

A Meeting of the
University Faculty Senate
April 8, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor and Chair Department of Science and Technology Studies and Speaker Bruce Lewenstein: "Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting to order. I have two mics so I better move.

"As I just noted, that clock is running about five minutes fast. So, I'll be keeping time based on having started a couple minutes late. And our meeting is scheduled to end at six. It will be 6:07 on that clock in terms of what time I'll be looking for.

"Remind you that there are no photos or recordings of any kind at the meeting. Ask you to turn off your cell phones, tablets, computers that make noises when you remember to open the lid and so forth. Reminder that when you speak wait for the microphone and then identify yourself after you have the microphone. This is critical for us to be able to have accurate minutes because otherwise we don't capture who's speaking. And identify yourself and your department.

"Senators do have priority in speaking. After senators who wish to speak have spoken if there are other faculty members and if there is time available they can speak.

"As we have been doing all year we will ask speakers in general to limit themselves to two minutes of time. Only senators or their designates may vote. We do have votes scheduled for this meeting, so if you have not picked up a clicker please be sure to do so.

"I've had no requests for Good and Welfare speakers at the end.

"In addition one item that was on the agenda initially, a report on faculty salaries, has been postponed because we're expecting new data before the next faculty meeting. So, it seemed appropriate to postpone that. That gives us 20 extra minutes which I'm allocating to the discussion of Shared Governance, which will, therefore, actually be 30 plus 10, will be 40 for that.

"If there are no objections to that agenda change. Okay. We will proceed on that.

2. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL FOR USE OF PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE TITLE IN COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

"The first item on the agenda is approval of the professor of the practice in the College of Engineering. That proposal was circulated. Are there any objections to approving the use of

that title in the College of Engineering? There we go. Without objection, we'll proceed to do that.

3. REPORT OF THE DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

"Next item on the agenda is report from the dean of the faculty, Joe Burns."

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: "Thanks. I'd like to welcome you all here and thank you for coming. This should be an interesting faculty meeting. I think we've got a very good attendance and a good cross-section of the community. So, we're glad to see everyone here.

"As you see you don't have your little gifts to try to make you come back. We are expecting to have some beautiful, bright spring flowers to come in and brighten up your day just in the midst of that heated discussion, everybody will feel much better. But please hold off and get the flowers off wards.

"Often we do these hugs beforehand. I think we're running a little bit late and I'm going to forego that.

"I'd like to just tell you some things that have been going on in the faculty Dean's office. I want to remind you that in two weeks or so, a little more than two weeks, we have a Charter Day weekend festival. It will be a big celebration on Friday night and then two days of 40 odd sessions of colleagues doing great things. Really exciting. I really urge you to go and look at this website just to see all the stuff that's available.

"You are expected to register for this meeting, for those events. It will cost you \$20 which is being donated to Cornell Cares and also to the Tompkins County Public Library.

"There have been some objections to this. This has been done strictly for efficiency if you'd like. We wanted to know who's coming and everybody who runs a meeting tells us unless you charge a little bit of money you won't get an accurate feed. And we wanted to know that. We also wanted to know which sessions were being filled up so we can put them in the appropriate size rooms. And so, we apologize. If you can't afford the 20 bucks talk to your dean.

"We are urging you to go to the Charter Day ceremony itself which is on Monday morning. The senate canceled classes for that so that you can go. There will be a little bit of a historical event, a video which is terrific. I've seen a version of it, and it's just really great.

"If you want regalia to March with your college, going individually in colleges, you'll have to sign up before Friday at those sites.

"We've had a faculty forum after the last meeting on revenue enhancement, and the whole idea of the professional Master's degrees as a possible revenue stream. If you're interested in that there is a Cornell cast available for it. Also our web page has all the slides, and there is some interesting numerical data there I think. And furthermore, there are half a dozen comments by various faculty members, some of them, most of them very, very profound and interesting. So, I urge you to look at that.

"Looking forward to the fall trying to decide what events we might want to have, what issues we might want to discuss. And one of the issues that I'm interested in is whether we are using the very large amount of money that we're spending on financial aid, whether we're using that efficiently. Should we change our financial aid policy in some way. Maybe a little bit less money but then use the extra money to then educate the people who aren't doing well or something. That's the thought.

"Another possibility is, as you saw at the last meeting, there are changes in the demographics. We have a much older faculty than we used to have. There are implications about retirement and about the availability of openings if faculty are not retiring. We might want to discuss that, one in the spring, one in the fall. If you have other ideas let me know.

"You'll remember a couple months back the senate here passed that we should move the meeting time so that it's family friendly so that it does not end after five o'clock. I said I would appoint a committee to look at that.

"After I asked the two previous Deans of the faculty how I should select that committee they said why are you doing it? You've got the UFC sitting there. They're very nice people.

"So, we're going to let the UFC choose three times to seem like they would work, and then we will ask for a vote from the faculty, the full faculty, because who knows, there may be people who want to be in the senate but are not here, they're not senate members because they can't come to the weird times. So, we want the full faculty to vote on this, and then we'll decide by next fall when the new senate times will be.

"Again, thanks for coming. I look forward to hearing the discussion."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you, Joe. The next item on the agenda is a report on Cornell Tech from Dean Huttenlocher."

4. [REPORT](#) OF THE DEAN OF CORNELL TECH

Dean of Cornell Tech, Daniel Huttenlocher: "Thank you. Now we'll see if I can figure out the technology, right. Can the tech campus make the slides advance? Amazing! The technology actually works.

“Great to be here today. I think it's actually been a year since I've been presenting at the senate. So, I look forward to telling you what we're up to and then hearing a bit from folks.

“So, I want to give you an update a little bit on Cornell Tech. These are largely some slides I have been using in a number of presentations recently in various settings looking both at where we are now but also where we're going and what some of the challenges are. And then I had, I asked Joe for some things that might be on people's minds and he polled the UFC and I have a few questions that I'll just sort of go through at the end of my talk before opening it up for general questions.

“So, one of the things at Cornell Tech is that because we're building this new campus both focused on leadership and on technologies in the digital age, and we're creating new programs, we're hiring largely new faculty, although a few faculty have moved down from Ithaca, we're enrolling students in these programs, it's an opportunity to really carefully rethink what's the culture of the place that we're building. And so, we've been focusing on that quite a bit in the last few years. And there are four things that are core to the culture that we're building at Cornell Tech.

“So, one of those is it's very much centered around innovation. Oftentimes people hear entrepreneurship which is one form of innovation but not the only one that we're working on.

“One that might be a little more puzzling out of context is product design. And there's this peculiar thing that's happening in the digital age which is that essentially all of us are becoming product designers. It's gotten to be relatively inexpensive to design new digital software and hardware products.

“And what I like to tell our MBA students in New York is that just like any self-respecting MBA today wouldn't say, what do you mean I need to know how to write models in Excel, whereas 25 years ago they would have thought that that was some strange thing that they shouldn't have to be doing. Soon, maybe ten years from now, any self-respecting MBA is going to have to have as part of their toolkit not just modeling but also product design.

