

Minutes of a
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
September 8, 2010

0. CALL TO ORDER

Call to order by Speaker Steve Beer: "Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to welcome you to the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate for the 2010-2011 academic year. I would like to remind the people present here that there will be no photos taken, no tape recording of the proceedings, other than that done by the administration.

"I would like everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phones and ask that anyone who speaks please rise and identify yourself by name and department or other administrative unit.

"At this point, we have no Good and Welfare speakers, so the seven minutes in addition to the proposed agenda will be allocated as needed to other items on the agenda. We will adjourn today at 5:30, which is one half hour earlier than the usual 6:00 adjournment time.

"At this point, I would like to call on associate dean of the faculty and chair of the Nominations and Election Committee to give the Nominations and Election Committee report. Professor Fred Gouldin.

1. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS

Associate Dean and Secretary, Fred Gouldin: "Thanks very much. From the length of this report, the number of names on it, you will know the Nominations and Elections Committee worked very hard over the summer. I would like to thank them all for their extremely hard work.

"So there are one, two, three, four, five, six different committees. The first one is Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty. Jerry Hass of the Business School has agreed to serve another term and he will be chairing the committee. And Carl Hopkins of CALS is joining the committee. On Academic Programs and Policies, Tom Cleland of Arts and Sciences will be chair. Jon Parmenter of Arts and Sciences will serve on the committee. Elliot Shapiro, Arts and Sciences. And finally, Qi Wang of CHE.

“Thanks. Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education, Brad Bell of ILR; Paul Bowser of that, and Andrea Simitch of Architecture and Planning.

“Thank you. The Financial Policies Committee, Joe Burns in Engineering, Tom DiCiccio of ILR, and Amy McCune of CALS. Moving on to the Library Board, Mark Conostas, Chris Earls, Rebecca Harris-Warrick, John Hermanson and Nerissa Russell.

“On North Campus and Collegetown, Sandra Greene, Anthony Hay; my colleague in Mechanical Engineering, Michel Louge and Jack Muckstadt. So that completes the report. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, associate dean, for this report, which the senate receives. I would like to now call on Dean Fry to present the report of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.”

2. REPORT FROM CAPP COMMITTEE

Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: “I am obviously not Tom Cleland. He is the new chair of Academic Programs and Policies, but I would like to say this committee has made an action already this year. They have approved the change of a field from Textiles to Fiber Science and Apparel Design. My purpose today was just to report that approval.”

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 2010 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Beer: “I would like to now call on you, senators, to approve the minutes of the University Faculty Senate meeting of May 12, 2010. Are there any objections? Hearing none, I presume that the minutes are approved as distributed.

“We will now call on Professor Steve Morgan and his co-chair -- I trust you can tell us -- for a resolution concerning Cornell Childcare Center.”

4. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CORNELL CHILD CARE CENTER - REPORT

Professor Marinella Casasola, Department of Human Development, CHE.

“Thank you. I want to acknowledge my committee members, Steve Morgan, the

co-chair from the Department of Sociology; Kim Weeden, also from Sociology and part of the CU Advance Team; Rachel E. Donovan, associate professor, Department of Policy Analysis and Management, who deals with childcare issues and policy; Peter Enns, Department of Government, who couldn't be here; Jennifer Thaler, Entomology; and myself, Department of Human Development. I have one of the infant labs on campus. And Steve Hamilton, also Department of Human Development.

So we have three of the committee members who have currently or have children at the center as well, and I want to begin by thanking Human Resources and Mary Opperman for their help in gathering information and also acknowledging the hard work it took to put a childcare center on campus.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Dean of the Faculty appointed an ad hoc committee to analyze the challenges facing the Cornell Child Care Center, as set forth in the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on March 10, 2010,

WHEREAS a detailed report was prepared by the appointed ad hoc committee, shared in draft form with the University Faculty Committee on August 4, 2010, and then submitted in final form to the Dean of the Faculty on August 31, 2010,

WHEREAS a redacted version of the submitted report, omitting some confidential information, has been distributed to the Faculty Senate,

WHEREAS the report details management problems with the Cornell Child Care Center, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the President implement the primary recommendations of the ad hoc committee, which are to

- *Give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract for service in August of 2011,*
- *Develop and release a new Request for Providers by January 1, 2011,*
- *Improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management costs and introducing a sliding scale for tuition,*
- *Appoint a seven-member Advisory Board, chaired by a senior administrator, and consisting of four faculty (two with expertise in child development and two with*

- expertise in management) as well as three representatives of non-academic units of the university, and*
- *Enhance the University's capacity to use the center for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff by increasing the quality of the center and by giving the Provost control over the allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the President indicate by November 1, 2010, through a letter to the University Faculty Committee, whether he will implement these recommendations.

