

Minutes of a Meeting  
of the Faculty Senate  
April 13, 2011

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: "Good afternoon. I'd like to call to order the April 13th meeting of the faculty senate. I would like to remind -- no audio recording, no video recording, and I ask that everyone please turn off or silence any cell phones."

"We have the session today that involves an extensive question and answer period with the provost, and I would remind people, if you have a question, please raise your hand. I will recognize you, and then please stand, wait for one of the ladies to bring you a microphone, and then identify yourself as to name, department or other administrative unit and then pose your question."

"So at this time, I call on Provost Fuchs to please come forward, and I believe he has a brief presentation for us prior to the questions."

#### **1. DIALOGUE WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost Kent Fuchs: "I didn't promise brief. I think we have 45 minutes. I have a number of items to cover, seven topics I want to address, then I will have Q&A. As Steve mentioned, he'll moderate that and I'll take your comments, input and address questions."

"I want to start by acknowledging what occurred two weeks ago. We had a team of reaccreditation visitors here that left town at 11:00 Wednesday morning, after over 800 days of preparation for their visit. By all accounts, it was a phenomenal success. We had a great chair of that review committee, the reaccreditation committee. She is the dean of Arts and Sciences at Penn, Rebecca Bushnell, and it was a thorough review."

"They looked into all aspects of what they call their 14 standards. And the response, which was read to us verbally at that time, was then documented in a draft report that we received on Sunday. We have ten days to make any factual corrections. We can't change their opinion."

"And their comments come in four forms: One is they can make commendations, and the document is filled with praise, as you might expect. We are Cornell, we are Cornell's faculty, and we expect commendations. The second is they can issue requirements. Those are mandatory changes that we have to make across the institution or in specific programs. There are no requirements. And that's a pretty

phenomenal success, given the change that has occurred in student learning and outcomes assessment.”

“They can also make, thirdly, recommendations. There are two recommendations. Those are on Standard 7 and also Standard 14. Standard 7 has to do with institutional assessment, and Standard 14 has to do with assessment of student learning. Both of those recommendations are ones that are well in align with what we put in our self-study about continuing what we've already initiated around assessing the institution towards achieving the goals we decided to achieve; and secondly, student learning outcomes. So we're actually pleased with those recommendations.”

“And then the fourth kind of comments they can make are suggestions. They have a number of suggestions, ways that we can work to make Cornell a better place. So there are a number of heroes in this process. I should say first off, as provost, I'm phenomenally pleased with the engagement of the faculty.”

“This is a process that you all might could have tried to avoid, and the faculty across all the colleges and schools were very, very engaged. Secondly, there are a number of leaders. I think everyone would say Marin Clarkberg, who is in Institutional Research and Planning, she has a Ph.D. in sociology from University of Chicago, was just masterful in guiding all of us that were involved.”

“And then Alan Mathios, Kent Hubbell were the chairs of the Steering Committee, and then all the chairs of the Steering Committee and the other committees we had were spectacular; and particularly the group that dealt with learning outcomes and student assessment. So I'm pleased. We won't have the final report from what's called Middle States until the summer, but I think we are in the trajectory of not only just being reaccredited, but doing what is necessary to use the process to enhance student learning.”

“The second is I want to make comments on the budget. We are in the process of issuing budgets to all the deans and vice presidents. They actually have those, and we are responding to their comments, the praise for the budgets we are giving them. And I would like to say something about that, because that will be pushed out to the departments and you will begin to see that in your colleges and schools over the next month or two.”

“Two years ago I stood in front of this group and described with a whole bunch of PowerPoint that we were facing at that point a projected \$215 million structural deficit. It wasn't at that point yet, but it was going to grow to that if we did not take fairly

significant and in some sense dramatic action to address that. That's out of a \$2 billion Ithaca budget, slightly less than \$2 billion."

"The good news is after three years now of budget actions -- and this what we just did was the third year of that, that structural deficit -- and let me make this statement, I will repeat it twice and make both positive and negative statements. That structural deficit is virtually eliminated for this coming year."

"Now, what are the actions that accompanied that and what am I worried about? Because I really am worried. Number one is that the reason the structural deficit for the whole institution is virtually balanced, eliminated is because of these actions of the past three years and those that we just implemented that are getting pushed out."

"There are \$31 million in budget reductions in which we have pulled back to the center revenues from every vice president, every dean on this campus. \$31 million. That's a combination of \$12.7 million in reduction from the State, \$8.8 of that \$12.7 is to the contract colleges -- of the \$12.7."

"It also is another \$4.5 million in targeted reductions, and \$13.4 million in what we call administrative streamlining program. In the Q&A, I would be glad to give you more details. That's the program in which we've targeted nearly \$80 million to take out of our administrative costs across the institution."

"I want to make a comment on that, because we are more than halfway finished with that program. That looks like not savings to colleges and vice president. Actually looks like budget reductions, even though we are reducing the administrative expenses, because we are pulling them back to the center, the nearly \$80 million over a period of four or five years; but as we move into a new budget that I will make comments about in a moment, that will change because the new budget model won't have a set of taxes that now the deans and vice presidents see associated with all kinds of activities that we've incurred over the past few years; but rather those savings, if they are savings associated with procurement or IT or any of the other initiatives that we have been implementing will reside in those colleges."

"We'll pay for the administrative costs, we'll balance the general purpose budget, but the new budget model will eliminate these individual taxes. We have implemented over \$40 million of the administrative streamlining program, and we have two more initiatives we need to drive to completion in which we are firmly committed to achieving this."

“From my perspective, this has to result in reducing administrative costs so that, as we discussed more than two years ago, we can protect faculty positions. Those two initiatives that are still ongoing are procurement, which is the biggest one of all of these. For those of you that love e-shop, that's the procurement. And secondly, it's IT. We have a new Chief Information Officer, Ted Dodds, a phenomenal person who's going to help us with the restructuring of informational technology across the campus.”

“What are my concerns? That sounds more or less like really good news. I have two concerns going forward that are the focus of a lot of hard work for all of us going forward. One is the state of the New York State budget, and I'll make positive comments about that in a moment, but that's something we don't control.”

“The second is what we lovingly call the general purpose budget. As a faculty member, that probably sounds like Day Hall lingo that has no relevance to your life, but it does. The GP budget is one in which we pool a lot of income and then pay a lot of expenses. And that central piece of the budget still has almost \$50 million that we have to resolve.”

“And that's really important, because we pay a lot of financial aid out of that; we pay a lot of other things out of that budget. So that is my focus going forward. That's Elmira Mangum's focus, as well as achieving the administrative streamlining program initiatives and driving those through completion. “

“What am I optimistic about? I am optimistic about the State. I am not an expert on Governor Cuomo, I'm not an expert on the state of the finances of the State; but from all accounts, the actions that were taken this year, this \$12.7 million, are the worst of what we are going to see, if the economy of the nation and the State continues as it is on an upward trend. So I'm optimistic about that going forward.”

“We have taken almost 30% reduction in the contract colleges and on the State side, so we've taken a big hit, more than the \$12.7 over the last three or four years. We have not increased endowment payout -- may sound like, again, Day Hall language, but it's really important -- for more than three years. In fact, we dramatically dropped it for two years.”

“This year we are not increasing it, but I'm going to argue -- I don't make the final decision, but I'll argue as best as I can that we need to increase the endowment payout next year. And a lot of things are paid on endowment: Some salaries, a lot of salaries, financial aid, a lot of key things. When we don't increase it, it looks like a budget cut,

because financial aid's going up because salaries are going up modestly this year. And so we don't increase endowment payout, it actually looks like we are creating a deficit."