“And so, the MBA is sort of the specific example of it, but this is something that permeates everything we are doing in New York, our technical programs, business, and even what some of our faculty are doing in their research. And then there's code and digital devices

“Another key thing about Cornell Tech is that we're very focused on this mix of excellence in research and the external focus of product and having an impact in the world outside. But we view the disciplines as being very important. So, being rooted in and having depth in the disciplines is key, but not being boxed in by them at the same time.

“So, to try to give you a sense of some of what's happening at Cornell Tech I just picked a few short phrases that I think are descriptive of what's going on today. So, one is definitely "learning by building" which is very deliberately different from the phrase "learning by doing" which might be a little bit more common phrase. Because building implies that we're actually creating things. Doing is just sort of an activity. Building means that there's an outcome. And building involves some amount of planning in what it is that you're undertaking.

“We're doing a lot to foster real world impact both in the structure of our Master's programs in the curriculum, but also in the support that we provide for our faculty and for our students engaging outside of the academy.

“We're moving very quickly at Cornell Tech and that's something that we view as not just about the start of Cornell Tech but something about the campus and its DNA overall. So, we very much have this act and then reflect kind of approach.

“And I must admit that I think that that's very hard for people who aren't at Cornell Tech often who say, well, what's going on at Cornell Tech, because you're more used to seeing when somebody did something that that's the way it's going to be for the next few years. Whereas, if you have an act and reflect approach the fact that we did something this semester doesn't mean that we're not going to change it in a fairly substantive way because we learned from our actions ways in which we should change, say, the curriculum or various other kinds of programs that we have.

“So, act and reflect does make it harder to understand what's going on at Cornell Tech when looking in from the outside. But for our students who are going into a world that is much more act and reflect oriented than the world that all of us grew up in this is actually a great environment for them to be in.

“We are focused on the digital age but that's quite broadly construed. It's not just the technical and engineering kinds of disciplines. In fact, the largest current Master's program is the Johnson MBA. And we have a lot of focus not just on technical skills but also leadership skills. And that's across all programs so that our engineering students are learning leadership as well.

“So, we're trying to really build a different kind of organization at Cornell Tech where we have programs that are integrated. We have programs that are integrated across traditional kind of department and school sorts of boundaries. A university by and large today is not just a set of disciplines. The disciplines also form the organizational structure of the institution.

“We are very rooted in the disciplines, but that's not our organizational structure. We're sort of teasing apart the academic from the organization.

“The Jacobs Technion-Cornell Institute, which is the collaboration between Cornell and Technion, in many ways sits at the heart of the campus. It brings together the only two countries in the world today that have both leading tech sectors in their economy and leading universities.

“So, there are other countries that have first-rate universities where technology is not a big part of the economy. There are other countries where tech's a big part of the economy but the universities aren't at the standards that we're used to. And this partnership between Cornell and Technion brings together the two countries where technology and academia are really first-rate.

“And the organization at Jacobs is around these cross-disciplinary hubs that are focused in application areas around health technologies, media technologies, and technologies for the built environment, but it really infuses the campus overall.

“Another thing that we're doing that is quite different is we have a lot of support organizationally for engagement with the community; things like K through 12 education. We have a full-time coordinator working on K through 12 programs. And also our entrepreneurial office headed by Greg Pass who was the first CTO at Twitter who is there to build opportunities for both our faculty and our students to engage in entrepreneurial fashion with the world outside.

“One thing that I wanted to try to emphasize quickly here is just that the kinds of research that we're doing at Cornell Tech is the same kind of research in many ways that you would find in any first-rate academic institution. But at the same time we're trying to tie it and contextualize it more closely to what's going on in the world at large.

“So, there's this dichotomy that people often believe either explicitly or implicitly between basic or fundamental research and applied research. And that's a dichotomy that we roundly reject at Cornell Tech. Our view is that we're looking to do things that both make a fundamental impact but also make an impact in the world at large outside.

“So, just as one example, maybe these are things from several of our faculty, but on the right here Shiri Azenkot, who is in the Jacobs Institute. She works on accessible user interfaces for the blind. So, designing systems like cell phones. We're all using these things all the time, and for low-sighted or unsighted people this whole computer age is becoming quite a challenge to engage with.

“That's a place, an example of a faculty member's research that both makes basic research contributions in terms of human-computer interaction but has a big application and implication for a lot of people's lives right away.

“I wanted to touch a little bit on the cross-program Master's Studio because I think it's an exciting innovation at the Master's education level. So, right now our computer science and our MBA students together spend about a third of their time in their curriculum on joint projects and some joint courses that count in each of the two different degree programs.

“And then the Jacobs Institute students who are in a two-year Master's program will start to join in in this next year; the MBA and the computer science degree are both one-year programs.

“So, these students are very focused on building things in an entrepreneurial way, engaging with customers. In fact, the picture with the two women there, they were literally out on the street of New York last fall discussing a prototype of a product they are building with people that they're stopping on the streets, which if you've ever tried to stop somebody on the streets of New York and ask any kind of question is quite a challenge in and of itself. And we bring a lot of design and iterative thinking into the curriculum.

“But this bringing together of students who each are in discipline-based programs where they're learning the discipline whose degree they're getting but they're collaborating in projects that span the disciplines is a very important part of our Master's curriculum.

“So, today we're about a hundred students which is quite a change from a year ago when we were about 15. Those hundred students, about 85 of them are master students; 20 are Ph.D. students. The Master students are in the computer science Master's of Engineering, the MBA, and the connective media which is one of the dual degrees, first of the dual degrees with Technion. And this photo was the whole student body at part of the kickoff that we were doing at the beginning of the semester last year.

“So, in terms of the overall curriculum and where we are, there are six planned Cornell Master's programs and then three planned Master's programs in the Jacobs Institute that are Technion Cornell dual degrees. The MEng and CS and the MBA are the ones that are up and running today. There are other MEng programs, NEC and ORIE, as well as a Master's in law and a Master's in professional studies and information science that over the next four years or so we plan to launch in New York. The Healthier Life program in the Jacobs Institute will have its first students start in the coming fall. Connective Media is up and running, and once we move to Roosevelt Island there will also be a Built Environment program.

“Then we have faculty and Ph.D. students now in a few areas, but at the time that all of these nine programs are up and running there will be about a dozen disciplines where there are Ph.D. students studying in New York and faculty.

“So, I did want to touch on some of the challenges that we're facing at the moment because I think on the one hand it's just unbelievable to me the pace at which we've been able to move things forward. It's a lot faster than frankly I would have expected. But that doesn't mean everything is just rolling down the street completely calmly.

In fact, the way I like to describe Cornell Tech is it's a school bus, of course, because it's a school. And it's a school bus that's, you know, slightly careening down the road. In fact, the wheels are falling off the school bus with relatively high frequency. But we're managing to slap the wheels on fast enough that we haven't skidded off the road yet. So, that's Cornell Tech today.

“And I'd say the biggest things that sort of keep me up at night are faculty recruiting, especially because we're doing a lot of senior recruiting. And you all know how hard it is to identify great senior candidates, and then to actually convince them to leave where they are.