"We have here the resolution. The first three points, the whereases are simply a summary of what led us to form the committee. What I would like to do is read point by point the resolutions. Be it resolved the Faculty Senate recommends that the president implement the primary recommendations of the ad hoc committee, which are: Improve the quality of care in budget-neutral manner, by reducing the management costs and introducing a sliding scale for tuition.

"Second, give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that Cornell intends to terminate its contract for service in August of 2011; develop and release a new request for providers by January 1, 2011; appoint a seven-member advisory board, chaired by a senior administrator, consisting of four faculty, two with expertise in child development and two with expertise in management, as well as three representatives of non-academic units of the university.

"Finally, enhance the university's capacity to use the center for recruitment of faculty and staff by increasing the quality of the center and giving the provost control over the allocation of a small fraction of the slots at the center. Be it further resolved the Faculty Senate requests the president indicate by November 1st, 2010, through a letter to the University Faculty Committee, whether he will implement these recommendations."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. The resolution is now before us, and perhaps there are questions of fact before we debate the resolution, which eventually will be voted upon. Any questions of information at this point? "If not, then we'll entertain debate. First we'll hear from a speaker in favor of the several resolutions. Any speaker wish to speak in favor of these several resolutions?"

"Yes. Would you please wait for the microphone."

Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology and Genetics, CALS: "I have a colleague and also a neighbor, two separate couples, who have had kids at the childcare center; and they made a point to seek me out and to encourage support of this resolution. So these are parents who withdrew their children from the center because of very serious concerns that they had, so I'm in support of it." Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Is there a senator or member of the faculty who wishes to speak in opposition of the several resolutions? Gentleman in the far corner."

Professor Dan Magaziner, History Department, A&S. "Hi, I am Dan Magaziner, from the History Department, and I would speak in opposition to the resolution. I find myself somewhat surprised to do so. I was involved in some of the original efforts to provide additional faculty oversight over the center. My daughter is there. She has been there over a year; but in the last many months, it has been my impression and experience that Bright Horizon has improved the way they do things there. The teachers are better trained; the staff, in general, at the place are happier. It is a better-run operation.

"I have no love for Bright Horizons. I am not in love with the idea we outsource our childcare to this massive corporate entity; but at the end of the day, my daughter is extremely happy there and she's extremely happy with her teachers, and I would urge my senators and senators in general to vote against the resolution, unless we have some -- A, I would like to know what would happen to the teachers and if there is perhaps some way to vote for more oversight perhaps, but not actually to the step of giving notice to Bright Horizons that we will be terminating the contract. It seems to me they should be allowed to continue the progress and good work that I think they are doing."

Speaker Beer: "Just a point of clarification; the resolutions that are presented to the senate are not subject to amendment on the floor. We will vote on the resolution after some time. The only possibility for alteration of the resolution is to refer it back to the committee who brought the resolution, and then it could be further considered at a future meeting.

"So now, is there a person who wishes to speak in favor? The lady in the front. And please wait for the microphone -- in the first row."

Professor Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology. "Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology and member of CU Advance and also a member of this committee. I just wanted to address some of the issues the gentleman in the rear raised, which

I think are actually very much consistent in some sense with what we outlined in the report.

“We do have data from parents that show that there has been a slight improvement in the parents who are remaining at the center's view. When you dig further into the data, there's a number of problems becoming quite clear and led us to this recommendation. Teacher turnover has been a major issue at the center throughout, and it is actually getting worse. It's gotten higher in the last six months than it was in the prior twelve months and before that, so there's no indication that Bright Horizons has been able to turn around in terms of teacher turnover.

“Another area we have objective data is in the number of records of licensing violations registered against the center. Those have actually not declined at all; so much so there are actually five additional violations we didn't know about when we submitted the report three weeks ago to the UFC. The Bright Horizons accrued 61 licensing violations in a period of two years, whereas comparable centers of roughly the same size in Ithaca are more in the order of ten to twelve over that same period. So there doesn't seem to be a decline in the licensing violations.

