occurred after a lot of conflict and struggle; so what I would recommend is that sort of process that eventually took place is what we should institutionalize.”

Speaker Beer: “Professor Burns.”

Professor Burns: “I don't have very much personal information about other universities. I certainly have family members who were on faculties of other universities, but my understanding is that they operate much like ourselves. And certainly governance across the nation, not only among faculties, is at a very low ebb at the present time, so I don't think our situation is unusual.

"It may be exacerbated by the dual nature of our campus and its breadth. I should respond perhaps to the report on faculty governance, which I thought was an excellent report. I think you've done a marvelous job. It's a good framework, but there are also -- of course it's important to have personal relations and have large numbers of contacts across campus, and I think that my own background has allowed me to do that. I've been operating in several colleges, I have had an art exhibit at the Johnson Museum, and I think those are important to have those sorts of interests."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, thank you. Are you ready for the coin toss? (LAUGHTER)

"The coin toss to decide who is going to go first in summarizing their position."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I would like more questions."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Burns, would you kindly pick heads or tails?"

Professor Burns: "Heads."

Speaker Beer: "Heads. You are first."

Professor Burns: "I will take the kick."

Speaker Beer: "Two minutes."

Professor Burns: "This is clearly -- I think we're all aware this is a very important time for the university. The enormous transition of the number of faculties, financial difficulties we find ourselves under, and it's a time when we really need an effective faculty. I think for our faculty to be effective, we need to all work together. We do a great job as individual faculty members, but we would be much more effective as influencing the institution.

"I believe that I could help in achieving consensus -- I'm sort of a consensus builder -- and in getting the faculty point of view across to the central administration. I like to think of myself as somebody who's fair, respects individuals, organized, multitasking, knowledgeable with broad campus-wide experience of Cornell, its people and research facilities, but I caution you to check with my wife and ask her."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Lieberwitz. Two minutes."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Thank you. Well, again, thanks for coming. This has been really a great pleasure, and I have to say it's been a lot of fun to be able to talk about issues that I find so interesting and actually have an audience that wants to listen is even better. So thank you.

"Just in the couple minutes to summarize, I've been here for 30 years and I've enjoyed being a professor. I love teaching, I enjoy my research, and I find the service that we're able to do in the university be very fulfilling, which is why I've been so active in service and certainly one of the reasons why I decided to study those issues. And I'd like to continue my service as your dean of faculty.

"I agree that we should work towards consensus. I think that we all agree on that, but I'd like to hold the role of dean of faculty so that I can help to make our faculty governance structure one in which we actually do feel that we're able to use institutionalized processes to move in an effective way towards a real consensus that comes from open sharing of information early in the process, so that we can have the give and take and compromise needed so everybody's satisfied that we came out with a decision which maybe not everybody's happy with, but that we feel we really worked together with our colleagues, with the administrators to reach that consensus.

"One of the reasons I think that's so important and why I emphasize some of those basic values of academic freedom and governance, faculty independence, autonomy, debate and decision, I think we can all agree that's what makes the university a unique institution. And I'd like to ask you for your vote in order to fulfill the role that I think the dean of faculty can fulfill in bringing lots of people together across the university in order to preserve those values and those aspects of the university that we find so important to our role here. So thank you very much."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much, Professor Lieberwitz. Professor Burns? No, we have now reached the point -- I'm sorry. You cannot respond."

(LAUGHTER)

"We have now reached the point where we have a few minutes for general discussion. And the candidates may return to the audience, if they'd like, or they may continue to be in the front."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Maybe there would be somebody who would want to hear something else."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, so general discussion on the candidates, on the office for a few minutes. Anybody wish to make any points or to argue one way or the other?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "I have also been here a long time, seen an awful lot of changes. I have participated in faculty governance as long as I've been at Cornell. I actually got very discouraged and quit at one point. Seemed like nothing had any impact.

In a particular instance I remember that really bothers me was we had a committee that met with -- many times, very unhappy, as some people may remember -- were really not consulted at all. In fact had shown extreme opposition to people were then named as dean. Hunter promised he'd give us a procedure and it just never happened, and that seems to be really typical of -- we just never can figure out how to follow up and really push through to get an effective voice."

Speaker Beer: "Does hope spring eternal?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Well, I'd love to think that -- I'm really happy to have two candidates that both seem to be very well-qualified and very interested in trying to restore the activity or the influences of faculty in the system, but I think another good example we can say is there's supposed to be a new financial plan coming out that maybe some faculty have some say in, but I certainly haven't heard a word about it. It's already several years late and God knows what will happen when it's announced."