“And we have the added particular challenge that we're looking for senior faculty who are not only stars in their disciplines but also are committed to this external engagement mission of Cornell Tech which just limits the pool.

“I think realizing the cross-campus potential is another really important thing and it's cross-campus between Ithaca, Weill-Cornell, and Cornell Tech. And there are various things we're doing there. But this is again a thing that I think will continue to be a challenge because of distance and takes constant attention.

“This act and reflect approach that we have is a somewhat exhausting pace, and being able to keep that up or figure out what the right pace is I think is a big challenge for us. But at the same time it's almost like these are two contradictory points.

“The level of innovation that we've been able to do in the Master's curriculum is really amazing. I mean it's just breathtaking to me with 30 years in higher education to look and see what we've been able to do there. And I would hate to lose that kind of rapid educational innovation pace.

“So, you know, how do we really continue to innovate because higher education, especially at these professional Master's levels, really needs to change and respond a lot more rapidly than we're used to historically.

“And then while it's really exciting there is this new physical campus on Roosevelt Island quickly appearing that's for 800 students as opposed to the hundred that we have right now. So, the sort of scaling problems that start to loom as we bring that first phase of the physical campus on-line are facing us.

“So, this is an architect's rendering of the campus for those of you who haven't seen it. The Queensboro bridge in the background. The foreground building here is the academic building. The building on the right is for companies to have co-working spaces on the campus. And then the tall building on the right in the back is a residential building. The building that's all grayed out doesn't quite exist yet. That's the Executive Education Center, possibly with an attached hotel. But that hasn't been designed. So, the three buildings that aren't grayed out are either under construction or will be under construction by May.

“This “Roosevelt Island site now” was the Roosevelt Island site as of when I sent my slides because I needed to get them in advance. Actually now that building is gone. So, literally in two days the last piece, it was sort of just at the phase where they were about to pull it down, so that last piece of the old Goldwater Hospital is now gone. The site is clear of buildings. There's still a lot of demolition happening on the southern part of the site with the foundation removal. And that will go on until about July, and then the demolition will be completed.

“And this just sort of shows the spectacular nature of the site. So, this is also taken from the bridge but looking back towards Manhattan. This site has got some of the best views in New York City. It's really amazing. Those of you who haven't been down there, I definitely encourage you ride the tram. It's sort of like going to a ski resort or something except a lot less vertical.

“So, 25 years from now, just to sort of put in context, success at Cornell Tech is going to mean a campus with about 2500 students and 200 faculty. So, it's about the scale of the College of Engineering here in Ithaca. And we believe tens of thousands of new jobs will have been created in companies, both new companies and existing companies, in the New York area and non-profits that build on Cornell Tech either because companies spun out or because our students went out and got new things going at existing companies.

“We think that our Master's curricula and external engagement model of things others are going to be copying by that point in time if not sooner. And my view is we will have three complimentary campuses; Ithaca, Cornell Tech, Weill-Cornell where those complimentary pieces reinforce one another.

“So, with that, that's my sort of prepared slides. I wanted to just take the questions that I got from Joe from the UFC and just kind of go through those for a second.

“So, the first question was, We've heard a lot about budgets lately and although we're always reminded that Cornell Tech is financially independent of the Ithaca campus I think many would feel better to know what the financial status of Cornell Tech is, which is a darn good question.

“So, you know, as with all of higher education, it's not just Cornell, it's not just the Ithaca campus. I think we all face challenges in how do we fund really high quality residential programs and research. That's just a fact.

“The business of higher education is changing. I know many people even cringe when one says the business of higher education, but all non-profits are also businesses. They're just businesses that are there for different objectives than for making a profit. And if they really can't make ends meet they don't exist.

“So, when I say business I don't mean for profit, but, you know, there are revenues and expenses and they have to line up.

“So, while we're located in Google's building, it's really an amazing gift that they gave us, free space for the first five years, our budget's in very good shape because we're essentially only paying minimal operations costs.

“When we first move to Roosevelt Island we will have a bigger facility than we need. And that's what happens when you build buildings. And so, those first three years or so on Roosevelt Island we are forecasting operating deficits for the Cornell Tech campus. And so, we're addressing those by building up reserves now that are big enough to cover what we anticipate those deficits will be and doing some targeted fundraising now to cover those deficits.

“So, essentially right now we're in the black and we're saving money for when we know we're going to be in the red, and then things we expect will balance out pretty quickly after the three-year timeframe.

“So, the capital construction project is by far the biggest piece of what we're doing in terms of financials in New York. And that is 90 percent funded at this point. So, we've raised the money for 90 percent of the Cornell part of the construction. It's also largely bid out which means that we have contractors under contract for things. So, the financial risk, and it's under early stages of construction as you can see in the pictures there with excavation going on. So, the financial risk in the capital construction project now is rapidly diminishing.

“So, the second question was, although there's a financial firewall between Cornell Tech and the Ithaca campus there's not a "time card" firewall. Central administrators and Ithaca faculty

are spending huge amounts of time on Cornell Tech, and like it or not that means spending less time on Ithaca matters.

“So, I wanted to first say a little bit about the financial firewall sort of principle between the campuses and then come back to the issue about how time is being spent.

So, the financial firewall principle was developed really to prevent inadvertent, to help prevent diversion of financial resources from one campus to the other in either direction. And in Ithaca, I think everyone is aware of the concern here, which is diversion of financial resources from Ithaca to New York City.

“But I can tell you that the City of New York, having given us about half a billion dollars worth of land and taxpayer money, is concerned about diversion of resources in the other direction like setting something up in New York that really is just a cash cow to ship money back to Ithaca.

“So, the firewall is there to help everybody understand that we're trying to make each of these things stand on their own two feet. But that doesn't mean, for example, that Cornell Tech doesn't contribute to services in Ithaca.

So, right now we're paying about a million dollars this year in costs for administrative services in Ithaca because we're using a lot of administrative services. And that will grow as the Cornell Tech population and activity level grows.

“But beyond funding administrative costs, I think, you know, I take very seriously personally and I think everybody at Cornell Tech who's involved in running and building the campus takes very seriously that Cornell Tech is a part of Cornell University and that this is an overall university endeavor. And in particular we put a lot of time in New York into thinking about how can we help the Ithaca campus streamline administrative operations because we're doing things new.

“So, why follow exactly the way it's been done in Ithaca for the last 25, 50, 75, 100, pick your favorite number of years going back to 150. We're able to ask new questions and help on all kinds of administrative things, look at how to approach them from a new point of view. And I think that's where a lot of value is in terms of helping constrain administrative and overhead costs in the university.

“One example that I can point to already which is less of a cost one but I think one that matters to a large number of faculty is you may be aware that we've quite radically changed or quite substantively changed the mission of what was called CCTEC and now is called the Center for Technology Licensing at Cornell. And Cornell Tech played a huge role in that

university-wide endeavor to change that. But we're working with purchasing, finance, all kinds of parts of the central administration to look at new and better ways of doing things that are going to be better for all of us.