“I think the third fact that led us to this recommendation is that there's been an increase, substantial increase in the investment Cornell has put into the center in response to problems that have been raised, and it is our view of the committee -- we unfortunately can't release the confidential information about how much money we are talking about, but it is our view this is simply not a sustainable improvement, unless there's a major, major shift in the budget model and a major increase in the amount of resources Cornell is willing to put into making Bright Horizons work. So that's what led us to this recommendation.

“We do, however, acknowledge that Bright Horizons and, in particular, I think Human Resources has been trying to respond; but our view is that although it may be better than it was before, it's still not up to the standards of care that Cornell faculty, staff and graduate students deserve for their children. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Speaker in opposition to the several resolutions? The gentleman rising.”

Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE. “I am not speaking in opposition -- but I would like to ask two questions. First question: If

you give notice to Bright Horizons Family Solutions that you are going to terminate the contract, is it correct that there's nothing that restricts them from applying for the new contract under the new rules?

Professor Casasola: "Yes."

Professor Burkhauser: "So that's one answer to the point made before. The second one is - I'm mystified by this sentence: "Improve the quality of care in a budget-neutral manner by reducing the management cost and introducing a sliding scale for tuition." What does it mean? Does it really imply you are looking for a budget-neutral solution in the sense that the consumers of this product will pay the full cost, or are you saying that you want to hold the share of the subsidy provided by Cornell to this enterprise constant, but somehow shift the way that consumers share the subsidy? If so, how exactly would that work?"

Speaker Beer: "Refer that question to the co-chair of the committee."

Professor Casasola: "So more the latter. If we reduce the amount that we currently pay in management fees, we can, with just a, as you will see in the report, a modest, very modest tuition increase for only the upper portion of the families at the center would then defray whatever costs. So that is what we meant by a budget-neutral manner. Does that make sense?"

Speaker Beer: "Okay. Is there a person who wishes to speak in favor? Okay, would you like to speak in favor? Yes."

Professor John Hausknecht, Human Resources Studies, ILR. "I want to thank the committee for all their hard work. I am a former parent of a 2-year-old at the center until last year. It was really the teacher turnover that pulled us out of there, and we saw no -- I guess hope would be the right word, for things to improve to the point where we'd want to continue him in care.

"So the points that have been raised here I think go a long way to improving the conditions, maybe in the future, down the road for other children; but it was sort of a disappointment, I think, as a new faculty member and new parent to go through the growing pains the center had."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. A speaker in opposition? The gentleman in the rear."

Professor Glenn Altschuler, American Studies and Dean, University Relations. "I have two strikes against me. I do not have any children and I'm a vice president

at Cornell as well, and I'm not really here to address the substantive matters here; and I, too, commend the committee for the hard work that it did.

"I would just make two observations: One, whatever this body does, it's very important that we make sure that this childcare center addresses the needs of everyone on this campus, and that means staff who have children, as well as faculty who have children, and there not be an academic-nonacademic divide here. That's an important goal, and I hope everyone in this body will share it. "To that end, if I may, I would like to make an observation about at least one of the resolutions. As a person who works closely with the provost, I would say it's something akin to madness to ask that the provost be the person responsible for any number of slots in this. Do you really want the provost to be spending his time deciding whether Johnny Smith's daughter is more appropriate than Susie Jones' daughter?"

"Surely, there are better ways to address this than to have administrators scrambling to be in the childcare business and to micromanage at that level. My own advice is that whatever this body does, micromanaging a childcare center is probably not the best way for this body to be spending its time. Thank you."
 Speaker Beer: "Is there a point of information from the committee on this issue?"
 Professor Casasola: "Please note that the request is that the spots be reserved for both faculty and staff, not simply faculty. So there was no bias towards faculty in that resolution. Also, another point of clarification."

