

A MEETING  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
APRIL 11, 2012

**0. CALL TO ORDER**

Speaker Steve Beer: "If you have something to say, please raise your hand, be recognized, wait for a roving microphone to be brought to you, and then stand and identify yourself by name and academic unit and then give us your piece. There are no Good and Welfare speakers, so we anticipate adjourning prior to 6:00 p.m. today.

"The first item on the agenda is discussion of the academic calendar, and Professor Jeff Doyle, who's chair of the Calendar Committee, is going to update us on the resolutions that -- or the discussion that he offered at the March meeting. Jeff?

**1. DISCUSSION OF THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR – CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

Professor Jeff Doyle, Chair, Calendar Committee: "Thank you, Steve. Yeah, this is an update for starters here. And mainly, as you'll see, because a lot has happened since that March meeting -- had a chance to laugh and be in a good mood here -- we'll start.

"So first of all, I want to remind you of the timeline, what we've been doing over the last almost two years now. So the committee was formed in October 2010. In spring of 2011, we released the principles/objectives document and gave people a chance to comment on that.

"And in November of 2011, the senior staff reviewed the fall calendar and commented on that, okayed it essentially for release, and then gave us a decision to retain commencement on Memorial Day weekend, which was a real critical thing for us in terms of setting the spring calendar.

"In February 2012, senior staff reviewed the spring calendar, and we released the first draft of the calendar. That's the version that you have seen and I talked about at the March meeting. We had a period of commentary. We received messages or e-mails from various people and feedback from various different people.

“And then during that period, since that release of that, we met with the SA, the university assembly, employee assembly, faculty senate. I was here before orientation staff, a lot of people, and received feedback. Then finally, just yesterday, the committee met to discuss all that feedback and do something with it.

“And that's what I'm going to tell you about today, because what we came up with is in response to all this feedback and it is different from what you have been looking at. We asked for responses with a target date of March 28th, and we did receive some by that time.

“Eventually, this is to the calendar web site or the e-mail site, and so what we end up with 26 faculty, notably right at the end of the commentary period, Engineering and CS weighed in very strongly on a couple of issues. I'll just mention that here. A few staff, no graduate and professional students -- they had their own separate process in giving us feedback on that -- a few undergraduates and even one parent to whom I responded, somehow found her way to the faculty senate web site.

“Another significant chunk of information came in just last night actually, and so I spent some time last night looking at this. Yesterday actually during the day, a response from Physics coordinated by Rob Thorne, quite a number of comments there.

“A survey, sort of in parallel to our student representatives on the committee, was created by a couple of other student assembly members and, with 400-some responses I just received, I and President Skorton and Ken Fuchs and a number of other people received in input last night. Then also last night I received a GPSA resolution endorsing the recommendations that you saw, that set of recommendations that went out in March.

“So what did the feedback look like here? Here were some of the things, a few major points, things that came up more than once, in some cases several times. Red shows things people didn't like about the calendar. Green is things they did like about our recommendations, and black is sort of in the middle there, as you can see.

“The big thing that we heard from students and particularly Engineering and CS faculty was not to eliminate study days between the end of classes and exams, as was true in the calendar recommendations we submitted for comment. And this

was based for the Engineering folks, and the CS folks, was based on the large number of projects that have to be completed. Students, of course, were more concerned with just the study period itself.

“A large number of premeds in the survey comment on that. Minimized partial weeks of instruction, and nothing I mentioned actually at the March meeting here, that we were concerned with that; but we created a number of unbalanced weeks in which for large lab courses this is a major problem in setting up labs and doing things.

“Students -- if you have read the "Daily Sun" and seen things, students are very concerned about cutting down on the days in senior week. Eliminating this Monday schedule on a Friday swap, a lot of people found that rather confusing and commented on that.

“A huge issue for, particularly, CU Advance group, many other people as well, to bring the Cornell calendar into better alignment with the ICSD and local school calendars, various different aspects of that. We have been in touch with folks from CU Advance about this, and this will show up a number of different times in a number of different ways.

“And one of them is which people like the idea of adding the two-day winter break, because that does actually bring the calendar somewhat more in alignment with what's happening in the local school systems. Making Martin Luther King Day a holiday was appreciated by a number of people, and making the Wednesday before Thanksgiving a full day off from classes rather than having classes end at 1:30. So these were all things that people commented on.

“So what did we do with this? Yesterday we had a longish meeting and came up with a number of modifications to that. I have to say this is entirely preliminary and things that you folks might tell me today or us today -- we have a number of committee members over there in the corner -- can change this yet again. We are still taking comments, and we'll see what happens with this, but here's what we've come up with for now in response to these -- the feedback we have gotten.

“Things in black are retained from the version of the calendar that you have seen with check marks here. Red means we changed it. The changes are in blue, so that's the format here for the fall calendar. Classes beginning on Tuesday; that's not changed.

“So this is before Labor Day, something that a number of people would like to see the semester begin after Labor Day. That's very difficult to do with the Thanksgiving recess and other things; but that's something people discussed, Labor Day, no classes. That's something that was built into the calendar before.

“Fall break is the same. Thanksgiving break, same as in the proposal that you have seen, with no classes on Wednesday through Friday. That's the same in there. Classes end on a Friday and, in the model that you saw before, there were no study days before the beginning of the exam period, and we have put those back in. So Saturday through Tuesday is a study period, now four days; exams beginning on Wednesday, instead of beginning on Monday.

“There was a study day interspersed in the middle of the exam period, which some people liked a lot in that original calendar that we circulated. We have eliminated that in favor now of going back to having study days before the exam period, and exams ended on Tuesday in the calendar you have seen. Exams end Wednesday here, to gain one of those days back for the study period and still end up with the same number of days in the academic calendar for the fall.

“So where this leaves us, then, is classes start the Tuesday prior to August 30, so that's before Labor Day. The schedule includes 68 days of instruction. And that's, again, to be in compliance with New York State requirements for the number of days and contact hours we have to have. It includes twelve Mondays. Again, the idea of that Friday-Monday swap was to add another Monday back in, because Mondays take a disproportionate hit from the various different breaks. We eliminated that based on the feedback that people didn't like that.

“The exam schedule has now 19 periods, begins on a Wednesday, with three, three, two exams. No exam Friday evening. We have placed exams on the weekend. We have to do that in order to do the other things we are wanting to do with this, despite that being another thing that was somewhat unpopular with people in terms of comments that we got.

“People didn't like the idea of having exams on the weekend, but we have retained that in here. And then so here we have the last part of the exam period. So three exams each day, so that's how we get the fall calendar.

“Moving on to spring, there are more changes in the spring calendar. Again, Martin Luther King Day remains a holiday, as it was in the older proposal. Classes begin on Wednesday; same as that. Winter break -- February break, this

is the Presidents' week break of Monday and Tuesday that was in that calendar that you have seen. It's retained in this one.

“Spring break, if you remember, had no classes through Thursday, beginning before the weekend, and then the full next week being **spring** break. So two extra days, we have taken that out of the calendar. So this was now back to no classes Monday through Friday, just as our current spring break is. Classes end on Friday. In this model, they end on Wednesday. In the new model, with again study days Thursday through Sunday. before the weekend, and then the full next week being spring break. So two extra days, we have taken that out of the calendar. So this was now back to no classes Monday through Friday, just as our current spring break is. Classes end on Friday. In this model, they end on Wednesday. In the new model, with again study days Thursday through Sunday.

