

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor and Chair, Department of Science and Technology Studies and
Speaker, Bruce Lewenstein: "I want to remind everybody that there are no photos or recording devices or programs for recording devices or things on your phones that record, et cetera, et cetera. Ask everyone to please turn off or silence your phones, tablets, computer start-up sounds, any other noise-making devices.

"Remind the body that senators have priority in speaking, and only senators or their designated alternates may vote. When it comes time to speak, please come to one of the microphones and identify yourself. As usual, I will ask people to limit themselves to two minutes.

"We have two people who have requested Good and Welfare -- time for Good and Welfare at the end of the meeting, so I will reserve that time.

"We begin with two consent items. The first one is the approval of the [minutes](#) of the previous meeting. Hearing no objection, those will be approved.

"The second one is approval of a proposal for the academic title of [Research](#) Professor by the College of Human Ecology. Been told there's an objection. Professor Brown. Professor Brown is objecting.

"I will allot five minutes for this item, and two minutes to Professor Brown to state what the objection is, two minutes to Professor Dunifon from Human Ecology to respond, and then I will call for a vote on this item. Professor Brown. I should say I will take that time from the last few items on the agenda.

"Professor Brown."

Professor Dan Brown, Department of Animal Science: "That one item that I thought would be worth discussing is there's a language on what type of criteria applied to exceed the percentage limit for non-tenurable faculty, I guess, and it gives detailed and reasonable reasons. The problem is that it doesn't say then who makes the decision.

"Now, I'm assuming that -- it says if the case is made for -- that case is made to the faculty of the College of Human Ecology, and put before them for a vote and this body for ratification for the exception, but it's not written in there. The way it's written, certainly not the current one, but a future administration could claim they will make the call, whether the case has been made. So I think it would be tidied up a bit if it said explicitly who it was that decided that exceeding the limits was justifiable."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you."

Professor Rachel Dunifon, Associate Dean for Research and Outreach in Human Ecology: "Thank you for the comment. So we use the same language for percentage limitation that's in the enabling legislation for this position, so we don't anticipate going above the 10% limit, which is what is in the enabling legislation; but we also included the same language in terms of conditions under which exceeding that limitation could be permitted. So I think we're consistent with what the intent of the original legislation was."

Professor Mike Thonney, Department of Animal Science: "When was the consent item posted on the web site?"

Professor Dunifon: "It was posted on March 9th."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Brown, you want -- come to the microphone, please."

Professor Brown: "There's a number of other versions of this where the language is vague, but I think it really needs to be nailed down, both on this and amending the other ones. Otherwise, we have the criteria and everything; but we still, I think, need to have in the legislation who makes the last call and whether the exceeding the limits are justified or not. It would be really handy."

Professor Dunifon: "So I think in that case, the entire enabling legislation would need to be changed and each college would need to respond to that equally."

Professor Brown: "Each college is allowed to have any type of legislation they want. They do not have to follow the enabling legislation. The CALS one is quite different. It also lacks some clarity here and there; but no, you don't have to follow the enabling legislation by being as vague."

"You can, if you choose, nail it down specifically. And I think would be in the interest of the College of Human Ecology if they did. Otherwise, they might have somebody making the decision 10, 20 years from now they don't want."

Professor Dunifon: "It's just not a requirement currently in the enabling legislation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "So the item's for approval of the senate, we've heard an objection to unanimous consent, we've had a discussion about it. I'm going to ask for a vote on approval of the item, approval of the proposal for the academic title. All in favor of approving, please raise your hands."

"All opposed?"

"I count significantly more votes in favor, and so I declare the item approved."

"The next item on the agenda are faculty matters."

2. REPORT FROM THE ACTING DEAN OF THE FACULTY, MIKE FONTAINE

Acting Dean of the Faculty, Michael Fontaine, Associate Dean of the University Faculty and Professor, Classics Department: "Hi, folks. Just a couple things. One novelty was that we received a [resolution](#) last month directly from the graduate student assembly. This hasn't happened at least in the last few years, and it asked us to consider supervisor/student relationships.

"This is actually something that came before the faculty senate last fall. We discussed it at length, in conjunction with a couple of other restrictions on student relationships with faculty; but because this came to us, I directed it straight to the committee AFPS, the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of Faculty.

"They met, and I conveyed a response last night over to the grad student assembly. There are printed copies just outside. If you didn't get one, please get one on your way out. It will go up on the web site, I think, tomorrow, as soon as we are back in the office. But just in general, it seems like a good thing we could be doing, more resolutions back and forth between different bodies, rather than sending everything to the central administration.

“And in that same context, I read in "The Cornell Sun" the student assembly has passed a resolution to come to us about mandatory diversity training for the faculty, but I haven't received anything, so nothing will be happening on that front until at least this fall.

“The last thing to mention is that we received a number of complaints about professors assigning tests this week and last week. That does go against our own [policy](#). I had a few people reply that because the test was not cumulative, it was considered another preliminary test. The students see that differently. In fact, our own policy sees that differently.

“So if you give an exam in the last week of class, whether it's cumulative or not, you are in fact breaching the policy, and the students have asked us not to do that. Thank you.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. Next on the agenda will be a report on the College of Business, an update from Chris Barrett.”

3. REPORT FROM DEPUTY DEAN ON THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS FROM CHRIS BARRETT

Deputy Dean and Dean of Academic Affairs, Chris Barrett, College of Business and the Stephen B. & Janice G. Ashley Professor of Applied Economics and Management, International Professor of Agriculture, Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management: “Thank you, Bruce. The College of Business has a variety of task forces that were commissioned by the provost just after the board of trustees voted in the end of January to create the college. I list those here in the lower left of this slide.

“Those committees began their deliberations sometime in late January or early February, depending upon the committee. They all completed their reports, sent to the Steering Committee chair, co-chaired by the provost and Dean Dutta, consisting of the deans of Hotel and CALS, as well as a number of vice presidents, deputy provost, myself, et cetera.

“So those reports were all filed earlier this month. You have copies available of the summary two-page reports that came from each of those committees. The full reports, subject to a bit of revision, minor revision by the Steering Committee, should all be released later this month.

“A crucial thing to keep in mind here, there was a great deal of concern, in some case I think appropriate concern, that the initial decision was very much a top-down process. Notice that this has been a fairly radical shift, as promised by the late president and the provost, immediately moved to a much more consultative model.

“We have a count here. Ninety-eight different individuals, formally a part of one or more of the committees, and a significant number of people beyond that; for example, the Faculty Governance Committee that John Siliciano and I co-chaired, consulting on almost entirely a weekly basis with each of the schools' faculties around the faculty governance matters under deliberation.

“So we've switched to a much more consultative model. Thankfully, I think the final products of each of the committees are enormously enhanced by that, not just because of process, but because of content. That participation substantially enhanced the quality of the resulting products.

“The report that I'm to brief you on is around faculty governance. The three schools' delegations, as I reported to you last month, met, talked extensively about their own aspirations and concerns, both, about the College of Business. And from that discussion emerged four central governance principles, of which I highlight continuity of the schools' missions is really central.

“The schools each have distinct missions that will remain at the core of the academic programs there, and continuity of faculty expectations is a second central piece. When we evaluate faculty for tenure, for example, the university's universal criterion is excellence in fulfilling the responsibilities of the position.

