

A Meeting of the
University Faculty Senate
Wednesday, April 9, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Professor Emeritus Charles Walcott: "We're beginning about five minutes late, but we have no Good and Welfare, so we ought to be able to end up on time.

"I would remind the body that no photos or tape recorders are allowed, and please turn off your cell phone.

"If you wish to speak, please identify yourself with your name and your department, and wait for the microphone. It's important to have the microphone because only that way do we get a recording of what it is you have to say. So whatever you have to say will appear in the minutes. And if you start talking before the microphone, your remarks in the minutes will be truncated.

"I suggest a maximum speaking time of about two minutes to allow for more speakers. And by and large the senators will have the first right to speak, and then other faculty will be welcome.

"So there are no Good and Welfare speakers, as I have said, so the very first thing we do is begin with the Nominations and Elections report.

"Mike?"

2. REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Associate Professor Department of Classics, Associate Dean of the Faculty Michael Fontaine: "Good afternoon, everybody. We have the results of the election. First of all, thank you everybody that stood for the election, and let's congratulate the people who have been elected to the following offices. They should be up on the slides. Yes.

"So for Faculty Trustee, Mariana Wolfner. And then for UFC on the Senate it's Chris Schaffer and Charles Van Loan. For the UFC, the Non-Senate seat, Shelly Feldman. Then for Nominations and Elections, Kathleen Long and Kerry Shaw. For the Senate-at-Large Tenured, Elizabeth Anker, Jeff Doyle, Irby Lovette and Rob Thorne. And then for the Senate-at-Large Non-Tenured, Ben Anderson and Michael Mazourek.

"As I said, it was nice to see so many people vote and so many people who agreed to stand for election. So thank you very much."

Speaker Walcott: "The Dean of the Faculty, Joe."

3. REPORT OF THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy, Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: "Welcome. Glad you're here. We do our normal thing of bringing in some Cornell produced food. This is a Cornell Big Red Cheddar invented by a Cornellian, produced by Cornellians, and so forth and so on. Good stuff if you have too much you won't get heart disease.

(LAUGHTER)

"So we are also going to do our normal thing of introducing ourselves to people nearby, just so that we all know -- you know, meet new folks. Realize if you're from Ag, there are actually people who are interested in engineering and vice versa. So please just give a hug -- actually --

(LAUGHTER)

"Okay. Good. Thank you. Thank you. This is considered to be the high point of the meeting by many.

"So I have a few things I want to tell you about some of the activities that have been going on; some pleasant, some not so pleasant. I will lead off by reminding that the Presidential Search Committee has just been formed.

"So if I can move to the next slide, Charlie.

"That is a 19-member search committee. There are four faculty members, the provost of Weill Cornell, an employee trustee, two student trustees, a vice president from alumni affairs, and then 10 trustees. We have a search firm which is advising us, and the faculty members are listed here. And all the local trustees -- you know, Presidential Search Committee members will be here along with the two leaders, the chair of board of trustees and the chair of the search committee.

"On two weeks from Monday, all day, there will be meetings with the UFC for an hour, and then any faculty member who wishes, for an hour and 15 minutes late on that afternoon. Unfortunately, I won't be here, but nonetheless, that's okay. "You notice here perhaps we received some complaints that the members of the search committee, the faculty members are not perhaps representative in the sense of there's only one humanist. People complained there were not enough humanists, and there's no one from the contract colleges.

"It's a small search committee, especially when we're told that the elected trustees will be on that search committee. The selections are very minor. And I was also sort of appointed. So we had one person to appoint. Very hard to hit more than one category with one person.

"But it is noteworthy I think as well, if you go back to Mike's presentation about the elected officials, all the elected officials, members of the senate, are from three colleges; Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and CALS. There were many nominees from the smaller colleges, but they were not elected. And we're seeing this perhaps as a trend. And it's something worrisome to me. I think we need better distribution, and we've got to figure out how to do that in a better way.

"We can move on to the next. There is -- there are two of these faculty. Four are coming up a week from today in this room. We hope to have a session on -- presented by the people who prepared the MOOCs that Cornell offered this year, and they're going to tell us about what their experiences were like; how much work it was to put it together, what support did you get, what fun did you have, what not fun did you have, what did you learn about teaching, so forth and so on. So we're going to do that and have a little wine and cheese afterwards to keep that conversation going, is the plan.

"And then in the fall -- we couldn't arrange this with the appropriate speakers this term, so in the fall we will have a forum on international programs and partnerships, and what are the issues arising in that in terms of faculty governance in the sorts of places we take Cornell's insignia into. So that should be interesting as well.

"Among the other topics, the less pleasant topics, as many of you know from a couple of things I sent out, we had a foul-up on the selection of the final exam dates. We started out with a new way of selecting final exams. Namely we waited until we -- this is largely prompted by the registrar -- waited until after all the enrollments were known, and then we optimized on those enrollments, to make sure that there would be as few conflicts as possible. The EPC, the Educational Policy Committee, myself and some student representatives, were asked to choose among three options that were given. We chose one of them. Unfortunately at the end of the day, the wrong listing was uploaded.

"We all have done that, but it was awful. And unfortunately making it even more unfortunate, we didn't find this out until six weeks after it happened. The assumption was that there was -- we had more conflicts just because we had cut down on the number of exam periods. It turned out, no, that the wrong file was uploaded.

"And by this time, I guess the registrar, myself and Dave Delchamps, the EPC chair, sat down and decided it would be total madness to switch back to the better, because the better would no longer be the better and we would really be in trouble. So we hunkered down and just said we're sticking with what we've got. "Fortunately, the registrar had skipped town by this time. That's fortunate for the registrar because I ended up answering all the complaining e-mails.

(LAUGHTER)

"Anyway, there has been a new calendar put into place. We get complaints about that. The weather has been crappy, too. So we're having a lot of unhappiness out there.

The calendar is a change, and we will have to see how it goes. At least the original legislation said we should give this a run of at least a couple of years, as much as three years before we revisit it. But if it's too bad, maybe we have to change it sooner than that. But let's see how it goes.

"We have the national -- or New York State and Albany has approved our Start-Up NY. This was a legislation that we looked at in the faculty senate and back in the UFC. And so we are now among the first of the universities in the State of New York to have a Start-Up NY approval to go forward with these tax-free zones surrounding the university.

"The next one, again looking at things that the senate has dealt with in the past and are still sort of ongoing, the faculty resolution on divestment and reinvestment of funds that we passed here in December and that the president spoke to us about in March is now in front of the university's assembly.