Speaker Beer: "We have any other view or supporting view or opposing view?
Gentleman on the aisle. One moment."

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: "I have been here a long time, too, and just to respond to the business with Hunter Rawlings, we seem to have a friendlier administration now, and I think some of our problems, however, are of a different nature. For example, Professor Burns mentioned the book store giving up the general books is what's happening there.

"The library, you didn't mention that, but there were some closed. Parking got rearranged without a lot of consultation; hit the employees very hard. It seems that there are parts of the university that just do things on their own, and that's a difficult problem. I don't see that it's going to be addressed -- it's not easy to be addressed by shared governance.

Somehow we've got to get hold of the sort of change in the culture of the university that's happening very rapidly and try and improve it. So I'd like to ask both of you, if you have just a little bit of time, what you might do about it."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, thank you very much. Dean Fry, you have a comment? All right, I think we have to move on, unfortunately, but we'd like to thank both candidates, members of the body."

(APPLAUSE)

"And as we move on, we come to Senator Abby Cohn -- I'm sorry. First Students For Justice in Palestine, and I'm not clear just who is going to address that point. Gentleman."

7. COMMENTS FROM "STUDENTS FOR JUSTICE IN PALESTINE"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Hi. I and my two colleagues are representatives from a student group called Students For Justice in Palestine, a mixed group of students of Christian, Jewish and Muslim faiths. We are here because we believe that the collaboration that the Cornell administration has entered into with Technion has been hasty, made with insufficient consultation, in violation of university bylaws and could cause long-term damage to the school's reputation.

"First, entering into a collaboration with the Technion, a university complicit in human rights violations that has helped construct the wall which the International Court of Justice ruled illegal in 2004, is at the very least controversial.

"Two, we understand that you, the faculty, were not consulted on this matter, even though it clearly falls under, and I'm quoting, questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit.

"We are troubled, not merely because we're dismayed by violations of procedure, but because we strongly feel that faculty and students should have had and should have a say in this decision. We are deeply concerned that this decision was hurried through under a shroud of darkness.

"Third, we will not pretend that our own position is nonpartisan. We come before you and have spoken out strongly in student media against this partnership because we consider it wrong and because we feel that an atmosphere of intolerance has been fostered here towards anyone who speaks out against the actions committed by the Israeli government.

“There have been death threats against Muslim students for showing solidarity with the people of Palestine during the 2008-2009 massacre. That is unacceptable. This upsets us, but it does not scare us. We're accused of being anti-Israel and pro-Palestine. We don't know what those words mean. We're anti-human rights violations, we're pro-human rights, and we're not ashamed to say so.

“We understand from discussions with the provost that there may still be time to discuss this partnership. And for that reason, we ask that you, the faculty senate, pass a resolution requesting a stay of the decision to sign the contract with the Technion so that the faculty can openly discuss the project, per university bylaws. We just heard half an hour of discussion about consultation. We would like to see that applied in practice. Thank you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a report from the University Faculty Committee by senator Abby Cohn.”

8. UFC REPORT

Senator Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “So Mary Beth Norton, as chair of the University Library Board, and I engaged in a conversation with the UFC about some concerns about the library. And as a result, the UFC plans to present an online petition that we are going to ask all faculty who would like to sign.

“So just to give a bit of background, you may remember that last May, the senate passed a resolution to maintain the strength of the Cornell University library system in light of concerns about sufficient funding for both digital and print collections. Since that time, there have been a number of important steps that have been taken.

“The university librarian has committed resources from the library's reserves for collection development, and the president and provost, working together with the college deans, have made fundraising for the library collection development a priority. And these are both very important steps; however, these together are really only a stopgap measure and they don't sufficiently address particularly the relative decline in collection development vis-a-vis our peers.

“So the UFC plans to circulate an online petition to all faculty, and the goal of this is so that we can pool our voices as faculty to highlight the critical importance of the library, and also at the same time in effect give ammunition to our college deans, the provost,

who I'm very glad to see is here today, the president and the trustees about how critically this problem needs to be resolved.

“So pretty soon -- we didn't want to compete with the opening of the online voting for the dean of faculty -- this petition will be coming around. And in particular, we want to bring it to all of your attention, because we really are hoping you'll highlight, talk about this issue with your colleagues and be sure that we can speak together.

“So there'll be an e-mail, and this is a draft of it. We are concerned about our relative standing vis-a-vis our peers, which is really the main way we measure our strength as a library; notably here among the 116 North American academic research libraries, in 2010, we were 43rd in terms of funding investment per faculty, 15th per student and 35th per Ph.D. field.