“Everybody's committed to excellence. The crucial issue is: what are the responsibilities of the position? And those are adapted to suit the specific missions of specific schools, and one of the greatest concerns the faculties of each of the three schools had was that we not have an inadvertent homogenization of positions; essentially to use the review process for tenure as a way of reconsidering what the positions ought to have been when initially hired.

“And so the guidelines that we have proposed from the Faculty Governance Committee, which the Steering Committee has accepted, go to great length to make sure we enumerate much more meticulously than has been the case to date the means by which we have guided junior faculty, what were expressly the

expectations of the position upon hiring, upon annual reviews, upon first reappointment, et cetera.

“So continuity of faculty expectations was maybe the single most worrisome feature for faculty from each of the three schools, and we've really put that at the centerpiece of the guidelines developed.

“Cohesion of the colleges. Obviously, the central reason for creating the College of Business is that we have fractured groups of faculty across the three schools who share a common scholarly interest, teaching foci, but we don't yet coordinate across them effectively. So achieving that coordination to enhance both the quality of scholarship, so we can create more cohesive scholarly communities, but also to be able to coordinate around teaching much better.

“In the process of going through these various committees, we have uncovered all sorts of examples of unnecessary scheduling conflicts between courses that students in different programs really ought to be taking simultaneously, and yet they can't do it because of the way we've set up the timing and scheduling of courses; things that, in principle we don't need a college to do, but in practice, we don't coordinate until we have some formal coordination mechanism.

“And we're using this as an opportunity to frankly draw on best practices from each of the three schools, to try and up our game across the board, particularly around transparency and fairness of processes in hiring, in annual and biannual reviews and reappointment, promotion, et cetera.

“So the central organizing units of the College of Business as proposed by the faculty governance committee are three, two of which have formal authorities and responsibilities. The schools remain the central apparatus. The schools have deans, the schools are the tenure homes, and the schools remain the repository of each of the degree programs presently offered.

“These aren't being blended into one composite degree offered by the College of Business. They remain distinct in Hotel, Dyson and Johnson. The unifying features of the college are seven cross-cutting, largely discipline-based areas.

“We have accounting faculty in each of the three schools. Those faculty unify under an accounting area that coordinates curriculum across all three schools' programs that creates a unified scholarly group across all three, with a shared

workshop, seminar, whatever is appropriate to the groups. You see the list of the seven there.

“Faculty are right now self-declaring their preferred affiliations with areas. As of mid-morning today, we had about 175 out of the 220 faculty had already declared their preferred area of affiliation. We've asked for those by May 20. By the end of the month, we expect to have area affiliations pinned down and go back to faculty to ask them to self-identify who among the area faculty they would support as the area coordinators, the leader of their area. So that process should be completed next month.

“Finally, less formally, there are themes, multidisciplinary themes that are designed as the features that pull us together to really accentuate the parts of Cornell that the College of Business is meant to help bring out and to help reinforce. So themes like entrepreneurship and innovation, sustainability, hospitality, agri-food industries, et cetera.

“These are the features that are to be self-organizing, declaring what a curriculum would look like for a student who's interested in piecing together entrepreneurial finance, management of teams and start-ups, marketing of new products, pulling across the disciplines, but with a common core program that they're intending to pursue.

“So that's the purpose of these themes. They don't have the same formal governance authorities that schools and areas have, because they're intended to be features that are perhaps more transient, that are designed to respond to student and external demand, but they are nonetheless crucial elements of how we organize.

“I've already mentioned we put together very detailed protocols on hiring, reappointment, promotion, tenure. I think crucial things there are enhancing the engagement of faculty with similar research interests from across campus and making that those assessments of junior faculty performance, for example, available at the beginning to the tenured faculty of the school.

“And as I mentioned, formalizing much more the articulation of the expectations of the positions, so that we can hold tenured faculty to respecting the position responsibilities that we asked faculty to fulfill.

“And finally, we will be constituting, when we reconvene in fall, an elected body, a faculty policy committee intended to provide input and oversight of college policy. So a body of elected faculty who can speak directly to the dean about matters that concern the faculty.

“So with that brief overview, I'm happy to field whatever questions the chair will allow us –”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have about nine or ten minutes for questions.”

Professor Richard Miller, Department of Philosophy: “This is a comment about an anxiety many of us had when the College of Business decision was handed down. Many of us are worried that the Dyson School's major emphases, which have been in development economics, agricultural economics, environmental economics, which have not been in management, are bound to be diluted by the emphasis of an entrepreneurship, of a College of Business. If the faculty of the Dyson School did not share this concern, that would be good enough for me. I use and admire them.

“Faculty of the Dyson School were not consulted, according to an utterly reliable source of mine, on the decisions being handed down. And the process you have described, I understand, has featured such measures as postponing a survey of faculty opinion till after the Steering Committee met.

“Incoming Dean Dutta, in describing what the College of Business is about, says that it is to advertise to the world Cornell's position in business education. When he was asked about diversity in "The Chronicle" interview, his response is: We'll be very careful to be diverse in the industries that we object.

“Your presentation last time, when you got to college cohesion, was essentially to say we hope for cohesion, and then you moved on to the fourth point. Nothing you've said about cohesion today stills those anxieties about the dilution of investigations of economic activity that are not matters of business education and research, are not matters of promoting entrepreneurship, but play a vital role in Cornell, in humane and insightful perspectives on what you are promoting in the decision that has been handed down.”

Deputy Dean Barrett: “Thank you, Dick. So for those who don't know my own background, I came here 18 years ago, precisely because of the features of Cornell that Dick so articulately laid out. I'm an agricultural environmental and

development economist. My research program is in rural Africa and Asia, and the unpleasant reality of my fields is that they don't pay for themselves in universities these days.

“So we have succeeded in the Dyson School in thriving areas of agricultural, environmental and development economics, precisely because a decision was made back in the late 1990s to pursue accreditation as a business school, and we've managed to build a very strong undergraduate business program that, for want of a better term, cross-subsidizes the areas in which I work.

“And if you look at other leading programs against which we compete, they are in decline in size, stature and funding, precisely because agriculture is shrinking. We don't get the same number of farm management and environmental economic students that we used to. And the way that a few of our programs have managed to succeed in reinforcing and maintaining those areas is by making sure we tie ourselves to an economics or a business program.

“There are a couple of different models out there. So those are the models that are working right now. That's what we've pursued in the Dyson School, quite successfully, I think. And I find reassurance, as somebody whose own career is very deeply wedded to these topics, that we are not aiming to become a plain vanilla business school.

“You have heard the provost say any number of times if we become Wharton North, we've failed. That's not the objective. The objective is to create a different kind of business school, one that really draws from and reinforces the things that make Cornell distinctive. We have the world's foremost College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. We have a phenomenal group of scholars working in Environmental Sciences and Sustainability. We have the Ivy League's best engineering school. We have premier architecture and planning that reinforce real estate.

“These are all things that give us strength that other elite business schools don't have. If we try to just win in accounting and finance, we lose. There's no way we can out-Wharton Wharton or out-Harvard Harvard, but we can do the things that they don't do very well, and we can be known as the best there is.

“In a faculty task force we have on mission, vision and core values right now, one of my colleagues, interestingly, a Johnson School tenured faculty member, likes to keep saying that the College of Business will be the business school

known as having an Ivy League brain and a land grant heart, that none of the other top ten programs can make such a claim. That will be the distinctive feature of the Cornell College of Business.