Speaker Beer: "We have another statement from the committee member."
 Professor Kim Weeden, Department of Sociology, A&S: "Just a point of clarification, it's -- as the report outlines, it's a madness that virtually all of our peers engage in already. So we did a lot of investigating of what our peer and competitor institutions are doing for faculty recruitment. The proposal we came up with is actually on the modest side, relative to what our peers are doing. "Stanford, I believe, has four childcare centers; one is reserved exclusively for faculty. Brown University reserves all its spots in infant care for faculty, I believe. And the majority of our peer institutions already reserve some fraction of the slots in their childcare arrangement -- maybe not as many as Stanford and Brown -- for the express purposes of using them to recruit faculty."

"Of course, the justification for this, I think is quite obvious, we are reaching a period in which there's going to be enormous hiring -- at least we are told -- the demography of the faculty is changing. There are more young people, more

dual-career people, and more women. Childcare is not exclusively a women's issue, but it seems to be tilted that way.

“The point of clarification I would like to make, it isn't madness in the sense all the other institutions are doing this as well. So what we came up with is a proposal that will represent a small fraction of slots, less than 10%, 8% of the slots. Right at the moment, the center is undersubscribed, so there is almost universal care for people who want it, because there aren't many people that want it right at the moment because of quality issues at the center. So I should say it's a very small fraction of slots and it is also relatively small, compared to what our peers are already doing. Thank you.”

Professor Steve Morgan, Department of Sociology, A&S: “Steve Morgan, just clarifying as well. Co-chair of the committee, but – co-chair and also serves on the University Assemblies Committee for Childcare Services. I would like to say, we brought this recommendation to the University Assemblies Committee, which includes about a dozen non-faculty representatives and asked whether they thought reserving this very small number of slots would in any way pose a problem for the University Assembly Committee, which represents the full university community. And as stated in the report, they strongly backed the proposal and wanted us to say in the proposal they had backed the idea of such a system before the childcare center was itself created.

“So we don't, as a committee, view this to be the least bit controversial from the perspective of what the University Assembly has said. So I refer you to what's in the report. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. We will now hear from someone in opposition to the resolutions. The woman on the aisle.”

Professor Tracy McNulty, Romance Studies, A&S. “I feel awkward speaking against the resolution. I am in favor of about 95% of what's in here. I would support most of them. The committee has done an amazing job of researching and exposing some serious problems at the center. I have been in contact with them quite a bit in recent months. I should say I'm also a member of the Quarterly Business Review Committee, which was constituted following the work of this committee last spring and includes representatives from Cornell, from Human Resources, representatives from the Bright Horizons administration and four parent representatives, of which I am one. It is really because of the

work that you have done that a lot of changes are beginning to be initiated there at the center.

"I feel a little like Dan Magaziner that spoke up first. My son has been at the center for a year and a half; is actually very happy there. Although I remain critical of certain important aspects of the administration, I worry what would happen to all the kids who are at the center now and all the teachers working there, if we were to terminate this contract with Bright Horizons now.

"I mean, first of all, there would be a lame duck period between January and when they would actually complete the running of the center, which I imagine the most hireable employees would begin looking for work elsewhere. I would have to assume they would be, in a certain sense, black listed by a new administration that would take over the center; so this would result in an additional loss of continuity of care for the kids there.

"So I'm not a huge fan of Bright Horizons. I think it is sort of a toxic corporation in certain ways, but I have seen the administration really willing to make substantive change and interested in soliciting parents' involvement.

"Finally, the last point I would like to say, I think we could be doing more to address the role of Cornell Human Resources in this oversight committee, because I have not at all been impressed by the two representatives of Human Resources who are involved in this committee. I don't think they act like employers who are paying for a service. I don't think they are pushing Bright Horizons to do as much as they could, so I think we could also be asking more on the Cornell side on the way of oversight. I will stop there."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. A speaker in favor of the resolutions. The woman in the first aisle, in the pink."

Professor Rachel Dunifon, Policy Analysis and Management, CHE. "Just to address those points, I think first of all, Bright Horizons, if there was a new request for providers, Bright Horizons could apply; so the goal would be to set the standards -- unlike what happened last time, set the standard at a level to create a childcare center we all would be proud of. And if Bright Horizons wanted to apply to run that center, they could do so; nothing to preclude them from trying to do that.

"And I think -- that was the main -- the main point sort of motivating all this is currently the center is a huge missed opportunity. It is a beautiful building out

there on campus that unfortunately not so many people want to be a part of right now. Just trying to work to make that different."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Point of information; we'll have five minutes more for debate and we'll come to the vote. The gentleman on the -- my left side."