“So again, study days built back into the beginning of the exam period as opposed to the other calendar which did not have those. Exams begin Monday. The study day on Thursday, again, is eliminated from this calendar as it was from the fall calendar. Exams ending on Tuesday versus Monday in the newer version here.

“Then the other impact here is on senior week or senior days, as it becomes now. What we have done is deploy a day that we had elsewhere in the calendar to now increase senior days from either Monday through Friday or Tuesday through Friday, depending on how you count it.

“One of the issues is that the senior days programming, of which there's quite a bit of it actually, is dependent on there being student volunteers, underclass volunteers and also having facilities available for actually having these activities, so there will be a potential impact if there are underclassmen having exams.

“And I'm getting ahead of myself, because one of the things I should say is that this Monday in here in the exam period is meant to be a day in which no or very few seniors will have exams. That's something the registrar can do with the programming that we have, and so that creates an additional day for seniors, but other people will still be taking exams on that day.

“And that's where the impact may be in some of the programming that happens. So in other words, in this case, we had actually been sensitive to student

concerns by adding a day back in here, as much as two days. Then commencement, Sunday of Memorial weekend, that stays the same.

“Now, I have to say, this is another thing that is a bit of a contention. We've talked with the CU Advance group about this, and they are actively lobbying the senior staff to see if this can be the senior staff's preference for having commencement on Memorial Day weekend can be changed, can be shifted.

“And that's up in the air. It's entirely possible that I'll get a message one of these days that says that we should go back to looking at models that have an earlier end of the entire semester. We could then move forward with an earlier start and cutting into winter break and we face all kind of issues at that point. So I just don't know at this time.

“So here's the calendar again. So classes start the Wednesday prior to January 28th; scheduled 69 days of instruction, 13 Mondays. The exam period is structured, as you can see here. This second Monday with three exams is built to minimize the number, maybe eliminate seniors having any exams at all during that last day.

“So those are the differences in the calendar, and this is what the calendars look like. This is the summary sheets. I'm not going to go through all this, but just to show you that Cassie Dembosky worked out the schedules all the way through 2018. This 2013 doesn't mean that's when the calendar would be implemented. That's out of our hands, not something we have control over. We are just showing what the schedules would look like for various different years and the way they are set up.

“So all these things I talked about; and here's the spring calendar, same thing. Commencement on the Sunday Memorial Day. So with that, I'm welcome to go back and talk about things more, answer questions, any kind of discussion you want to have. And we have other people who can comment.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks very much, Jeff. Any questions or discussion by members of the body? The gentleman in the center in the green shirt. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Dick Miller, Philosophy: “As I understand it, there's still an increase in the number of short weeks in this proposal. I think this is a very bad idea. A

weekend is for retaining the coherence of a discussion is concerned, might as well be a century, especially in an introductory course.

“Many introductory courses are taught on the basis of Monday lecture, Wednesday lecture, Friday discussion sometimes in a required section if the professor is leading one of the sections. There's really no time in the courses I teach that an adequate development of a topic that week that then makes sense in the discussion section if it's a short week. So I think this is an effort to solve a very difficult problem, but it's deeply flawed.

“I'm also disturbed by the process in which it's presented to us. I'm very well aware of all the pressures that are on people who design these meetings and on the committee. The first time I heard of the proposal was in the last presentation, a brief presentation with no opportunity for discussion. Now we have a discussion of a proposal that's new as of yesterday. I'm told that we will have the authoritative discussion with the faculty senate at a May meeting, a time which many of us are under special pressures.

“It seems to me if it's worth having a faculty senate, that's because the faculty senate is a place in which people with diverse issues throughout the university in the faculty can discuss them and try to resolve them. I think that function has not been well-served by this process.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any other points? Gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “First of all, thank you for trying to tackle this very difficult issue and thank you for listening to us Engineering faculty members about the study week. It is very important, I think, to have those days back.

“I still think that it's a little bit kludgy to have these partial weeks, and I think -- I read the rationale, but the rationale for not just having a full week at Week 5 and a full week at Week 10 was students couldn't maybe afford to go home or something. Honestly, I think they'll find something to do. They'll go to the city. I'm still not sure -- I think that's the weakest part of the calendar is not having the full week at Week 5 and Week 10, and therefore having all these partial weeks as a consequence. That is my only comment.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the blue.”

Professor David Zax, Chemistry and Chemical Biology: "I am just confused -- and this is partly as someone who teaches a very large introductory class in chemistry -- about the idea that having exams in 8 days as opposed to 13 is less stressful. That part has never made any logical sense to me.

"And in addition, as I teach 900 kids who are supposed to take finals, and every year more and more of them somehow miss the final exam because of various reasons for which we are expected to provide makeups, that seems to get harder and harder as the number of days in the exam period gets smaller. So I'm just wondering?"

Professor Doyle: "So may I respond?"

Speaker Beer: "Sure."

Professor Doyle: "So there, that's one question I can answer, sort of, at least with some help from the registrar, in that a lot of modeling was done looking at the current schedule and the way it was set up and the way those exam periods were deployed in the current schedule and how it was all set up."

Professor Zax: "That's not a fair comparison, because you could do it in 13 as well."

Professor Doyle: "So you are arguing that there should just be a very long exam period, as long as we can possibly make it."

Professor Zax: "No. What I'm arguing is that to say that this is a stress reduction technique strikes me as made up."

Professor Doyle: "No, it's not. It's not made up. I guess the way I would answer that is to say that there are aspects, elements in the calendar that we set out to do that were specifically to reduce stress, and there are other things that we also tried to do to make the calendar more rational in other ways and to deploy days in various different ways, and compromises were made.

"One of the places that we found days was by having a more rational and better organized exam schedule. It had not been looked at for a very long time. Modeling was done to show that we could achieve an exam schedule in a shorter number of days. That addressed many of the different questions or problems

that people had. And the result of that was that we had days we could deploy in other ways while not extending the semester physically much longer than it was.

“So you are right in the sense that the change to the exam period to a shorter number of days is not in itself a stress reduction, and maybe perhaps was never intended to be that, but it's part of a larger picture that we hope will have the effect of having less stress on students in other ways.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the brown jacket.”

Professor Thorne, Physics: “So what I did, we have a regular Monday lunch in the physics department. We have a big discussion on the faculty there, and we followed it up with a survey of the faculty to which a dozen responded, and I think the general consensus was that almost nothing in the proposal was an improvement.

“First, it's nice to celebrate Martin Luther King Day, but our students will be celebrating it by driving. Second, it's a really good idea to try and match the holiday calendar with the ICSD calendar, but the problem is that the break as it's currently positioned comes far too early after only three weeks of instruction for the students. Anyone who's taught large intro courses knows that student stress has barely started to build at that point in the semester. And it's also too early to be useful as a study break to help them prepare for the first round of prelim exams.

“Then the compression of the exam period also is obviously -- it can at best be neutral on stress, and almost certainly will increase stress. So my colleagues came up with a simple proposal, which was let's just start class a week earlier, like almost all of our peer institutions. That would make the Martin Luther King holiday a real holiday that could be properly observed. That would make -- and then extend that -- it would position that two-day February break at a time just before the prelims, when it's actually more useful academically.