“So I very much share your concern, Dick, and I would have never agreed to take on this position if I feared that it would actually dilute the areas I've dedicated my career to. On the contrary, I think it is the most effective way for us to safeguard them.

Professor Bensel, Government Department: “So this is a good overview, but it's really the process of consultation. It's not the outcome. As you say, the final report isn't available, isn't ready yet. It still raises very important questions on education policy.

“As you say, the care and concern with continuity and disciplinary areas and multidisciplinary themes does recognize the potential impact of the formation of the College of Business on curriculum and on education. And then when you talk about including changes in multidisciplinary programs, that also stresses that impact.

“So what I would urge, and this has been, as you know, a sticking point from the very beginning, since this involves education policy and it's across colleges, it should come back to the faculty senate when there's a final report. Will that happen?”

Deputy Dean Barrett: “So the Steering Committee, co-chaired by the provost and Dean Dutta, received all these committee reports. They have been slightly revised in response to relatively modest suggestions from the Steering Committee and with response to feedback from the faculty and the three schools.

“So for example, the Faculty Governance Committee report was provided in its entirety to the faculties of those three schools. It's not been publicly released yet, but it was very important to get their feedback on that. And at this point, I believe that those are just to be publicly released this month in advance of the board of trustees meetings, where it will also be presented to the trustees.

“I'm sort of above my pay grade to understand the issues of disagreement between the faculty senate and the administration over what falls under the domain of educational policy broadly. When we use the term multidisciplinary,

what we mean is that we cut across the disciplines within the College of Business.

“So for example, economists and finance people and marketing people who share common interests in small and medium enterprises in developing countries; it's not necessarily touching on people -- faculty from outside the college, although we very much want to reinforce the sorts of collaborations that already occur.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you, Chris. I realized there are many more questions, but we have a very full agenda. I forgot to announce that because we started five minutes late, we will continue the meeting until five minutes after 5:00.

“Next on the agenda is the report on a credit hour policy from Marin Clarkberg, Director of Planning and Research.”

4. DISCUSSION ON CREDIT HOUR POLICY WITH MARIN CLARKBERG

Marin Clarkberg, Director of Institutional Research and Planning: “I'm representing this issue to you today in my capacity as the accreditation liaison officer for the university, and that's how this came to my attention. What I want to bring to your attention today is the issue of credit hour, having a credit hour policy and, in particular, the consistency of the credit hour policy for the university.

“The federal government, U.S. Department of Education, has asked all universities to have a consistent credit hour policy. That legislation came out in 2011. I can talk about sort of the regulatory framework, the compliance issues. Again, that's my orientation on this issue.

“There are at least two other ways that we could think about credit hour policy and credit hour consistency as mattering, when is that from the student experience, when students look at courses that are three credits and four credits and don't understand the difference between in terms of workload and expectations. Another issue to consider might be the budget model, because credit hours do enter into the budget model.

“So the university has a policy. The policy is shared on the registrar's web site, and it was circulated with the information for today's meeting. It is a very bare

bones policy, and it complies with the Department of Education policy. And basically it says one credit hour is assigned for meeting 50 minutes per week in a 15-week semester, like we have. Three-credit course would be one that meets for three 50-minute hours, and so forth.

“In a quick look at the -- this is the very bare bones policies. The different colleges, not surprisingly, have different internal policies. A quick look at courses across the university would suggest that they are very different policies. The modal course, for example, in Arts and Sciences is a four-credit course. The modal course that meets for three 50-minute sessions each week in Arts and Sciences is a four-credit course.

“There do appear to be differences. I'm not really in the position to do the internal in-depth look and audit of what is going on in terms of credit hour policies and consistencies, but I'm bringing this to the faculty senate to see if there's interest in the senate taking up that issue. The Educational Policies Committee has discussed it. I am not on that, and I don't know who represents it.

“Do you guys want to say anything about it? Or how do we run this?”

Speaker Lewenstein: “So we'll now open it for discussion, and I'll start by asking someone from EPC to comment.”

Professor Robert Thorne, Department of Physics: “I'm Bob Thorne.”

Professor David Pizarro, Department of Psychology: “We're basically here to say, to let everybody know that the EPC has been discussing this and we want to involve the senate. We're here really just for that information and to facilitate discussion. And if we can answer any questions about how our discussions have been going, then great; but I think the issues have been outlined well, so we should open it up.”

“Professor John Brady, Department of Food Science: “Did you say there was federal legislation about this? And if so, I'm sorry to say I'm very ignorant of this. Could you just say a little about why they have any say in what we do in this regard and what their interest in that is?”

Marin Clarkberg: “Yes. Their letter starts out by saying they give out \$150 billion in federal financial aid.”

(LAUGHTER)

Professor Pizarro: "I would like to follow up on that, because I don't know; will it get cut if we are not consistent? I mean, is there real danger? Has there been precedent it will get cut? Is this something that is pressing for that reason?"

Marin Clarkberg: "I think probably not. So again, I think there are multiple reasons why we would want to have a consistent credit hour policy. I'm representing this as our liaison to Middle States, which is the organization that accredits the university. They are the middle-man here. They have been asked by the federal government to enforce our compliance.

"So where it would come up would be additional work required of us, from our accrediting body. And again, accreditation is also part of this financial aid bit of receiving federal dollars."

Provost Michael Kotlikoff: "I'd just point out the president signs off on the compliance of the university associated with our accreditation by Middle States. So the president is assuring our accrediting body that we are in compliance. And in fact, there is some doubt that we are in compliance."

"Professor Brown: "I have been thinking about this for a while and noticed there is a wide discrepancy in student contact hours and credits. For example, I have nine student contact hours for a four-credit course. There are four-credit courses and other courses on campus that may be just one or two meetings for four credits. And it seems to be all over the board.

"I mean, our students do as much reading, as much preparation, we spend as much time doing consultation of students and so on. There's no difference there per credit. And it never really bothered me, because how the different colleges run their shops is probably none of my business.

"Where it started bothering me was that rather than -- under the new budget model, rather than supporting teaching according to student contact hours, they are requiring student credit hours. So rather than just being aha, I wonder what that was sort of thing between the various colleges and fields, it's become actually a point of concern in terms of the equity of the new budget model.

"Should it be student credit hours, should it be student contact hours, some hybrid -- you are on that committee. I'm glad I'm not. It must be really hard to

figure that stuff out, but I think we are way, way in some places not compliant, and other places we are. And I just have the question that what are we going to do about it.

“Professor Pizarro: “I’m in Arts and Sciences, and we teach courses that meet three hours a week and get four credits, as you can see from the data very nicely; thank you. And I think there’s some ambiguity. One is should we change -- should we all adopt a common policy.

“Another one is, and what I read as some ambiguity in the interpretation of what it means, for instance, the Department of Education says one 50-minute hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction. And so does that mean meeting? I think a lot of people read this as a course that meets three times a week for one hour or 50 minutes is a three-credit course; but in some, for instance, courses, there’s a lot of writing and feedback given from that writing.

“So now, if I meet an hour each week for writing assignment, is that the contact hour that would make my course worth four credits? Or should it be -- I think this is unclear, and do we want -- one of the questions I have is, for Arts and Science, where we don’t seem to have the same standard, do we have reasons to fight for keeping that ambiguity, or should we all -- is it more prudent to adopt something that we all agree on and enforce it across the board?”