"So I'm very optimistic, because of the performance of the endowment, that we'll be able to start doing what we call increasing endowment down to payout. That will help immensely. We have a lot of new business practices in place that will keep us from overextending ourselves into the future, for decades into the future. I will talk about capital projects in a moment, and that should reassure you we are being good financial stewards, both in tough times of the past three years and also into the future when the resources will begin to come back."

"And lastly, we are working hard on a new budget model for the institution that will have transparency. The deans, the vice presidents and others will see where the resources are coming from; the sources, as we call it, and the uses of where they are. There will be a budget for the provost around academic initiatives, there will be a budget for administrative initiatives, and we will have associated with that a significant plan for how -- and a process for how we manage capital projects, as well as other investments."

"That budget model has a lot of decisions to be made. We have made some, and we have been working with the FPC, chaired by Ron Ehrenberg. Elmira has spoken to them a number of times; all kinds of groups have weighed in on this over the past nearly two years, but that budget model is probably one of the most significant activities I'm engaged in, in the past year as well as going forward, in terms of the positive impact I believe it can have on all of us going forward."

"On Tuesday of next week, the deans are meeting to talk about -- they are going to see all of the budget actions we took for this coming year. We are going to have a significant discussion about increasing costs to financial aid, because we've got to manage that and plan for it, I think is the right way to describe that. And we'll look and argue, as you might guess, about the decisions that were made going forward with this next year in terms of the budget."

"I wanted to mention the two areas of planning we have been engaged in -- I'll do it briefly, but I have a lot to cover -- that have to do with both academic planning as well as administrative planning. Two years ago we launched a process with 20 task forces; most of those were in your colleges and schools. Then we had a set of those at the center that we have managed centrally that had to do with cross-college, cross-university initiatives."

“I wanted to mention three of those. One I've already covered; the new budget model. That was one of those task forces that we are working on and we'll bring to completion. The second in which the senate's library board has been a big factor is the work around libraries. Most of those decisions have been made and implemented with lots of contributions and consultation with faculty, with the library board, with the librarians and also the academic leaders in the colleges and schools.”

“So there are a number of libraries that have been consolidated, some of the space has been reused for student study space, and I think the decisions are made and now those actions are taking place. I am excited about that. We are committed both centrally and also in the colleges and schools to make sure we develop our collections. There is a lot of feedback around collection development that we have taken seriously; then specifically, accessibility of resource materials for research and also education, as we made those decisions.”

“Another one, which a lot of progress has been made with faculty task forces, with engagement with chairs and deans, is around Economics, and also Management Sciences. Those were in two different task force reports. That's now being led by Senior Vice Provost Ron Seeber. And as those recommendations come forward, we'll engage the UFC and others, but the faculty are now looking at how we can enhance economics and also create what we are calling business at Cornell or Management Sciences in the colleges and strengthening that, both external visibility as well as internal excellence.”

“There are a number of others, including public policy, that we are discussing, and are engaging faculty to help us think about what we should do in some of those areas. Then there are all those task forces in your colleges, and you all can tell me about what you all are doing with those.”

“We also had the strategic plan, which was finished last summer. And the plan has three themes that I talk about when I speak externally or internally: Those are One Cornell, number one; number two, a focus on assessment; and number three, focus on excellence, specifically faculty excellence.”

“Let me briefly say what that means and what it does not mean. When we say One Cornell, we are not talking at centralizing. The provost has no goal -- this one or future or past ones -- of running all your colleges and schools or that. One Cornell very simply talks -- from my perspective, talks about how we'll work together collaboratively in, first off, respecting the distinctive nature of programs and departments; but secondly, building the excellence of the whole institution. And it has to do with businesses, practices as well as academic excellence.”

“Number two, the assessment is about all that we do. We are just focused on measuring what we can in terms of our progress in building the excellence across the institution. And then lastly, the obvious theme of excellence in everything we do, but particularly faculty.”

“I wanted to talk about the seven initiatives that are in that strategic plan. There are a lot of goals, a lot of objectives, and I have notes on all of them, but let me focus on a couple of them. There are seven initiatives that are the focus, from my perspective, that we at the center are paying a lot of attention to.”

“There are objectives, there are goals, 70 pages of things we have committed to achieving, but there are seven initiatives that I would encourage you to read in the strategic plan, because that's what I pay attention to. The first is faculty renewal, and that is where -- specifically in the plan it phrases it in terms of the ability to hire and recruit faculty in advance of retirements, faculty renewal.”

“The trustees have taken this to heart. The trustees have committed with us to allocating \$100 million for this initiative, and it's very specific in the sense it's current use monies -- not endowment monies, not external loans -- that we use to recruit faculty in advance of us, me and you, retiring.”

“Of the 1,500 faculty we currently have, there will be 800 to 900 of us that will not be here in ten years. It's phenomenal. That's based on analyzing every one of our colleges and schools and looking at the demographics. What we don't want to do is wait for those lines, those positions to become vacant to start recruiting, as every one of our peers are doing. So we have decided to recruit faster than we have lines available, and to do it with current use monies, with this \$100 million.”

“Let me give you three numbers. The average number of faculty we recruit, we hire across the institution before the economic downturn is 75 faculty per year. That's the average for ten years before 2008, before the economic downturn. In the economic downturn, that 75 dropped to 42. This year, we have 115 searches going on, so almost 50% more than the average in the good times, and three times as much almost as last year and the year before.”

“That is the result of not being frivolous about our economic state. It is really us focusing on faculty renewal. I am enormously excited about that initiative. And we have raised over \$10 million already for that from gifts, just in the past nine months.”

“The second goal, initiatives -- and I won't spend too much time on these, because some of these apply to actually some of the speakers coming up later -- is to identify a few departments or fields of critical importance and to move them into a position of world leadership, into the top five or higher in terms of their peers worldwide. I have already mentioned Economics, that that is a focus, both in terms of the campaign and with the deans associated with the field of economics.”

“The second one is the Africana Studies and Research Center, the Africana program. That one has currently ten tenured track faculty. One of those faculty has requested and we have agreed to move her out of Africana into the Arts and Sciences college; but my assessment of that program is that the size of that program, which is related to the base budget, is not one that's going to allow us to move it into a top five program, which it is currently not.

“So some of you have read that two, three weeks ago I announced that I would be taking provost monies, reoccurring monies and one-time monies and investing those in Africana Studies, giving them to the Arts College to then use to enhance the program. Their current base budget is \$2.3 million per year, and over five years I'm providing to Arts and Sciences for Africana another \$1.2 million; so over a 50% increase.”

“In addition to that, \$2 million to help them launch the Ph.D. program and to set up other initiatives that will be done collaboratively between the college and the program. Let me speak to my two decisions about Africana and the process that was used to come to those both internally and also externally; and also my willingness to take input on that process and on the decisions, very specifically; and whether or not my plan should be modified or changed or not implemented at all.”

“Remember, there are two decisions: One is to move Africana from reporting directly to me, where I serve both as their provost and also as their dean, into the Arts and Sciences college, both administratively and academically. And the second is the commitment of the resources that I just described.”

“In terms of the resources, I asked in December that the Arts and Sciences dean, both Peter Lepage and Elizabeth Adkins-Regan, developed collaboratively with Africana a multiyear budget; plus probably \$1 million, just based on my assessment of the budget. And I received that proposal from Arts and Sciences, and that college kept Bob Harris informed, even though Bob was not willing to develop the budget collaboratively with them.”

“So I met with Bob Harris three weeks ago for an hour in my office with Alice Pell, we reviewed the five-year budget, then I asked Bob to meet with the Arts and Sciences dean and also Alice Pell to review it again. Then I announced that I was going to implement the budget.”

“The other decision, the second one is to move them out of directly reporting to me to reporting and being a part of the Arts and Sciences college. As you know, their undergraduates are already members of that college, their graduate students are members of the graduate college, so there's no change there; but it affects the administrative home and academic home of the program, of the center.”