Professor Kevin Attell, English Department, A&S: My daughter goes to the center. She has been there since the beginning, basically, so I've sort of seen the progress from the opening to the current situation. I admire the work the committee has done. I was a signatory to the original proposal to form the committee, so I have long been aware of serious problems at the center and have long been interested in addressing them; but I also urge the senate to vote against the resolution, primarily because of the idea of terminating the contract at this point, without any sort of indication in the proposal, at least, that there has been consideration of what that would mean to the kids who are currently at the center.

"As Tracy said, there's a sort of long lame duck period in which everyone there knows that their job is maybe not going to be there anymore. And nobody knows -- and the Bright Horizons administration, we don't know what that would entail on their part, so that's a sort of troubling possibility for those of us who still have our children there.

"To speak in favor of Bright Horizons -- and I, too, am not a huge fan; not a booster of Bright Horizons -- they have made improvements, and I think that does need to be acknowledged. Significant improvements. More improvements can be made. We could have gone elsewhere. And I see three or any of the other local places we had spots, and we chose not to. This is just to say that not everybody who has remained at Bright Horizons has done so because they could not go anywhere else.

"I don't think -- beyond what I just said, I think termination of the contract, without really thinking through what that would mean to the kids and the teachers who are currently there, and there's no indication in the report -- I agree with much of what's in the report. I disagree with parts of the report. I also have knowledge of, but have a different experience of -- the issue of violations I think is debatable, how serious the number of violations is.

"Anyway, I think I said my piece, and I think voting now to simply terminate the contract is precipitate and troubling to those of us that have kids there now."

Speaker Beer: "Perhaps a member of the committee could address that point."

Professor Casasola: "One thing I want to point out is some of the short-term improvements are because Cornell has invested a significant amount in allotting more teachers. These, given the current budget, are not sustainable, so some of these improvements may not be long-lasting. Teacher turnover continues to be an issue.

"The idea was -- there was a lot of consideration. The idea of any change to a child's life is very anxiety-producing to any parent, and so it was troubling to us that the contract raised the possibility that the teachers would not be able to continue; however -- can I say this? Or no. Okay. I'll stop there, but yeah.

Professor Morgan: "The nature of the mandate or what information we can share with the senate is a bit more constrained than we would like it to be, so the longer version of the report contains a great deal more discussion of this transition period, how the teachers might well be able to -- we have specific recommendations there, but we can't lay that out in the full public report, because we have been asked not to lay out particular features of the contract.

"So I understand we are all extremely concerned. We have talked a lot about how current families at the center would have been affected by the termination by next August by resolution, but I ask you to trust we think we have a way for getting to a resolution that you would be happy with. We can't really say --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Long-term positive outcome for the families and children and teachers, because I think, ultimately, all the parents expressed high satisfaction with their teachers. And our goal is to ensure the teachers are sufficiently supported so they don't continue to leave."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "We believe there's a mechanism for keeping teachers at the center."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. The period for debate on the committee's resolution has come to an end, and so are you ready for the question?"

"Okay. All those in favor of the resolution, as illustrated by Mr. Greene, please rise.

"Those in favor may sit. Those opposed, please stand.

"Only those senators may vote. I assume that those in favor who rose before are all senators. Is that correct?"

“Okay, those who are in opposition, please be seated. Any senators abstaining, please rise.

Vote: 51 Yes ; 8 No; 5 Abstain

“The resolutions clearly pass, so we will move on to the next issue on the agenda, which is Professor Carl Franck, for a discussion on academic integrity and admissions.”

5. DISCUSSION CONCERNING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ADMISSIONS

Professor Carl Franck, Physics Department, A&S. “Thank you. I would like to talk to you about the efforts of my colleagues, Terry Cool, Ephraim Garcia, Linda Nicholson. We sponsors wish to bring to your attention a revised resolution you see before you. This resolution seeks to increase academic integrity awareness among Cornell undergraduates.

“We are currently planning to vote on it at next month's senate meeting. Our concern is while the vast majority of undergraduates are honest, cheating at Cornell saps our academic strength, dissipates faculty and graduate student teaching assistant time and energy that could be more productively and enjoyably spent in research and teaching; and most importantly, lowers our regard for students.