Marin Clarkberg: “If I could comment, I think Middle States and even in the legislation is they are not very rigid and mechanical. They do have a rigid and mechanical framework for thinking about it, but we can write a policy that says other things in it.

“For example, some institutions give one credit, where we give four. It’s not called a credit hour. It is a different kind of mechanism. That’s fine, but we need to write it down, articulate it and say that we are looking at it and we assess whether we do an audit, you know, periodically assess that this is applied consistently and fairly across the institution.”

Unidentified Speaker: “And just one other comment, that we should also -- Arts and Sciences, for example, might be out of line in some ways with other departments here, but it may be completely in line in how it assigns credits with Arts and Science colleges across the country. And that is something that seems like might be worth considering as well.”

Professor Cynthia Bowman, Law School: "This is kind of a follow-up on that. I've taught at a number of institutions and never taught at one where you got four credits for three contact hours, three classes a week, if they are all 50-minute classes.

"And so I'm wondering how did this start, and what was the purpose? Because it does seem as though students could then take fewer classes over the course of the semester because of how they add up; to say nothing of the credit that professors get for teaching. And I'm just curious as to why you would defend that policy in Arts and Sciences. That's you, right? You're Arts and Sciences?"

Professor Pizarro: "I'm not -- I'm here to facilitate the discussion, so there might be people here who want to defend, but I guess I'll reiterate that contact hour and meeting time are not the same thing, and so -- what's that?"

"They are not three credit hours in the --

(Comment off mic.)

"So the question is, if you do routinely meet with students one hour every week, giving them feedback on their writing, I guess does that count or not. And should we have language that is stricter."

Professor Michael Fontaine, Classics: "I just want to convey an opinion I have heard -- I don't know if it's true -- in Arts and Sciences, that we will penalize our students applying to graduate school if we give fewer credits for the seminars and things they take at the upper level. I have no idea whether that's true, but I have heard that from people."

Professor Brian Chabot, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "To add a little bit to the complexity of this situation, the curriculum committees in the colleges are the gatekeepers over whatever the college policy is. And in Agriculture and Life Sciences, we have been following the SUNY guidelines for this matter, which I think are pretty much the same as the New York State guidelines. They have more detail than you shared, as you may know, about different kinds of courses and how to allocate credit.

"So a couple of years ago, the curriculum committee in this college decided that the arts accreditation policy was out of compliance, so we stopped accepting for

cross-listing courses that had four credits, where three credits was the calculus. So we have this kind of tyranny or whatever going on within the institution.

“I have another point, and that is that these guidelines do allow for exceptions, so one of the issues we have been wrestling with in the college is by what evidence do we accept exceptions to when a faculty member wants to award more credit than the class meeting time would allow; what evidence do we need to allow that to happen.

Professor Mike Thompson, Material Science: “I would say this is also an issue for the students in terms of fairness, that they perceive it very unfair, the amount of work they put in, and they will receive three credit hours from even a department within the same college, compared to less work and higher credits. And we need to reflect that.

“The other is there are objective data, at least in the engineering colleges, the students in their survey at the end of the semester fill out the number of hours they perceive they spent on the courses, and that could and should be reviewed to reflect how that matches into this number.”

Provost Kotlikoff: “So if I could make a suggestion. This is a matter of educational policy that does affect more than one school, and so I think it's under the purview of the faculty senate, but I do think it's an issue that has existed for a long period of time and there's not a clear mechanism by which we go forward here.

“So the suggestion that I would have would be that we ask to do an audit, and there are exceptions that allow four credits for an extraordinary amount of work, out-of-class meeting, et cetera; but we do an audit and ask for the rationale behind credits given beyond the obvious policy.

“That would give us some scope of the problem, and then allow us to take the next step, which would be to craft a policy that is university-wide and allows us to come into compliance with state and federal law.”

Professor Pizarro: “I just wanted to address quickly, Professor Kotlikoff, I'm not sure that we even need an audit. I understand that would be a lot of information-gathering, but we have a lot of data and, as Arts and Sciences, I already can tell you that we don't comply in -- if by compliance we mean the stricter three credit hours, three hours of class time.

“And so the problem is there, and it's more a matter of just custom for our seminars; for instance, in psychology, we meet for one three-hour session, but we get four credits because we just assume we are giving them a lot of reading and that's just the culture of the way we are doing things. So if the audit would be to find out if there's a problem, there's a problem.”

Provost Kotlikoff: “I agree, but part of the problem is the rationale that I hear for the four credits in many cases is this additional work. And I don't think we want to constrain our courses in a way in which we say everything has to fit into one cookie cutter mold. So that's the only reason I suggest this audit, because I hear so often well, I'm giving four credits because of X or Y.”

Professor Thonney: “I object to more audits. We have plenty of audits at Cornell, more than we need, and this is just going to create more work for more administrators, which we definitely do not need.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: “So I think it would be useful to hear what the plans are for the EPC in terms of how you are thinking about addressing this. And obviously, that may change as you do things, but that would be useful.

“The other thing is, and I wanted to emphasize what I thought I heard Dan Brown saying, which was this issue of credit hours; seems to me that we shouldn't look at it as kind of a technical idea of how do we add up hours. The question is what are we trying to achieve and what are the consequences of choosing one route as opposed to another one.

“What are the underlying standards that we are trying to promote, which I think is in our discussion, but gets kind of lost sometimes when we start to talk about audits and adding numbers. So I wonder if you could talk about that with regard to what the committee wants to do.

“Then my reading of the Department of Education definition is that it is more flexible than what we use here, and so is your committee going to consider that question of whether the flexibility in terms of equivalence of work might be good to add, as opposed to just the question of numbers in relation to class time or whatever?”

Professor Pizarro: “Risa, there's a lot in your question that I think should be addressed. The simple answer is that our first step was to come here and hear

what you all had to say about this, because we're sort of starting from a point of really trying to gather information. That's why this has been so helpful.

"I think the sentiment is, and maybe we can tease two things apart here; one, should there be a policy, whether broadly written or constrained, that applies to the whole college, and then we could worry about enforcement and compliance. But as it is now, there is no such thing that we all can appeal to, as flexible as it might be.

"And so I think that some people on the EPC think that in particular Arts and Sciences and ILR are the odd people out here and that we might just try to adopt a university-wide policy. How flexible that policy is may be just constrained by how flexible Middle States is.

"But there's a second goal which somebody eluded to, which is fairness. And there are a few issues of fairness, not just a budget model and students who feel like they've been sort of cheated, but also there are many cases in which, for instance, our majors have to take a statistics course.

"I don't know if this is the case for statistics, but it could very well be that we say there are five or six courses on campus that would count as statistics. One of them is in a college that gives three credits and one of them is a college that gives four credits.

"And to decide on that basis doesn't seem fair, for a variety of reasons. To the professor, for instance, it might not be fair. If there are reasons for that being four, maybe it would be a disincentive, it's more work, then it would be incentive for the student just to take the four -- so I think it is more than just getting -- the big question is should we all get something that adheres to the guidelines from the government.

"And the second question is what would that look like. And we have good reason to do it, even without those compliance or regulations."