“And my decision on that, my initial decision on that was the result of reviewing the 2005 program review, in which the former provost, Bidy Martin, decided in two different letters to the center not at that time to change the administrative home, even though that report said in two different places that it was an administrative anomaly and criticized the impact of having it report to the provost; but I decided after reviewing it and then discussing it extensively with the past director and also the current director and also with the deputy provost, interim provost David Harris, the only way it was going to be successful in moving out of a program that was not top five into top five was to have those two things: More resources that would be associated with more faculty and a Ph.D. program, and secondly -- 20 minutes, okay. I'll speak faster. Maybe I'll skip the next four initiatives.”

“So this is part of -- let me be very frank and candid with you all. I am taking input until June 1st. I have to, on July 1st, have implemented whatever I'm going to do. And so this is -- what, the middle of April or so. I am open, willing to take input about my initial decision, any parts of either of those decisions, and I'm willing to reconsider; but come June 1st, I'm taking the action that at that point I'll have to finally decide what to do.”

“At this point, speaking candidly, I have heard no good valid academic reasons why Africana should report to me and why I would be better in providing administrative and academic support than the Arts and Sciences college.”

“Let me now talk about a couple other initiatives. Let me just list them and tell you who you can speak to, because I want to speak about capital projects and then open it up. Another initiative is around creating a culture in support of teaching excellence. Laura Brown, talk to her. She's created a whole bunch of things collaboratively with the colleges, associate deans, Susan Murphy, Kent Hubbell and others.”

"The other initiative is around stronger connections across colleges to enhance educational opportunities for students. Laura and Ron can address that, or me, any one of these. Enhancements to infrastructure and support of research; that's Initiative Number 5 in the strategic plan. A lot of progress around dramatically improving the office of sponsored programs, if you have dealt with them in the past."

"Enhancing the diversity of faculty, staff and students, Initiative 6. Changes both in terms of support staff, facilities; we've created a whole new building for programs in 626 Thurston that we're remodeling, spending over \$2 million on that. We've just allocated 4,000 square feet in what we call CCC space for initiatives in this area."

"Professor Zellman Warhaft, who is here in the audience, is helping us think about how to enhance the faculty diversity. His report will be coming out this summer. And then the president and Vice President Murphy, Vice President Opperman and myself have decided to take on, in terms of administrative centrally, the responsibility of holding each one of us accountable. By us, I mean the leaders of the colleges and the vice presidents in developing metrics and making progress in this area. So we're changing how we're organized centrally in holding each other accountable."

"Then the last one of the initiatives is strengthening connections between public engagement, research and education. Ron Seeber would be a great person to talk to about that or myself."

"Capital projects. I mentioned we have this robust process, and we've developed a five-year capital plan tied to the campaign that allows us a process to decide when we add new capital building projects to that five-year plan. Elmira Mangum is in charge of that, but a lot of people participate in that, as well as your colleges and schools."

"There was controversy two years ago about significant capital projects, so I wanted to make sure you all know we have four more coming down the path, each of them over \$50 million. So those are Stocking Hall, Warren Hall, Gates Hall and a new humanities building."

"Let me be specific about each one of those. Each one of these, if they go forward, if they are implemented, are fully funded, no debt associated with them, either external or internal, and the funding comes from two sources almost predominantly -- almost exclusively, either the State of New York, which is Stocking Hall and Warren Hall, and those have been in the works for decades. A \$96 million project for Stocking Hall, a \$51 million for Warren Hall. The State is not cutting those resources and those are moving forward."

“The third is Gates Hall. That building is fully funded now. Half of it is from the Gates Foundation, then the other half is from philanthropy and new resources that were part of this project. And lastly, the humanities building. That's not actually on the capital plan yet. The reason is we don't have all the \$61 million needed for that project, but we expect we will.”

“There are some major gifts that are being solicited as we speak. The case for that building is well-documented. You all may know there are actually tentative designs from three years ago that we stopped because the resources weren't available, but it's my expectation those gifts will come in and we'll add it to the capital plan and we'll move forward; but there are very rigorous constraints now about having 100% of the pledges committed before we go out for bids and 75% of the cash in hand before we move forward.”

“Lastly, before I make some summary remarks is when I think about exciting initiatives of the future, one of those has to do with New York City. New York City and the Boroughs of New York City are an integral part of Cornell Ithaca's future; humanity, social sciences, life sciences and the arts, and now also in the physical sciences and engineering.”

“So some of you may have read that Mayor Bloomberg has said in December of this year he's going to announce a university that will be creating a new Applied Sciences and Engineering campus in New York City. They're providing a building, providing a lot of space and initial funds for a capital project. We've submitted an expression of interest for that.”

“I am working, as well as the other leaders with CAPP, in developing academic programs that will be there, and we intend to win this. This is a big deal. It's transformational for the campus if it happens. Our competition, we believe, is Stanford. They've been very public about their intention to win; and also NYU and Columbia for different reasons, but there are 18 different submissions. I actually have the proposal here, if you would like to see it, the expression of interest.”

“In summary, we've made a lot of progress, you all and everyone else across the institution, were going through some pretty daunting times and challenges over the past two years. A lot of heavy work and heavy lifting, hard work that has to be accomplished, but I'm really optimistic. I really am. There are budget reductions that we have to take, but there are new revenues that are going to come as well.”

“There are program changes we have to make, but there are new programs we are going to create collaboratively together. So I look forward to working with you, with your department chairs, with the deans and all the rest of the leadership as we finish off the hard work we have to do and look forward to exciting new initiatives.”

“Can I say something about Ron Ehrenberg?”

“So Ron Ehrenberg. Is he here? I just found out that Ron just received the Jacob Mincer Prize for contributions to the field of labor economics. The reason that's important, three of the last twelve recipients of that also got Nobel Prizes in economics. So pretty special. Thank you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Beer: “We have about 12 minutes for dialogue with the provost. All members of the university faculty may ask questions. I would remind you to raise your hand and be recognized, then stand, wait for the microphone, and then ask your question.”

Provost Fuchs: “And Steve's going to moderate.”

Speaker Beer: “I will ask one other thing; if any senators came in and failed to sign in, please do so now.”

Unidentified Speaker: “Student questionnaires are the only way to evaluate teaching. It's the worst possible way to do it. Every study shows that. I'm interested in people learning, and that's what I really want to see us measure in some way is whether or not students are learning.”

“It matters if they like it. That's fine. I'm not saying we shouldn't have student evaluations, but we need some other more substantive way to evaluate teaching, if we are serious about it.”

Provost Fuchs: “Yeah, and I would associate with that not only the evaluation, but taking action, all of us, no matter how good we are or excellent in teaching, I think, can improve. There are three things that have taken place under Laura's leadership as well as others: One is significant improvements on what we call the center for teaching excellence. Some changes there that I won't go through the details, but that's a much stronger program now.”

“Secondly, creating a distinguished faculty member who this past year was Ron Harris Warrick, and he now has created a mentoring program that allows a matching of a distinguished faculty member with a junior faculty member, likely outside of your own department, that allows them to talk -- this is about teaching; not about anything else -- in a nonthreatening way.”

“And the third is a certificate program. For us as faculty, that may sound a little silly, but it's not. It is about going to eight workshops, it's about having a visit by a senior faculty member in my class and getting critiqued, then participating in a summer program. This is a way of documenting, for whatever reason, your department chair or promotions, that your personal commitment to teaching; but I agree with you. It is not just about student evaluations. It is about learning, and that ties into this whole learning assessment we have been engaged in. Good point.”

Speaker Beer: “Woman in the second row.”

Senator Carole Boyce Davies, Africana Studies. “It's lovely to see Africana is so centrally a part of your report. I want to clarify again for the purposes of the faculty senate that we were not consulted, and I have a question.”