“We reflect at a happier time at Cornell when exams were not so tightly proctored as now and we didn't have to work so hard to suppress cheating that is Internet-enabled.

“I am saying this, having been involved in many academic integrity cases in my department. I can only imagine the experience of students and faculty that serve on the academic integrity hearing boards that routinely deal with many saddening cases. This is not to mention all the effort other groups, such as our advising deans, put into these matters.

“So our weakened academic integrity culture is the problem. Our small step toward a solution of changing students' attitudes is to diminish the willingness of students to cheat in the first place by increasing awareness of the Cornell Academic Integrity Code.

“In summary, the code says a Cornell student must not misrepresent the work of others as their own. The code goes on to detail the mechanisms by which faculty and students deal with code violations. We are concerned that for many students, real attention to code comes far too late, upon being charged with a violation.

“Our goal is to change a sense of academic integrity to strongly support the majority of students whose honesty we depend on. Also it would be even worse off than we are today. In the pursuit of a means of increasing academic integrity awareness, we had the good fortune of corroborating with the university-wide Committee of Admissions Deans that advises the associate provost for admissions and enrollment, Doris Davis.

“On the same day as our last senate meeting, this committee met with associate provost Davis and considered the resolution we placed on the senate agenda for a meeting that afternoon. We proposed a question be added to all Cornell undergraduate applications as to whether the applicant would agree to abide by the code if they were admitted and entered Cornell.

“The dean's advisory committee promptly responded with their conclusion by mid-day. While they appreciated our efforts, they felt the appropriate place for such a question was not in the Cornell application, but rather in the next step of the matriculation process for a student who was accepted to Cornell; this response to what we call the case for Cornell.

“This is a stage where a student is asked if they accepted Cornell's offer of admissions. The admissions dean's committee was to pose the question of abiding by the code as a part of the acceptance to Cornell's offer process. Those of us who were at our last meeting may recall that we sponsors hardly withdrew our original proposal in favor of the admission dean's advisory committee plan. “In the ensuing senate discussion, the concern was raised that while the proposal had merit, it was flawed in the sense that it posed a phony question; namely, we were asking a question for which there could only be one answer, whether or not a student would abide by the code. The same concern was raised in discussion in my department.

“Going back to our last senate meeting, we followed Stephen Pope's suggestion for a solution of this concern. In a case for Cornell's stage of the matriculation process, in order to accept Cornell's offer, a student must affirm they will abide by the academic integrity code. One is not asking a question, but rather Cornell

is requiring an affirmation of their acceptance of the code as a condition for entering Cornell.

“We feel this is the properly respectful position to take toward our potential students and appreciate the improvement over our original resolution. Here therefore, we have our current draft of the resolution that you see before you. “It is a resolution to include an agreement to abide by the academic integrity code as requirement for matriculation to Cornell's undergraduate degree programs, whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell's proud of its academic integrity, but continues to suffer significantly from the violations of the code; therefore, in an effort to increase awareness of the code and better establish it as a part of the Cornell identity, the senate resolves, following consultation with advisory committee of the associate provost of admissions and enrollment, that acceptance of the code should be a requirement for matriculation into Cornell's various undergraduate degree programs.

“Specifically a student's affirmation of acceptance of Cornell's offer of admission should include language stating the student will abide by the code. Recently, in the runup to today's meeting, we sought to get a current reading of the Associate Provost Davis's position on our initiative. She explained while she regarded this as an important matter, since she was leaving Cornell shortly, she appointed Vice Provost Barbara Knuth and Director of Admissions Jason Locke to look after the issue.

“Vice Provost Knuth graciously responded today in time for our meeting as follows. Note she only had a week to consider our revised resolution. We first asked her for information about how other universities treat this matter. She went on to say, “You may also be aware many efforts are underway regarding student knowledge of and adherence to Cornell's academic integrity values. If you are interested in learning more about these efforts and have not consulted with Barbara Grumlar, I suggest you do so. She is a knowledgeable and valuable resource.

“If the faculty senate suggests requiring acceptance of the code is a matriculation requirement, many details will need to be worked out. These include such questions as how and when to communicate about the code with accepted students, how and when during the acceptance process they are required they certify they will adhere to the code, whether electronic or paper communications should be used; who would be responsible for ensuring each matriculated student has so certified. If a student signs a paper or online form, does it become

part of the student's permanent record and how and where does the form reside?
What is the role of the college admissions office versus central admissions?
Other questions would likely arise in the implementation process."