"And they met yesterday, sort of the second, the third time they met on this, in addition to their, you know, small meetings on the topic. And they decided yesterday, after good presentations on the pro side and on the con side,

informative presentations, that they will consider two possible resolutions at their next meeting and vote for one of them, presumably. And the two resolutions are to totally endorse what we endorsed here. The second one is to endorse the carbon neutrality, achieving carbon neutrality by 2035 rather than by 2050. But not saying that we encourage the trustees to divest, because of the fear that it might negatively impact the core mission of education and our achievement of carbon neutrality. Which of those will go in front of the UA, I don't know. And of course it will be subject to amendment and then vote. But nonetheless, that's the way that stands.

"And then the last thing that I see going on that I thought you should be aware of is that you may know that the trustees have requested that all the colleges start to investigate new revenue streams because of the precarious financial situation and the challenges we face in the next few years. And so I believe that many of the colleges are starting to investigate ways to bring more funds into their coffers and into the university's coffers.

"I want to make sure you bring back to your departments that the faculty ought to be involved in these conversations. We want to be sure that when we go to get new funds, we don't abdicate our responsibilities to our core missions of education and research and we do a better job coming out of this rather than a worse job.

"And so I encourage you to speak to your department chairs or your departments and make sure that they're engaged fully in this exercise, which is so important.

"I think I actually have a little bit of time, so if there are any questions or comments. Great. I'll just get nasty e-mails instead."

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you, Dean Burns.

"Elizabeth Adkins Regan is going to present the resolution or the -- whatever."
(LAUGHTER)

4. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF THE FACULTY - [SLIDES](#)

Professor of Psychology and Neurobiology and Behavior, Elizabeth Adkins Regan: "Good afternoon, everyone. I'm here as the Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the faculty to present the resolution on [enabling legislation](#) for the title Professor of the Practice.

"I would like to begin by ceding some of my time to Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, John Siliciano, who has a much more extensive and knowledgeable base of operations for the history and background for this.
"John."

Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, John Siliciano: "Thanks, Elizabeth. And thank you all for hearing me out.

"I'm not here in the capacity of representing the provost, but I'm actually here in two different capacities. One is that I served as the reluctant draftsman for the committee. Nobody likes to draft faculty legislation. But I had worked in 2002

on the senate committee that drafted the Clinical Professor legislation, and so have some familiarity with the underlying documents and volunteered my assistance to the committee.

"And my second role was at the request of the provost -- he did not want to take the lead on any of these title issues but believed it should arise from the faculty and the units. But we saw a great deal of ferment in all of the colleges around the problem of Cornell's outdated titles, and the beginning of a lot of rogue action. Kent asked me to step in and help coordinate and facilitate that conversation.

"I want to just talk a little bit about the legislation here. This is Part A of a two-prong effort to update our legislation. This deals with the Professor of the Practice legislation, which is basically an amendment to the 2002 Clinical Professor title legislation.

"The second part, which is still under consideration by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee relates to the Research Professor titles. This ferment across the university reflects the fact that we are woefully behind our peers on both fronts. We are essentially the only major American university without the Research Professor title. Almost all of our peers also have the Professor of the Practice title. And so I use the word "woefully" purposefully.

"What are our specific woes? Well, this creates very serious competitive issues for us in four different ways. And I see these in my role in the provost's office. "One is, in the primary way or the most obvious way, that we are noncompetitive when hiring specialized faculty who are seeking professorial titles. We simply can't compete with any of our peers when we are trying to hire somebody for a specialized purpose. We do have the Clinical Professor titles. They have worked adequately -- have worked well in the Vet School, semi-well in the Law School. They are now also adopted by the Hotel School and the Johnson School but worked poorly in those. There are other units where they won't work very well simply because it's an odd nomenclature for those. So in each year, we see these hiring difficulties when we're trying to recruit this kind of faculty.

"However, there are three other impacts that I see. In my role in the provost's office, I have responsibility in several areas. One is the university's dual career efforts, which every faculty member, when you ask them about hiring at Cornell, will identify as one of our major challenges. So I have responsibility for dual career recruiting.

"I also have responsibility for faculty diversity, and I oversee the tenure process. The lack of adequate modern titles that are commensurate with our peers has an impact in our tenure hiring in significant ways. One is that for dual career hiring, it's very common that the accompanying spouse is also seeking an academic position. And we are not able to offer the full array of professorial titles, non-tenure-track professorial titles that our peers are. And so every year I see us lose in dual career recruitment because we cannot provide a title that our peers are providing.

"This has a special diversity implication in that if we're trying to recruit a woman into our tenure-track -- and I'm talking about tenure-track recruiting -- they are 2 to 2.5 times more likely to have an academic partner, somebody seeking an academic position, than if the primary recruit is a male. And so this dual career

impact is particularly pernicious in terms of recruiting women into the tenure-track, because their spouses are more likely to be academic and more likely therefore to be looking for a commensurate title that they could get from a competitor.

“And finally I see evidence that the lack of competitive titles is undermining our tenure standards in that in some cases I've reviewed -- and I've seen 600 over the last 10 years -- it looks like what we're doing in some departments -- and this is not good -- is to use the tenure positions in order to attract people that really should be hired into specialized faculty, non-tenure-track positions. And so in order to maintain the integrity of the tenure standards, we really need to have the right position. In some sense, the physics of this is, if we don't have the titles our peers have but we do have a need to recruit specialized faculty, they will tend to show up in the tenure ranks where they shouldn't be. We should have the right titles for the right positions.

“There are a number of ways to go about how to approach this question of updating our titles. I recommended to the committee and vetted with the colleges a very conservative approach, which was not to start from the ground up but to simply recognize that what we had was a good start in the 2002 Clinical Professor legislation, but that there was a nomenclature problem in that in some schools what we were looking for was a Professor of the Practice title rather than the Clinical Professor title, even though it described a very similar group of faculty.

“And so what the proposed legislation does is simply engraft the Professor of the Practice title as an alternate title, but it engrafts it onto an entire set of approval processes and limitations that are in the Clinical Professor legislation. There are some units that urged us to scrap the entire complex set of legislation, but I wanted to keep this as low-impact as possible. That's something the Senate may want to do eventually, but I think for our purposes, I'm simply trying to get a modern set of titles on the board.

“The Professor of the Practice title is the one that's most commonly used by our peers, very often in conjunction with the Clinical Professor title. So the Clinical Professor title applies in clinical settings, such as the Vet School, the Law School, where there are actual live client clinics. And the Professor of the Practice is used for specialized faculty in non-clinical settings. These are the peers that use this. “Other of our peers use alternate titles: Teaching Professor is used at Stanford, CMU, and Johns Hopkins; some use Professor in the Field; and there are a few other odder titles out there.