“We have had nothing on paper as well as to the nature of the structural relationship that will occur in the future, whether or not we'll be recruiting an outside director; none of that. There is nothing in writing. We have nothing to work with, so I want to really make sure that it is on the record again, that the provost came to us and announced it (his proposed change) without a prior discussion. “

“I want you, though, if you would clarify: did you discuss this with the past director, Salah Hassan, and do you therefore consider discussion with the director as equivalent to consulting with the faculty? I need to clarify that publicly as well for our purposes.”  
Provost Fuchs: “Sure. As I stated, I discussed it with both directors, the current and the past. Salah Hassan was the past and Bob Harris is the present. It's not the equivalent as talking individually or in a group to faculty. “

“I also say that I'm willing, as I stated, to talk to the faculty now and willing to take input about changing my initial decision; but the Africana faculty have to be willing to do that, be willing to enter into a dialogue.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman in the red shirt.”

Provost Fuchs: “Faculty Club, right?” (Laughing)

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: "You know, it's very frustrating that it makes a joke, because it is extremely important. I am not joking when I say that I'm extremely sad about the whole situation. And the situation, what is frustrating is that hearing what you are saying, how important it is to keep people, and I consider myself one of the young."

"When we come here and we say we have something that extremely important to us and you refuse to even meet face-to-face to me to listen. And we are coming and say it's not about money and we have passed the senate resolution that says we want to talk and we will find the money. And you answer, the answer is money, it's really bad. And I'm personally -- this decision really makes me start looking in other places."

"And what I want to ask you frankly is what one should do in order for you to say it's important enough that I put the little effort that is required. What faculty members should do in order to make clear that something is very important to them."

Provost Fuchs: "Sure. First off, a correction, I did meet with you several times in person. We had many e-mail exchanges as well, and I believe Bill Fry met with you as well. So this is an area which I made no budget reductions, even though I made a number of budget reductions across the whole institution."

"The contribution that I make for faculty lunches, Faculty Club is the same. Those monies have transferred out of my office into the dean of faculty office, and I asked him to manage the process. Number two, the deficit that accumulated was significant, as you know."

"Let me finish, please. And so I committed to resolving that deficit. And it's a real deficit, real funds had to be transferred into a deficit that's accumulated. Number three, what does it take to persuade me? If you will have your department chairs and your deans tell me this is a priority, we can make it happen; but you've got to have it."

"I have heard not a single one of our 100 department chairs, not a single one of our 13 deans tell me this is important for the future of the institution. I am willing to make it happen, but they've got to tell me."

Senator Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: "Hearing about buildings when we are still in a situation of financial stress and virtual hiring freezes; and my own department, which is a pretty good department, but the tiniest of all, political science departments amongst peer institutions, far smaller than others and we haven't been

able to hire somebody in constitutional law for so many years, since Jeremy Rabkin left."

"So seeing the four new buildings, hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent there, rather than in faculty and research and libraries and those really central purposes does worry me. Do we need buildings more than we need faculty and research money?" Provost Fuchs: "Yeah, you sound like Vice President Mary Opperman, who says we need people more than facilities. This is one of those tough, tough areas. So let me make some comments. Elizabeth, you won't be satisfied, but I'll expose the issues. "

"First off, this is often sort of the punt, but it's true; for the State funds, which were most of the funds, half the buildings, that's money that the State allocates. It can't be reallocated. You spend it on buildings or the State takes it back. So Warren Hall and Stocking Hall, there's not a chance ever we could have reallocated that."

"You should come back and say isn't there some cost associated with the buildings once they are up and running, O&M. The answer is yes, and that doesn't pay for that. So there's a reoccurring cost and we have to take that into account."

"The others, again, are on philanthropy. You could argue if we were better fundraisers, we could convince the Gates Foundation, for example, not to give to Gates Hall, but to give for faculty. So what's that trade-off here? The deans and others -- and not excluding myself or the president or anyone else -- make trade-offs between faculty, which to me, those are the top three priorities: Faculty, faculty, faculty -- but trade-offs between faculty, between students, which in this case would be financial aid or fellowships or grad students, critically important between programs, between staff support. And that's the balance."

"So I just met with the law school accreditation team for an hour and a half. For an hour and a half they beat me up about the space the law school needs. Well, I'm not smart enough to figure out whether the law school needs 45 or 44 faculty or it needs \$40 million more for its buildings. So I asked that dean to make that priority shift or change or make that decision; but I've got to be convinced that he's making the right one, although I'm not an expert in law."

"So those are the trade-offs. These are tough decisions. I would say we should not let this place degrade physically. It will never catch up if we do. On the other hand, if we don't hire these 800, 900 faculty in the next ten years, this place will be weaker than it was in the past, and we've got a window to make it much stronger. So I think I'm agreeing with you, but I'm also saying we are putting up four buildings."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman in the --"

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications Department: "I want to raise a related issue to that. So our department, for one -- I know we are not the only one -- is feeling the pressure as these three buildings are getting renovated. There's been space crunches, which are completely understandable; but what we found is that not only are our classrooms that we are typically in charge of being put on schedule, but we have lost conference rooms, lunch rooms, meeting rooms we use for things like TA sessions, dissertation defenses. They can't be scheduled far enough in advance for us to claim them on a schedule."

"So with an understanding that people are getting squeezed in space, how do we make sure the fundamental workings of a department, the kind of educational and graduate work that happens in those spaces, how are they protected. And will those spaces go back to the departments that are losing them during what I hope is a temporary reshuffling to help Warren finish, and Stocking?"

Provost Fuchs: "It is a great question, because we as a university virtually have no space. There has been discussions for decades about creating a space where people can move temporarily. So we do all kinds of crazy things, lease space, put up temporary space, et cetera. So the issue exists, number one."

"Number two, I have suggested to the deans that we centralize the management of all space on campus. That is not a very popular suggestion, as the deans in this room would recommend, because there are some colleges and schools that have got space, and I would love to be the space god and give -- reallocate and manage it centrally."

"I have not won that argument yet. I haven't given up, but I haven't won yet. So my specific recommendation is keep your college officer informed, your dean and your department chair. You can also send e-mail to me, but space I control is pretty limited, but it's a real issue. It really is."

"What I'll do, to be serious, I'll bring it up with the deans and remind them."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Stein in the extreme rear."

Emeritus Professor Peter Stein, former member of the Physics Department" "First, there's a question, and second is a comment. The question is, if you look at the size of Cornell as measured by the number of people -- at least Cornell and Ithaca. The size of

Cornell and Ithaca, as the number of people that get a paycheck from Cornell, my understanding is that compared to three years ago, that number is down by something between 5% and 10%.”

“Now, my question is that three years from now, how do you think that number will compare to what it is now? That's my question.”

“And my comment, which is a response to your response to my colleague who asked about the university club, to me, it seems that the way you phrase the question is one that isn't going to work for this. The university club is what economists call a public good, and a public good is something that people won't pay for; if you ask them, would you be willing to put your money in to pay for this, because their priorities are doing their primary piece of business and not doing that, which is shared by everybody. I think that's an important thing to realize.”

“If you ask the governors of the states how important was it for us to have a good state department or a good navy, it's not clear that would appear very high on their list; but we all agree, I think, that it's important to our welfare to have those particular operations be high quality.”

“One way you might ask it is to think about how much money it would cost to do this, and then divide that amongst the departments or something like that, and ask the question, is it worthwhile for me to put this amount of money into it to make that happen, which is a different way of asking it. Not asking would they take it out of their budget, but how do they think about you taking it out of your budget to do that; but I did ask a question first.”