“So, the firewall principle also doesn't prevent financial arrangements between schools and colleges in Ithaca and the New York tech campus. So, it's just that those have to be worked out like any kind of program here that was between two colleges would be where the two Deans need to agree this is good for both colleges and we are both going to invest in it. So, I do expect to see more in the ways of joint programs between New York and Ithaca.

“So, regarding administrative load and departments in schools, that is a place where you get down faculty administrative loads. When we're doing recruiting in New York, that involves faculty in Ithaca.

“And in the departments that are doing that, that is real work, and all I can say is that I believe and hope, and if we're not then we need to talk about it, delivering real value to those departments in terms of the programs that we're creating in New York, the faculty that we're able to hire in New York that are part of those departments. And I realize that it's extra work, but I hope and believe that the value that comes with that to those departments offsets that work.

“And I think so far that's true. Certainly when I talk to people individually that's the feedback I get.

“So, then there was a question about the, sort of the art scene saying that New York's more known for its art scene than engineering and digital high-tech scene because there's been discussion about the arts and Cornell Tech.

“So, there, I guess the quick, to make a long answer shorter is always the problem of a dean, give me a short question, I give a seven paragraph answer, but the shorter answer is that Cornell Tech's mission, because of the funding and the land from the City of New York, falls under what's called applied sciences and engineering. The focus is digital technologies in the digital age because that's the thing we propose to do with applied sciences and engineering.

“The exciting part of that to me is digital is essentially becoming everything. It's not a vertical separate thing anymore. It's becoming a horizontal both in industry and in academia. So, I think there is a lot of opportunity to start to design programs. They have to have some digital technology component to fulfill Cornell Tech's mission.

“But they already were not doing things that are just conventional engineering and computer science. The biggest Master's program is the Johnson School. The law school's got a program

up in Albany right now waiting for approval that would be a Technology Management LLM degree in New York City.

“So, these are places where I think there's a lot of opportunity to do things that are much broader than traditional engineering and computer science.

“So, then there was a question about the degree to which we're competing for donors between Cornell Tech and Cornell and Ithaca. Again, these are all great questions which is why I just figured I'd go through them. And they're useful questions for me frankly because most of them are things I do worry about day-to-day but I don't always articulate. So, I appreciate them.

“So, Lance Collins is the dean in Ithaca who is probably most affected right now, the engineering dean, because he has the biggest sort of natural donor base, alumni base that might be attracted to Cornell Tech and what's going on in New York City. Lance and I spend a lot of time both on joint fundraising, but also on making sure that we're making the pie bigger rather than sitting here fighting over things.

“And I will put words in Lance's mouth, but I trust you ask him directly. To date, Lance believes that Cornell Tech and the opportunities and excitement around it have done more to help fundraising for engineering in Ithaca than anything else he could imagine. I mean, this has not been a sort of donor thing, I'm giving money to New York. Its donors coming and saying I'm really excited about New York. What does it mean for the Ithaca campus? What does it mean for the New York campus? Some want to support one. Some want to support the other. Some want to support both. But the end result has been more giving to engineering, not less.

“This is something we need to keep an eye on and not turn it into zero sum and battles, but right now all the evidence points to this being something that is good for the Ithaca campus stand-alone much less the university overall.

“So, there's a question about entrepreneurship and basic research. I sort of addressed that I think a bit in my slides just about how those fit together.

“One of the things I do want to say is that at Cornell Tech, while entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities are very important, what we really talk about is external engagement. So, that can be social impact. Doesn't have to be commercial entrepreneurship. It can be social entrepreneurship. It can be working with governments, with larger companies. But all of our Master students are required to have an external engagement component. It's part of the curriculum. And all of our faculty, that's part of their expectation in their job. And we view that as a fundamental piece of what we're doing.

“There are a finite number of hours in the day, but just as one hopes that research and teaching are things that can be mutually beneficial, and in many cases they are, we view external engagement as another one of those.

“There was a question about how Cornell Tech external engagement squares with the engaged Cornell initiative. So, here I'm going to put words in the mouth of the engaged Cornell people because I can really only speak about Cornell Tech but I'll say what I think.

“The key thing at Cornell Tech is as I mentioned in the last question, that external engagement is a programmatic requirement at Cornell Tech. It's not an option. All of our Master students are required. All of our faculty, it's a job expectation to be doing your job well.

“I think many of our objectives are aligned with the engaged Cornell, but the environment at Cornell Tech is very different because it's something that everybody there is doing. It's part of the expectations of everybody's life down there. And that just makes it a particularly interesting place to be pursuing those kinds of activities.

“There was a question about teaching and advising of undergraduates and if that is subtracted from the faculty responsibilities in New York, you know, what's added.

“You just give me the hook if...”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Left-handed or right-handed?”

Dean Huttenlocher: “I can stop. Let me not stop.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “One more question.”

Dean Huttenlocher: “I'll do one more. So, there was a question about the Technion military connection. So, I don't want people who asked the questions who happen to end up at the end of Joe's list to be missed, this was Joe's ordering, not that you ordered it other than probably by how they showed up in your in-box. So, is the Technion military connection any different than Cornell's connection to the military through DARPA, ONR, AFOSR, et cetera. Somebody definitely knows their military funding agency alphabet soup there.

“So, my understanding of military funding at the Technion is that, and, in fact, Israeli universities in general, is that it's an analogous to US institutions in that there's a government agency like DARPA, ONR, et cetera, that provides that kind of funding. In Israel there aren't multiple such agencies. So, in the US literally each service has an agency associated with it.

In Israel there's one agency called the Ministry of Security in the government that gives all of the government funding to universities that's related to the military.

“And then similar to most US universities, the Technion specifies that open academic democratic work is the cornerstone of campus research. So, by and large, by my looking at it in terms of the translation they are very similar.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. We have about ten minutes left for questions. Are there people who wish to raise. Back in the gray vest. Yes. Please wait for the microphone, and remember to identify yourself and your department, and limit remarks to two minutes.”

Professor John Brady, Food Science Department: “I'm going to preface my remarks by apologizing for any ignorance and naiveté about this because I've only recently joined the senate, but does the Charter of Cornell Tech, this is in reference to the previous question about arts. Does the Charter of Cornell Tech prevent future programs that are non-digitally information-based in the long-term when you're 25 years from now?”

Dean Huttenlocher: “We have a lease agreement with the City of New York for that 12-acre site and there are a set of obligations that we have to meet over the essentially coming 35 years to keep that lease in good stead. And all of those objectives are around things that are broadly construed related to applied sciences and engineering.

“So, that doesn't prevent Cornell from doing things on the site that might be in addition to that; I mean, there is some restrictions on how much extra stuff we can do. But we're not limited to only doing things that meet the city mission. But we have to do the stuff that we committed to the city or they have the right to take the land back and to ask for their hundred million dollars back.

“So, my focus right now is certainly on meeting the first set of objectives that were extremely aggressive in terms of schedule which was to get a whole campus up and running by summer of 2017. So, that's what we're focused on now.