“As I said, this legislation simply engrafts it onto the Clinical Professor legislation using the complicated approval processes that are unit-specific, meaning every college has to approve this by itself. It's not a generically available title. And this does allow for units that have already bought into the Clinical Professor title, like the Johnson School and the Hotel School, who find it odd or inappropriate to go through a process of migrating to the title.

“In terms of the use limitations, this is the key language in the new legislation. The rest of it simply adopts and engrafts itself onto the Clinical Professor title.

“I built this language in part based on looking at our peers. So this is derived in part from Columbia, MIT and Penn, to make very clear that this applies to a

distinct class of faculty that we use primarily in our teaching programs. They are long-term, non-tenure-track faculty, highly experienced in individual and relevant fields, professional practice, providing effective practice-oriented instruction. This makes clear that they're not supplanting but they're simply supplementing the core pedagogical instruction that we derive from our tenure-track faculty, further emphasizing that their primary responsibility is teaching. And then maybe to beat a dead horse even further, the title is not used to replicate that of our tenure-track faculty.

"So that's essentially the key operative language here to talk about this class of faculty. In some sense very similar to the clinical faculty, but they're simply operating in a classroom context.

"This proposal is supported by AFPS. It's also been vetted by all the schools and colleges. Again, the provost did not want to take the lead on this but simply wanted to facilitate the effort in the colleges. This proposal was circulated to all the deans. I asked them to ascertain whether there was support within their colleges in whatever way they thought was appropriate. So they either worked with their chairs or worked directly with the faculty. And then all deans have reported that they wished to have the senate support this legislation.

"The final word is that we are a complete anomaly. Sometimes you hear that our titles are based on the Oxford system. 'Oxford still uses Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, and if it's good enough for Oxford, it should be good enough for Cornell.' It is actually no longer good enough for Oxford. As of last year, their study concluded that Oxford's current use of the Lecturer title is poorly understood in much of the rest of the world of higher education and is a barrier for attracting the best candidates and for retaining staff of the highest quality. They're currently revising it to explore using appropriate professorial titles. "So thank you for your time."

Professor Adkins Regan: "Thank you, John. That was very helpful. And if we can go to the -- or do I advance?"

Speaker Walcott: "You can do it."

Professor Adkins Regan: "Okay. I wanted to then share with you the process that the committee engaged in and the arguments that it heard for and against the idea of the Professor of the Practice title that we took into account before reaching a consensus that we supported the idea and wanted it to come to you.

"This is the committee membership. It's somewhat diverse with respect to other colleges that are represented. The committee met three times to discuss the proposed title and the draft enabling legislation. We interviewed people to hear arguments for and against. We suggested a couple of revisions to John, who had drafted the original legislation. We compared the duties and benefits of the current Clinical Professor and proposed Professor of the Practice title with all the other existing tenure and -- tenure-track and non-tenure-track titles that occur at Cornell. And in the end we reached a consensus that we supported the proposed resolution.

"The arguments in favor, you've heard some of these from John. You've heard most of these already from John, but this is from the committee's perspective.

"We can see that the word "clinical" makes no sense for some of the colleges. If you try to imagine an outstanding artist or architect coming to Cornell to teach how to actually do architecture or art to some of our students, would they want to come here with a title Clinical Professor? It might be very off-putting. And so an amendment to simply fix that nomenclature issue seems like a good idea. "We resonated to the points about how our -- Cornell's competitiveness is hampered by not having appropriate titles when it comes to hiring people and solving dual-career hire problems. And we noted that the appropriate safeguards for abuse of a title like this, which is non-tenure-track, are already in place in the Clinical Professor legislation.

"Arguments against, one has to take seriously and discuss and think about potential risks of any kind of title addition of this sort. With respect to encouraging increased reliance on non-tenure-track instructors for teaching our students, that's one reason that there's a very narrow definition of this, and it's rather restricted.

"Does one want to continue diluting the meaning of the word "professor"? For which the Cornell model has traditionally been the tenure-track, researcher-teacher hybrid model.

"And of course one wants to think carefully about the risks of eroding the all-important academic freedom for teachers at Cornell that tenure provides, which does not apply to any of the non-tenure-track titles.

"So we took all of that into account, and on balance we felt that the benefits outweighed the negatives, the risks, given that, first of all, the really big issue under this was already addressed and decided upon in 2002 when the Clinical Professor legislation was voted on. This is just a nomenclature amendment to that legislation. That's when the real deep discussions went on about these issues that may have solved any of those concerns.

"Once again, only the nomenclature is being amended by providing an alternative language that better fits some of the colleges that need this kind of title.

"Once again, I will mention that the language that you saw that John presented really rather narrowly defines what this is. This is not just anybody that's teaching students here and that's doing a terrific job. This is a very particular kind of teaching wherein somebody who has been a success in a profession outside of academia, for example, comes to show our students how to do the practical hands-on stuff to become good at that profession.

"And we found it very reassuring that the ground rules will be the same as they are for the Clinical Professor, with all kinds of brakes and safeguards to make sure that there's no abuse of the title, no kind of slippery slope leading to having way too many non-tenure-track people on the teaching faculty. There are limitations in that existing legislation that apply here as well.

"And so thus reassured and having decided this is a good idea, we bring to you the resolution that this enabling legislation be adopted. You received a copy of it, but here just to refresh your memory are the whereases and the actual resolution itself."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you, Elizabeth.

"We're now ready to hear some comments and questions. And I would like to recognize senators first, and then other members of the faculty.

"And let's start on the far left. Yes, sir. The microphone is coming."

Professor Michael Todd, Operations Research and Information Engineering:
"And also my first degree was from Cambridge.

(LAUGHTER)

"Notwithstanding, I'm in favor of this. When I look through the materials, I didn't see the percentage caps in the original -- the enabling legislation for Clinical Professor. And I was wondering if those were under the control of the units or whether when a new proposal is made to add some Professors of the Practice to a unit, whether that comes to this committee or the senate or whether it's dealt with only in the unit.

"I'm just somewhat concerned with this dilution of the regular tenure-track faculty."

Speaker Walcott: "John or Elizabeth? Please come up here."

Professor Adkins Regan: "All three of us can do this. But there is a 25% limit that John will explain."