“Why not extend that two-day break into a full week break then, which would then, for people that have families, with a two-day break, they still have to find child care for the other three days of the break. If they have a full week off, they can actually use it to enjoy their family. And then keep the exam schedule where it is now.

“So you heard all this. So there were some small comments in the online commentary that accompanied the proposed calendar changes, but -- about two issues, but neither of them struck me as deal-breakers against this kind of calendar. So could you elaborate on that?”

Professor Doyle: “No, I can't actually. I simply don't have it at the tip of my fingers here to tell you what the issues were specifically with doing all the balancing that we were doing with the calendar. Frankly, it didn't come up a whole lot at our meeting yesterday, the Physics model.

“We did talk about -- trying to remember now -- we did talk a little about starting the semester earlier, but I think one of the issues there was if we are locked in on commencement on Memorial Day to extend the semester further in the other direction and start earlier, doesn't seem like something we really would be able to do or would be very useful to do perhaps. I think that's where we may have started. Help me out here, folks, here from the committee. Did we say anything much about that yesterday?”

Professor Kate Walsh, Hotel School: “I am Kate Walsh, also the vice chair of the committee with Jeff Doyle here. In regards to starting earlier, we did have extensive discussion about it, and we spoke about the idea that the winter session has some small version of classes happening and that some faculty are actually writing grant proposals during that time.

“And the third issue had to do with the staff and the stress on the staff for actually having to get the dorms all ready to go one week prior to when they do now. It's something we can all reconsider, but that really was an extensive pushback that we did receive from that idea.”

Professor Doyle: “Earlier, not yesterday. I want to be clear, not yesterday specifically having to do with the Physics overall proposal, but those are the considerations that we had dealt with earlier in the deliberations.”

Speaker Beer: “We will take another three or four minutes of discussion. Professor Cohn.”

Senator Abby Cohn, Linguistics. “I would just suggest to the committee not to give up on the Friday-Monday swap so quickly. I think we're not used to that, so it seems like it might be a difficult thing; but I have colleagues at many, many institutions who do that routinely and find it completely easy to deal with.

"I have kids starting in middle school that had a crazy schedule, didn't match the days of the week. The high school used to be on a six-day cycle and they managed to get where they need to. So I don't think that alone, just our own reticence to entertain that should be taken off the table, and I think balancing the number of days is an important consideration. "

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman in the front row seats."

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: "I want to thank the committee for hearing our concerns about stress associated with the elimination of the study break. I think you've done a good job of responding to the concerns that my colleagues and I had. I'm just going to comment that the day of break during the exam period had struck people as a good thing; and I suspect that if they see these changes, they'll wonder if you compressed a little too far."

Professor Jeff Doyle: "Yeah, it turns out that some of the modeling in the end showed that the study break in the middle of the exam periods did not help as much with the elimination of bad events, these sort of three exams in a row or three within 24-hour periods, as we had hoped it might. So I think this model will actually be better in terms of reducing those problems as well. Is that right, Cassie? Yes."

Speaker Beer: "We could take another few points. Gentleman on the aisle."

Professor Bruce Turnbull, Operations Research and Statistical Science." I too, am very worried about the compression of the examination schedule. I was wondering, I'm sure with your models and algorithms you back-checked the past couple of semesters with how those would have been. If you could share those with us, that would help me in my evaluation of wherever this compression really can work."

Professor Doyle: "Okay, Cassie. We could get a quick response from the registrar, who is here."

Cassie Dembosky, University Registrar: "We can absolutely share a summary of what we found. I actually will point to David Shmoys. He helped us do some of that modeling. We can put that together, and I'd be happy to share it with you. "Yes. We actually found -- we had a lot of -- I don't want to say slack. We had a little slush in the exam schedule. We found through the modeling we can make a more efficient schedule and actually drop the two periods."

Professor Turnbull: "If you can show us the results."

University Registrar Dembosky: "I think we can, yeah. I think we can, yes. I can't say absolutely for certain apples to apples, but I think we can show something, yeah."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, thank you. I think we can take one other discussant. The gentleman in the red jacket."

Professor Mike Thompson, Materials Science: "The point of this whole schedule change is to reduce stress on the students. I'm trying to understand how packing all the finals in a continuous sequence does that. The concept of having one-day break in the middle of the finals is a known period for relaxation the students appreciate, and both of these seem to eliminate it. Have you talked with students about that as well?"

Professor Doyle: "Yes. In fact, we have students on our committee, and they have talked to their peers. And although there was initially some appreciation for that day worked in, it looked very good; in the end, I think students -- and Natalie is back there from the student assembly, and Jeffrey may be gone now, but there are student representatives here, and ultimately, I believe the consensus -- maybe it's too strong a word to say that, but at least the opinion was that it was better to have the study days in the early part of the -- before the exams started rather than have the day interspersed in there. Maybe it would be good to have both, but we couldn't do that with the numbers we were working with. Natalie, is that correct?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "So the student assembly is going to be talking about a resolution tomorrow that basically talks about the points that students feel are things that would definitely want to be seen in the calendar. One of them is having as many study days before exams as possible, but also looking at creating a natural break or another day during the exam period.

"Since everything is being played out, that's a concern of students and ones we'll address. I'll be sure to send the resolution to the faculty senate once that's discussed at the student assembly tomorrow."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. One final question for Professor Doyle. What is your plan with respect to a resolution?"

Professor Doyle: "Well, I don't know."

Speaker Beer: "Very good."

Professor Doyle: "Maybe that's the only thing I can say. I mean, we are still -- obviously based on what I'm hearing here, we are still expecting to get some more feedback, and we welcome that; resolutions of various types and so on. So I think we would still very much like to wrap this process up with a vote by the end of this semester. If that's possible, we'll do it.

"If there is a concern, as one of the questioners expressed, this process is being rushed and there isn't enough time to comment on it, we are sensitive to that as well. I feel no particular constraint about continuing to discuss this until we get it something like right."

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Well, thanks very much for all your efforts, and if you could leave your microphone here. Okay, so we'll now move to the possible revision of the Academic Integrity Code by the Educational Policy Committee. Are you the chair?"

## 2. [RESOLUTION 1](#) TO REVISE THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Professor Robert Turgeon, Chair, Educational Policy Committee: "I am the chair, Bob Turgeon, the chair of the EPC this year. So we have two resolutions. Let me tell you first, the first one, to revise the Code of Academic Integrity. And the reason for this was it began with a rather interesting case where a student was at another university, Boston University, was charged and convicted of having a student help her with an assignment and that student came from Cornell.

"And the Cornell student then was charged, once we heard about it, and the defense that the student raised was that if you read very closely the code, it suggests, really implies that it only refers to assisting students at Cornell as a violation. And so that was thought to be a rather narrow interpretation.

"It is my understanding that the university has decided to go ahead with that hearing. I'm not sure where it resides; but meanwhile, the university counsel has suggested to us that it does seem a little ambiguous the way the code is written now, and that it might help to clarify things a little bit.

"And so the way that we want to do that is simply by introducing this part of a sentence. If you look toward the middle of the principle, "academic integrity is

expected not only in formal coursework situations, but in all university relationships," you see where the ambiguity is -- "and interactions connected to the educational process, including use of". So we want to add "as well as in relationships and interactions connected to the educational process at other academic institutions" to just make that a little bit clearer.