Professor Thorne: "And there are lots of other things besides credit hours that are assigned to courses that affect students' choice and allocation of resources. Median grades in courses have a huge impact on student enrollment and allocation of resources. So this is just one part of a pretty big puzzle, I think."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Time for one last question."

Professor Paul Velleman, ILR: "Since you brought up my course -- I teach the large introductory stat course in ILR. And in fact, it was a three-credit course when I first taught it. We expanded it to a four-credit course and added material to it, so it now covers multiple regression analysis, a variance number of things not covered by some of the three-credit courses that do introductory statistics. So that's a sort of issue to be concerned with.

"I would also question, though, part of what we do is issue degrees, we award degrees, which depend on some number of credits earned. We could just cut everybody's course credit by 25% and require 25% fewer credits to graduate and it wouldn't change anything. So we have to look at the overall scheme."

Professor Pizarro: "I think a good way to proceed is to take your feedback. Please feel free to e-mail one of the members of the EPC committee if you have any more detailed feedback, and we'll go to EPC in the hopes of proposing whether it's an audit or whether it's a --"

Speaker Lewenstein: "One suggestion that's been made is that we ask for a sense of the senate as to whether we should have an audit. Anybody like to call for such a --"

Provost Kotlikoff: "I think the use of the term "audit" is probably problematic.

(LAUGHTER)

"What I was really asking for is a rationale for offering four credits and an evaluation of those rationales."

Professor Pizarro: "I will say right now maybe what we want is to actually talk to the people who are offering four-credit courses, rather than do a blanket thing. I was talking to a member of my department, and he said honestly, I took over this course. It was four credits before. I thought that would be kind of a blank move for me to make it to three credits. So he kept it that way, and he has no rationale. So in some cases, zero rationale."

Speaker Lewenstein: "The question is, is there a sense of the senate -- we should ask, is there a move for a sense of the senate as to whether some systematic data-gathering might be done.

"Moved. Second.

“All those who think that there should be some systematic data-gathering on this issue, raise your hands, please.

“Opposed?”

“Abstain?”

“The sense of the senate is that there should be some systematic data-gathering. There are perhaps a third who either voted no or abstained. Thank you very much.

“Next on the agenda is a discussion of housing, and we'll begin with Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Barb Knuth.”

5. DISCUSSION ON HOUSING WITH VICE PROVOST BARB KNUTH

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Barb Knuth: “Thank you. I'm here to ask for your input and insights with regard to a task that Provost Kotlikoff ask that I undertake, and that is to lead an external review of the west campus house system. The west campus house system has existed about ten years, so seems to be a good time to think about the impact it is having on our campus, on the student community, on the faculty who participate.

“The [document](#) that you had in advance talked about the general charge, draft charge. The process that I've kind of designed for undertaking this, that will include currently information-gathering, talking with faculty and students who are in the program, more as individuals, not as groups or focus groups, anything like that, but doing a lot of document review.

“I intend, over the summer, to invite a small internal committee to help flesh this out. And then with the idea, then an external review team, invited from other schools who have comparable context or have residential learning communities that are strong can come visit the campus in the fall, probably mid to late fall, so that students who are living on west campus at the time have already had some experiences there.

“And then conduct a review and issue a report that would then be used by both the provost's office and student and campus life, who both collaborate in delivering the west campus house system programs.

“So I'm seeking your input on the [charge](#), the general charge that you had, which focuses, again, both on the undergraduate educational experience, as well as the experience of faculty, and any insights you have about the focus of the external review team.

“I have posed a number of draft review questions that might be asked of the review team to address, and I'm looking for your comments. Is this generally on track? Do you have any suggestions about how this can best be focused to be meaningful, to produce meaningful information that can be acted upon in an effective way to direct or influence the future of the west campus house system? So I'll leave it at that and take questions.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have about five minutes. Professor Schaffer.”

Professor Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering Department: “So I guess one thing I think could be valuable here, we have two systems, the north campus system, the west campus system, both of which have the goals of, at least part of their goals of increasing student faculty interactions, but their models are quite different.

“And I'm not saying that you need to expand this to a comprehensive review of north and west campus, but there might be select questions about places where the structure or things like that are notably different between north and west campus, where comparative analysis could be good to identify best practices that could then be used in both things, both places.

“Just given the fact that you're undertaking all of this work now, it seems like at least identifying a few places where also looking at what we are doing on north campus and assessing it, it would just be valuable information. It would be a shame to waste this chance, while you're doing the west campus anyway.”

Vice Provost Knuth: “Thank you.”

Professor N'dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Studies: “Actually, we were all faculty in residence during that time, and I served as faculty in residence on west campus. My first year was the last year first-year undergraduates were allowed to live on west campus. So connecting this to the previous speaker, they are connected; the idea that all first-year students should have the north campus experience before exploring the west campus, so they are interconnected.

“And there was a lot of debate surrounding the whole project. So I'm wondering if in the end there was integrated, in the implementation, the plan for a review at specific point, or it's just ten year, let's do a review?”

Vice Provost Knuth: “That's a good question. Thank you. To my knowledge, there was not a point in time that was identified for review. I think Provost Kotlikoff saw this as an opportunity. The other opportunity that exists, which you'll hear from in just a moment, is that Ryan Lombardi is leading an all-campus master housing plan review.

“And so the question -- for example, it is a big question: Should all first-year students be required to live on north campus or be required to live somewhere on campus. That may be a question that's more relevant to that overall master plan process than necessarily the west campus review.

“Certainly both these efforts will inform one another. This is a bit farther along than this one is and, certainly, the information that's coming out of that master housing plan data-gathering effort will be informative for this, but you're right. As it's designed, it is more confined to asking questions specifically about west campus house system improvement, understanding that there is the desire to see where the synergies are with north campus and what we can learn from north as well.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Time for one short question. Professor Lieberwitz.”

Professor Lieberwitz, ILR: “Just a short question. This will apply for the next discussion as well, but if you are going to create an internal review committee, this would be an opportunity -- and you may have already thought of this, but this would be an opportunity to make sure that the processes of faculty governance are put into place; for example, having the Nominations and Elections Committee from the senate work with you to identify faculty to put on the internal committee.”

Vice Provost Knuth: “Thank you, yeah. It was actually kind of complicated when I first asked for the ability to meet with somebody from the faculty senate. I think there was some deliberation and question about is there even a body in the faculty senate who would have jurisdiction here, so I appreciate that suggestion. That's a nice way to integrate.”

Professor Lieberwitz: "And there might be some standing committee to bring in, but Nominations and Elections Committee could help you. And I think that's also, from way back when we did our faculty governance report, we emphasized that when there are joint committees, that Nominations and Elections Committee should be involved in helping to identify the faculty for that group."

Vice Provost Knuth: "Thank you for that suggestion."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you very much. Now we'll move to a report on the housing master plan, Vice President Ryan Lombardi."

6. CONTINUATION OF HOUSING DISCUSSION BY VICE PRESIDENT RYAN LOMBARDI

Vice President for Student and Campus Life, Ryan Lombardi: "Good afternoon. Thank you for having me. I wanted to spend a few minutes updating you on where we're at with the housing master planning process that ties in nicely to what Dean Knuth was just talking about. We are trying to make sure we look at this holistically, whereas the study she's undertaking is focusing a bit specifically on the faculty relationship and the governance over the west campus house system.

"I am taking a much more broad look at all our residential program across campus. I'm looking at a couple different things here. We are taking a look from a programmatic perspective, but also taking a very hard look from a capital perspective and the actual facilities and where we're at with that.