“This rather dense slide here, which you can read at your leisure when the e-mail comes around, highlights the crux of the problem, which is that it's our very important strategic goal of the university strategic plan to be a top ten university, it's central to the library strategic plan that we be a top ten library, which is critical for meeting our goal as a top ten university and our recent investments in collection development have not allowed us to meet those objectives.

“The gap is growing. We need to address this as soon as possible. Most striking in this regard is both our cumulative increased expenditure from 2005 to 2010, where the median of our peers was 35%, and Cornell's increase was 1.7%. In 2010 in particular, the median collection developments investment was \$23 million. Cornell's was \$16 million, leaving a gap of \$7 million.

“So we applaud the administration and the university librarian for working together to try to come up with solutions, but we think that much more aggressive action is needed. So we call on the faculty to join us in voicing this concern. And this is just the draft of the actual petition.

“We speak together to highlight the importance of the strength of the library; and again, you'll have time to read this at your leisure, and we call on the central administration college, deans and faculty to work together to meet the strategic goal of being a top ten library.

“And so the reason that we're talking to you today is that we really encourage you to talk to your colleagues, talk about why this is important, let people know to expect this petition, not to just delete it, and to respond to this.

“We also propose we'll put together an e-mail alias, so that if people want to commit written comments about either why the strengths of the library are critically important to them or particular areas of concern, that information can be conveyed as well. And I have heard that I gather the provost is planning to sign the petition, and we appreciate that support, so thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Cohn. Now, keeping very nicely on schedule, the next item on the agenda -- I'm sorry we have to move to the next item, which is the Good and Welfare talk by Senator Professor Grossman of the Physics Department.”

9. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: “Okay, so I'm here, I want to respond to the talk done before against the Technion. Can you hear me here?”

Speaker Beer: “Please use the microphone.”

Professor Grossman: “So a little about me; I'm from Israel, I was a professor at the Technion. I still have an active grant going with the Technion. They consult me with other things. I'm very personally involved with this kind of thing. And unlike most of you, I lost my father when I was 5 years old in this conflict. I lost many friends.

“I mean, it's still a picture I cannot forget. I was 9 years old, there was someone in my neighborhood, and she was swimming with me on the same team. She was short from probably distance of 5 meter. And on those days, it's not like today that after an attack, you put it with this like yellow strip. All the kids run after the attack and oh, look, here she is. And I still remember like the blood on the wall. So very, very personal, okay?

“If there's one thing that I like -- I care more than physics, it's this kind of thing. It's really, really deep inside me. So that's why I'm here. So one thing I must say, I completely agree with the fact that they should have come here and discussed it with the senate. You know, I had my other issues, that I think it's not okay that they did not come to inform the senate.

“So on this side, I completely agree with them, they should have come here. The bigger problem, however, is what is going on here; and boycott idea running by the Palestinian against Israel academia. And this is not against Israel government. And I myself, I completely disagree with the Israeli government on so many things, but this is very different than go and call for a boycott against us.

“And I want to mention it; it's two sides to this conflict, okay. By no means I say we are doing it right, but come on. I mean, I don't understand. When you see things done wrong, there's both sides. And everybody, if you just think that we are wrong, come, look, read, educate yourself on how complicated the situation is.

“I wish it was simple. To my friend I said you know, this is more complicated than the strong interaction. There is no way we can solve it. It is really complicated. And I'm really here to tell you one thing: Boycott is not what we are after. You do not want to boycott Israeli academia. And just coming from Israel, I tell you if there is someone who is -- who think really the right way, it's the Israeli academia.

“So these are the people you want to boycott, and who we are, we as Cornell, the people who try to call for openness, we going to boycott someone else just because someone has some grant with some military. At Cornell, we don't have grants with military. I mean, what are we pretending we are doing here. This is really something that we have to understand.

“And they didn't say today, but in a meeting two weeks ago, they say this is not against people. It is against an institution. We work in some arbitrary, complex mathematical space. No, it's against me. Don't pretend. I am the person, I am the one from the Technion, and there's many like me. When you boycott the Technion, you boycott me. You don't boycott something, I'll withdraw.

“So we definitely have to discuss it, but I really hope that you support the non-boycotting. If you want to support, you know my e-mail. My name is Yuval; very easy to find me. E-mail me, and I hope we don't have to discuss such things in the future. Thank you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Grossman. And I'd like to thank all the members of the body and particularly our candidates for the deanship for the very active participation at today's meeting. So we've reached the time of our adjournment. The University Faculty Senate is adjourned.”

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty Senate