"And then that would also involve adding, as guidelines for the students, is an example of violations, the last one, providing unauthorized assistance with examinations, papers or any other academic work to students at other academic institutions. So that's the resolution."

***Proposed Changes to the Cornell Code of Academic Integrity, Resolution 1:***

*Whereas a recent alleged violation of academic integrity has indicated the need to clarify and explicitly expand the scope of such violations, and*

*Whereas the specific case involved a student who allegedly provided unauthorized assistance to a student at another university by writing a research paper which the other student submitted under her own name for the completion of an assignment, and*

*Whereas the student at the other university was charged under her university's academic integrity code, admitted that she had not written the paper and was convicted, and*

*Where as in a preliminary inquiry conducted by the College of Arts & Sciences, the Cornell student argued that, although he was not admitting the truth of any of these charges, the Cornell Code of Academic Integrity does not apply, because such an action did not help another Cornell student to cheat, and*

*Whereas University Counsel has confirmed that the Code of Academic Integrity is ambiguous on the issue of jurisdiction in this regard.*

***Therefore be it resolved*** that the Cornell University Faculty affirm that Cornell's Code of Academic Integrity covers all academic interactions, not only those directly affecting the Cornell community, and that the following changes be made to Cornell's Code of Academic Integrity

"Principle" and Section "I. B." as follows *(with changes identified in red)*:

***Principle***

*Absolute integrity is expected of every Cornell student in all academic undertakings. Integrity entails a firm adherence to a set of values, and the values most essential to an*

academic community are grounded on the concept of honesty with respect to the intellectual efforts of oneself and others. Academic integrity is expected not only in formal coursework situations, but in all University relationships and interactions connected to the educational process, including the use of University resources, *as well as in relationships and interactions connected to the educational process at other academic institutions*. While both students and faculty of Cornell assume the responsibility of maintaining and furthering these values, this document is concerned specifically with the conduct of students. A Cornell student's submission of work for academic credit indicates that the work is the student's own. All outside assistance should be acknowledged, and the student's academic position truthfully reported at all times. In addition, Cornell students have a right to expect academic integrity from each of their peers.

### **I. Guidelines for Students.**

#### **B. Examples of Violations**

The following actions are examples of activities that violate the Code of Academic Integrity and subject their actors to proceedings under the Code. This is not a definitive list.

1. Knowingly representing the work of others as one's own.
2. Using, obtaining, or providing unauthorized assistance on examinations, papers, or any other academic work.
3. Fabricating data in support of laboratory or fieldwork.
4. Forging a signature to certify completion of a course assignment or a recommendation to graduate school.
5. Unfairly advancing one's academic position by hoarding or damaging library materials.
6. Misrepresenting one's academic accomplishments.
7. *Providing unauthorized assistance on examinations, papers, or any other academic work to students at other academic institutions.*

Speaker Beer: "Before we proceed with debate on the resolution, I would remind senators that we're going to vote on this resolution, and we're going to do that with clickers, so all senators should have clickers at this point. Are you ready for the discussion of this resolution?"

Okay. Gentleman on the aisle near the front, please wait for the microphone."  
Professor André Kessler, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "In Point 8, the "unauthorized" is something that strikes me, because is there a case where there would be an authorized assistance to an examination in another -- so wouldn't it be less ambiguous if "unauthorized" would be removed?"

Professor Turgeon: "I could imagine a case where there may be some interaction between the university and there may be an authorized use, so think "unauthorized" is pretty useful."

Professor Kessler: "The concern I have is who is the authorizing entity? This is the problem. It could be other students authorized me, right? This is more the concern. So who is the authorizing entity?"

Speaker Beer: "Professor Cohn."

Professor Cohn: "I understand the intent here, and I can imagine how incredibly galling it was to the relevant Academic Integrity Hearing Board chair when he or she was faced with this, but I would like to speak quite stringently against this change, and I'm speaking as a former Academic Integrity Hearing Board chair of Arts and Sciences.

"I think we would be entering an extremely slippery slope that would be very difficult for us to enforce. I don't think that "university relations" is ambiguous. I think because it's a capital U, it clearly refers to what we do at Cornell, and I think that we of course want to hold all our students to the highest level of academic integrity and other forms of integrity, but I think suggesting that we would know how to police this would be putting ourselves in a very difficult situation.

"And I throw out a situation which frankly is not too far from something I had to deal with. I have had former students who went on to work as authors at writing mills, and these writing mills are very ambiguous. I know people who have quite high integrity who might be doing writing assignments in a gray area without actually knowing whether they were assisting a student at an academic institution in producing that work or not.

"By this wording, we would be saying that those people were doing something that was against our code of academic integrity. I don't think that all of those students intentionally might be doing such a thing if they were making some money on the side doing some research, and I really don't think we want to be in the business of trying to adjudicate and police these sorts of matters."

Speaker Beer: "Okay. Yes, please, Professor Turgeon, answer briefly."

Professor Turgeon: "I think that the first point is that the university counsel has weighed in and, according to the counsel, he thinks that the language is ambiguous."

Professor Cohn: "But that doesn't suggest --"

Professor Turgeon: "He suggests that we do add this. The second point is that I think there are always cases that will come up that are difficult, and the academic hearing boards have an opportunity to listen to arguments that students have. Simply because we put this in here doesn't mean that everyone who does enter a gray area is immediately liable."

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

Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine: "Couldn't we get around this by omitting Number 7 here and including what you had on the preamble or whatever, the first change that you did? I mean, these are just examples."

Professor Turgeon: "Yes. I think, if my understanding is correct, the later part is simply a guideline."

Professor Fewtrell: "Abby, would you be against having it included here?"

Professor Turgeon: "So we simply eliminate -- the problem seems to be with the guideline rather than the legislation, so we could --"

Professor Fewtrell: "Decapitalize university, because I would read a capital university with a capital letter as being Cornell; whereas if it was lower case, I would assume that could be any university. That may just be me."

Speaker Beer: "I am afraid we're going to have to move along. The time allocated to this resolution has passed. Are you ready to vote on this resolution? Seems not so. Professor Cohn?"

Professor Cohn: "I move that we table this discussion, this vote. I think it's a very important issue. I think it requires further consideration and we want to be sure to get the wording correct, so I move that we table this."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, it's been moved to table this resolution. This is non-debatable. Is there a second? Seems to be several second hands, so all those in favor of tabling this resolution, raise your right hand. I'm sorry?"

Speaker Beer: "Oh, okay. So please turn on your clicker. And those in favor of tabling this resolution, please click A. Those in opposition, click B. Those wishing to abstain, click C. And we'll give you about 30 seconds to click.

"Okay, you all clicked? A few more seconds. Okay, here we go. The vote is 28 in favor of tabling, 14 in opposition, two abstentions. Clearly the motion is tabled.

"So we'll move on to the second resolution by the Educational Policy Committee. Here you go for the second resolution.

### **3. RESOLUTION 2 TO REVISE THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (RESOLUTION 2)**

Professor Turgeon: "Yeah, second resolution. This is a resolution concerning an inconsistency in university, in the term "academic misconduct" is used by the university policy and in the Code of Academic Integrity. And perhaps it's easiest to understand this if we jump ahead just a little bit and I'll show you.

"Here's just sort of summary of how the Code of Academic Integrity works, or what it says. It is of course a document that describes and discusses integrity in coursework. The violations include plagiarism, et cetera, and it has a section in it then that deals with violations of academic misconduct. And it describes those as talking during an exam, using unauthorized materials, disruptive behavior.