"It's been quite a while since we've studied this. In fact, my predecessor launched a very similar study just prior to the economic recession that ended up, of course, not being able to go anywhere, because we all know what happened in the economic recession. And so we thought it was a good time to take another look.

"This was made very evident to me when I was being recruited to come to Cornell about eight months ago. My predecessor teed it up. President Garrett and Provost Kotlikoff asked me to take this on very early on. So you see a little bit about what we are hoping to do, which is look very, very broadly at this effort. We do have a working group that's been meeting for a couple of months now that is a broad and inclusive working group. We have faculty from the west campus house system engaged in that conversation, some students, some staff, and this is a group that's kind of moving it along.

“So I'm going to go through the slides pretty quickly here, because I want to get into any opportunities for questions or discussions. I know these were sent out this morning; didn't give you a lot of time, and I apologize for that.

“So we have been collecting a lot of feedback on campus, and some of this had been very informative to me as a fairly newcomer to Cornell. We have been taking tours, looking at facilities, but we have also engaged a whole lot of people on campus. We formed a Community Advisory Committee, as an example, where we have local -- members of the local Ithaca community giving feedback on housing and the impact that it might have on the community and things we need to do there. We're meeting with the Campus Planning Committee, which also has faculty involvement on it. So we're trying to make sure we are engaged very heavily there.

“The Meinig scholars, actually, the first-year students did a great research project for us that we just heard their presentations on a couple of weeks ago, to inform us. I would say the majority of our conversations at this point really have been with students, because that is our primary audience as we look at the residential facilities, but we're going to start to broaden that and you will hear a little bit more about that as I go through.

“And we have been touring campus. And that doesn't just mean walking around campus, which of course I have been doing, trying to get the lay of the land here, but really digging into these facilities and trying to understand the needs. You may or may not know this, but we have a very significant deferred maintenance log all across campus; but certainly within the residential housing stock, that is a very acute issue for us that I have inherited coming in here.

“So part of this conversation is trying to figure out how we create a road map to address that deferred maintenance problem. You will see that we have conducted some surveys, and I'm not going to spend a lot of time on these data, because you have the slides. You can kind of dig through them. I may mention a couple of highlights as we go through.

“We did a survey, a random sample of students that we surveyed. A couple of highlights, I mean, just to summarize, more students want to live on campus. The west campus system, as an example -- and I'll get to this when I get to themes -- is very well-received, but only about a quarter of our sophomore students can live in the newer west campus houses, which those students report a very positive experience. But when just a quarter of them have the

opportunity, that creates some dissonance, as you might imagine, in the community.

“So they would like more -- food does matter in building community on campus, as you might imagine. So again, I'll just zip through these pretty quickly here. Proximity to campus certainly matters, food matters as you see here, in terms of building community. Proximity to campus really does drive satisfaction and contributes significantly to satisfaction.

“Cost, not surprisingly -- bless you -- is a very important dynamic as well. And you just generally see, again, the data that students would appreciate more options on campus, things like the house system, being able to have housing for more of their years on campus.

“For graduate and professional students, we're taking a close look at this too. So the study encompasses undergraduate and graduate and professional students. And we know we're under-serving that population as well.

“In fact, one of the most salient points for me in the data collection of graduate and professional students is that we're really at a competitive disadvantage with our peers from a housing perspective in terms of the options for on-campus housing for those students when they are considering which institution to attend.

“So when you think about you are trying to recruit these great, promising scholars to come and study with you, we don't want to be the disadvantage that hinders your ability to do that. And unfortunately, I think we're playing that role right now.

“The good news is we're working on that, and the Maplewood project will help significantly, but I don't think we'll be able to stop there, and we'll need to keep working very diligently. So proximity and cost, very important drivers for graduate and professional students, especially graduate students, as you might imagine, those who have very long tenures here at Cornell, probably not surprising data; and ability to commute and how that works through, very important.

“So we have been benchmarking as well. And when you see this list, you may have had some reactions to this. It's important for me to note that we are benchmarking a bit more broadly than what we'd consider our academic peers,

because we are trying to find campuses that have perhaps similar contextual problems or challenges that we do in small communities like Ithaca, but also with larger student bodies than many of our peer institutions.

“So that's why you see some of the schools up here, but also schools who have had to navigate the deferred maintenance challenge and who have put a good bit of investment into rehabilitation and renewal, as opposed to just new construction and how they have tackled those issues.

“So some initial themes that I want to share with you about what we're getting, students are reporting very strongly that there's not very much continuity within the housing system. Their words are that they always feel like they have one foot out the door.

“So in other words, a first-year student comes in, lives on north campus. Within just a couple months of their arrival, they already have to start figuring out and making plans for where they're going to live in their second year. You can imagine they're still trying to make friends, trying to get their academic footing, et cetera. That's not necessarily an ideal outcome.

“And that continues each year. They have to think that far ahead. And without the capacity for them to be able to stay planted in one particular community, they always feel like they have one foot out the door. There's not continuity. They do like the variety that we have between our co-ops, our west campus, the gothics, the newer west campus, north campus, the program houses. They do like that variety. As you would imagine, with our students, that's a positive thing they do. Very much provide a lot of positive endorsement of the west campus house system and say that's a good thing. We don't have enough of it, so that's resonating very clearly.

“Equity is an issue for our students. So one thing you may or may not know is we actually have very few different housing rates. So a student who lives in a west campus house, which is a relatively new facility, with high-quality amenities, faculty involved in it, et cetera, pays the same as a student who lives in a building that hasn't been touched in 60 years, may not have central air conditioning, et cetera.

“So we did that to socialize in regards. We didn't want to see a socioeconomic stratification of where our students were living. So I think that was a good reason that we did that, but the students are acutely aware of that equity and the

fact that some are paying more and some are not getting as much bang for their buck, so to speak, in their words.

“And in general, just that students would like more. They wish we had more options for on-campus housing. We are trying to understand how these decisions we make on campus have driven the off-campus market. We hear quite a lot about the prices of the apartments and the houses in Collegetown. They are astronomical, and in some cases the quality is very low.

“And quite frankly, my opinion is the landlords have been able to do that because they don't have a lot of competition. And so if we were to think about what we're able to do on campus, we'd want to understand how that impacts the off-campus market.

“So I zipped through those quickly, because I wanted to have a couple minutes to get some feedback. I hope we do have a few minutes; any thoughts or reactions or advice you would give to me, and I'll get into next steps.

“So we are in this kind of gathering information, continuing focus groups. We are approaching summer, which means you and many of the students are not going to be available, so we're going to kick this off again early in the fall, before wrapping up, but I would welcome comments or suggestions or questions at this point.”

Professor Assie-Lumumba: “Two questions. One is the issue of developmental and educational nature. Putting together all first-year students, as opposed to mixing them with upper classes, it has significant implication in terms of development, interpersonal communication. Without doing a specific study, I could fill it, on-campus. So I hope that some kind of thought will go into it, as you explore the new possibilities.

“The second is, how do we factor in new development? When I came first, long time ago, as a Fulbright, I was staying near Ecology House, which is on north campus. And over the years, student have really galvanized around the idea of environment and sustainability. And I'm wondering if there could be some kind of development in the area of program houses, to capture some of the new development, new features, new areas of interest of the student body.”