Provost Fuchs: “Okay, so I'll answer the question and I'll -- I won't comment on your comment. You asked me to predict the size of Cornell in terms of people three years from now. Let me divide it into three groups: Students, faculty and staff.’

“Students, I hope the graduate programs grow. This is my bias, but the dean of the grad school is sitting right in front of you, and I think we need to debate that. Undergraduates, we changed the entering class from 3,050 to 3,185 or 87, and we're frankly debating whether to change that any more. Stanford, MIT and others are growing their undergrad classes.”

“I am concerned about the student-to-faculty ratio and many other things a growth implies. So I'm ambivalent there. Not ambivalent; just have two perspectives. Staff, we are down almost 9% in staff. I don't think we can regrow the staff. I think it has to stay

where it is. I wish we had a lot more staff of all kinds, but I think it will have to stay where it is. Faculty, there's going to be a temporary significant increase in faculty; but if we don't have the continued resources to have those faculty go on new positions and new lines, it will then go back down to where it is today, but that would be over a ten-year period. My best crystal ball."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. Thanks for presentation and the dialogue. Now it's time to call on Professor Hass, the chair of the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty to present a resolution for discussion only. This resolution will be voted on at the May meeting, but it's a substantial resolution; and therefore, it's for discussion only at this time."

## 2. JOHNSON SCHOOL REQUEST TO LENGTHEN ITS TENURE CLOCK – FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

Emeritus Professor Jerry Hass: "Thank you. I believe you had an opportunity to look at the motion, and I won't take the time to read it all. So I'm going to kind of move ahead on the slides, if you can pop it -- keep going."

*Whereas Article XVI(2)(c) of the Bylaws of Cornell University sets the maximum period of time in service for assistant professors before the university must grant tenure or terminate employment:*

*Assistant Professor – shall be appointed by the President for a term not to exceed four years. The maximum period of service for assistant professors with term appointments shall be six academic years of full-time equivalent service, continued only for reasons which, in the judgment of the President, are temporary.*

*Whereas the majority of the other business schools and universities with which the Johnson School competes for assistant professors have longer terms of service before the decision to grant tenure or terminate employment is made,*

*Whereas the Johnson School is significantly hampered in its recruitment and retention of promising assistant professors by being at a competitive disadvantage with regard to the maximum period of service before tenure decisions must be reached,*

*Whereas, following discussions with deans from other Cornell units, the Provost supports the motion because it meets important and highly limiting criteria that make it unlikely that other units will seek a similar extension, namely*

✎ *Unusual circumstances particular to the unit that render the general time frame problematic,*

- ✧ *Demonstrable competitive disadvantage of the existing requirements,*
- ✧ *Problem related to the unit as a whole rather than a particular subset of the faculty, and*
- ✧ *Lack of other options.*

*Whereas the Johnson School's tenured and untenured faculty unanimously support the motion,*

*Whereas the Committee on the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty has reviewed the request and unanimously agreed to support the motion,*

*Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate support a motion to be presented by the Provost to the University Trustees to amend the Bylaws of the University to incorporate an extension of the maximum appointment for assistant professors at the Johnson Graduate School of Management from six years to eight years of full-time equivalent service.*

*Committee on the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty*

*Joel Baines, Microbiology and Immunology, CVM*

*Nancy Chau, Applied Economics and Management, CALS*

*Jerry Cherney, Crop and Soil Sciences, CALS*

*Chekitan Singh Dev, School of Hotel Administration*

*Jerome Hass, Johnson School of Management*

*Carl Hopkins, Neurobiology and Behavior, CALS*

*Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations*

*Peter Stein, Physics, A&S*

*David Wilson, Molecular Biology and Genetics, A&S*

*April 4, 2011*

"The motion is resolved that the faculty senate support a motion to be presented by the provost to the university trustees to amend the bylaws of the university to incorporate an extension of the maximum appointment time for assistant professors at the Johnson Graduate School of Management from six to eight years of full-time equivalent service. Cut to the quick, it's extending the tenure clock from what now is a six-year period to an eight-year period."

"The next slide, please. The organizations or entities that support this proposal have of course kind of progressed through time. The Johnson School junior faculty unanimously approves the proposal. The Johnson School senior faculty unanimously approves the proposal. Three deans that were the traveling team for our accreditation strongly encouraged the extension for competitive reasons."

"The provost in consultation with the other deans of units around the university has approved the proposal; but in doing so, set forth a set of restrictive conditions that need

to be met to seek an exception to the university six-year norm. And those restrictive conditions are, one, unusual circumstances particular to the unit; two, demonstrable competitive disadvantage associated with the six-year rule; third, the problems related to the unit as a whole, rather than a subset of the unit; and fourth, that there are really no other options.”

“Finally, the provost asked the senate's Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status to meet and discuss with Johnson School representatives on this motion, and we did so a few weeks ago. At that meeting, the focus of the discussion was on the restrictive conditions and the Johnson School's case, vis-a-vis those conditions.”

“Rather than second guess that case in the discussion, I'm going to turn the microphone over to Mark Nelson, who is until recently the associate dean at the Johnson School that was, among other things, responsible for faculty hiring and retention. I should point out that I have a couple of colleagues with me today from the AFPS, David Wilson is here.”

Professor Mark Nelson, Associate Dean, Johnson Graduate School of Management:

“Thanks, Jerry. Thanks for the chance to talk to people today at the faculty senate. So what I'm going to do is really speak to some of the evidence with respect to these four restrictive conditions. The first is this idea of these unusual circumstances. And really what we are facing is this combination of teaching pressures and research pressures, and that in translating into competitive pressures.”

“So on the teaching side, it is important to have a feel for what our student body is like. We have two kinds of MBA students, so these are all professional students. The residential students are an average age of 27, with five years of work experience. They've left their jobs to get this degree. Our EMBA students are an average of 36, with 12, 13 years of experience.”

“So these people have a lot of experience, they are self-financing, they have left their careers and have come back, and they are having pretty high expectations for the stuff that's going on in the classroom translating directly into their practice. It's particularly important that those expectations get met, because that folds back into the rankings that are critical to us. So we really need to maintain the rankings to be able to get access to the students we want, the recruiters we want and support from our alumni. So it's a tough and somewhat unique teaching challenge.”

“When you think about the profile of the MBA students, it's interesting to compare that to the profile of a rookie faculty member that we'd hire, because they are also late 20s, so the same age or less than the age of the students that they are teaching; but they have spent the last five years in a Ph.D. program, appropriately focusing on research. So there's sort of a mismatch between the business experience they are bringing to the table and what the students are looking for.”

“And what this means is that there's this steep ramp-up in the first few years for these folks to meet the pressures they're facing. On the research side, we as a school want to maintain high research standards, and what that means is that our junior faculty have to be pumping out publications; but there are a couple things there that lead to them getting a slow start. One is that post-docs are extremely rare in business schools. We really don't have them. So people are coming straight from their Ph.D. program.”

“And the other thing we run into is publication lags with slow journal turn-around. So we are running into a combination of pretty high teaching pressures and, of course, high research pressures. And so what that combines to is some real challenges in terms of being able to make it under a six-year clock, and we have been seeing this getting more acute.”

“The junior faculty understand this, the market understands this and our competition understand this. What they have been doing is, if they don't have a longer clock already, our peers have been moving to a longer clock. If you could advance it.”

“So this is a reshuffle of the peer comparisons that you had in the proposal, and all I did was to show that there are some nine- and eight- and seven- and six-year clocks. This peer set is the ten schools in the "Business Week" top ten, plus some real key competitors for us. Some of these schools have recently lengthened their clocks; some are working on it now. Some have longer clocks because the university has longer clocks. Some have clocks that have diverged from the university to be longer; but the real key is this right-most column where you see longer, longer, longer. Most of the folks have a longer clock than the Johnson School has.”