"And clearly, the intent of this is these are behaviors which don't really rise to the level that they would be sent to the Academic Integrity Board. So it says then that academic misconduct as defined here is not a violation of academic integrity; but if you then go to university policy academic and research, you see Policy 1.2 defines academic misconduct quite in different way.

"This policy includes plagiarism, falsifying data and some of these things. It's also obviously meant to be a more serious infraction, and it would be done -- dealt with by an inquiry directed by the dean of the faculty, et cetera.

"So this could and sometimes has apparently been difficult to deal with, and it could be easily resolved by simply redefining this section here and not calling it

academic misconduct, so it wouldn't be in conflict with Policy 1.2. So the way that we think we could do this is just by eliminating "academic misconduct" and instead calling this "classroom misconduct and other behavior disruptive to the educational process," and it would be the same sorts of things.

“And then saying later on that instead of academic misconduct, classroom misconduct is not a violation of academic integrity, et cetera, et cetera. So it's more of a clarification than anything else.

***Code of Academic Integrity, Resolution 2:***

***Whereas*** the term “Academic Misconduct” is used inconsistently in University Policy 1.2

(<http://www.dfa.cornell.edu/treasurer/policyoffice/policies/volumes/academic/misconduct.cfm>)

and the Code of Academic Integrity (<http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html>), the former relating to acts that violate the integrity of scholarly and scientific research and communication

and the latter relating to acts of classroom and examination misbehavior, and

***Whereas*** guidance by the Dean of Faculty requires clarification concerning jurisdiction of student misconduct.

***Therefore be it resolved*** that the following changes to the Cornell Code of Academic Integrity be made:

- Change the title of Section C.3 in the Code of Academic Integrity, “Academic Misconduct,” to “Classroom Misconduct and Other Behavior Disruptive to the Educational Process” and edit text to consistently reflect the change.
- Add Section C.3.c which preserves faculty rights to remove disruptive students from the classroom.
- Add article C.4. (which refers to University Policy 1.2).

-----  
• Current text in the Code of Academic Integrity:

***C3. Academic Misconduct.*** A faculty member may impose a grade penalty for any misconduct in the classroom or examination room. Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to, talking during an exam, bringing unauthorized materials into the exam room, and disruptive behavior in the classroom.

- a. *The faculty member must promptly notify the student of the reason for the imposition of a penalty for academic misconduct and the degree to which his or her grade will be affected.*
- b. *Academic misconduct is not a violation of academic integrity. The student may, however, seek review by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board on the basis either that the finding of guilt is arbitrary and capricious or that the penalty for academic misconduct is excessive or inappropriate to the circumstances involved. ("Arbitrary and capricious" describes actions which have no sound basis in law, fact, or reason or are grounded solely in bad faith or personal desires. A determination is arbitrary and capricious only if it is one no reasonable mind could reach.)*

• Proposed text:

**C3. Classroom Misconduct and Other Behavior Disruptive to the Educational Process.** *A faculty member may impose a grade penalty for any misconduct. Students are not authorized to replicate, reproduce, copy, or transmit lectures and course materials presented, or "derivative" materials including class notes, for sale or general distribution to others without the written consent of the faculty or academic staff member or class participant who is the original source of such materials. Other examples of classroom misconduct include, but are not limited to, talking during an examination, bringing unauthorized materials into the examination room, using unauthorized electronic technology during an examination, and disruptive behavior in the classroom.*

- a. *The faculty member must promptly notify the student of the reason for the imposition of a penalty for classroom misconduct and the degree to which his or her grade will be affected.*

- b. *Classroom misconduct is not a violation of academic integrity. The student may, however, seek review by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board on the basis either that the finding of guilt is arbitrary and capricious or that the penalty for misconduct is excessive or inappropriate to the circumstances involved. ("Arbitrary and capricious" describes actions which have no sound basis in law, fact, or reason or are grounded solely in bad faith or personal desires. A determination is arbitrary and capricious only if it is one no reasonable mind could reach.)*

- c. *This section does not limit a faculty member's prerogative to remove a disruptive student from a classroom under appropriate circumstances.*

**C.4. Academic Misconduct.** *Academic misconduct related to integrity in the conduct of scholarly and scientific research and communication is addressed in Cornell University Policy 1.2*

<http://www.dfa.cornell.edu/dfa/treasurer/policyoffice/policies/volumes/academic/misconduct.cfm>).

*Policy 1.2 applies to faculty, staff, and students.*

Speaker Beer: "So is the resolution clear? If so, are we ready for debate? The gentlewoman on the aisle with the red and black outfit."

Professor Valerie Hans, Law School: "Can you tell me what unauthorized material is again? I'm not clear about that."

Professor Turgeon: "Well, we can go directly to the -- students are not authorized -- derivative materials, class notes and et cetera, et cetera."

Professor Hans: "It was on that slide. Bringing unauthorized materials into the examination room, which might rise to the level of --"

Professor Turgeon: "Yes, talking during an exam does as well. So my understanding of this is that sometimes you go into an exam and students may talk to one another and be a bit disruptive and do other things, but it may be the feeling of the instructor that this is not really an infringement that would require going to an academic hearing board and all that stuff; but nonetheless, the student, if they persist in this, could incur a penalty.

"And so it's really a judgment call. Yes, you're right, that all of these could be considered one way or another. It's really a matter of judgment."

Speaker Beer: "Okay. Time is moving. Are you ready to vote on this motion? We either have to vote on it or, as we did with the other resolution, table it. We do have to keep to the agenda.

"Okay, let's -- I'll assume the body is ready for the vote, and I'll try to activate the clickers. So those in favor of the resolution -- would you please state it, Professor Turgeon, again?"

Professor Turgeon: "The resolution is to change the wording of the academic integrity legislation to eliminate the term "academic misconduct" and instead change the wording as been supplied to you, the title of which will be "academic misconduct and other behavior disruptive to the educational process." And

there's additional language in here that brings us up-to-date; for example, using unauthorized electronic technology during an examination.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, so those who wish to vote in favor of the resolution, please click A. Those in opposition to the resolution to change the code, click B. Those wishing to abstain from voting, click C. And I'll give you 30 seconds from now.

“Okay. About there? Okay, the votes are in. 40 in favor, 2 in opposition, no abstentions. The resolution passes.

“So we'll now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a discussion led by Professor Stein. Professor Stein is going to deal again, as he introduced at the last senate meeting, possible changes to the charge to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Statuses of Faculty.”

4. **RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND PROFESSORIAL STATUS OF THE FACULTY (RESOLUTION)**

Emeritus Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “By the way, it is my understanding that we were going to vote on this measure today, not just discuss it; isn't that correct?”

Speaker Beer: “All right, if that's your choice.”

Emeritus Stein: “Anyway, when I was here a month ago, I explained this for about 20 minutes, and it seemed to me that what I'd like to do now is to cut to the chase and talk about the important part of the resolution, the part that I think might be controversial and try to explain what that's about.

“This is to make a number of changes to the Academic Freedom Committee's procedures for how to deal with a faculty member's grievance. The majority of the lines just have to do with regularizing the way the AFPS Committee proceeds and to try to make sure that it acts as an appeals committee.