Vice President Lombardi: “So on the first part of your question or statement, yes, we are looking at that in north campus and examining whether or not that is the

right principles for us to adopt in that, if we should make any adjustments to that, and having those conversations.

“And then the second -- to address the second piece, the fact we are considering whether or not we need additional growth and what that growth would look like, what types of new development, of course, all this gets overlaid with financial constraints and what that means and how we would do that both with our rehabilitation need and this deferred maintenance issue. But also, if we do want to grow our capacity because we are not serving that -- as many of our students as I would like to serve on campus. So that's absolutely something we are considering. Thank you.”

Professor Bensel: “In your data, did you break out sororities and fraternities for off-campus housing from other students? It strikes me that when you talk about continuity and about community, that's what the fraternities and sororities are offering, so to create something more of that in campus housing is, from my point of view, to improve educational experience -- I'm not real confident that sororities and fraternities are doing it.

“I know people will want to do this anyway, but if they're joining fraternities and sororities because you're searching for this continuity of place and so forth, then we could be competitive.”

Vice President Lombardi: “Yeah, it's interesting, because I do sense this is qualitative, and our data does have some of that information. We haven't gotten to that level of analysis yet. We also have some good demographic information I'm really interested in understanding in terms of where students are choosing to live.

“But some qualitative feedback I've gotten is in some cases, students are choosing to enter into fraternity or sorority not because of broader ideals that are represented there, but because there's a place to live. And I don't think -- I don't have a particular whatever to take up with Greek life, but I would argue that's probably not the right reason for a student to choose whether or not they want to be a member of those organizations, just because there's a bed there. And the strongest advocates for Greek life, I think, would agree with that. So thank you.”

Professor Thorne: “Naive question. What is constraining Cornell from really competing with the private landlords and building out and providing a lot more housing for our undergraduates?”

Vice President: "Money. I mean, I'm eight months in, so I'm trying get a landscape of the budget, but I believe it's really dollars."

"Professor Thorne: "Is this a revenue-producing part of Cornell's --"

"Vice President Lombardi: "It is. It is a cost recovery, anyway. So we are able, if we build something, to usually pay for that, because we charge essentially rent on those rooms. The institution, because of some of the other priorities and decisions it's made, doesn't have a high appetite for debt right now, so even though we could pay on that debt based on the revenues we would gain, overall, institutionally, we are not in a position to take on a lot of debt."

"So that is something we are looking at and something we need to factor in to this financial analysis about how we tackle whether we are making a recommendation at some point to reconsider debt or whether or not we have to think about other creative ways, fund-raising and other ways to try and accommodate this."

"Oh, yes. Thank you. So just again, timeline perspective, so we've done some of this initial analysis. Some are -- when we don't have students and faculty really engaged, we really will dig into the finances of this and try to unpack that a little more."

"In the fall, as soon as you get back, as soon as students get back, we really want to start testing out some of these conversations about what do we do, this north campus question, for example, and having broad, inclusive conversations about what should that look like. The program houses, how do we right-size those, what does that look like."

"Then we are shooting for a mid-fall -- there's no concrete deadline -- mid-fall to package this up, and then create this road map we can follow. I think we'll then have to be disciplined to follow this path of how we want residence life on this campus to look for the next couple of decades."

"So that's where we're at from a timing perspective, and that is it. Thank you so much for your time. I appreciate it."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Next on the agenda is report on Cornell in China from Laura Spitz, Vice Provost for International Affairs."

7. REPORT ON CORNELL IN CHINA FROM LAURA SPITZ, VICE PROVOST FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Vice Provost Spitz: "So thank you for having me today. Professor Fontaine asked me to update you on where we're at, and then I would like others, appreciate any questions or feedback. I just want to emphasize that I'm updating you on what we're calling the Cornell China Center Initiative, but it would be a small C center, not a capital C center, because the precise scope and scale is yet to be determined and will be determined in consultation with the new faculty committee that's been convened, the Steering Committee. And I'll come back to that in just a minute.

"I wanted to contextualize the update with a little bit of background for people who are not aware of how we find ourselves in this position right now. In 2012, then President Skorton produced a white paper, and in that white paper recommended that Cornell consider something less than campuses in multiple cities abroad.

"And following that, there was a series of task force and committee reports and so on, making recommendations that we move forward with such an initiative. And then those recommendations were accepted by our new president initially, when she first got here in September. And since then, we've been moving forward on that initiative. So that's how we find ourselves at this place.

"One more other sort of background piece is that this is donor-supported, but not donor-led. So we actually went to donors and asked them to support the initiative for the first three years so that we could see if this is where we want to be, how we want to be in the world, how we want to do global. And so we have the funding for the first three years, and we're really grateful for that.

"Of course, continued funding and success depends in part on how we define our purpose, and I think I've been hard to pin down on that. And the reason is because I think it's a really terrific thing that at this point our purposes are multiple.

"My observation of others in this space who have been less successful is that they jumped in with sort of a single purpose in mind and found themselves spending a lot of money on activities or programs that were not successful and created a gap between what they thought they could do and what they are doing. And the gap is an expensive gap.

“So we are trying really hard to be as broad in our purposes and our understanding of our purposes as possible, and including as many people on the campus as possible in order to be as successful as possible.

“Broadly speaking, our purposes coalesce around the three stakeholders you'd imagine: Faculty or academic purposes, programmatic purpose, college research engagement, those kinds of purposes, students. So we'd like very much to have a landing place for students. We'd like to increase the numbers of learning opportunities that we can give them abroad, the kind of internships we can give them abroad and so on.

“And then, of course, we have administrative purposes that we could imagine using this office for. So I'm happy to talk more about them, if that would be useful to you, but I wanted to move to the update.

“So the academic mission is front and center, and here's where we are sort of nine months from when the decision was made. First we have a Faculty Steering Committee that's been convened. All colleges and schools are represented on that committee. They were recommended by their deans and others. They are charged with the strategic planning for the center.

“They are also -- I want to say there's two parts to that. There's a strategic planning from the center; that is to say university initiatives or something I'd call multi-college or multidisciplinary initiatives, but also they are the liaisons with their college, to help the colleges also develop planning around the center.

“So in addition to strategic planning, they are also doing the space use plan. So we can't really have a center till we know what we want to do in it, and we need to figure out what the spaces are that we require for our activities. As part of the space use plan will be a where question. We're going to land in Shanghai.

“In fact, we are going to have an office this summer, which I'll tell you about in just a second, but that's like a landing office, from which we'll build out, not necessarily the location of the center itself. So as part of the strategic planning that the Steering Committee will engage in will be a question of also location.

“And I think it could also -- the answer could be more than one location, smaller offices, not one big center; but anyway, that's for the committee to come back with. So that's the faculty piece.

“We have a China advisory board that's been convened in China, made up of alumni and friends of Cornell, very successful in their areas of business and expertise. It's currently made up of seven, but we are adding now to as many as 15. It met in Beijing in April, and it will hopefully meet again this fall in New York with the interim president.

“And the purpose of that advisory board is advice and guidance and expertise in assistance and so on in what is really a complicated regulatory and political environment in China on the ground.

“The third people piece that we have is that we've now hired our first executive, inaugural executive director not of the center, but of the center initiative. So still trying to make that distinction. I'm not sure -- we are hiring on a term, because we don't know yet if the same set of skills would be -- that she'll have the same set of skills that would be required to actually ongoing running of a programmatic center kind of activities, but her expertise is in startup management, reputation management.