“So when we are thinking about what the practical effects are of those and what the alternatives are, we have considered -- we're trying to walk through the restrictive criteria the provost was speaking about -- first off, in terms of effects, what we've noticed, it's just making it really difficult to hire and retain faculty.”

“So our junior faculty want a longer clock. The peer schools are offering a longer clock. When I was involved in hiring for our school heavily across all areas of the 13 folks that

said no to us, 12 of those went to a school with a longer clock or, frankly, lower standards. So it's a constant issue that's coming up in the hiring process and we are seeing people leave."

"We are also seeing turnover at Year 3 or 4, when people filled up their teaching and their pipeline's built up, but it's not going to make it through in enough time to be able to get to the tenure threshold, so they jump to one of our competitors, who's only too happy to have us having trained their junior faculty for them."

"That is challenging for us, too; and then there's the potential for false negatives at the tenure threshold, where again, there's too much uncertainty, because stuff's in the pipeline, but it hasn't come out. We also think this is contributing to higher training and search costs for us and feeding back into these rankings because we've got more churn."

"We have thought about alternatives. The market for us, our competitors are sort of moving to a longer clock to deal with the timing pressures. The alternatives we thought about, first off, the idea of just have the junior faculty not teach for a few years, but we just can't afford it. We can't afford to hire folks and not have them teach."

"Another possibility is for us to unilaterally move to a post-doc or fellowship system, then after someone's with us for a year or two, then jump to a longer clock. The problem with that is, our peers aren't doing that; so someone would look to us being kind of counter-normative and choose between a post-doc with us or assistant professorship with another school."

"Finally, the idea would be, well, exit the rookie market and just go after the experienced people; but frankly, the experienced market in business schools is extremely competitive, and these folks are very expensive. And we also want to invest in junior faculty, rookies."

"So we haven't thought that any of those possibilities were tenable; and therefore, are respectfully asking for your support for our proposal. At this point, questions?"

Speaker Beer: "Thanks very much. Maybe we can take one short question from the gentleman in the lavender shirt."

Senator Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: "Short. I have to ask everyone's question in one question. Do your faculty get study leave in the seventh semester and, after tenure, do they get a year off?"

Associate Dean Nelson: "Our faculty do not get study leave in the seventh semester. They get a half year leave after Year 6, basically after promotion."

Senator Toorawa: "This is Part 2 of the same question. Is there -- this is not meant to sound hostile, but it's going to -- is there some reason you haven't tried to align with the rest of us? If you give time off in the seventh semester -- at least in arts college we do that, then -- if I were coming here and I was told you will actually have a year off within six years, not within nine, then you'll cycle through that way, that would be more attractive to me as a faculty member."

"I am not in business, so I don't know what the other considerations are. I am having some difficulty imagining creating a two-tier -- or potentially, once the Pandora's box is opened, creating a multi-tiered tenure system. We are a highly ranked business school, and we couldn't have gotten there by accident; so we are obviously doing something right. So I'm a -- I'm unclear on this."

Associate Dean Nelson: "Okay, a brief answer. So I guess a few things here: One is that a problem isn't only having the time to do the work, but also the time it takes for the work to get through the process, given the upfront investment on both the teaching and the research side."

"In terms of our leave policies, we align closely with other business schools. In terms of this being something that percolates through to the rest of the university, we actually think the provost's conditions are good ones in the sense of being something that should prevent just an automatic proliferation of this to other folks."

"I should say -- I know we are short of time -- if people have questions that they are interested with talking with me or Jerry or others about in the interim, because we are going to return to this in May, we are really happy to do it. We'd love to hear your thoughts."

Speaker Beer: "I really appreciate that comment, and thank you very much. I recognize that there are members of the body who wish to ask questions; but unfortunately, I have to -- well, fortunately, I have to call on Vice Provost Laura Brown for a report on advising initiatives."

### **3. REPORT TO THE SENATE ON ADVISING INITIATIVES**

Vice Provost Laura Brown: "Thanks for your interest in hearing about advising. I convene a standing committee made up of the associate deans from the colleges, and my job here today is to describe the conversations we had and the report that we

completed last term on undergraduate advising, which I think Bill provided to you with a call to this meeting, or to those of you who were -- who are senate members."

"Namely, this report -- and we have included along with this report the publication of the education advisory board, which is called Mentoring Student Demand for High-touch Advising. It is an interesting, timely report that I would be glad to share with any of you who want a copy. I brought a few with me today."

"We began this work about a year ago, and it led us in various directions. We are hoping it will stimulate other conversations and other activities that will improve and enhance undergraduate advising. And this happens to be one of those opportunities we were looking forward to in terms of sharing our conversations and conclusions."

"So I want to emphasize that we are eager for our report to serve as an incentive across the campus, and we strongly urge you to share it widely with colleagues and administrators. So you have it in your inbox now, and you can send it along to anyone who you think might be interested. I'll start with an overview of our discussion and of the report we produced, then I'll be glad to answer your questions as time permits or to provide you with opportunities to interact with or raise ideas that you might have about this topic."

"Let me say first that the associate deans took up this issue last year for a range of reasons, including our own sense that undergraduate advising deserved attention and support, including David Skorton's initiatives around the concept of the caring community that arose last year, and also included this very body's resolution asking that, quote, the vice provost for undergraduate education, working together with the university registrar and the associate deans, establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising, including face-to-face meetings. So those were your words."

"So let me say first I think our report produced one positive result well before it was completed and published. We began our discussion by asking the undergraduate colleges to provide a summary of their advising practices to date, and we shared those summary descriptions. And as we did so, we generated a series of observations about certain best practices, as well as certain not-so-best practices simply from that comparison and occasion to exchange ideas."

"So there were changes made in college advising programs that were instituted in the course of our composition of the report, and so the colleges revised their account on their own programs at the end when we came to publish the report. So I want to say one benefit of the decentralization of Cornell is we don't have to go outside of this

institution to discover other practices and other activities that we can get useful comparisons from; and we can learn from one another without leaving town.”

“So the grounding work of the report was a comparison across colleges. For us the next step was a statement of the university-wide advising mission, which I think was one of the requests of the senate last year. We placed this mission statement at the outset of the report, and I hope you had an occasion to look at it when it came into your e-mail.”

“It includes three different phases or forms of mission statement. The first, education goals, a focus on educational goals. And these have to do with providing students with educational options, academic decision-making, information and referrals.”

“The second major dimension of our description of the advising mission had to do with mentorship expectations, the idea that a personal relationship, an emphasis on regular meetings, a responsiveness to the range of moments in a student's academic career from first year to career planning. And finally, third, support structures that effective advisors ought to be able to count on: Accessible information, clear expectations, recognition and effective tools.”

“So I want to suggest the presence of a university-wide advising mission that represents the commitment of all the colleges might make it easier to develop assessment processes, initiatives within the colleges and other kinds of activities that enhance undergraduate advising.”

“I want to call attention to another dimension of our discussion and our report, which is the section on advising initiatives and topics. I think all of us are aware of the many different ways outside of the formal advising relationship that students obtain academic advice from faculty mentors across the campus. We wanted to highlight these opportunities, because we felt that the task of enhancing undergraduate advising and the advising relationship goes well beyond the attention to that formal connection that students make through their advising offices.”

“So among these other initiatives, we chose to describe the possibilities and need for mentoring around academic integrity, the very significant forms of student-faculty interaction that take place in the residence halls through the faculty fellows, house fellows, faculty in residence and house professor deans; the mentoring relationships that arise, as many of you know, through opportunities in undergraduate research; and the advising that's done by peers in various contexts.”