“Namely, it looks at the previous decision and decides whether that previous decision was rightfully made, rather than doing a brand new investigation; but the part that the -- the guts of the procedure we're asking for change about has to do with one particular paragraph that's in this.

“And let me try to give you a little background, and let me try to speak simply about it. The major problem that several AFPS committees have seen is the final stage of the process, where the AFPS committee comes to a set of conclusions and passes it to the provost, then the provost makes the final decision.

“And I would like to emphasize that the unhappiness that these AFPS committees have had were not with any decisions that the current provost has made, and I don't believe the current provost has made any decisions of grievances that have come to his attention, but what happened was that several AFPS committees were dissatisfied with the interaction they had with the provost, in the following sense: They felt a certain distance from the provost.

“What they felt was that the AFPS made a series of findings, passed it on to the provost, and what happened there was no interaction whatsoever with the provost after what, in several cases was a very long time, the provost simply made a decision, and that was that.

“And in one or two cases that I was involved with, actually the decision was announced by the dean of the faculty at the next senate meeting, and people felt - - and in addition to that, looking at the record of what happened, we could not find a single case where a grievance made by a faculty member was upheld by the provost; that in all cases, the dean's decision that we could find, the dean's decision was the one that the provost endorsed.

“And people felt that there was a fair amount of energy that was put into looking at these cases and that the result of it did not justify the energy that was put into it. And therefore, the committee suggests rewriting the procedures in the following way, and you could read the paragraph. It says the committee will send its final draft to the provost.

“Now, the fundamental problem is that the committees felt that the provost really didn't give serious consideration to what the committee had recommended; but on the other hand, we could not -- it was difficult to find a way out of that, because university policy says that the provost has got the absolute authority to make the decisions in this case and that the provost could not agree to do anything other than make a decision on his own recognizance after looking at it.

“And so the question was how do we get around that. How do we write something where the provost feels it is important to seriously consider the judgment that the AFPS Committee has made.

“So after long negotiations with the office of the provost, we came up with a mutually satisfactory solution, and the mutually satisfactory solution has got in the following: That one starts out by acknowledging the fact of the sovereignty of the provost. The committee will send its draft report to the provost, and the committee understands that the provost may respond to the committee's recommendation in whatever way he or she sees fit. So that's an absolute acknowledgment of the sovereignty, the ultimate sovereignty of the provost.

“On the other hand, it says that while the committee has no right to tell the provost how to proceed in making that decision, the committee will ask the provost -- and the reason was given the importance of fostering an atmosphere of mutual respect and cooperation between the administration and the faculty senate and its committees and ensuring all faculty members who seek to have a grievance addressed will receive a fair and impartial adjudication of the grievance.

“The committee and the senate request the provost the following procedures in coming to a final decision. So now let's look at the procedures: One, to meet with the committee, present any additional information regarding the issues addressed in the report, and have a full discussion of the report and its recommendations.

“And the idea here, there were cases where what happened was the provost looked at the report, and then the provost said, well, what I'll do is make a de novo investigation, and then make a decision, having nothing to do with what the AFPS Committee has done. The committee felt that was disrespectful to the AFPS, and if the provost wanted to make a de novo investigation, he has to make it in some sense in cooperation, that the results of that be shared with the committee and have a full discussion.

“After having done that, to give the committee sufficient time to issue a final report that may be influenced by the discussions with the provost. The idea there is if the provost has new information after the committee makes its initial report, that they all discuss that and look at both sides of it.

“And then in coming to a final decision, asked the provost to carefully consider the rationale behind the committee's recommendation, in light of evidence and the charge of the committee; and accept the committee's recommendation, unless the provost finds the committee's recommendations are inconsistent with its charge.

“And the charge is limited. It says the committee can't simply substitute its beliefs for those of the dean, but has to show that the dean's decision was not consistent with the evidence or it violated a university policy or something like that.

“So we ask that the provost make the committee's recommendation the central issue and to agree with it, unless the provost finds fault with the way the committee proceeded, and then to come to a final decision within 90 days. And I gather neither the provost or vice provost are here -- oh, yes.

“We worked very closely with Vice Provost Siliciano, and we both agree that this is a procedure that the provost is inclined to follow. I think that's -- and so that's all I have to say, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.”

Speaker Beer: “Very good. The gentleman in the striped shirt.”

Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: “I think we have a process without any substance. It's my experience and the experience of my colleague, Colin Campbell, that this committee, Academic Freedom and Professional Status, is completely ineffective. It doesn't -- instead of me reading my letter to Bill Fry, I'm asking that it be entered into the minutes, my grievance how this committee should have acted, my grievance requesting this committee to act.

“And I think anybody in this room will read through this, once you have evidence, to see how ineffective our own committee is. We don't need the provost even look at anything if the committee doesn't have what it takes to see through a grievance. So I ask that this be entered into the record. And I also ask that it be used as a test case to see if the new process works. Why not have a test case?”

Speaker Beer: “Just to clarify, there is no new process at this point. If the body votes to approve the resolution as offered by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status, then there will be a new process; but until that

happens, there is no new process. Now, I construed your comments as being in opposition to the resolutions offered by the committee."

Professor Wayne: "No, no, although what I would say is the problem is with the committee. That is where I see the problem."

Speaker Beer: "Well, the committee has taken -- has moved the resolutions that Professor Stein offered, and the body is now considering those resolutions. How should the body interpret your comments: Either for or against those proposed resolutions?"

Professor Wayne: "I'm all for a resolution that makes the committee effective."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, very good. Any other comments? The gentleman on the aisle, near the rear."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "Maybe John can answer this question: Why, if the provost has final decision, as always, are we only requesting that he or she follow these things? Why aren't we requiring the provost follow, and why isn't the provost willing always to follow them? Is Item 3 the sticking point? And if we took 3 out, would the provost say I'll always do 1, 2 and 4?"

Speaker Beer: "Professor Stein, could you respond, and then perhaps the senior vice provost could respond also to that."

Professor Stein: "I can understand why you're asking that question. The way this was originally written, it had something closer to what you're suggesting. After discussions with university counsel, university counsel was of the opinion that if such a -- if the provost abrogated his authority, which is essentially what you're saying, that would open Cornell to lawsuits that could be expensive, very expensive and very time-consuming.

"I'm not in a position to comment on that, but it carried weight with the administration when the university counsel said that. The university counsel did not feel the same way about this wording, which I fundamentally believe is essentially the same."

Speaker Beer: "Vice Provost Siliciano, would you care to comment?"

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: "Sure. I'm John Siliciano, Senior Vice Provost. In terms of your question, David, Peter has it exactly right. We put that proposal before university counsel. Their interpretation of the university bylaws is that the trustee could not -- not the trustee. The provost could not in a blanket way agree to abide by personnel decision recommended by a committee, that ultimately that authority needed to be retained by the provost's office.

"So what we came up with here is -- I agree with Peter, this is essentially the same thing, though couched in less mandatory terms. It basically gets to the same place where the provost -- and I go further than what Peter said in terms of inclined to follow, we're committed to follow this practice. This is what we should be doing. We should have been doing it all along.

"I was in the office with not only this provost, but the prior provost, and in some cases I think we should have handled it differently. So I think Peter and his group has come up with the right solution, but we can't go further and waive our obligation under the bylaws."

Speaker Beer: "Okay. Brief comment.