“I think as we move to Roosevelt Island we'll start looking at programs that make sense but that don't meet the deliverables to the city. We'll still need make sure that we are making good progress on the city deliverables.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Professor Bjorkman in the green sweater here.”

Professor Thomas Björkman, Horticulture: “I'm going to ask a question that I asked you a year ago to see how it's turning out.

Dean Huttenlocher: "Do I remember the question?"

Professor Björkman: You'll know exactly how it's turning out. So, under our conflict of interest rules, a professor can't advise a graduate student on a technology they're working on and be engaged with a company that's commercializing. It seems like that would be a big hinderance in the middle of your natural activity. How's that turning out?"

Dean Huttenlocher: "This is the problem with putting me in front of a room full of people. I speak my mind.

"So, this has been a core issue for me over the last year. It's one that I think we're making substantive progress on in that it was discussed at a recent Dean's meeting here in Ithaca and Bob Buhrman and his office have been working on it a lot.

"That policy is a policy that almost every US university of our stature has. And it's rooted in a desire to protect the student. And that desire is incredibly important. And so, whatever we do we need to make sure that we don't put students in a position where a faculty member who has power over their academic career has a financial conflict that we're not managing in some way that we can remove the faculty member's power.

"But the problem is that it's separated completely, I've had students come to me and say, this is crazy. I either have to not work with the one adviser at Cornell who really makes sense for me to work with or I have to watch that adviser do a company and make money off of essentially my work but I can't participate in it. So, we're supposedly protecting the student but from the student's perspective we're not.

"So, this is something where I'm pretty confident we will make substantive progress probably in the next six months maybe because it's being actively discussed. And I think a great thing about Bob Buhrman and the office, Vice-Provost of Research, because those guys get a lot of crap just because of the role they're in. Right? They are trying to protect the institution.

"So, I want to sing praises where they're due. And I think both the incredible amount of work that was necessary to change from CCTEC into the Center for Technology, licensing and refocus its mission, but also things like this, how do we protect students in a way that's really protecting them instead of sort of lip service to protecting them. These are things that Bob and his office are putting a ton of work on with us.

"So, we're the agitators, but in the end these are things that the institution has to carefully weigh, the Deans have to be broadly involved with, the faculty have to get engaged. We have to figure out what's the right thing to do in terms of a policy.

“But I think the current policy is wrong, and I'm working on getting it changed. And I'm confident something different will happen sometime. So, hopefully that's progress. I know it's the glacial like one year later progress.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “Question about the cross-campus collaboration obstacle. Is there anybody working on doing something that involves undergraduates and/or MEng students at Cornell Ithaca, giving them some kind of opportunity to tap into this entrepreneurial wisdom in New York City, spend two weeks at the end of their MEng year, blah, blah, blah? I'm thinking of this as a marketing tool for potential students. We could attract a whole range of great undergrads and MEng students that way. And I'm just wondering if there is anybody working on that.”

Dean Huttenlocher: “There is discussion going on. And the cruel reality is until we move to Roosevelt Island there's essentially no way for us to pull it off. It's been tremendous that Google's given us free space, but we're like shoehorned in in completely bizarre ways. Literally, the reason we have a hundred students this year is because that's how many we could fit. We could have had more. The same will be true next year.

“So, it's hard for to us take extra people in when the school year is going on because of space. And in each summer we're doing renovations because Google keeps moving us around, which is also a good thing because they give us more space each other. But we try, we were sort of looking to say could we try to do something this summer; just didn't pan out. And my guess is next summer will be just as bad. The year after, assuming the construction is done on time, we'll be on Roosevelt Island over the summer. And that would be the first time to look at it.

“But absolutely to do things that make opportunities both for Ithaca students in New York but also for New York students in Ithaca are really important.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Professor Birman here in the gray sweater in the front.”

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: “It occurred to me that you might shed light on a question that's going to come up in the next hour. Could you just say a few words about engagement during the period before Cornell Tech was launched with the faculty and with the universities?”

Dean Huttenlocher: “Let's see. I'm going to get my years wrong. It was the end of 2010, December, 2010 when the Bloomberg administration put out the call for proposals, and Provost Fuchs, now President Fuchs, Kent, I'll just call him Kent. So, Kent came and sort of got Lance and me and said let's do something and we started putting a proposal together.

“In March already, February or March of that year that we were working on the proposal, Bill Fry was dean of the faculty then, we reached out and talked to Bill about the fact that Cornell wanted to put this proposal in. The proposal itself needed to be confidential for a lot of reasons. We were competing against Stanford and other universities. So, it was I'm pretty sure CAPP because Tom Cleland I think was chairing it then. We had CAPP engaged starting in February or March of that year before we even put in the first pre-proposal to the City of New York.

“And through the proposal process, you know, they weren't involved in writing the proposal but we came and talked to them about a number of things in the proposal. I'd have to literally go back and look at e-mails to see.

“And then once we won the competition, of course, there were degrees and stuff to get approved. And some of those were things that were under the auspices of the senate. So, things like dual degrees between Cornell and any other university or under the auspices of the senate.

“So, starting again early in that next year, I can't remember if you were dean already, Joe remembers better than I do when you started, then we went and talked to UFC first about the dual degrees with Technion and then brought it to the full senate for a vote.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Short question. Professor Sanders in the black dress there.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Department of Government: “This is a very different kind of question. I'm interested in the cross-campus integration and complimentary aspect.

“On this campus a lot of us do a different kind of product design, different kind of systems building. We're interested in culture and language and the interaction of cultural and other activities and government and how they work and what makes them work better, diplomacy to solve on-going conflicts, how you prevent wars, human rights, all that kind of stuff. That seems to me, pardon a little plug for social science humanities, at least as important as the next iteration of iPhones if you look at the problems in the world today. How are you going to take advantage down there of what we know up here because it really is very important?”

Dean Huttenlocher: “I first have to say that I couldn't agree with you more. And, in fact, while I understand that the relation between the professional schools and the social sciences not in the professional school is a complicated one, part of the reason that we have law and business in New York is because they do work on public policy and other kinds of things. But we also, where possible, are hiring social scientists whose work really fits in the digital, right, because for us in the end those are the students we're educating. And we view those people for being the best possible bridge to Ithaca because they are going to be people who are in the

disciplines that people in Ithaca are in.

“So, computer security and privacy, for example, is one area that's very important to us. We've already managed to hire a few technical people in that area to build a pretty strong group. But we'll have two positions. One for a sort of social science or policy person and one for a legal person who will be part of a computer security and privacy group that spans technology, policy, and the social sciences. And then those people being on the Cornell Tech campus will be the most natural bridge. But there will be other ways I'm sure. But that's the starting point.

“I couldn't agree with you more. These are really important things to have in both directions and to have the campuses really taking advantage of each other's expertise. My own research, frankly in part, has been much more around what I would call on-line social systems which is if you look at these devices it's not the device that's so interesting. It's the fact that literally at the rate of one a month new ways of people interacting with each other are coming out on these devices.