“We could add to that list the faculty advisors of the athletic teams, who play a very significant role in helping athletes understand academic requirements. Also, the faculty-student relationships that arise in student service activities, experiential learning opportunities and those other resources that supply our students with academic advice that are not formally within the advising offices. ”

“So if we are interested in improving advising writ large, we should also seek to improve these other kinds of interactions as well. Finally, we took up the issue of impact of technology on advising and agreed pre-PeopleSoft advising offices did require faculty advisors to sign off that they had met with their advisees, either through pin numbers or through signatures in the old days when paper was in the mode of interaction.”

“We recommended each college require first-year students at least to meet once with their advisor, but we were not able to agree as a group on a means to achieve that end. Instead, we suggested several possibilities, including using the PeopleSoft flags, including group meetings or periods of monitoring the mentoring relationship between advisor and student.”

“The report ends with some specific recommendations which are designed for any and all audiences, and these focus on advice for administrators, for faculty, for students; and they stress assessment and review of advising practices, and recognition, collaborations, leveraging and accountability.”

“So I encourage you, like I said, to take this document and go with it somewhere. I think there are places where it could be utilized. So I would be glad to entertain a minute of questions.”

Speaker Beer: “One question. Senator Cohn.”

Senator Abby Cohn: “Thank you, Laura, for the report, and thanks to associate deans for these efforts. First of all, just a point of information; I do not think the report has yet been widely circulated. I looked at it because I asked Bill for it, but it has not yet been circulated. And in its full form, you might want to make it clearer what are the appendices and so on.”

“I did have a chance to just skim it, and I felt that the report definitely did address issues of expectations, but was very weak on mechanisms. And since the issue of us not having a mechanism for compelling effective advising to go on, whether it's face-to-face

or over e-mail or Skype or whatever, it's something that was a very serious concern to this body."

"And until that's addressed, I think many of us will feel we have not -- that the issues raised in resolution haven't yet been addressed. Perhaps it's really at the level of each college these conversations need to go on, but then I would have liked to have heard about how those conversations should move forward."

"Maybe, as is often the case, the complexity and difficulties of these matters are exacerbated or most extreme in Arts and Sciences, since within Arts and Sciences we have such an array of practices; but I would like to know how we are supposed to move forward and use the report and other mechanisms to start being more effective."

Vice Provost Brown: ""You are describing our current situation, which is that this report was designed to provide a context in which the next step would be for the colleges and for the central administration to consider and discuss implementing particular changes; but I will make sure it gets out to everyone. And anyone who wants a copy, my office can individually e-mail it to you, but I'll make sure it gets out to the group as a whole."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. Now I would like -- oh, thank you very much for your report."

Vice Provost Brown: "You are very welcome."

Speaker Beer: "Are there any senators or alternate senators present who did not yet sign in?"

"Seeing none, I'll announce we do not have a quorum; so therefore, I'm going to ask Professor Bass from the University Faculty Committee to please present the resolution, but we will not vote on it for lack of a quorum. Hopefully we'll vote on it at the May meeting of the University Faculty Senate."

#### 4. [RESOLUTION](#) TO EXTEND THE MAXIMUM APPOINTMENT PERIOD FOR POSTDOCS - [PROPOSAL](#)

Associate Vice Provost for Research Andrew Bass: "Just to point out, I'm the Associate Vice Provost for Research and I'm a professor in Neurobiology and Behavior. I'm not -- so thank you for letting me bring this before you."

“Let me give you a little history on this. This is a request that originally came before the provost's office by a faculty advisory committee known as the Life Science Advisory Council, which advises the provost's office on the life sciences. This has been in existence since 2004, and it's made up of a group of faculty from across the Life Sciences, Engineering, Physics, Chemistry and the Boyce Thompson Institution for Plant Research.”

“And many of you may be surprised as I was when I first looked into this that the policy at the medical school is for post-doc term limits to last up to five years. And I then looked into, on my own, looked into what the policies are at what we consider to be some of our peer institutions. At those institutions, post-doc limits are typically up to at least five years and often up to six or seven.”

“And in addition, there's a 2000 report from the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academic of Engineers and the Institute for Medicine, which fully supports having post-doc limits of at least five years. And I then looked into the matter further. There's an individual known as Christina Holmes. Christine Holmes is the director of the Office of Postdoctoral Studies at Cornell. This has also been in existence since 2004.”

“I urge any of you who have post-docs that you work with to go see Christine. She had an advisory group of 12 post-docs, and all of them are in support of extending the term limit of post-docs for up to five years. They see it nothing other than a benefit to their future success.”

“I then brought the matter before all the academic deans, all of who unanimously supported the proposal. And in addition, I checked with Mary Opperman in Human Resources to be sure extending the post-doc appointment to five years in no way would lead to any detriment in the benefits that a post-doc would receive.”

“If anything, it was looked at as a benefit to them, and it would make their position more distinct from other research-type positions at the university. So therefore, the resolution comes before you. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.”

**Whereas** the postdoctoral term limit at Cornell-Ithaca is 3 years

**Whereas**, in the spirit of “one Cornell”, the postdoctoral term limit at Weill-Cornell Medical College is 5 years

**Whereas** the term limit of a postdoctoral associate is at least 5 years at several other institutions including Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Memorial Sloan Kettering, Michigan State, MIT, NYU, Rockefeller, University of Illinois, University of Pennsylvania, Washington University, and Yale

**Whereas** the Life Science Advisory Council (LSAC) that represents a diverse group of faculty from the life sciences, physical sciences and engineering , “unanimously supports an increase in the postdoctoral term limit to a minimum of 5 years” (from LSAC letter of June 9, 2010 sent to Robert Buhrman, Senior Vice Provost for Research and Andrew Bass, Associate Vice Provost for Research)

**Whereas** Christina Holmes, Director of the Office of Postdoctoral Studies at Cornell-Ithaca, and the postdoctoral associates that she meets with monthly, support an increase in the postdoctoral term limit to 5 years

**Whereas**, as confirmed by Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources, the benefits that postdoctoral associates currently receive are the same as all staff and faculty at Cornell, it would not be a detriment for them to stay under the postdoctoral title for a total of 5 years

**Whereas** all of the Academic Deans unanimously support an increase in the postdoctoral term limit to 5 years

**Therefore be it resolved** that the senate recommends that the postdoctoral term limit at Cornell-Ithaca be extended from 3 to 5 years.

Speaker Beer: “Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology. “We were wondering over in Entomology if you could amend the proposal to include Cornell Geneva as well.”

Associate Vice Provost Bass: “Of course. Sure.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other questions on the resolution on the screen? Since we do not have a quorum, it would be appropriate to have a straw vote. A straw vote is not binding, but it gives the movers an indication of the level of support. Would you like that?”

Associate Vice Provost Bass: “Very much so.”

Speaker Beer: "Okay. So rather than click away, all those in favor, please raise your right hand."

"Okay, those in opposition? Those abstaining from the straw vote? One."

"Okay, thank you very much, and we'll move on to the chair of the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies, Professor Cleland, for a report on behalf of the committee."

## 5. [REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES](#) –

Professor Thom Cleland, Psychology: "Thank you. So just a fairly quick report, Academic Programs and Policies had three things come up recently; one very routine. We recommend to this body approval of a proposal for a new graduate field in -- a field minor in sustainable energy."

"So perhaps more of interest, or perhaps of more potential for debate is that CAPP has screened a proposal from the Johnson School for establishment of a [clinical professor title](#). This is essentially a nontenured track faculty position at the senior level replacing a senior lecturer position, just for the professorial title."

"CAPP has no reservations with this, upon having reviewed it, but per the legislation establishing the clinical professor title at Cornell at large we made available to its colleges, there's a 60-day comment period for any faculty, this body included. The proposal has been mailed out. It is also available on the University Faculty web site -- Bill? Did it go up onto the web site of the University Faculty? For those that would like to look at it in more detail. In 60 days' time or so, I'll be presenting this again for a final recommendation to the senate."