Professor Delchamps: "I wasn't saying the provost should commit to following the recommendation of the committee. I was saying the provost should commit unequivocally to following these procedures. The bottom of the previous slide says we suggest the provost will do that. Why doesn't it say the provost will commit. That was my question, not the other one."

Speaker Beer: "Any other points? Okay, are you ready for the resolution as offered by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty? Assuming you are, I will try to activate the clicker again."

"Okay, so all those in favor of the resolution as presented by Professor Stein on behalf of the committee, please click A. Those in opposition, please click B. Those who wish to abstain from voting on this resolution, please click C. We'll give you another 30 seconds from this point.

"Okay, the vote seems to have stabilized. So the vote is 42 in favor of the resolution, one in opposition, no abstentions. Clearly the resolution carries. Thank you, Professor Stein."

Emeritus Stein: "Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "And please leave the microphone. Very good, thank you. So we'll move on with our agenda, and the next item is discussion by Vice Provost Siliciano on diversity matters."

## 5. DISCUSSION OF NEW APPROACHES TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY ISSUES AT CORNELL

Sr. Vice Provost John Siliciano: "So I appreciate Bill giving me some time to update you on a variety of efforts at the university and college level relating to diversity. I want to focus on one, but mention the top two. One is that you did receive from President Skorton a university-level diversity initiative.

"It is a very broad initiative, and it's described fully, and you can also find it on the Cornell home page; but it is a requirement that all unit leaders, meaning vice presidents and deans who are responsible for academic and administrative units, must commit annually to achieve at least five initiatives out of a broad menu of initiatives related to diversity, including a requirement of advancing composition in terms of diversity and are being held accountable on a yearly basis for achieving those goals.

"So this is a requirement with an edge that is beginning this year. So this summer we'll have the identification of initiatives by the units and then follow-up throughout the year.

"The second change is that the university has reorganized its university diversity council into a body that has direct responsibility for supporting and monitoring the units in terms of their ability to meet the initiatives set forth in the university diversity initiative. It's comprised at this point of a combination of senior university executives with operational authority over given areas and those with particular expertise in those areas.

"So for example, in terms of student composition, the responsible authorities are Susan Murphy, who's the Vice President for Student and Academic Services, and Laura Brown is the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. They are partnered with people who have particular expertise in those areas. And I'll say a bit more about that.

"What I wanted to focus on is independent of this effort, which is in some sense the university working at the sort of top-down level, the deans and vice presidents to achieve diversity outcomes. I want to talk more specifically about

the role of the provost's office, what are we doing internally in the provost's office independent of these more formal initiatives.

“Basically within our office, we have multiple roles relating to diversity. So as I mentioned, Laura Brown is charged with undergraduate diversity initiatives. Barb Knuth, who's the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, is responsible for diversity in our graduate student population.

“Within my office is the Office of Faculty Diversity and Development. It is staffed by the senior vice provost for academic affairs. Currently that would be me. And Gail Levitte, who is the executive director of the advance project -- I'm sure you know about it -- and is also the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. Gail, can you just raise your hand, so folks know who you are?

“So we are thinking this is a new office, it's basically combining a bunch of functions to focus in a more targeted way on diversity within the provost's office as it relates to faculty diversity. And I'll talk more about what we are undertaking, but I wanted to mention what we view as some of the key operating principles as we try to advance the ball relating to faculty diversity.

“The top one, I think is quite critical, is that in our view, progress and diversity fronts is really -- it comes from multiple diverse sustained and often low visibility efforts. There's been a tendency in the past to have a very high visibility, announcements, initiatives, grand strategies about diversity.

“Practically they have not proved as successful as what really seems to move things along, which is almost a faculty-by-faculty trudge involving a bunch of multiple, diverse sustained efforts. It is a trench-by-trench kind of effort that has to endure over time. It has to be deployed in multiple ways to really achieve what we want, requires a combination of both expertise and authority.

“Again, one place the universities stumble here is they either have people who have expertise in diversity, but without operational authority, or they have people with lots of authority, but no particular expertise. So you can see one model or another and you can imagine why they don't work.

“What we are trying to do is combine both in the faculty realm, but also in that broader UDC that I mentioned previously. We're trying to combine expertise and authority in some sense, intelligence with muscle in terms of achieving these.

I'll let you guess in my office who that would be, but the intelligence is right here mainly. So this allows us to actually do things.

“So the person in my position, what they add, I don't have a particular expertise in diversity itself. What I do have is hands in experience in a lot of the levers that get things done in the university. So this person, the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, conducts all the -- chairs the dean's searches, works individually with 85 of the department chairs, does department chair training, supervises the tenure and promotion process, runs the dual career program.

“All those things are the kind of bit-by-bit or piece-by-piece components of an effective diversity strategy. So we are trying to combine that. Eyal brings to the office the tremendous success and expertise of the advanced program over the last five years in terms of advancing diversity for women in the science, technology, engineering and math fields. So it's a partnership that works well.

“Third thing is that information is really essential. In many, many ways, our efforts are undermined by the lack of information, both as to what is happening and as to what is possible. Information, for example, about pools, departments often assert in good faith that they have done the best they can in terms of the recruiting a diverse faculty, but they don't have a good sense of the real pools out there. They haven't developed their rigorous empirical understanding of the possibilities in terms of recruitment pools.

“Why do faculty leave? That's another component of diversity, which is retention of the faculty we have hired. We don't often have a good sense of why faculty leave. If they are leaving because there are problems with the university, problems with climate, for example, that is something we need to address in targeted ways. If faculty are leaving because this has been a very successful place as a junior faculty member and now Stanford or Harvard is wooing them away with lots of money, then that's a different story; but we don't know the answer to this, so we need to develop better sets of information on the status of things.

“The other thing is what we found very effective in a number of fronts is simply providing information about best practices. We have done this over and over again in the tenure process. We have 85 departments with some variation in how they conduct tenure, how they mentor students, how they do a number of things.

“Very often simply providing visibility between departments about how they handle issues has been very successful, as opposed to simply mandating a single central approach. So this is another element of our strategy. Important element is resources in terms of advancing diversity. Resources meaning funding, is often very useful, but the tricky point here is that it must be used and leveraged strategically.

“We can create a large pool of money at the center theoretically -- it's hard these days to support diversity, but what we don't want to see is deans and departments deciding that whenever they are looking at a hire that would advance diversity, they will come to the university and seek to use their money. They should be using their money to recruit the best faculty, including faculty that add to diversity.

“Nobody wants to be a diversity hire funded centrally. Instead what we want to do is use monies to leverage strategically to assist departments and colleges make the hires of those very good faculty.

“It's noted before what we are doing in the diversity university initiative is replacing the sort of standard exhortation that we must do better, we should do better, let's try harder with actual principles of accountability, which will require deans and vice presidents to account every year as part of their performance how they did in terms of achieving the goals that they have set out for themselves.

“Obviously, progress here occurs on multiple levels that we try through our office to coordinate in terms of department, college and central resources. And finally -- perhaps this often is understated -- the most important role in terms of diversity actually occurs in the faculty level. It's whether a department decides to make a hire, decides to provide a supportive climate for faculty members. So faculty participation is a critical element. It can't all be done through bureaucrats like me.

“In terms of specifics, there are obviously many components to achieving a diverse faculty pool, but there's two main strategies. One relates to recruitment. The other relates to retention. These are some of the things we are working on within our office. One is about the development of pools in which we seek to hire faculty.