“That's the scary part because nobody really understands what kind of social systems are really being designed in these things until hundreds of millions of people are using them. I'm totally with you on that.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “I'm going to call time. Thank you very much, Dean Huttenlocher.”

5. [PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS ON SHARED GOVERNANCE](#)

So, we'll now move to the discussion of shared governance. A reminder that there will be resolutions to vote on. So, if you've come in late please come down and sign in. Be sure you've picked up a clicker if you are a member of the senate.

As you know, we have a resolution and some substitute language for the resolution. The way we're going to manage this is that initially the resolution will be presented, then the substitute language. We will then have normal open discussion.

At about 5:57 on that clock I will ask the sponsors of the original two main motions if they have responses to questions that have come up during the discussion. And then about five minutes after that we will move to any votes that are necessary.

During the discussion I may ask for people to indicate what perspective they are about to present so that we can try to have a balanced discussion across the multiple perspectives.

So, I'll begin by asking Professor Cheyfitz to come and present the resolution. I've asked Professor Cheyfitz to talk for about five minutes.

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, The Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters and The American Indian Program: “You have the resolution before you and it's up here. So, what I want to do is give a little history and its function which is important in terms of what I consider to be a crisis in shared governance.

“So, I'm assuming everybody's done their homework or can do it while I'm talking and presenting these comments.

“Beginning with Article 13, Section 2 of the by-laws of Cornell University, the resolution points to a history, at least since I arrived at Cornell in 2003, of the university administration by-passing a key senate agreement, the 2000 Principles of Cooperation, which is cited in the fifth “Whereas” clause of the resolution; a key senate report, the Governance Committee report of 2007, I served on that committee; and a key resolution, the 2011 Resolution on Protocols to Ensure Faculty Governance of which you have copies. They were passed.

“All of these senate documents request that the administration follow the proper procedure for shared governance, which requires that the senate have the opportunity as stated in the 2000 Principles of Cooperation of ample time to discuss educational policy before such policy is considered by the administration. These principles make explicit the procedure for shared governance articulated in Article 13.

“After all, Cornell is a university. So, there isn't much if anything in the way of major policy decisions that isn't educational policy, including the budget, though I think we have been facing the corporate transformation of the university in which from the administration's perspective on educational policy does not mean what many faculty take it to mean or think it should mean; hence, the need to define it which is what our resolution does as opposed to the substitute Birman resolution or [amendment](#) which erases the crucial third and fourth “Whereas” clauses of our resolution.

“Unless the senate defines ‘educational policy’ we are essentially sanctioning the status quo in which the administration has carte blanche to arbitrarily set the limits to what it defines as ‘educational policy’ from moment to moment and without informing the senate.

“The fact that the administration continues to ignore senate resolutions, reports, et cetera on shared governance testifies to the situation which is, unfortunately, where the Birman resolution leaves us.

“In effect, although Article 13 of the by-laws gives the university faculty, i.e., the senate, the responsibility of considering educational policy and the 2000 Principles of Cooperation and Consultation state that meaningful shared governance requires that the senate have adequate

time to consider these matters before they are taken under advisement by the administration, there is nowhere in any university official document a definition of 'educational policy.'

"When I was on the UFC from 2009 to 2011 we broached this issue with the president and provost, and a committee was formed of members of the administration and the UFC to arrive at a definition of educational policy to be brought before the senate. That committee effectively never got off the ground although I understand that it has just been revived and what will happen with it remains to be seen.

"So, in fact, there is an acknowledgment by both the administration and the UFC that educational policy needs to be defined.

"What has happened in the absence of such a definition is manifest in the top-down decision-making that now characterizes the administration in many matters of what without much difficulty can be construed as constituting 'educational policy.'

"Some of these matters, including the budget or the budget deficit, are cited in our resolution, but there are many others too long to be included here. And it is clear that the resolution is not about the decisions in any case but about the process by which they were made.

"So, the resolution presents some long, overdue business to the senate, an assertion of the senate prerogative to shared governance in matters of 'educational policy' before these matters are decided by the administration. By rights, the senate should not have to make such an assertion at this late date in Cornell history, but circumstances tell us that it does need to make this assertion if shared governance is to become an actual policy and practice rather than simply a rhetorical term or phrase.

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Cheyfitz has presented a resolution. Is there a second for the resolution? Motion is seconded.

"Professor Birman."

Professor Kenneth Birman, Department of Computer Science: "Thank you very much for a chance to address you and I apologize again for the spam.

"The situation I find myself in is somewhat ambiguous because when I first read the Cheyfitz resolution I was actually quite opposed to it, and I felt that way because of an issue for me around the specifics of the items called out as offenses under this general review.

"I came to view things differently. I feel that the fact is that the university has not consulted with us adequately on some matters of great importance to all of us. Examples that come to

my mind are debt-financed construction in the last decade. I've been here for more than 30 years. I've seen a lot of that.

"The new budget model, for example, which seems to be enormously impactful and was not discussed at any great length; relationship between the university and CC Tech when it was created and given a new mission. These things weren't discussed with us, and I think they absolutely needed to be. So, I found myself triangulated.

"We have a motion which calls out things which, in fact, I don't agree are issues. For example, we heard from Dean Huttenlocher that there was actually quite a bit of engagement around the details of creating Cornell Tech and on the other hand items that are missing.

"I ended up feeling that we could improve the motion and simplify the problem; that a more inclusive finding... Let me just jump to that.

"So, I feel basically less can be more. That we as the senate should simply state that the university has had a pattern of failing to engage with us without laying out details. First of all, we don't have to all agree on precisely what the offenses were, and at the same time it's more inclusive in the sense that for those of us like myself are concerned about other items it's covered.

"So, what I did was to take the original motion, retain as much language as I could while removing the specifics that I found redundant in two cases and troubling in some others, replaced them with a short piece of text which you see here.

"And I think that this yields a motion which can express our displeasure with a sense of having been disinvested from activities that are important to us, decisions that are important to us, and on this I agree with Professor Cheyfitz, but without calling out the particulars that he does where I believe it's very debatable whether many of those items, in fact, fall under the claims of his motion.

"So, I'll stop with that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you, Professor Birman. An [amendment](#) has been moved. Is there a second for the amendment? Amendment is seconded.

"So, we will, under parliamentary procedures, now have a discussion. Because it's essentially substitute wording we can talk about the two of them simultaneously. So, I would call if there is any discussion about the issues. In the interests of fairness, I'll begin with just having the introducers to the main resolution present.

Speaker Lewenstein: "Gentleman in the blue sweater. Reminder that senators have priority, and speak for two minutes and identify yourself please."

Professor Benjamin Anderson, Department of History of Art: "My question is just one of clarification regarding the amendment. My understanding of paragraph four is not that it claims that the university administration acted inappropriately in any of these cases; it simply claims that these are examples of cases in which the university administration would be required to consult with the faculty senate. So, it doesn't read to me like a claim of abuse. It simply seems to give examples of two initiatives that would in principle require consultation. So, that's my question I suppose to Professor Birman as to clarification of the amendment."