"And third is that, as you heard from Kent Fuchs at the beginning of the meeting today about Cornell's interest in the proposal for a New York City Applied Sciences and Engineering campus, and our body, the Academic Programs and Policies, has agreed to provide faculty advice and consultation to the provost in this regard. And again, anyone is welcome to contact us, should they see fit to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "We have time for a question or two. Are there any?"

"Senator Cohn, wait for the microphone, please."

Senator Cohn: "I actually was curious just to know more about this proposed Applied Sciences and Engineering campus in New York City. I understand that from what Kent Fuchs said, that's coming from the mayor of New York City; but I guess what I'm wondering about is what the process would be to move forward in terms of the kinds of academic deliberations we would undertake precisely because it would be cross-college, since it wouldn't pertain just to engineering, thought it seems that's the primary locus."

Professor Cleland: "So as I understand it -- I'll ask you to direct specific questions to the provost's office about these, but I'll tell you about our role. The goal in involving CAPP was sort of as a representative subgroup of this body for faculty advice and consultation of a group that's in whose jurisdiction this topic generally falls and it is broadly drawn from across the different colleges and is not sort of self-selected specifically for this single topic."

"So as information unfolds -- because this is still very new. The call is recent, the initial proposal is still in process -- I guess we are, for involvement from this body or faculty at large, we are another route that your questions can be directed or your comments taken. They can go directly to the provost's office, but if you would like to address those additionally or instead to CAPP, they would get to the same place by a different route."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman with the shawl."

(LAUGHTER)

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: "With respect to Number 2, being at the vet college, I have one understanding of what a clinical professor means; but in Johnson School, could you just give us a little context of what a clinical professor means?"

Professor Cleland: "Yeah, I also found the terminology unusual at first. I think of clinical as medical, but what it essentially means is -- for details over the period of the proposal, but what it essentially is, is a nontenured track position that's effectively designed for people with experience in the business world coming to teach, you know, teach at Cornell, providing their experience and primarily teaching and mentoring status."

"The difference or the main difference, as I'm to understand, between the clinical professor titles and the tenured or tenured track professors is the latter are engaged in research, which is not expected of the clinical professors. It is a matter of bring your

experience and teach here, which is important for the business school, which was the basis for our decision.”

“Currently, that's -- people like that receive titles of -- I have forgotten -- essentially senior lecturer or something along those lines, which just isn't without the title in cachet of clinical professor makes us noncompetitive with peer institutions. That's really the main difference.”

Speaker Beer: “Well, I think that's all the time we have for questions on this issue, so thanks very much. And now it's time to turn the meeting over to Dean Fry, first for a report on the Nomination and Elections Committee, because we are skipping the minutes for lack of a quorum. So next month we'll have two sets of minutes to approve, that from March and those from this meeting. Dean Fry.”

## **6. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE**

Dean Bill Fry: “Thank you, Steve. This is a report on actions by the Nomination and Elections Committee. There are several committees to which members are appointed. And for Academic Programs and Policies, Thomas Cleland, Glenn Galbreath, Ross Brann; to the Educational Policy Committee, Paul Sawyer, Robert Thorne, Jim Bisogni; to the Faculty Committee on Program Review, Ynte Schukken, Kent Brown, Clif Pollock, Mike Walter, Claude Cohen.”

“Next, please. To the Library Board, Eric Nelson, C. Thomas Avedisian, Tim Healey, Barbara Lust, Michael Tomlan. Music Committee is Travis Lars Gosa. University Hearing Board, N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, Ephraim Garcia, Richard Penner and Christine Olson. “

“And then for elected positions, there are committees to -- that the members are elected by the faculty as a whole, to Nominations and Elections: Michael Lynch, Margaret Washington, Rob Gilbert, Christiane Linster. To the UFC, Risa Lieberwitz, Parfait Eloundou-Enyegue, Bruce Lewenstein, Dawn Schrader, Carol Boyce Davies, Rich Burkhauser and David Pelletier.”

“Senators at Large, these are also elected: John Hausknecht, Fouad Makki, Nina Bassuk, Antonia Bento, Dan Krall and Rob Thorne. So I ask your acceptance of this report.”

Speaker Beer: “Any objection to accepting the dean's report? It is accepted.”

Speaker Beer: “Dean Fry now has remarks.”

## 7. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Dean Fry: "First of all, as Laura was talking, I realized I was supposed to have sent the advisory report out in March and I didn't do it. So I apologize. It's the only thing I forgot in March."

(LAUGHTER)

"Then I want to also indicate there are documents available of the PDFs I sent out in call to this meeting. There's background for the clinical professor title and also for the Johnson School tenure issue."

"And finally, also, there is the first report of the Calendar Committee, which identifies a set of principles that that committee has identified. They are looking to receive comment on that set of principles, hopefully to receive those by May 15th. It's clear that that committee will not make a firm recommendation about a change to the academic calendar before the end of this semester, so their activities will continue into next semester, but some of those are really pretty significant."

"I did meet with a group of faculty a week ago concerning the student experience, and we learned shortly before that meeting that the group of academic deans had agreed that the date for identifying an SU decision for students would be moved to the add/drop deadline, which this group of faculty thought was a really good thing to do, and we really appreciate that."

"I want to talk next about the dean of the faculty. I am in my third year of a three-year appointment, and just need to -- I've gone through a series of decisions. What the legislation says is the term of office shall be three years, but the dean may be reappointed by the senate for further period for not more than two years."

"Initially I thought I would not ask to be reappointed, then I reconsidered and thought I would be reappointed, but what has also happened is I have agreed to chair my department next year starting for three years. I informed several people of that event and thought I would therefore not request to be reappointed."

"And there was some suggestion that I stay on as dean of faculty, and I've consulted with members of the UFC, with members of administration, my department and others; and so I'm going to ask to be reappointed for one year only. Clearly, a significant decision, and that is up to the senate to decide."

"I think it would be easiest if that were an electronic vote rather than during the senate, so that will be part of an electronic vote that would go to the senators in the next several weeks. So if there are comments or questions, I'd be happy to address those; but that's I think the essence of my report for today."

"Any questions or comments? How come you have all these questions and comments for the provost, but not for me?"

(LAUGHTER)

"I think it's a statement of who has the budget power."

Speaker Beer: Carole? The lady in the second row."

Speaker Davies: I am trying to understand the Faculty Senate protocols in this regard; i.e. why are you requesting a one year extension?

Dean Fry: "I don't think I can do it for two years."

Senator Davies: "I don't understand the protocols. Would that affect subsequent ways that we nominate –"

Dean Fry: "No. What happens, when there's a term ending for the dean, it's a university faculty vote, and the Nominations and Elections Committee will identify candidates and put those individuals up for a university faculty vote. And so if I'm reappointed for a year, that will happen next spring."

Speaker Beer: "I think you had a few other comments or questions? No?"

"Okay, it would be in order to adjourn, since we've met the time for adjournment. We cannot observe it officially. Because of the financial crisis, this room cannot afford a clock."

(LAUGHTER)

(MEETING ADJOURNED)

\*Two issues were voted on electronically and passed on April 29, 2011. They were:

1. The first issue concerns the extension of the maximum time a person can be in a “postdoctoral” title at Cornell. The Senators who attended the Senate meeting on 13 April were in favor, and there were no Senators opposed. However, because we did not have a quorum, the vote was not official.
2. The second issue concerns my extension as Dean of the Faculty. Our Rules indicate that the Senate can extend the term of a Dean of the University Faculty for up to two years. I am asking to be re-appointed for one year. A new dean will be selected next spring. Colleagues on the Senate and in the administration have suggested that because there is so much happening at the moment, that changing deans at this time might be disruptive.