“I mentioned before getting accurate pool data to assist departments in actually understanding the potential they have for hiring. Again, in good faith, many

departments let themselves off the hook too easily by saying there's no one in the pool or we looked very hard. There are actually ways to understand better who is in the pool, and there's actually ways to not be passive about the pool, but to actively develop better strategies for enhancing the pool.

“So we're trying to provide support along those lines. A key component, obviously, is to have effective search and recruitment practices. Lots of variability among the departments here. Some are excellent, some are definitely in need of support and help. The advanced program itself -- and many of you have probably seen this or are aware of it -- has developed an excellent set of programming related to the search process and the interview process.

“These include some scenarios acted out by Cornell's interactive theater ensemble and are now on DVD's that are part of the training program. If you watch them, you'll find them excruciating because you'll recognize the standard faculty colleagues you know so well. Also requiring departments to have better and more refined hiring plans and processes in place on an ongoing basis.

“Also, again, we need to think about resources. We currently have maintained a strong dual career fund. The university, in combination with the colleges, spends approximately \$6 million a year to support dual career. What we need to do is not only restore, but develop more general diversity funding so that we can strategically leverage key hires to assist departments, to make those hires when they just need a little extra funding in order to make them happen.

“The final major effort is around retention. It really is the other form of recruitment. We tend to put a lot of energy and focus on hiring, then we bring people here and then we lose people over time. And this not -- it affects all faculty, including faculty that enhance our diversity.

“There are four ways or general avenues we are trying to think about this. One is to provide support, mentoring programming for individual faculty members. True of all faculty in some cases, particularly true of diverse faculty is they come to the university and it's an incredibly complicated place to negotiate, particularly as a junior faculty member.

“Providing support; we expect departments to do this and colleges to do this, but also at the center we have the capability providing an array of support. Examples, and there's a number of others, a robust new faculty orientation program, a variety of professional development workshops. In a few weeks we

are doing one for junior faculty on the tenure and promotion process, something which many of them find mystifying and terrifying.

“We have a variety of faculty development grants to allow junior faculty to attend conferences, to bring scholars in their fields to campus and the like. There's the new child care development or travel funds, and there's a variety of other ways that we help the faculty members individually negotiate Cornell.

“A second is to focus on departmental processes. How do departments support and enhance diversity in terms of their own processes. Mentoring is one classic. A major component is also, again, uneven among departments, in terms of where they have effective mentoring. It is probably the key thing in assisting untenured faculty make it through the process.

“We spend a lot of time refining and monitoring the tenure and promotion process. We're also beginning to put effort into mid- and late-career support for faculty who can fall off track and become discouraged and we might otherwise lose them.

“Third major area is around climate and community. The faculty work life surveys we have conducted in 2005 and 2010 indicate that by far, the most overwhelming factor relating to faculty satisfaction and therefore relating to whether faculty stay is not salary, not office space, not lab space, it's not hockey tickets; it is the climate of the department. And if the climate of the department is bad, we lose faculty.

“For minority faculty in departments, climate is particularly difficult because their overall sense of community can be smaller as well. So we need to focus on climate and community. This has to sort of work in several directions. One is that we are trying to assist and require the chairs to deal with climate issues, typically negative issues. These revolve around the sort of 3D faculty, I think the disturbed, difficult and disengaged faculty.

“You all know this. You only need one or two in a department; can very substantially change the climate of a department. And those negative changes tend to impact most strongly on junior faculty, and so we provide chair training in multiple ways, including simply how to deal with the difficult faculty member. People become chairs, they didn't go up through HR training, they are like you and me, they don't know how to do this stuff. There are ways to do it and we try to help them.

“We also try to help individual faculty by building connections in community in a variety of ways in terms of ways to get together, groups. Finally, there's the question of resources and our ability to deploy them strategically to help.

“So these are some of the things that are underway. We need, welcome and value input from faculty on this effort. Not only do we need -- obviously, faculty are responsible in their own units as the key people that help diversity - but we value your input at the center.

“We can be reached through this e-mail, OFDD. Not a very compelling acronym, but that's our office, or either of us. So thank you for this and any further help you can give us.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks. I think we have time for a question or two, if there is one. Professor Chabot.”

Professor Brian Chabot: “John, I certainly support what you're doing and any improvements are most welcome. I do wonder what accountability means in this. Does it mean just telling you what has happened, or is there something more?”

Sr. Vice Provost Siliciano: “That is what they used to call the \$64,000 question. We have moved from exhortation to accountability. We expect deans and vice presidents to be held accountable. The question Brian asks is the right one: What does that mean? And it means something more than simply coming in and giving your annual report, what I did last year. We expect to see progress here.

“And so as I mentioned, it is part of the overall set of metrics upon which the performance of our university executives is to be evaluated. I'm sure you can sense there has to be some play around this, because I know that even in your department, you know that you can put as much effort as you can imagine into a recruitment and have it fail for reasons that are outside your control. So in some sense, it can't be a purely numerical game.

“On the other hand, colleges with multiple hires, you should be able to see progress there. Any given search can succeed or fail; but over time, you should see it. Now, we're still having a lot of discussion. Again, I invite your input on what this accountability means.

“In some sense, some things you might be able to monitor on a year-by-year basis. Some, you may want to take a longer view, because recruitment strategies, efforts may take three or four years to begin to show some discernible impact, but it is the question that we need to think about. I think we don't have the full answer.

“I think just thinking about it is part of that answer, is that we are asking constantly, what do we mean by accountability. We mean something. We mean that these people need to deliver on this key component.”

Speaker Beer: “Very good. Thanks very much, vice provost. So now keeping the schedule, we are going to hear from the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Cleland.”

## 6. CAPP REPORT

Professor Thomas Cleland, Chair, CAPP: “I will keep this very short. This is just a report from CAPP that on behalf of the senate, we approved a field name change and concentration change as to appear: Genetics and Development field has changed its name -- or as of this moment changed its name to Genetics, Genomics and Development, and adding a third concentration, genomics to the existing Genetics and Development. Exemplary presentation overall. No concerns. So thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We can take a 15-second comment or question. Seeing none, we'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a report from the associate dean of the faculty.”

## 7. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS REPORT

Associate Dean and Secretary, Fred Gouldin, Dean of Faculty Office: “Thank you, Steve. I'm happy to report the results of the recent university election. They're on the screen, as you can see. So Joe Burns, who's a faculty colleague of mine in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering was elected dean of the faculty. Michael Fontaine is the associate dean.

“Debbie Cherney and John Sipple have been elected to serve terms as senators at large, so they will join this august group. As far as senator-at-large nontenured, it's Miguel Gomez. And finally, for Nominations and Elections, Thomas Fox, Steven Hilgartner and Alan Zehnder have been elected to serve terms on that committee. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much, Fred. So now we'll move ahead with the last formal item on the agenda, the approval of the minutes of the March 14th, 2012 meeting. And let's practice our clicking again. All those who are in favor of approving the March 14th minutes, please indicate by clicking A.

"One moment. Okay, those opposed to approving the minutes, click B. Those who haven't read them and wish to abstain, click C. I'll give you about 15 seconds for this momentous vote. Okay, so 31 have approved, no one has disapproved, and five are abstaining.

"It is time to consider the possibility of adjournment. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

(AYES)

"In opposition? We are adjourned."

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)