Speaker Lewenstein: "As I said at the beginning, what we will do is collect these comments and have a single response at the end."

"Anybody else wish to speak? Professor Schaffer in the striped shirt."

Professor Chris Schaffer, Department of Biomedical Engineering: "I guess my comment was I agree with the issue that 'educational policy' needs to be well-defined. I guess I would point out that neither of these resolutions defines 'educational policy,' nor neither calls for someone to go and make an explicit definition of 'educational policy.' So, it could be that we're missing some of the key points here."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Gentleman in the, I only know him as Ted."

Professor Ted Clark, Department of Microbiology and Immunology: "I agree with Chris that I think, you know, 'educational policy' does need to be defined and with Dr. Cheyfitz. But the first amendment doesn't really do that I don't think. I mean, not to my satisfaction."

Speaker Lewenstein: "The original version?"

Professor Clark: "The original version. Whereas the second one kind of skirts that issue but maybe does it in a way that it doesn't really need to be there."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Let's see. Penny can you bring the microphone over here. The woman in the black jacket please."

Professor Jill Frank, Department of Government: "I just wanted to offer a friendly amendment to both of the resolutions to the paragraph that says whereas the "current president and the newly appointed president, newly appointed interim provost and next appointed provost." I'm wondering whether we can substitute that language with "current and future" so that it's not unduly limited to the current and newly appointed but is into the future. Thank you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Let me ask first Professor Cheyfitz, is that considered a friendly amendment?"

Professor Cheyfitz: "Yes."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Birman?"

Professor Birman: "Absolutely."

Speaker Lewenstein: "So, that language is accepted by both positions as a friendly amendment."

"Professor Delchamps."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I wanted to add my voice to the line of people saying 'educational policy' needs a definition. I was on UFC at the same time as Eric when we allegedly had a subcommittee, including members of the administration, that was going to define 'educational policy' and this was a result of some real nit-picking by some central administrators in my opinion on "is this a policy issue or is it an educational not policy," that kind of thing. And I think that reasonable people can differ on the definition of what 'educational policy' means. I don't think it necessarily means everything to do with the university which is the way the first motion makes me feel that folks want to define it.

"Eric said in his remarks that he has been informed that this subcommittee to define educational policy has been resurrected. Is that the case? If someone could answer that during the comment period I'd appreciate it."

Speaker Lewenstein: "I recognize Dean Burns."

Dean Burns: "So, permit me to start with my views on the current state of our shared campus governance. I maintain that under our President and recent Provost plus many Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts and Deans, governance today is improved from where it was say ten years ago, but it's far from perfect. I believe that a top-level policy should insist the faculty is engaged more often and sooner on pending major decisions so that, as Cornell's policies are being developed, choices will always be informed by faculty views, not afterwards when implementation is sought as sometimes happens now.

"Overall, however, my view of today's shared governance is more positive than either resolution posits. Maybe this is because I attend so many meetings including almost all the

president's senior staff, the academic deans, the trustees, and there rather than failure I see progress, slow progress but progress, driven by new willingness on both sides today to seek solutions that advance Cornell through today's muddy and turbulent waters.

"I remind you that shared governance requires that all constituents—the administration, faculty, staff, students—be involved. This demands that the faculty actually participate in the governance such as you're doing here at the Senate. Sign up for committees. Engage your brains. Speak up. Share. That's right, share.

"Some academics decry the state of governance without putting very much time or mental energy into actually seeking to solve mutual solutions. Shared governance means each of us likely must occasionally compromise and tolerate imperfect solutions that usually take many hours to achieve. As I well know, it is far easier to simply complain.

"Next I suggest that both the faculty and administration must continually revisit (many others have said the same thing) revisit what their constituents mean by 'educational policy' and 'shared campus governance.' The necessary mutual understanding of such complex concepts can best be achieved in a group of manageable size rather than the body of a whole such as the senate here.

"A mostly faculty governance committee already exists although it has not been very active. It includes Abby Cohn, Bruce Lewenstein, Risa Lieberwitz, Dave Lipsky, John Siliciano and myself. We have been inactive for far too long. But even before these resolutions appeared, we had started towards scheduling a meeting that will now occur next Wednesday morning. This group will benefit very much from receiving your wisdom on governance and educational policy issues. Thank you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Miller in the blue shirt."

Professor Richard Miller, Department of Philosophy: "In part I'd like to speak in favor of the specificity in terms of examples in the original resolution. I'm a philosopher. I'm not convinced that we're going to find a happy outcome to a general definition of 'educational policy.' So, examples are very important.

"It does seem to me that in our procedure, for example, with MOOCs, there were aspects of consultation, but I have my doubts about the real thing, the committee approving our participation at edX MOOCs. It was pre-determined decision given the commitments I think of the leadership of that committee.

"The committee on MOOCs policies that I was on I was quite committed to reflectiveness about the extent of the university's resources devoted to edX MOOCs. I don't see any

evidence that our advice or our structural advice has been taken. International partnerships are, I think, a live issue for reflection by the faculty at large. In these and other ways I think the examples are right.

“What I do want to emphasize is a disagreement with Dean Burns that suggests that the work proposed in both resolutions is only half-done. I think that the senate, this senate, the people in this room now and their successors should be a genuine deliberative body. I think that small committees that then use the senate as a pipeline with a two-minute spigot on people responding to what these committees say with an even bigger pipeline from administrators, however interesting and able they may be, as they sometimes are, though sometimes definitively are not, is no substitute for deliberation in which we offer our views that then become the property of the senate, administered by the UFC with a great deal of initiative.

“I think that would be our side of consultation. I'm not blaming the administration for doing it. It's our job. I'm not blaming the UFC because they are very dedicated people who disagree with what I just said. But I think that's how we should supplement our voting in favor of the original resolution.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Professor Sanders. I'm sorry. In the back. Professor Nadasdy.”

Professor Paul Nadasdy, Department of Anthropology and American Indian Studies: “I want to very briefly speak in favor of the Cheyfitz resolution. I think issues about defining educational policy and so on are important, but they can be done subsequently. The resolution simply says that the administration has to live up to the procedures and policies that it's already agreed to, and that does not strike me as a particularly radical thing to demand of them. And so, I would urge the senators to support the original resolution.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Professor Sanders. Wait for the microphone please.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Department of Government: “This is a tiny little step for the progress of democracy, but if we aren't willing to take it how can we expect anybody around the world to press for democracy, and of all places at a university. Universities have this what to me as a government specialist is a really bizarre medieval autocratic structure that's very anachronistic in the west today. And I think we ought to work on pushing it outward and making it different. The administration likes to say, oh, we're not a medieval democracy. We're a modern corporation. It lacks even the external checks of the modern corporation.”

“And we get hundreds of millions of dollars from public taxpayers and a tiny group of people decide how to spend that money and how to make all other policies. So, it's a really weird institution. And I think we really have to press to make it more democratic, to make it more open because, and I'm not just patting us on our collective backs, but I mean what are we?

We are university faculty. We studied a long time. We read a lot. We watch things. We know a lot. Why should they not consult us? There is expertise in this room about every conceivable subject. And yet they don't even bother to ask us. That really has to change, and I can't understand why everybody wouldn't support this motion."