“She started the Harvard Center for Harvard. She is a Cornell alum. She genuinely loves Cornell, so we're actually very excited to have her because she was working so close with Harvard for so many years, she really understands the educational mission, the educational piece, but she also is really embedded in the political landscape and the regulatory landscape in China, so we're really glad about her.

“Then the fourth piece of the people pieces are on-campus staff partners. So we have staff in my office who are charged with working with the committee, staff who are charged with working with the new director. We have various central offices involved.

“So as you could imagine, government relations, external relations is involved, because we have to figure out how to work with different government agencies in China. AA&D is involved, admissions is involved. We have student partners trying to figure out what students could use this center for and how we could support them. We have Cornell Abroad as a partner and so on.

“I should have also mentioned we have other sort of unit faculty partners. So for example, the Einaudi Center director has been working with us and thinking about if there's an opportunity for the Einaudi Center's activities to sort of

happen in China. Director of the East Asia Program is the chair of our Faculty Steering Committee.

“So those are the people pieces in place. I'm probably missing something. The next steps is we'll have an office in Shanghai this summer. It will be a temporary space. We are always mindful in this of having what I would describe as an exit strategy. We hope we're going to be successful. We have really lots of good ideas, we have tremendous faculty involvement now, but of course we don't want to take the university down a path that we can't get back from, if we needed to. So it will be a temporary space.

“The faculty strategic planning will begin. We're doing legal and preparatory work. Quite a lot of legal work has been done. And regardless of where we are in our process, we are going to sort of mark our decision to be in China with a physical space by having a sustainability conference in the spring of 2017. There's already a committee formed for that conference.

“We imagine that it will be incredibly multi-disciplinary, so there will be the human elements of sustainability and social sciences and environmental sciences and food security, all the things you'd imagine that we do really well here on campus. So that will be in the spring of 2017.

“So I'm happy to take questions. I probably missed saying something that I should have.”

“Speaker Lewenstein: “We have about five minutes.”

“Professor Miller: “I wanted to ask where Cornell's, I think, very strong presence at Peking University -- Beida, as people call it -- by the China and Asia Pacific Studies Program fits in. I'm not in CAPS, but I'm a big fan from first-hand experience. It's a very rich educational experience for Cornell students to go there, which means they're at the top of this highly ranked university system and, of course, at the political core of China.

“I also see ways in which that strength perhaps could be strengthened even more, and I'm not sure were in the plans. One thing once heard of is to have students from Beida come to Cornell's program. And undergraduates from China had added a lot to my political philosophy courses. I think that would be great enrichment.

"We've sporadically had a presence, Cornell faculty, through a Cornell distinguished scholars lecture series. I found it was a great way of connecting with people in China on issues such as inequality and democracy, and quite rich and free-willing discussions. I'm sure Katz and Stein and Martin did, too, but there's no regular funding.

"So take this as a CAPS fan's enthusiasm. I think Shanghai is wonderful, too, but can we build on the strength we have?"

Vice Provost Spitz: "So thank you for that observation, and then the embedded question about location. I was just visiting the CAPS students when I was in Beijing. It's a tremendous program. So the outgoing CAPS director and incoming CAPS director are both on the Faculty Steering Committee, and I really hope that whatever happens, it's building on that program in Beijing.

"With respect to location, even our director, we hired her, said we're having a center in Shanghai. She said: No, you're not.

"So I feel like there's a building consensus that what we do, we should be doing in Beijing, and that's why we scaled back to just a small office landing in Shanghai.

"So it's an open question. I'm not saying it will be Beijing, but there's definitely a growing sense that that's where we'll end up, especially since we have such strong connections not just to Beida, but to Tsinghua as well. I'm not allowed to do that.

Professor Mingming Wu, Biological and Environmental Engineering Department: "I know there are a lot of little programs that's connected to China that some of -- involved in. I wonder if this program could unite all the little programs, because I think it's very difficult for a small program to have kind of visibility that your program is having, and it might make all these program more useful, if it's centralized at Cornell.

Vice Provost Spitz: "Thank you. So that is one of the -- my explicit hopes is that we would make more visible all of the amazing work we're already doing and find ways to intersect, collaborate, leverage those kinds of things; but in addition, we're really hoping to bring seed money to this initiative so we can give faculty money to figure out what they want to do in this space. But that would also

include, I'm hoping, funding for existing programs that need just a little bit more money to be the size that would be optimal."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Time for one more question."

Professor Emeritus Charles Walcott, the Cornell Association of Professors Emeritus: "I'm puzzled as to what it is you're actually doing. We have outposts in Qatar, we have outposts of a variety of sort in New York City. What order of magnitude -- are we planning a university in China? Is that the idea, or could you give us some sense of the scale that you're thinking about and how it might work?"

Vice Provost Spitz: "Sure. Thank you. So no, it is not a campus. I mean, that's clear from all the recommendations from the different faculty groups that nobody -- the appetite for a campus is very small, even if we thought that was a good idea. The most recent report recommended sort of, as I said, something in between what you would describe as very small and campus outpost kind of situation.

"Where you land in the in between I really feel has to be faculty-driven, so we're asking the Faculty Steering Committee to answer that question for us; but if I was predicting, I think it would be a space that's large enough to enhance already all the really important engagement and work we do with China, and not so big that it creates a new burden on the university.

"It's really meant to make it easier to do what we already do, and make it easier for us to be innovative in that space.

"I don't know if I've really answered it, and I would be happy to continue that conversation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you very much. Last two items, we have two items, our Good and Welfare. Dean of the Faculty Elect Charles Van Loan.

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Charlie Van Loan, Computer Science, Dean of the Faculty-Elect: "This will only take a minute, but I want to thank several people who really made this year possible. So in the dean of faculty office, Andrea Smith and Karen Lucas put together -- helped run the senate, get things set up, staff the committees.

They do an awful lot of behind-the-scenes work, and life as we know it wouldn't exist.

“And then Sam Nelson has been our parliamentarian, and Bruce Lewenstein has been our speaker. And they have done a fantastic, very nice job for the whole year, and we thank you.

“And I especially would like to thank Mike Fontaine. Mike and Joe ran the whole operation for four years, and then Joe had a severe illness starting in the fall, and Mike has just stepped up and done more than anyone could imagine, without very little help. A lot of us volunteered to help, but he stiffed us and pretty much did everything himself. So you have done a fantastic job, Mike, and you should really be proud of what you did, and we are very proud of you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. Professor Miller, I believe you have been designated to raise the issue for -- yeah. Charles Brittain isn't here.”

Professor Miller: “Charles Brittain was one of the three members of the committee that investigated actions of the Cornell University Police Department. He can't make it to this meeting, but it is his strong view and he just asked me to pass it along that the recommendation of a community review board of that committee should be proposed in a motion before the Cornell Senate in the fall. And I'm very glad to be Charles's voice here, because I share that sentiment.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you. There are no motions during Good and Welfare, but this was a notification of something that will be coming up at the end.

“As Charlie van Loan said, this is my last meeting as speaker. I want to first apologize to all the people whose names I have butchered during the last two years, but I also want to thank you all very much for the honor for serving as your speaker. The meeting is adjourned.”