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "It graphs on the 25%. And so the total number of people occupying combined Clinical Professor titles and Professor of the Practice, should the unit differentiate, is 25%. So that, as Elizabeth says, is one of the key checks and balances that makes sure that Cornell retains the dominant teaching function in its tenured faculty."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: "I take it from the discussion this is not then going to change Senior Lecturer positions here or Lecturer positions here. This is going to be pinpointed at sort of special people from the outside? That's how it's been described. Is that correct, or are we going to convert Senior Lecturers here to Professors of the Practice? Some people that I talk to think that's going to happen. So they're supporting this because they would like a professorial title. But the discussion doesn't seem to point in that direction."

Professor Adkins Regan: "That's correct. The committee -- the committee's understanding and the language in this makes it clear that this means a prototypical person would be a Professor of the Practice, not someone who has been here all along as a teacher, but someone who has been out practicing a profession and now is coming to Cornell to teach those practical hands-on skills to our students."

Professor Cheyfitz: "All right. I think that should be made clear to some units, because I got an e-mail message to support this based on the fact that there are Senior Lecturers in a particular unit who were looking forward to a conversion of that particular title to this title.

"And then -- so it's good to clear that up. But I think it needs to be -- I think it needs to be cleared up.

"The other problem I see potentially, precisely because of the information that's been coming to me, is this creating a kind of invidious comparison now between people who have been here and have been teaching admirably and our Senior Lecturers who have been promoted have been here a long time, and then people coming in who are going to get professorial titles, that they thought they might have a chance to get themselves.

"So I see a possible morale problem here."

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "Eric, these are good issues and we're aware of them. When we did the 2002 legislation, and this incorporates on top of that, it does say explicitly that the Clinical Professor legislation is not meant as a wholesale replacement for -- wholesale path for -- Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Instead it requires each unit to go through the analysis about whether that particular title applies to faculty.

"Now, it turned out that the Vet School had clinical faculty and the Law School had clinical faculty as Senior Lecturers and they did convert, but only through a detailed analysis of whether each faculty member was appropriate.

"And you're right, it actually can create these tensions. That's one reason we do like using the existing legislation, as it provides a set of conversations. They can be difficult, but they occur within the unit. They require votes by different groups of faculty. I think that's the appropriate place to work this out.

"But the committee was very aware of the need to have this crafted in a way that was very specific and installed that restrictive language."

Professor Cheyfitz: "So some conversion might be possible?"

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "It might be possible, but if the units do their job -- and this all gets reviewed by the Faculty Senate in terms of approval of this -- they're going to make sure that people that are appointed to these titles meet the specific criteria set by the committee and by the senate."

Professor Cheyfitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, sir, in the middle."

Professor Dan Brown, Department of Animal Science, CALS: "There are some aspects of this that are attractive, especially if it's implemented in a very limited basis, maybe 2 or 3% of a given unit or faculty. But putting in a cap of 25 for professor -- and that -- if you read the original enabling legislation, it was 25% of current tenure-track faculty can be replaced by this type of class. And I think that's completely unacceptable in this form.

"We have seen in this campus and certainly our department and college has suffered from the practice of reducing, outsourcing, insourcing private contractors for all types of support services along campus. And we're suffering from that, and the quality of teaching and research that we can complete, at least in our neck of the woods.

"To extend the idea of hiring contract -- shorter term contract teachers instead of tenure-track faculty, extending the disastrous principles of this outsourcing of the university supplying the support staff, supplying that to the core purpose is not good.

"You gave some examples of places where this worked. And I've read -- you know, looked up some of these institutions.

"Some of these institutions that have Professor of the Practice very rarely apply. For example, if a member of a former president's cabinet came to teach in the government department for five years, they don't care about tenure, but they have this new title.

"Other places -- you listed Duke has entire departments made up of Professors of the Practice. Their art department, for example. They're basically at-will employees, well, with short contracts.

"So, you know, in that list you have places where it works, places where it's been a disaster. I could be mistaken. Somebody from the art department can fill me in. I don't know if Duke is the top leading art department in the world. But it's done all with these short-term contractors.

"So in this current form -- many of the things -- arguments are made, yep, it would be good for flexible hiring of spouses and all of the things that you said. As long as it's limited, greatly limited. And I'm not mollified by the idea that faculty and so on in each of the units are going to get a chance to vote on this.

"Right now our positions that were tenure-track are being replaced by Lecturers from the college. And that's over our objections, not with our input. I'm not surprised that the college is supporting it, if you mean the college administrations. Because this gives them the opportunity to quickly replace the -- to replace, as people retire, very quickly to replace them with that.

"And I know that's not the intent. Perhaps it's not the intent of the central administration here. But one thing we know about the administration of Cornell, we're going to have a new one in about a year. And what they do with this blank check, I don't know.

"So as currently formulated, and applying the 25% cap to many departments is completely inappropriate. I would like --"

Speaker Walcott: "Your time is almost up."

Professor Brown: "Okay. I would like to move to amend this to change that to 5% for the Professors of the Practice. What the law school and vet school does is up to them. And ask the speaker to ask for a second in discussion of an amendment to reduce that very high cap that carves into the tenure-track faculty."

Speaker Walcott: "Substantive amendments are not permitted. If you want to do that, I think you probably have to table the motion. Because the amendments have to be submitted, what is it, a day in advance or something like that. We're just dropping the two. I know how substantive that is."

Dean Burns: "I saw this parliamentarian come in. Is he still here?"

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics: "That's clearly a substantive amendment. It has to be done in the next meeting."

Speaker Walcott: "Please continue."

Professor Christine Shoemaker, Engineering: "I agree with the previous point. But I also want -- my concern is that the long-term -- it keeps saying long-term. And what does that mean? It also said in the document that we got that Senior Lecturers cannot have contracts longer than five years. So the implication is that these Professors of the Practice are going to have longer contracts than five years. And I don't see how that serves the purpose that we want, and particularly certainly it's not going to help spousal hires. We're trying to -- you're talking about a couple of years of support. And the department would be very uncomfortable giving that title if the implication is it's going to be long-term support."

"So I think that that needs to be clarified. I know many schools do this, as you said, on short contracts, sometimes even just a year at a time. I don't see what the purpose is of repeatedly using the term "long-term" here. Or if it's going to be used, to explain what that means."

"I also -- sorry?"

Dean Burns: "The legislation says the rule of three to five years, the contract is renewable in three to five years."

Professor Shoemaker: "I'm sorry. I overlooked it. All right. That's better."

"And then also a question of how do you make the decision about whether comes in as an Assistant Professor of the Practice versus Associate versus Senior. Is that a unit-based decision?"

Speaker Walcott: "Substantive question. John?"