"She says, "As you develop this idea further with your senate colleagues, it may be useful to discuss the feasibility of various proposals, the likely effect of student knowledge and understanding of and compliance with the code, relationship to other code initiatives and efforts underway for matriculated students, et cetera, with those who have expertise in this area, including central administration and college admissions, directors, associate deans and college advising staff. Thanks again for your efforts. Barb."

"In response to Vice Provost Knuth, I feel the resolution is properly vague on the matter of implementation. Rather, what we are calling for is a matter of principle. We should expect no less of our students than to abide by our academic integrity code.

"We look forward to your latest thoughts about the resolution, including any feedback you may receive from your departments. We strongly urge you to support it when it comes up for vote next month, since we feel while it might be a small step toward improvement of academic integrity culture, we believe it would be a vital one. Thank you."

Speaker Beer: Just to clarify, the resolution is -- a formal resolution may be presented for consideration at a future senate meeting; but if there are any questions at this point, perhaps they could be posed to Professor Franck at this time. Any questions?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: "As my colleague, Professor Franck, surely knows, I'm no stranger to this particular issue and believe that the lack of academic integrity severely degrades this institution and that our enforcement of it is severely lacking.

"Having said that, I walked into this room about ten minutes late. And the reason I was ten minutes late is I was making a bid on Priceline for a hotel in New York City. And I got a little mixed up and it took a little longer than I thought it would, but the last step in that process was to say please initial here if you have read Priceline's policies and you agree to them.

“And well, I must be truthful; I had not read Priceline's policy, but I had no hesitation in initialing and clicking it and coming out the door. I think this is a common experience that people of my generation don't have as much experience with as people, incoming students, but they do that all the time.

“I just seriously ask you whether you have any reason to believe that students will take this compulsory -- it's the same thing, right? If I didn't initial that, I couldn't make my bid on Priceline, so I initialed it. Now, I perhaps demonstrate my lack of Priceline integrity, but there you have it; but I just wonder whether or not you have any reason to believe that students doing this would take that any more seriously than I took initialing my -- putting my initials on that Priceline bid.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you care to respond briefly?”

Professor Franck: “We had a major slew of academic integrity violations in one of our service courses, and it is just a sad experience to alert students to the nature of the code when their careers -- academic careers are in jeopardy. It is a bow shot, it's a symbol. That's what we are trying to do here.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on to the next issue. Thank you very much, Professor Franck. The next issue is a resolution by Professor Lawless.”

6. RESOLUTION CONCERNING TIMELY RESPONSE TO FACULTY RESOLUTIONS

Professor Harry Lawless, Food Science, CALS: “Thank you. Do we have a slide of it? A brief bit of history; it was William Lesser from AEM who originally penned the first vision of this, which was a little simpler and passed by the CALS Faculty Senate last spring. We introduced another version of it to the faculty senate, which was discussed and tabled. The tabling had to do with the feeling that the scope of it was overreaching, that it was too broad and there might be sensitive or personal or tenured decisions that might not be the kind of thing that the university should be expected to respond to publicly.

“And so we've added a rider at the bottom -- and I'll try to get my shadow out of the way -- by virtue of a footnote that tries to address that issue, saying the faculty realizes some committee decisions may involve personal or sensitive information, such as tenure decisions, and thus are exceptions to this expectation for a public response and disclosure.

“The other amendment we find over the previous version, Dean Fry communicated to me the administration would prefer 45 days to respond rather than 30; and seeing no objection to that and envisioning there might be complicated circumstances that would require careful deliberation in their response, I agreed to make that amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, we have the opportunity for a short debate. Anyone wish to speak in opposition to the resolution offered on the screen? Anyone wish to speak in favor of the resolution? The lady near the front, in the third aisle.”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government, A&S: “Wanted to speak in opposition. If the administration found 30 days too constraining -- this seemed like to me a reasonable amount of time and it's been used in other circumstances -- but if they found that too constraining, they could bring up the circumstances and request a delay that has gone on in the university's negotiations with the City of Ithaca, for example. They have done things like that. I just don't see any reason to stretch it out. 30 days seems reasonable to me, so I would oppose the amendment.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Is there a speaker in favor of the resolution? Seeing none, are you ready for the question?”