Professor N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Studies: "I don't think there are too many examples because I had the opportunity of serving actually with Eric on that Faculty Governance Committee, an Ad Hoc Committee that worked and made the recommendations. And there are many things that happened after that. I'm not going to name them, but having been here for a while, more than 20 years, and after those recommendations of the Faculty Governance, what was done, the process through which it was done, was in contradiction with the recommendation.

"And one of the points that was often made had been the confidentiality in this same room when similar questions were asked about why they were not informed in other sites, where the faculty was not informed and engaged. The argument was confidentiality.

"So, the issue is not as Joe was saying. It's not that there were not debates, but who was involved in those debates in what site. So, I think these are the issues of opening to the faculty.

"So, there was consultation and the faculty was not consulted, they are not mutually exclusive. Who was consulted? It's not sufficient for answering the question of whether or not the faculty was consulted.

"So, I think the resolution gives a few examples, not too many for me because there are many others that could have been also included."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Björkman."

Professor Thomas Björkman, Horticulture: "I want to speak in favor of the substitute because we each have particular things where our educational activities are impacted by a particular decision that's seen as non-educational. And picking two that are, there's not a consensus on, seems on the divisive end. So, not specifying any we can each reflect our own particular ones that have been gored and have that be in the resolution, but maintain the very important aspect of having an educational policy defined broadly enough that the decisions that administration doesn't consider educational policy, the assessment of those impacts on educational activities as part of the process."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Seeing no additional requests for speech, the opportunity for response, Professor Birman, there was one specific question to you early on.

Professor Birman: "There was a specific request asking, in fact, one that was reiterated, was whether or not this motion is correct without a proper definition of educational policy. I think this is valid because many of the concerns that I have are about university actions which are indirectly very strongly influential in educational policy yet they certainly don't seem to relate to our comportment in classrooms.

"However, I thought about this and I myself am not sure how one would go about providing an adequate and appropriate definition. So, when I produced this amendment I felt that I couldn't take that step.

"The friendly amendment that was suggested in contrast is I think something that I actually thought about and I didn't do because I wanted to keep as much language intact as I could.

"Let me comment on one or two other things that were raised with which I agree and others which I don't. The last comment that was made to the effect that if we enumerate a list of issues there's an element of divisiveness associated with that.

"As many of us, but perhaps not all of us know, Professor Cheyfitz actually has number of agendas these days. And one of them has been a very passionate argument that the university must sever connections with anything Israeli-related. He wishes to see us disinvest from Technion, and he wishes to adopt what he calls a boycott against Israeli academics."

Professor Miller: "Point of Personal Privilege."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Yes. "

Professor Miller: Professor Birman is characterizing Professor Cheyfitz's views in ways that we have no idea whether they are accurate and certainly a departure from our procedure debating these two resolutions, to give Professor Cheyfitz a platform for detailed response. I think Professor Birman should be ruled out of order."

Professor Birman: "I accept that. I will not attempt to characterize his views. What I will say is that I think that for every one of the elements enumerated there are individual passions that run strong, and by calling these out we effectively endorse a view that these are particularly important issues. Meanwhile, there are other issues that are excluded, and by excluding them we endorse a view that those are not particularly important issues to us.

"So, I feel that if we wish to express a sentiment to the administration of discontent with the degree of engagement, and I do feel that, that we're compelled to do this in broad and not specific language because the specific language implicitly focuses attention on the specific

things called out. And I'll stop; I believe that covers everything I was going to try to reply, respond on."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Cheyfitz, do you have responses?"

Professor Cheyfitz: "So, as I said in introducing this resolution, it's not about the results of these decisions, all right, with which some of us agree, some of us disagree. It's not about fighting these battles again. And also our opinions are part of a university discourse which is supposed to be based on academic freedom and free speech. So, I certainly don't appreciate being focused on for my particular views on one particular issue.

"Since I'm an English professor let me just say examples are just that: They're synecdoches for those of you that understand that vocabulary. They're parts that stand for the whole and my comments said that they can include a lot more examples. So, that's important as well. They are examples. They are not issues to be rehashed. They are to give an indication of the parameters and the categories that constitute 'educational policy.'

"We broadly define it in the resolution to include teaching and research across the university as Article 13 defines it, to give a broad definition of educational policy which then could be negotiated or debated. Right? It's a starting point. It's what negotiators do. So, I want to make that point as well.

"It's a way of bringing specifically the administration to the table to talk about these things, because if you leave these examples out and if you leave the broad definition out the administration will just go ahead and do what it's been doing. It will define 'educational policy' in the way it wants to define it. It will say that the senate has not defined it and we will be right back where we started from.

"Finally, let me say shared governance is about the senate. It's not about special committees. It's not about consulting the faculty ad hoc generally. In fact, the Governance committee precisely moved against that kind of operation because it's easy to hand pick faculty who more or less will agree with you for committees.

"This is the body that is supposed to be doing the advising, the advisement to the administration. Article 13 is quite precise. It says that the senate gets a chance to discuss educational policy and to express its opinion on it before it goes to the administration.

"That's the beginning and end of what we want to do here. We want to ask the senate to take the power that's designated to it by Article 13, okay, and tell the administration that it wants to sit down at the table and talk about what educational policy means. Because right now that's the hole that needs to be filled so that we can get shared governance back on the road it

should be on.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. We have reached the time for a vote. The procedure here is that we will vote first on the amendment, and if it fails we move on to voting on the original motion. If the amendment succeeds we still need to take a second vote because all it does is substitute language into the original resolution which then has to be voted upon.

“So, please have your clickers ready. I'm going to allow two minutes for voting. "A" will be voting yes. "B" will be voting no. "C" will be abstaining.

“We're voting on the amendment. So, the substitute language. I can put it up there. Voting on the amendment first. So, we vote on the amendment first. And "A" is voting yes for the amendment. "B" is voting no for the amendment. "C" is abstaining.

“Has everybody registered their vote? We're expecting to see 54 or 55. Is your blue light on? Make sure your blue light is on. There is an on/off button. So, make sure your button was on. Ah, we have a couple more votes showing up. Wait a second. Now we have some people re-voting. Well, some people might have come in. There are a few extra people. I think the system is designed so you can't vote twice. It seems to be holding steady.

“We are at two minutes. I am going to stop the vote. [Transcript incomplete here: 4-9-15 *Daily Sun* article says it was 19-33-5] So, I think it's clear that the amendment does not pass.

“So, we will now be voting on the original motion. Vote "A" to support the original motion. "B" to vote no on the original motion. "C" to abstain.

“Based on the previous one there is still two more to come. I assume the people that had to leave early have voted. Does everybody believe they have registered their vote? One person may not have. It's also possible that one person left. It's acceptable. I will close the voting now though two minutes have not gone by. If it's a tie I'm in trouble.

“Based on the vote I declare the resolution supported. [*Daily Sun* reports is as 40-8-8] I also at this time declare the meeting adjourned.”