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "That's the same issue that arises with the Clinical Professor title. These are things that the unit can clearly ascertain. They have the expertise in terms of the qualifications. And the Clinical Professor titles that are currently in use, are assistant, associate and full professor. And we've detected virtually no problem in a unit knowing how to operate with those criteria."

Unidentified Speaker: "So the interpretation of long-term appointment means two to three -- what was it, two to three years?"

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "Again, it's based on the Clinical Professor. So the initial appointments at the assistant level are three years, and then they're five years. That's the same as the Senior Lecturer legislation. It simply sits on top of that."

Speaker Walcott: "In the far back."

Professor Greg Page, Department of Art: "Hi, can you hear me? So our dean came to all of the departments in AAP and talked to everyone about this. My colleague, Medina Lasansky, is here also.

"This would very much help our department and our college, because we do have lots of instances and lots of situations where individuals would fit perfectly with this title.

"How we're viewed in the profession, it's always addressed as what's your practice, what is your practice? Whether it's in fine arts, whether it's in architectural, museum studies, curatorial studies. Which those two aspects would be perfect individuals who might come to Cornell in our college and fall under that kind of title and work perfectly as a short-term visitor and teaching something specialized with that type of subject. In architecture, and there are many other examples where it would work.

"Also, the dual hiring situation would also really help the architectural, art and planning college with this.

"So that's one reason why I think we really would like to -- and that we really do support this. And Dean Kleinman actually did address all of the different departments in the college, and they are all really supportive of this title.

"The aspect of in terms of what happens with other universities eliminating art departments or diminishing tenure, that is a concern. It's true. In some cases where -- Emory University totally got rid of their art department and other aspects of their undergraduate degree programs, too.

"But those are other situations. I think -- you know, and it depends on what units and how committed they are to tenured faculty and that kind of continuation of the tenured faculty.

"I've been here for 34 years now, and I think our current dean is very well committed to tenured faculty in the department and in the college as well. But also utilizing this title to also help us to be more competitive as what John pointed out as some of the benefits to this. So thank you.

Professor Valerie Hans, Law School: "Thank you. I'm Valerie Hans from the law school. And I wanted to convey the law school's view about this proposal, which we very much support.

"The law school was one of the first units to use Clinical Professor back in 2002. It was very helpful to us, because some of my colleagues actually do run clinics where they supervise students and are able to train them in some of the skills that they will need when we graduate and pass the bar and become real lawyers. So that was incredibly helpful. It actually was a perfect definition of what they were doing.

"But we also have some classroom training on lawyering which teaches people how to write briefs and make legal arguments and things like that that goes across the substantive areas that the rest of us teach. And we have used that particular term "Clinical Professor" as a way to apply to those individuals, the small number of individuals who work on that.

"So for us, Professor of the Practice would actually be very good for us, because we could more nearly approximate what people are actually doing in the law school.

"I will say, too, I think it's generally a good idea for law schools to envision Professors of the Practice being a regular part of our law school faculty group. I don't know how many of you have kept in touch with changes in law schools and demands of the legal profession, but there is increasing concern that we are not preparing our students adequately to take on law positions. And so their training, the kind of stuff that they get in those classroom environments and then also in clinical training and perhaps other Professors of the Practice who might come and help our students learn what it's like to be a real lawyer I think is going to be increasingly important for us to maintain our competitive advantage as a law school.

"So we're supportive of it and we hope that it passes. Thank you.
Speaker Walcott: "Ken?"

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: "And I'm not a senator, so thank you very much for allowing non-senators to speak.

"We very much support this in computer science. We're a unit in which Clinical Professor simply doesn't work. And it's not an appropriate title to offer. So in our setting, we're forced to offer people either Senior Lecturer positions or tenure-track faculty positions.

"Last week I was doing a review for the European air traffic control people, and I was talking to practitioners who are building the world's very best high assurance software. These are skills we need to be teaching our students. And one of the senior people asked me, by the way, beyond this, what would be involved if I were to come teach at a place like Cornell?

"And I was thinking to myself you couldn't offer a person like that a Senior Lecturer position. It would seem insulting. Particularly considering that our peer institutions would talk to such a person eagerly and would be offering a much more prestigious position.

"And so it seems to me as a matter of sort of professional appropriateness for people who have very, very high qualifications -- which is what we're talking about -- but certainly not for the kind of wanton use that you're afraid of. I would be horrified if that happened. And I talked to the committee about this legislation. I've been working on this for some years. I think it has a lot of protection built in against the sort of scenario you're afraid of.

"But for these very qualified individuals, we need to treat them with respect. And this type of a title would let us do that. And today many of our units really lack any title that would be appropriate. And as John said, when we see dual career situations, sometimes people come and then accept a title that's almost insulting. It's almost embarrassing for them professionally.

"So I very much support this, and I hope the senate will as well."

Professor Debbie Cherney, Animal Science,: "It really seems like you've got two things that you're talking about; these highly qualified people that are out in the

profession, and Professor of the Practice certainly seems appropriate for them. But then on this other end when you're talking about, well, it's going to improve our ability to attract these dual career couples where you get in a young assistant professor and you want to get the spouse and you're going to offer them an Assistant Professor of the Practice. Is that correct?"

Senior Vice Provost John Siliciano: "That's a very good point. And I understand. I don't want to be suggesting that we use these titles to cheat or get people in the door. People need to be qualified for the titles. And so in terms of the dual career, I'm talking about our general lack of competitive titles. This plays out more in the Research Professor area, where someone has been working in a lab at another university, and they're the trailing spouse. When we get to this, if we do get to this, the conversation is even more strange given our current titles.

"But you're absolutely right. We're not trying to create someplace where we can simply shoehorn in any dual-career accompanying spouse. The people have to meet these criteria. But a dimension of the problem I see every single year is we fail in dual career. And I hear about it. I hear the anguished calls from the chair. And there's a very clear diversity dimension to it as well."

Professor Cherney: "I was in that position a few years ago. So I can see if you've got into that position and then some younger person comes in and gets that higher title, you're going to have somebody mention some real morale problems when they're looking at this person that came in and has essentially now jumped up above them.

Speaker Walcott: "Joe, could we call the question?"

Dean Burns: "Anybody here wish to call the question?"

"The amendment -- yes, back there. Are you willing to call the question?"

Unidentified Speaker: "No."

Speaker Walcott: "More discussion."

"You were next, sir."

Professor Harold Hodes, Philosophy: "Me and my department, I guess we all recognize that there is a need that's being addressed by this proposal. We've had two misgivings about it. First of all, the cap is a one-size-fit-all cap. It might be more sensible to have each of the colleges propose a cap for that college and to have the legislation embody what the cap's proposed out of the colleges. "Secondly, we are concerned about the slippery slope created by the phrase "relevant field of professional practice."

"According to at least one quite ordinary way of understanding the phrase "professional," an academic professor who is engaged in lecturing and research is engaged in a professional practice.

"Now, I gather from the introductory remarks that Liz made, the intention here was not to include that sort of professional practice within the scope of the term. But there's nothing in the legislation that makes that explicit. The phrase about

non-duplication of what tenure-track faculty do is clearly a gesture in that direction. But I'm concerned that it's not explicit enough.

"So I guess the upshot is I can see two respects in which I think that this proposal could be improved.

Speaker Walcott: "Professor Burns?"

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "May I respond briefly?"

Speaker Walcott: "Sure, go ahead."

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "In terms of the percentage question, again this legislation engrafts onto the Clinical Professor legislation. And this goes to your point as well of the 5% versus the 25%.

"The 25% is the maximum that the 2002 legislation allows for the use of these titles. However, we sent you this legislation as well as part of the posting. It also allows and in fact requires any unit adopting these titles to specify its own internal percentage. So it can -- and let me read you the language.

"Percentage limitations. This is in the underlying legislation. 'The proposal shall include a statement restricting the creation of positions in the proposed titles to a certain percentage of the tenure-track faculty of the originating college and of the tenure-track faculty in those departments or programs where those positions are located.

"So if in CALS the view is that we need to restrict this to 5%, then that goes in their enabling legislation. The 25% is the university limitation that no department can exceed. But you already have the authority to do that.

"I also credit your point that you can imagine ways that people could work their way around this legislation. But it really does contain the restrictions on this that all of our peers are using to dial this in to the kind of very specific people. Again, it says practice-oriented training, that Ken mentioned."

Speaker Walcott: "We've run out of time for discussion. And I think the time has come to try for a vote."

Unidentified Speaker: "I move to table for another month so that we can fashion some amendments along the lines that Dr. Stein suggested that the --"

Unidentified Speaker: "Second."

Speaker Walcott: "A move to table has been made. That's not debatable. We have to vote on that. I guess we should probably use the clickers. It's a quicker way. So if you will get your clickers."

Unidentified Speaker: "We don't have a clicker."

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Walcott: "I guess we're going to have to do this the old-fashioned way. The clickers are coming. The clickers will be coming. Please make sure you get a clicker.

"Does everybody that needs a clicker get a clicker?"

Unidentified Speaker: " No."

Speaker Walcott: "No? One more.

"I suppose we should take a clicker vote on whether you have a clicker, but we'll pass over that."

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Walcott: "All right. I'm going to turn on this thing. And so we are voting on whether to table this resolution.

Speaker Walcott: "If you wish to table it, you will vote for A, table. And if you do not wish to table it, you will vote for B. And if you wish to abstain, you will vote for C.

"Okay. It should be ready to vote."

Unidentified Speaker: "We can vote now?"

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, you may vote now, please.

"Wait just a second or two.

"Okay. I think that's it.

"Well, it looks to me as if the motion to table has failed, 27 to 22. So that brings us then back to the original motion.

"And can we proceed with that?

"Again, all in favor, A. Opposed, B. Abstaining, C.

"Sorry about that. My fault.

"Has everybody voted? Okay. It looks to me as if the motion has passed, 35 to 10, with one abstaining, one abstention.

"Thank you very much. We now proceed to Vice Provost Buhrman.

5. REPORT FROM ROBERT BUHRMAN SENIOR VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH, VICE PRESIDENT FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND RESEARCH POLICY

"Thank you. I appreciate the invitation to come again to the senate and give you an update on research.

"My office is primarily responsible for overseeing externally sponsored research. So my comments will be heavily on that. Although I think that all Cornell research and scholarship is equally important and makes our impact on the world.

"These are some numbers I give the trustees every year. This is our research portfolio as far as funding. This includes the medical college and also the tech campus. Of course they're just getting going. So to me it's a fairly impressive number. Last year we expended \$630 million, approximately, on sponsored research in our campuses doing our discoveries. That is down a bit from the previous time. We were down on the Ithaca campus, Ithaca-based campus -- that includes Geneva -- slightly less than 1%. The med school was down a bigger decline.

"I could say that overall a 3.5% decrease from the previous year. Now, of course what matters is the research. As I've told my young faculty years ago, unfortunately in many of our fields, money is the mother's milk of science, and we need to have the funding to do the work that we want to do.

"Just to show you some things, to put things in context. The previous graph was in uninflated or deflated dollars. This is cost of dollars using the government's CRP index. And I broke it out by the three colleges. And as you can see, over the last decade things have been up and down. You can recognize the ups, which is the stimulus package, which was great while it lasted (but it didn't). Overall there has been some increase. And even though we're constantly -- in the fields that do get sponsored funding, constantly complaining, in some sense we have it better than lots of parts of our society.

"The federal funding has been flat. This tells you a little bit more -- that was total funding before, this is for the last 11 years of federal funding. Again, you can see ups and downs. The up in the med school particularly here is the stimulus, because NIH got the biggest benefit of the stimulus, and now they're paying the biggest price in not having it anymore.

"Now I've gone all the way back, not as far back as I've been here at Cornell on the faculty, but back to '78. And, again, this is constant funding. Again, we constantly worry about us not having the funding, but if you look at the trends over the last 25 or 35 years, it has actually been up. It's not up as much as we want, because humans always want to see things getting better, and when they're flat, they're terrible. That's the nature of the human race, I think.

"What is the big thing here? This, again, is the NIH doubling, or trying to double under Presidents Clinton and Bush, which happened, but now it's been slowly going down. But, again, this is surprising, in the physical science -- this is largely the physical sciences and engineering -- a big step up here. Then it was flat, then some increase, and so forth. I don't know whether you find this interesting or not, but it puts it into perspective to me a little bit about our research budgets and what we're doing.

"This is total sponsoring -- federal and sponsored -- for all the university over the years. Again, this is in 2013 dollars as reported by the Federal Government.

"So what is our portfolio made of? Well, not surprisingly 40% of all research we do on this campus and in New York City is medical research. That means it's funded by NIH predominantly. That's actually low for a typical peer university. Although Cornell has no peers in many sense, including the fact that our medical college is relatively small in research; they've historically emphasized clinical practice rather than medical research. The new dean and the new research

building that's now operational (it went operational in January) is hoped and expected to change that.

"We're very strong in biology. That's a lot of life science, on the campus here at Cornell. And then in agriculture and these other areas.

"Just to give you some breakdown where the funding comes from. The DHHS, of course, is NIH and the public health and the FDA is mainly NIH. We get 16% of our funding from NSF. That is unusual. DOD, we're a little bit low. USDA and so forth all the way around.

"We get 10% of our funding now from foundations. That's good news and that's bad news. The bad news is foundations do not pay the full cost of research. The Federal Government doesn't pay the full cost of research because they cap what you would call overhead (or is officially called facilities and administrative fees). They capped that starting back in the '90s due to some unfortunate incidents that our progeny, Stanford on the West Coast, put in place. We told them better than that, but they didn't listen. So they don't pay, but foundations will typically only pay 10%.

"Now, we take the foundation funding because it enables us to do things we want to do. It's important work. However, as it becomes a bigger part of our portfolio, we have a problem, because those costs have to be borne, and those are borne by endowment payout, gift payout and tuition payout -- and that is a challenge. And we're still trying to understand that.

"And then we have institutional funds at 18%. A lot of that is in the contract colleges, because we receive funds from the State to the contract colleges: Ag, Vet, ILR and Human Ecology. And they're expected to do research, and that is booked that way. Whereas in the endowed colleges, we don't book the scholarly work that our humanists do or other people do if it is not what we call a program; that is, specific funding coming in for it. So it changes things.

"Show you how we break it down by different areas. Cornell is low in medical sciences but we're actually high in the life sciences when you add all the outstanding work we do in CALS and Vet, which some of our peer colleges, Stanford or Harvard, do not have an Ag School or a Vet College.

"Cornell has had a long history of being exceptionally strong in the physical sciences.

"The accelerator here, I can tell you that next week there will be an announcement that we're getting \$100 million from the National Science Foundation to keep the storage ring going for the next five years. It has been a long struggle. The people have worked very hard to win that reward. And it will be announced next week. That keeps us going. We have other major projects that we hopefully will get good news about.

"You can just kind of see the distribution of what we do. This is the national average. And this is where Cornell outperforms or overemphasizes. It depends on how you want to look at it.

"The source, the Federal Government gives us nearly but not quite 60% of our total funding. State and local, largely to the contract college but not exclusively,

is this number. Industry, we are below the national average in getting the funding from industry. That's a historical reason and a local reason. And it may be changing.

"The institutional funds, again a lot of the people here are the other state schools that have state support. Private schools do not put as much in institutional funds, unless you're Harvard. We over performed in foundations.

"Now, a little bit of that is a misnomer because we have one foundation that gives one of our campuses a lot of money for research, and that is called Qatar National Foundation. And it gives it to the med school. So that's about 40 million a year that goes to the medical college. And it's listed as a foundation. It's actually a wholly owned subsidiary of the Emir of Qatar, but it's okay. It's good money and they do good work. The checks don't bounce.

(LAUGHTER)

"So, again, which agencies give it, just breaking it down again. As you can see, we underperform in NIH. Or we do other things, like NSF. Last year, I've already mentioned this, we were number two in NSF funding. The University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign is number one. They have a major supercomputer center there which the annual funding of that supercomputer is about 40 million a year, after the capital acquisition. It's a quarter of a billion dollar acquisition.

"In industry funding, which is the other one here, business listed by -- this is from the NSF website that maintains this data. Again, we're -- as a university, we're a little bit below where we think we should be given our size. We're 26th. And typically we could perhaps be up to 15 if we were competing, given our size, with other schools.

"Stanford, for example, gets 60 million dollars a year in industry funding. Cornell gets 30. MIT gets 90. Just putting it in perspective. Stanford and MIT are the biggest, MIT being the biggest.

"I don't know if you're interested in this. This just shows trends over the years. The big blue here is the NSF federal funding going up. This is for across the country. So this is the pot we fight for. So in the early part of this century, the federal funding went up to 65%, and then it peaked up through the stimulus, and now it's down and it's going to be trending down to be 60% or so of the funding. Foundations is growing -- sorry, universities is stepping up. And of course that means money is moving away from some other task, improving the classroom, and other things we're spending on research.

"Industry funding has actually declined over the years. It is not a growing revenue, although there's a lot of activity trying to get that to grow or get our better share here.

"And the foundation funding is growing. As I just indicated, all those have some challenges. Industry will pay the full F&A if foundations don't. But industry is declining and foundations is growing. So it's not a winning combination. But it enables work that we want to do.

"Again, just showing you what the NSF budgeted over the years. This is the stimulus act. A very unusual thing. The consequences of that were decaying exponential or decaying plot. And this is the budget for this year. The red

arrow is what the Congress -- the red bar at the top was the total that President Obama asked for. The red arrow is what we got. Which is not terrible. It's a slight increase over last year. But it's not a wonderful thing

“The same thing for NIH. This is the Obama administration request for the current fiscal year. The omnibus bill that passed earlier this year brought us into NIH at 29 -- essentially \$30 million. That's a lot of money. We only get a little bit of it. So we should try to get more. Right? But that's the investment.

“I'm just going to turn very quickly to other things that report to my office. I've talked to you in the past about compliance. I'll mention that in a minute. But just say technology transfer metrics, that's our -- CCTEC is our intellectual property licensing office for inventions and copyrights that are created by Cornell faculty. And I'm just going to show you some peers. Because generally Cornell is viewed as not being a high-tech place. Now, New York City is going to fix all that. We'll see. But it turns out our numbers are not all that bad. There's a group called the Ivy Plus, which is the Ivy League 8 plus Chicago, Johns Hopkins, MIT, Stanford and Wash U. So these are the common leading privates. Now, if you say I would like to compare to the leading public schools, we have that kind of comparison, but in the interest of time I'll just show you this one.

“When we do comparisons, we say how much funding do you get and then divide all the metrics by that. So you're normalizing for research dollars. So that kind of puts things on the scale, because if we're much bigger than another Ivy, we would be normalized down or vice versa.

“So in the case of options -- options are saying deals we do with companies for money -- we ranked 4 out of the 12. In disclosures, which is our faculty, students and post docs disclosing ideas, we rank 4 out of 12. In patents issued last year, this is fiscal year '12, we ranked 3rd. Here we don't do so well. In licensing income we ranked 9th. And the statement here, they're not from running royalties, that's because historically we have not done too well with having a big drug or a big whatever. We had a nice settlement from HP after a very bitter lawsuit with them. And we have some other things going on which are giving us good licensing income.

“One right now, by the way, is an apple called SnapDragon. Have any of you had a SnapDragon? Thank you. I got a penny out of that.

“SnapDragon, and RubyFrost, the two apples that Cornell has released as a branded apple. That was following the lead that the University of Minnesota did. You may have had a Honeycrisp. They patented that apple, and they also patented SweetTang, but Ruby and SnapDragon will take them eventually.

“And we're getting significant return from that. And it's supporting the New York state apple growers because the association of the growers licensed it from Cornell, and they're controlling who gets the next root stock to propagate. So I think it's a win all the way around, in light of the declining state funding for agriculture research.

“And in startups, we have six. We had seven startups last year. It puts us sixth in the country -- sorry, sixth in the Ivy Plus.

"Just a couple of other things. Our research portfolio looks pretty good. We expect to be essentially flat in research expenditures for this year. And that's not a bad thing. I want to thank the faculty that are here and everybody else who serve on our compliance committees. We have an animal research program that's one of the best -- I think it is the best in the country. It is now fully accredited. We've been audited, we've been inspected, we've been checked. And over the last three years, there's been no negative findings, which is a first. And it's due to the staff and it's due to the faculty doing really good work. And I'm very appreciative of that.

"We have a very good research-related conflict of interest program now. Not all the faculty are happy about it, but we have 100% compliance, and we have managed conflicts and no problems.

"A managed conflict means simply that a faculty member or a post doc has a company and there's a relationship with the Cornell work, and we just have to make sure that that relationship is above board and fully disclosed to the right people.

"We have research ethics training going on, and we're going to be rolling out an improved process to train our students particularly about plagiarism, authorship issues, so that they can more quickly move into professional work and understand the rules of the profession. When is there a ghost authorship? What does plagiarism mean? We all try to teach this to our students, but we clearly are seeing evidence that not everyone's getting the message. So we have to do more. Some are mandated by the Feds.

"Am I out of time? I think I should stop."

Speaker Walcott: "You've got a couple more minutes."

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "Is anyone going to want to ask questions, or should I keep going?"

Professor Hans: "I do have one question."

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "Okay, let's do it."

"While we're waiting for the mic, I'll just quickly go through. We've been audited by the National Science Foundation. I don't know how much you know about that, but an awful lot of your staff have been involved. That audit looked at all NSF-funded expenditures over three years. We're talking 300, 400 million dollars of expenditures. They initially said we owed them \$30 million in overcharges. We got it down to \$800,000. We think we'll get it down close to zero.

"They were putting in all kinds of rules and regs about what we can do and whether or not we can buy a computer on a research grant and whether we can't, and whether if you check into a hotel and don't check out getting a zeroed out bill, whether we can put that into reimbursement. And some of the stuff is really silly. Unfortunately, some of the faculty are going to have to improve their recordkeeping on these kind of things, because the auditors just won't let us do it otherwise.

"Ma'am, please."

Professor Hans: "I had heard in recent years this worrisome trend in Congress to -- vis-a-vis the NSF funding and budgeting, especially with social behavior on the economic sciences unit. And I wonder if you can give us any update on what's going on with the current budget. Thank you."

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "Okay. Good news, bad news. The good news is -- and this has to do with the congressman from the -- in the House side, chairman of the science committee, said that we can only support social science research if it improves national defense or economic well-being. How do you prove that or disprove it, I don't know."

"That was in the bill last year. It was passed in the sequestration bill. This year in the omnibus resolution it was taken out of the negotiations. Good news. So the NSF can go back doing business as their peer review sees fit."

"Next year in the bill that's coming out of the House it's back in. David Skorton has been very vigorous in lobbying for this. Our representatives in Washington have been vigorous on this. I've been, to the extent I can play a role there. And our new vice president for government relations has laid out a plan for lobbying and -- advocating is a better word, for sanity here."

"But we don't know what's going to happen, because unfortunately this aspect of the NSF and all aspects of science research is collateral damage when it comes down to the federal budget negotiation under the environment that we have and I'm sure we'll have this current year. That may be good, that they won't get to anything and it will just be a flat, continuing resolution, which is what I personally expect, but that's just a guess knowing the history."

"But that's the thing. We are striving hard to let the scientists, including the social sciences make the call, and let the NSF. And hopefully we'll prevail, but it's uncertain. And that's an excellent question."

"Any other questions? I think I'm out of --"

Speaker Walcott: "You have time."

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "All right. Basically there's more regs coming."

(LAUGHTER)

"There's an effort under President Obama to reduce the regulatory burden. At least that's what he said. And sometimes what he says is true. This one wasn't. Because what happened was there was a committee in the Office of Management and Budget that built the regulatory burden on research and why you didn't need to do it or did need to do it, they wrote a report, which was great. It left out saying they were really silly. Then the Office of the Inspector generals and the auditors who presided over the OIG said, 'You can't do that, this is our cause.' And so they went back and put in stuff that was terrible. And then all the universities including us lobbied like heck to get back to the status quo. Because that was going to be the best outcome. And no change would be better than what they were going to do."

"And where we ended up was a little bit better and a little bit worse. There's going to be more burden on purchasing with federal funds. You have to demonstrate more that you searched high and low for a lower price. Even though this company is the only one that makes a part that will fit your machine, you have to go out to bid and stuff like that. It's stupid. But, you know, it's America. So deal with it.

(LAUGHTER)

"Overall it's not too bad, but there will be some more regulations. And we unfortunately will have to roll it out to the people who are going to be dealing with it.

"And that is I think enough for today. And I thank you for your attention, and I'll be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Walcott: "You have a question there."

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "Yes, sir."

Professor André Kessler, Evolutionary Biology: "This is just a question of understanding. So the graphs that you showed in the beginning that showed the trends, are they corrected for inflation?"

Senior Vice Provost Buhrman: "Sorry. That's corrected by the national view of what constant dollars are. So that does show an increase. And it's very hard for us -- I mean, I was shocked when it did that. I thought it was going to show -- but, you know, as I say, I think as a human behavior, when things get better, we say, well, that's the way it should be, and when things don't get better, that's terrible.

"In fact, it has gotten better, as far as our ability to mount major research programs. I've been here on the faculty -- I hate to say it -- 41 years, and I would like to see this happening all the time. But actually it does this. But there is a slow up trend. And we do wonderful things here with the federal support and foundations support and other things. And you have to keep that in mind. It's a sweet gig and we should keep pushing, though."

Speaker Walcott: "Thank you so much. I declare that 6:00 has come.

(LAUGHTER)

"There is cheese, I am told, to be sampled. We are adjourned."
(Meeting adjourned.)