“Okay, all those in favor of the resolution as presented on the screen, which indicates 45-day reporting period from the administration, please indicate by raising your right hand or arm.

“All those senators opposed, please raise your right hand, right arm.

“All senators abstaining from the vote, please raise your right arm. Okay, the resolution clearly carries.

Vote: 52 yes; 3 no; 5 abstain.

Thank you. The next item on our agenda is a report from the University Faculty Committee.”

7. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department: “Part of this will be very brief and part will be a little longer. We have spent the last few months, from spring to the present moment, in the first place discussing, acting in our advisory capacity to

the childcare center debate. That debate's been resolved. I think everybody's been fully informed about what that's about, but the other item is still open. "We have been discussing -- in 2009, the graduate student -- or student, graduate and undergraduate student support for childcare was reduced in September 2009, without notice to the students really. They found themselves with what had been an average grant of \$2,700, some going up to \$5,000 cap, which is the faculty staff cap, reduced to what is now a flat rate of \$1,700 for childcare. "That's a taxable -- always a taxable amount for the graduate students, where it is not for faculty and staff; so we approached the provost about restoring to those students who had come to Cornell with the expectation of a certain amount, had been promised that amount, restoring that amount to them, to that specific group.

"I will read you, then -- it won't take long -- an e-mail we sent to the provost, and it sums up the state of affairs. "Dear Kent, as we discussed at the UFC meeting with you Tuesday, March 23rd, 2010, the UFC urges you to restore to its 2008-'09 levels the student childcare stipend for the students with children who were then enrolled at Cornell.

"As the student letter of concern of October 16, 2009, sent to President Skorton by students with children and other Cornell community members notes, quote, many students with children took the childcare grant into account when applying to or accepting an offer from Cornell, and many chose Cornell over other equally reputable universities. These students are disappointed not to have had prior indication that the grant might be altered," end of quote. "The finish to our e-mail or the relevant part is, "In light of the precipitous reduction in the grant, as well as what appears to have been a level of support promised to students who entered before the current financial crisis erupted, the UFC feels the university has an obligation to maintain the level of childcare promised to students matriculated at Cornell expecting a specific level of support."

"The provost has so far not found a way to supply those funds and doesn't seem to feel there is a way to supply those funds, short of taking money from fellowships to other graduate students, which seemed to us not a good idea. That's an issue I think you folks could think about.

"It was mentioned here, but if I could make a brief aside, the childcare center also recruits graduate students to Cornell. Well, with a reduction in childcare

support, I think one has to think about whether that recruitment is comparable to our peers' recruitment. That might be something the senate wants to look into.”
 Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. We will next have remarks from Dean of the Faculty Bill Fry.”

8. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY WILLIAM FRY

Dean Fry: “Thank you, Steve. I have a very short report today, and it has to do with the calendar. I think you noticed that Monday was a holiday and there were no classes. I enjoyed that time. I got two lectures ready on Monday, which was really nice, so some things can happen.

“That change was agreed upon two years ago and instituted this year. I promised that we would initiate an overview of the entire Cornell academic calendar. We put it off last year because there was so much going on; but this year, I started that process.

“You will see on this slide that the -- we are in the process of forming the calendar committee. Jeff Doyle agreed to chair the committee. Kent Hubbell, Michael Matier are members of it. There will be a representative from the SA, a representative from the GPSA, a staff representative and a few additional faculty. I will serve ex officio, and Laura Brown will also serve as ex officio.

“We would like to hear your comments about the calendar. We are developing and refining the charge to the committee. A current draft is that the committee will recommend a course of action concerning Cornell's calendar that will be academically appropriate, that will not exacerbate student stress, that will align more closely with the calendars of local schools and that will honor federal holidays, as is academically possible.

“I have no prediction at this point as to whether we'll do anything; but as near I can tell, we will consider a lot of stuff, and hopefully we'll be able to make some improvements on the calendar. It's a hope. And with that, I will conclude my comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Dean Fry. Are you willing to take questions on other matters, since we still have a few minutes?”

Dean Fry: “I bet everybody would just love to leave.”

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: "Any questions for the dean of the faculty? Seeing none, motion to adjourn would be in order. We are adjourned. Thank you."

Meeting adjourned: 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty