

Faculty Senate Minutes  
May 14, 2008

Call to Order by Speaker Steven Beer. "I would like to remind members of the Body that there are no photos to be taken and no audio recorders are allowed during the meeting. I ask everyone either to turn off or silence your cell phones. And when you speak please stand and identify yourself as to name and department. We have used the ten minutes allocated to Good and Welfare for assembling this afternoon. There are no Good and Welfare speakers. I call on Dean Walcott for some remarks."

## **1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN OF FACULTY**

Charles Walcott, Dean of the University Faculty: "Thank you. I will be very brief. First, the meeting dates for the fall... I realize it's hard to think about the fall at this point, but I do want to warn you all we have delayed the first meeting in the fall by one week. Normally it would happen on September 10. We are proposing it happen on September 17th. The reason is that David Skorton can then be with us. That seemed like a good thing for the first meeting in the fall. The second meeting we have also delayed by one week to the 15th of October to avoid Yom Kippur. That also seemed like a good thing to do. And if we were delaying the first one, it doesn't seem unreasonable to delay the second one. So those are two important announcements, which I'm sure you will remember come September.

"Secondly, I can report that the changes to the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty were overwhelmingly approved in the most recent ballot. And what that means is that each department is not only now able to select a Senator but to select an alternate as well. And in the letters that have just gone out to everybody, that suggestion has been made.

"And finally I know that a number of you are ending your terms, I would like to say thank you very much for your service on the Senate. I would like to pay a special tribute to our retiring faculty-elected trustee, Kathy Rasmussen, and thank her for her efforts. And, this is of course my last formal meeting as Dean of the Faculty. So I thank you all for your patience."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you Dean Walcott. I call on Associate Dean Anton for a report of the committee, which he chairs, Nominations and Elections and for the results of an election that was recently held."

## **2. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT**

Brad Anton, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "Okay. I have several items here. Item number one is a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee.

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

Faculty Committee on Program Review

John Eckenrode, CHE  
Janice Thies, CALS  
Mildred Warner, AAP

University Benefits Committee

Jack Blakely, ENGR.

Childcare Committee

Marianella Casasola, CHE  
Mark Lewis, ENGR.

Codes and Judicial Committee

Paul Chirik, A&S

University Hearing Board

Michael Sturman, Hotel

This report was given at the April 9th Faculty Senate meeting but could not be approved because we did not have a quorum. We have filled vacancies on the Faculty Committee for Program Review, the University Benefits Committee, which operates jointly between the Faculty Senate and the University Assembly and several subcommittees of the University Assembly including Child Care, Codes and Judicial and the University Hearing Board. I ask for approval of this report."

Speaker Beer: "All those in favor of approving the report please signify by raising your right hand. Opposed. Abstentions. The report is approved unanimously."

Associate Dean Anton: "Okay. Item number 2 is the report of the recent University Faculty election. First I thank all of our colleagues who participated in the election by running for positions. And I congratulate the winners, and here they are: Faculty Trustee, Rosemary Avery from Human Ecology; Faculty

Senate At-large Tenured, Valerie Bunce; Faculty Senate At-large Non-tenured, Wojtek Pawlowski; Nominations and Elections Committee, N'Dri Assié-Lumumba, Steven Bloom and Nicolas van de Walle; the University Faculty Committee, Kathryn Gleason and Timothy Mount. I don't think we need approval of this, because they have been elected.

Item number three. It's my turn to say thank you. Another academic year comes to an end, and it time to say thanks to some of the people who made things happen for us all. I thank the members of the Nominations and Elections Committee, especially Tove Hammer and Nelly Farnum who are finishing their terms and Kerry Cook who is leaving Cornell in mid-term for a new opportunity at UT Austin. Of course I thank the staff in the Dean of the Faculty's Office. That's Sandie, Diane and Tori, and all of the Faculty Senators whose terms are ending, particularly the At-large Senators that were chosen by elections that the Nominations and Elections Committee supervised. Those are Anne Blackburn, who completed a three-year term, and Brian Kirby, who filled an unexpected vacancy for one year on short notice, and Rosemary Avery, who is leaving the Senate mid-term to be our new Faculty Trustee.

"As you know, Charlie Walcott is finishing his term as Dean of the University Faculty this summer, and he is retiring from the Department of Neurobiology and Behavior. This is why we had some special refreshments today. I want to thank Charlie for several things. First and foremost, his tireless service to the Faculty of Cornell University. Charlie came here in 1981 to be Director of the Lab of Ornithology, a position he held until 1995 while overseeing a dramatic growth in size and reputation. Along the way he served on numerous faculty committees, and then he became the Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty in 2000. And that job I can assure was service in a punishing form. He has been Dean of the Faculty since 2003 - five years now. And this is a lot of time at Cornell, taking bumps and bruises mostly for the welfare of others. So I also thank him for his patience and wisdom, the patience and wisdom that he has been giving me while I have been learning how to be the Associate Dean. And I perceive it hasn't always been easy. And finally I thank him very much for agreeing to serve as our Associate Dean in the fall so I can take the sabbatical leave. And I wish you good luck for a long time, Charlie."

Speaker Beer: "Now I would like to call on Professor David Delchamps, the Chair of the Committee of Educational Policies for a resolution of the Committee."

### **3. RESOLUTION FROM EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINAL EXAMINATIONS AND OTHER END-OF-SEMESTER EXERCISES**

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering and Chair, Educational Policy Committee: "First of all I presented a motion briefly at the April meeting, but we didn't have a quorum. We do have quorum today, correct? Before we look at the resolution I want to tell you why we are doing it, and for that reason I would like you to see the old text (Appendix 1). Here we go.

"Basically, the reason we are doing this is that the current legislature is not being followed. And it's in a form that really can't be followed, given modern practices. Modern practices, as you know, as far as end-of-semester exercises and final exams and things like that, vary widely across units. There are all kinds of things going on all over the University, as we discovered when we did a survey a year ago. We already knew anecdotally, but now we have firm evidence thereof. This first piece of the old legislation that sits in the faculty handbook says that the University faculty long ago established and has never reversed the policy of each course to require a final exam, or some equivalent exercise. We thought that was a little bit restrictive, given our practices to begin with. And we thought that we needed to eliminate that or revise that. We received a strong signal from the faculty two years ago when Ann Lemley brought before us the resolution regarding final exams, and we thought that was an important thing to do. So keeping this in mind, I mean if you look at this, you can think of it either as this the defining essence of Cornell, or if you deconstruct it, this is something that you're going to reverse some day. Maybe now is the time to that. But in any event, that's the beginning. That's the preamble. And if you go ahead you will see that it tells essentially faculty that they have to do this, and then it goes to a list of numbered items that are restrictions on what the faculty can and cannot do during exam period, during study week, during the last week of classes. These are intended to just to protect the students from work overload. So essentially the old legislation was what to you have to do, and when can you do it, and when you cannot do it. So we figured what we would do is rewrite this in a form that we could actually obey as a faculty across the board. And so if you go back to the first page we have rewritten the whole preamble to recognize the variations across units.

Advances in pedagogy and..... I won't read it to you. I suppose you have all read it already in some way or another. But the point here is that the commonly used end-of-semester evaluative exercises are more numerous now than they used to be, I would guess. We have studio work in the Architecture, Art and Planning College. We have in my department of Electrical and Computer Engineering certain courses called "culminating design experience" courses that are project-focused, where the students make project presentations at the end. But those aren't necessarily in the form or the timing of traditional final exams or other term papers and things like that. There are all kinds of things that go on.

There are some courses that don't have any final exams, reading seminars and things like that. Advances in pedagogy have broadened the range of such things.

"Basically we said that the rules and guidelines that follow are designed to protect the students from unreasonable demands on their time, etc. And these are sharpened-up versions of the numbered items in the old legislation, worded in a way that accommodates the variations in end-of-semester exercises that we all recognize are there. Here is a definition of terms. The academic calendar has classes then it has a study period, then it has exam periods. In regard to full disclosure, two of my colleagues from Operations Research who actually designed the scheduling algorithms that we use now for final examinations pointed out to me that it was a little bit deceptive to call it an eight-day period for final exams, because not only is it not eight contiguous days, it's actually 22 periods spread over nine days. But I figured rather than put that kind of detail in here, I would just leave it this way. I would accept as a friendly amendment if you just want to strike out eight days and just have it be followed by a period for final exams. That's fine with me. This just defines the term. The University Registrar's Office assigns to every course a designated final exam time for that course. And this is for every course, even a course that is not going to have a final. That's how they are assigned.

"This next slide is basically a repetition of what's in the current legislation, that is, if a student has three exams scheduled in a twenty-four period, he/she has a legitimate need and ought to go to his or her instructors and plead for one of them to give a make-up, so that that collision doesn't occur. And unfortunately, in my opinion, it doesn't obligate the faculty involved doing that, but it encourages the faculty strongly to follow through on that.

"Now this slide shows new numbered items. Some of them are chapter and verse from the old legislation. But some of them aren't. Item number one is chapter and verse from the old legislation. So I'll just let that go. Item number two is chapter and verse, and, surprisingly to me, this one generated the most discussion at the April meeting. People were unaware that this was there, and I think that it probably touched a nerve, because it says no permission will be given for any reason for this to happen. Faculty members don't like to hear that. That's the way it is. Item three; this is also chapter and verse from the old legislation. If a faculty member wants to reschedule an exam and gets permission from the majority of the class to do so, the faculty member can do that provided that students are allowed to take it at the scheduled time if they insist on doing so. And the faculty member has to make the arrangements.

"This is new. This has to do with take-home examinations. The old legislation made no reference to take-home examinations. And as you all know, a lot of

courses have take-home exams. Take-home exams are scheduled in many different ways. Sometimes the faculty member will say I'm going to give you a take-home exam. You can come and pick it up any time in this window and bring it back to me forty-eight hours later. That's one way to do it. Or they could say we are having a take-home exam, you pick it up this day and return it that day. That's a rigid schedule for that one. Or, there's a take-home exam. Here are your problems. You have the next four weeks to ponder them. Just hand it in before the end of finals. So there are all kinds of take-home exam scheduling possibilities. And rather than go through all of those and dot all the i's and cross all the t's, essentially what we decided to do was that the final due-date for take-home final examinations, that sounds kind of awkward and if you want I'll explain it in more detail, can be no later than the date appearing on the official exam schedule for that course. In other words, if you are giving a final exam, then the earliest day it's due and can be allowed to hand it in, you can't make that any earlier than the final exam day for your class. And that's essentially so that if a student is taking say four mathematics courses at the 400 level, all of which have take home exams, all the professors are not allowed to have their take-home exams due the Monday of exam week. That would be kind of unfair. The reason we have this exam schedule is to spread out the student workload, and why not use these days, even though they are actually scheduled dates for official sit-down exams, as guidelines for take-homes as well? So that's new.

"The next item covers culminating end-of-semester exercises other than take-home exams. You can read it yourself. If there are any questions about it, you can ask me. This is essentially truth in advertising. We felt the old legislation was a little bit too restrictive, because it said you can't do stuff like this. It's not allowed. The new legislation is you can do this stuff but you have to tell them well in advance that you are going to do this, how it's going happen, and when it's going to come down."

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "Just a point of clarification. Why do you say 'must advertise it before the semester begins,' rather than for example 'at the beginning of the semester?'"

Professor Delchamps: "Part of that is so that students who are signing up for classes know that's going to happen."

Professor Cohn: "But where is it even going to be advertised, since they have to sign-up based on a non-description anyway. They have to sign up in the spring."

Professor Delchamps: "We checked with David Yeh, and we found out that we don't have to have stuff like this in the Course of Study, but there are essentially infinite spaces in the on-line system to put additional descriptors for courses now. I was surprised about that. And we were thinking that people would do that if they were going to have a course that had unusual circumstances."

Professor Cohn: "So what about those of us who might not have written our syllabus until the day before class, even though we are very responsible, engaged teachers?"

Professor Delchamps: "Well I guess my feeling is that writing a syllabus is a little different from something structural like this in terms of the evaluation."

Professor Cohn: "I don't know."

Speaker Beer: "If you can hold the questions until the presentation is complete, then we'll have the question and answer session."

Professor Delchamps: "This is another one that essentially covers a base that five doesn't cover exactly. And this is if you are not going to have a final exam, if you are not going to have a culminating, or if you are not going to have a take-home, but you do have a culminating end of semester exercise, you can't have that be the very last day of the last week of classes. There has to be some way for students to be allowed to submit something up until the day associated with the final exam. That's essentially because some students need that time to the end of the semester. The semester does not end on the last day of classes. It ends at the end of exams. For a given course it ends on the day that course's exam is scheduled. Some people on our committee felt very strongly about this point. That's why we put it here. And that's it, I believe."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. Are there questions on this proposed resolution by the Educational Policy Committee? Let's start over here."

Professor Jerrold Davis, Plant Biology: "I wonder if during the discussions concerning these policies if the matter of final lab exams in courses that have separate lab periods ever came up."

Professor Delchamps: "It came up in our survey as one of the variety of one of the many ways the students get evaluated at the end of the semester. And we were hoping that this legislation was broad enough to do that."

Professor Davis: "In what way, that is to say there will be no final lab exams during the final meeting of the lab section."

Professor Delchamps: "No."

Professor Davis: "I mean that's during the last week of classes."

Professor Delchamps: "Well, we felt that it didn't cover the entire course. It covered just the lab segments. That was the way I interpreted it."

Professor Davis: "It's not being forbidden?"

Professor Delchamps: "Right. It's at least my understanding of the current legislation is that you just can't have the final exam during the last week of classes."

Professor Phil Nicholson, Astronomy: "I have a question about your Item 5 and a brief one on Item 6. The issue of announcing ahead of time when the class presentation or something is going to be due, I think it's fine. It seems quite reasonable to tell people up front in the description that the requirement for this course will be that you make a class presentation. I do this regularly in my graduate course, but I usually make a habit of leaving the scheduling until later in the semester. And I take a poll amongst the students and I try to find what time is the least obtrusive given their other exams. It seems to be that insisting that you specify the date up front maybe just makes the system too inflexible."

Professor Delchamps: "I don't read that necessarily as having the date be fixed. I think your arrangement, in my view, fits with this in the following sense. That as long as the pre course information states that you will be evaluated in the following way at a time that is mutually agreeable to all of us. I think that would be fine."

Professor Nicholson: "And on Item 6, not on what you put on the screen but in the text that you sent out, there was a little "for example" at the end of this. So I was a little puzzled, because we could do something here, which I thought was already illegal, and that was making a presentation that was set during study period, for example. And I've always taken, as that was a non-permissible thing. You either had presentations in the last week of classes or during exam week"

Professor Delchamps: "Yes. That was in the old legislation. However, we discovered when we polled the various people around campus that for example, in Architecture, Art and Planning where there are studio classes, these things have to be spread out over an incredibly broad range of times. And there's no way around that given the logistics, not only the student logistics but also faculty logistics. And so we figured we had to accommodate that somehow, but we



wanted to make sure there was a little thread remaining for students to hold on to until the very end.”

Unidentified: “So this is one these rules that is already being ignored in certain cases.”

Professor Delchamps: “Yes, it’s being ignored, and we wanted to write legislation that could be obeyed.”

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies: “I’m a little embarrassed to say that I might have misunderstood the earlier rules all along. I have been breaking them consistently. May I ask a question? I was under the impression, perhaps wrongly, that final exams were scheduled (or sheduled as I was taught in the proper British language) once the professor says they want a sit-in final exam. Even if they are not having a sit-in exam, they actually do schedule a time for the exam?”

Professor Delchamps: “Yes, but not a room. The room is scheduled when the professor says I want to have an exam.”

Professor Edmondson: “So the time scheduled is whatever it is.”

Professor Delchamps: “Yes. The time is on the books.”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “Number 5. The way I read the language, I’m troubled by having to tell them this before the semester begins but even if I were to comply, which I suppose I probably would, I’m troubled about the nature of the associated due date. I don’t read that as anything other than calendar date. I don’t see how you can say well a date that is mutually agreeable to the people who end up signing up for the course. This is before the semester begins. It’s awfully vague. And that language doesn’t suggest vagueness. I would argue for ending the sentence earlier, the nature of the exercise so that people understand what is involved in the course. Associated due dates seems to me binds us to a date.”

Professor Delchamps: “Well I was thinking it covered his scenario but if the body feels that that’s not the case, I would feel personally, without consulting the committee, that if you did chop the sentence off there and it begins the nature of the exercise, period, then that would to me cover the range of when it’s going to happen. You know what you have to do and that kind of thing.”

Professor Toorawa: “The reason I said it is I think even when it’s not registering you might have a class size that you think will be extremely large and end up as

being very small. This happened in one course for me next semester. The reverse is happening in another course. I am actually going to change the nature of the exercises to match the size of the class. If I were to go from the traditional exam to the nontraditional in that class, I would be in violation, because before the semester has begun they would not have known that is the new exercise. On day one the class or syllabus given that day is what is expected. So it just seems to me safer to give us just a little bit more leeway than this document."

Professor Delchamps: "As I hear you, you have two concerns with this. One of them is this clause associated with due dates and the other is before the semester begins phrase."

Speaker Beer: "If you wish to make changes in the resolution the appropriate way to do that is to offer an amendment, and then the Body will consider the proposed amendment before considering the entire resolution."

Professor Delchamps: "We can't make amendments at the meeting. It has to be done before the meeting."

Professor Edmondson: "Can we introduce friendly amendments?"

Professor Delchamps: "Friendly, yes."

Professor Edmondson: "Yes, very friendly."

Professor Cohn: "I would like to suggest two friendly amendments. I would like to suggest that we go from saying, 'must advertise before the semester' to 'at the beginning of the semester.' And we eliminate 'and the associated due dates'."

Professor Delchamps: "I see a member of EPC here, would you care to speak to that?"

Professor David Henderson, Mathematics: "I think, 'at the beginning of the semester' can be viewed as a friendly amendment to substitute for 'before the semester begins'.

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "It seems like it's quibbling. I think the point is that either you have to get it in months in advance to get it in the on-line version or you else you can say it at the first class. And I think that the sense of the friendly amendment is that you can say it at the first class. So I think that you don't have to define it. I think the beginning of the semester is just fine. It gives the student an opportunity to drop the course immediately if they don't want to do it an end-of-semester exercise."

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communication: "A small point which is if we took that friendly amendment we would be less concerned about the associated dates, because if you do it on the first day of the syllabus by then it might not be unreasonable for people to say what day the thing is due."

Professor Delchamps: "Well I think one argument that someone had was that this phrase really read dates rather than range of dates or week of the semester of something like that.

Professor Gillespie: The other question is a little more sensitive. In the for example, listing papers and project reports to me are things that are turned in, and some of the other ones are ones where you need an audience. Audience things require much more scheduling. I wonder if we should ask the students whether paper and project reports could live under the rule of the take-home exercises, like use the deadline that was set by the registrar, and that helps us sort these things out. Whereas the ones needing a schedule, you know, groups have people that have to be in the same space, have a very different spin on the problem, and I can see why there's more.

Professor Delchamps: "One of the reasons we didn't deal with the papers was that the current legislation explicitly says papers may be required of students during the study period if announced sufficiently far in advance, etc. We didn't want to take away that kind of freedom that has existed. That's a good point."

Speaker Beer: "May I remind the body that we have three minutes left for consideration of the resolution."

Professor Vicki Caron, History: "I just had a question about Number 6. If somebody's teaching a seminar and they have a walk-up paper, which I think is actually the fact for most of my colleagues, then you are suggesting the paper would have to be turned in on the day that the exam was being scheduled. That would really pose a huge problem if these are long papers, like fifteen page papers and people end up on the last day and have only a day or two to read them. I think that's sort of an unfair burden on the faculty."

Professor Delchamps: "I think that this point came up. We decided to go with it as written for the following reasons. Reason number one is that some years you luck out and some years you don't as far as when you do this, early or late. The second reason is that in the modern age, the information age, it's not going to be a seventy-two hour turn around required for grades and there is going to be more flexibility. We have talked that over with the registrar and we are confident that this will be a livable way. It is different in fall from spring because

senior grades have to be in earlier in the spring. But after lengthy discussion of this point, your view was definitely heard.”

Speaker Beer: “The time has arrived for the Body to consider this resolution with its friendly accepted amendments that have been offered by the Educational Policy Committee. Are you ready to vote?”

Professor Caron: “Could we please clarify what we are voting on in terms of the language of point number 5?”

Professor Delchamps: “Okay. Here is what I have. It reads as written except where it said ‘advertise before the semester begins,’ it now says ‘advertise at the beginning of the semester.’ And strikes the last clause, ‘and the associated due dates.’”

Professor Bruce Turnbull, Information Operations and Information Engineering: “Can we have a friendly amendment to get rid of the four days and the eight days? It’s actually incorrect.”

Professor Delchamps: “Yes. I am going to leave the four days but I accept taking away the eight days.”

Professor Turnbull: “Does the four days include Sunday?”

Professor Delchamps: “Yes. The four days include Saturday at noon through Wednesday at noon.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay. It’s time to consider the resolution as amended by the chair of the Educational Policy Committee. All those in favor, please raise your right hands. Those opposed. Those abstaining.

The resolution (Appendix 2) has been accepted by the University Faculty Senate.

“I now call on Dean Walcott to present another resolution.”

#### **4. MOTION AND VOTE ON HONORARY DEGREES-DISCUSSION OF WEILL CORNELL MEDICAL COLLEGE PROPOSAL ON HONORARY DEGREES**

Dean Walcott: “Let me just say a word or two about the origin of this resolution (Appendix 3). About two years ago in the fall, I received a letter from our colleagues at the Weill Medical College requesting the University’s approval of the idea of giving an honorary degree. I forwarded this request to CAPP

(Committee on Academic Programs and Policies). It was talked about at a number of meetings, and CAPP wrote back to Weill suggesting that there was a long precedent against honorary degrees at Cornell, and it would require a substantial and good reason to abandon this precedent. We asked if our colleagues at Weill had considered the possibility of some kind of a medal or award of a different sort. After that message was received we arranged a meeting with the chairman of the Board of Overseers at the Medical College, Sandy Weill, and some representatives from the Medical College with CAPP and the UFC. There was a long discussion, and as a result of that discussion a small committee was formed consisting of Rosemary Avery, Fred Gouldin, David Hajjar, Ralph Nachman, and Jack Barchas, all of whom are here this afternoon to consider how to prepare a proposal that they felt had the best chance of being favorably received by the faculty. This proposal has been back and forth from this committee to CAPP. CAPP felt strongly that if we were going to have honorary degrees, it should not be just one unit of the University that offered them but all of the units of the University.

“The University Faculty Committee had a number of specific concerns, which this committee has now addressed. Both committees felt without expressing any opinion on this proposal, either pro or con, that it should be brought to the faculty in general for their consideration. And so what we would like to do this afternoon is this. You have before you a motion. We have the committee here, and I will ask them to come up front and sit at the table if you would. We need to discuss this proposal (Appendix 4) and see if you are willing to entertain the motion. And I think to begin the discussion I have asked Dr. Hajjar if he would be willing to say a few words by way of introduction.”

David Hajjar, Executive Vice Provost and Dean, WCMC: “Several years ago our faculty at WCMC in New York City began discussions about how we would like to really recognize excellence in superb achievements in our field of science and medicine. We primarily were focused on the medical school unit of Cornell. We were not thinking that this would be a University-wide proposal at all. We didn’t consult other deans in the University. We felt that this was something that we wanted to do at the medical school campus, and we started to look into this to see how it was done in the other Ivy League medical schools. As we looked into the other Ivy League medical schools to find out the process, how they went about selection, what was their reasoning for doing it, we were particularly interested in seeing if this was abused in any way. Was it something where really top people in the field of medicine and medical science were being honored? We looked a whole variety of ways in which this was being done. As Charlie nicely went over the history of this process, from our end we sent up a letter to the Ithaca campus to see how they would basically respond in the various committees at the University.

“As I said, the reason why we wanted to do this is that we wanted to recognize individuals that had prominence in their field and superior achievement as defined by what we would think a selection committee to figure out whether or not it would be appropriate. When we looked into this process, we found that in many of the Ivy League schools the Trustees are the selection processes. A sub-committee of the Trustees could do it. We felt that after the consideration of that, we wanted to have it be faculty centered. We wanted mainly faculty members participating in the process including the selection. In the letter that’s part of your package you can see what our proposal is about, who would basically decide. That would be part of the selection process to figure out who would decide who would be appropriate candidates. We wrote down some basic rules. You had to be alive. It would be a very small number that would be selected. They had to attend the convocation and graduation exercises. It would be honorary doctor of medical sciences, not an MD. It would be a doctor of medical sciences. We looked, as I said, at the other 12 Ivy League schools to see how they did it. And we followed pretty much their pattern and basically why they suggested those candidates.

“I have to also tell you and let be very frank with you, we are very sensitive to the issues that were brought up to us previously. We have no intention of putting together a committee of Wall Street barons that are going to sit and decide who of their friends are going to get an honorary degree from the medical school. We did figure this out and that’s why we aren’t suggesting a committee full of the Board of Overseers as members. We know what goes on in this particular regard, and we are quite sensitive to it, particularly those of us that were trained here on the Cornell University campus. And of course we understand the concept that is steeped in tradition but as my colleagues and I have debated back and forth, this is constantly evolving medical world, not the field, and that it would not be inappropriate to consider the possibility of recognizing the great talent that is out there. And that is basically the intention of our committee.

“Again, you have the list of the people who we would like to be involved in the selection process. I thought it also would be appropriate to invite our University Professor Ralph Nachman to come with me and answer any questions or give any opening remarks if he wants to, as well as Professor Barchas who is also Chair of our Psychiatry Department and basically participated in this process in the past when he was at UCLA and Stanford. I would be happy at this point in the process to answer any questions that you may have, or if my colleagues on the committee either from the Ithaca campus or from the Medical School campus would like to offer any comments and thoughts.”

Speaker Beer: "Are there questions from members of the Body?"

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: "Yes. I'm just curious why the Provost of the University wasn't on the selection committee."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "The Provost of the Ithaca Campus? Because we put our Provost of the Medical School on the committee. We could. There was no reason we didn't put Bidy on. We can put the Provost of the University on. We can add her. We are not wedded to any specific formula. The only thing that we felt passionate about is that we didn't want to have it as a committee of all the Board of Overseers."

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics: "I read over the three criteria that you list for selecting the honorees. I wonder whether someone who has shown exceptional generosity to the Medical School still would not fit these criteria unless he or she was an exceptional scientist or ethicist or something along those lines."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "That is not the intention of our committee. We know how the chair of our Board of Overseers came up to Ithaca and gave his opinion. But we have in place a selection committee, and it is our intention that we would adhere to the criteria that we put forth, which again is a combination of many criteria that the other schools do use. Our intention is not to go down the Forbes 500 list and say here is an honorary degree because we expect a gift. If that was the case, I wouldn't be here."

Professor Phoebe Sengers, Science and Technology Studies: "I have to say that in my four years as a Senator this is a resolution about which I got the most e-mail from everyone in my department. I think it would be fair to say that the general tone was apoplectic. And the major reason for the concerns of my department appear to be that this singles out the biomedical sciences as being an area of study which particularly needs honorary degrees because it's particularly valuable and important compared to all the other areas in which the University has made contributions, such as for example agriculture and the development of the green revolution. My fellow faculty members believe that there are no grounds by which the medical college should be treated differently from all the other disciplines that are seen at Cornell. If you have any arguments to make against it, that might be a good thing to know."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "I can comment on that. I don't work on this campus any more. When we first came up with this proposal we were advised to focus on the medical school campus because it was our idea to bring this up. It had been brought up here in the late sixties or early seventies. This proposal

originated again on the medical school campus. I understand the sentiment of the faculty in your department how they may feel, but we were told to focus on the medical school, because we are from the medical school. There was no effort made by senior administration here or any leadership group to say, wait a minute, why just the medical school? We would like to consider this too. Let's have a university-wide committee. That was not introduced to us as something that we were at least going to have it. Many of the major top universities in the country they do give a variety of honorary degrees. They do letters. They do a doctorate of arts. A whole variety of degrees are given. We focused on the medical school and not other academic units. We can work together as a team, or we can basically mind our own business and present to you what we think should be done in the medical school."

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Department of Clinical Sciences: "I was looking at the benefits to be derived from this program (that is sort of on the first full paragraph on the second page). And I was wondering if such things would benefit other colleges in the university or bring attention to Cornell as recipients would establish a bond with the University and return and give lectures, so forth and so on. It seems to me we already have program in place that sort of does that, such as the A.D. White Professors-at-large, and things of that nature. I was wondering if your committee considered those mechanisms that could essentially result in the same outcome without changing long-standing traditions."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "We did consider it. In the medical school at Cornell as well as the other peer schools we have in New York, and I'm sure you have on the Ithaca campus, the visiting professor comes up and also named professorships in the department of medicine, for example. There's about fifteen of them where it's quite an honor to be invited. In the department of public health there are visiting people that are brought in, named professorships that come in. These are people that some have terminal degrees, doctorates; some that don't. They come in and they spend a week on campus. They give a variety of seminars and other things. We have something like that already, but what we were thinking about is an accolade that basically would honor real distinct individuals that have gone beyond the call of duty to support the biomedical sciences. This was basically in the back of our minds. We have all sorts of other academic-style vehicles on the medical school campus, but we felt that this would be something special. And that's why we wanted to consider something special."

Professor Stein: "Could we go back to the criteria again? This proposal has a long and twisted history. And one can't forget about it when looking at it for the first time. I came into the room not very favorable to it, but looking at this if only the first bullet were there, I would feel a lot different about it. I don't really



understand what the second and third bullets are meant to cover. They may, for instance, have displayed eminence in public service or other appropriate endeavors, may well be funding. They may be political. Someone that brings us health care coverage or something like that. All of which I think are inappropriate. I think that if we said someone who has had extraordinary achievement and distinctions in biomedical sciences or maybe you might write in practice, a doctor who had practiced wherever or something like that. I would be much more favorable to it. But when I see the other two bullets - I say what they are trying to do is to slip in..."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "No one is trying to slip in anything. We added that because we were looking at what other schools were doing, and how some of the other people that they were honoring. Those individuals didn't have extraordinary achievement in the biomedical sciences, but they were great contributors to make sure others had great achievements in the biomedical sciences. For example, like what many schools did concerning Bill Gates and the efforts that he did to advance AIDS research. So when we put in the public service line that's the kind of individual that we were thinking about. And as I said in another part of the document it's not to be politically motivated at all. Now, if those two second bullets are still too wishy-washy for the Senate, and you want them amended or deleted, we will indeed seriously consider this."

Professor Cohn: "So I want to follow up on this line of discussion and actually go to the second paragraph of the text where there is additional language that seems to open up more possibilities in the direction that both Peter and Lisa had suggested. So it said this would primarily pertain to physicians and scientists. So primarily really opens things quite wide. And then it goes on to say 'who have made exceptional contributions in education, research or patient care reflecting the medical school's tripartite mission as well as on a selective basis to a broader constituency who has shown extraordinary support for the biomedical sciences.' That could be anything. I appreciate the characterization of the committee and how that puts some restraint in. But I personally could not possibly support a proposal that didn't tighten all of these aspects of the language. To have there be in writing a commitment to your understanding and not the Board of Overseers' understanding of what the endeavor is here. And that would be the bottom line. And I would like to add one other thing. The criteria are listed, and then it says that, so there's a list of candidates that are going to be nominated, and I would consider not only adding the Provost from the Ithaca campus but also maybe weighting in a little more. There are other constituencies that might be represented here, but then it goes on to say a simple majority vote is required to confirm or reject a nominee. I would like to see a much higher standard there. If you are serious that it's by virtue of who you are putting on this committee that you are going to control how there is not political

or financial pressure imposed, then I think that needs to be a much higher requirement.”

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: “Again we followed the format that other schools were doing because... So when we discussed the other criteria our group found on the medical school campus felt that this language would be more appropriate by the majority. Again, if your particular opinion carries the day we will certainly change it.”

Professor Cohn: “But we are different. We have never given honorary degrees before at Cornell. So don’t follow them. Make your own justifications for why you want to do it.”

Professor Walter Lynn, former Dean of the Faculty and Professor Emeritus: “I rise to speak against this proposal in total. This interesting letter prepared by you and shared with the call to the meeting does two things. It refers to the exception. It is anti-tradition. Why don’t you guys give honorary degrees to everybody? It really is a plea to do that. The exception comes at the end. Say if you won’t do that, make an exception for us. That’s the major issue for this Body to consider at this point. Does it wish to violate its long-standing tradition of not granting honorary degrees? And therefore it makes the question of an exception really an interesting irrelevant question.

“I should point out as you do in your letter, we have good company who do not grant honorary degrees, namely MIT and Stanford. It’s a long-standing tradition for that. They don’t seem to be diminished in their ability either to attract faculty or to gain recognition for their schools’ fine scientists and physicians. Secondly, the final issue is on the exception. If we create an exception we are in fact opening up a slippery slope to have the entire University open itself for professional activities that go on on this campus for the Vet College, the Business School, a whole variety would also do that. I think the issue for this body is do you want to grant honorary degrees or not. The tradition has been no, repeatedly done by this faculty starting in the early part of the century. Repeatedly rejected by a variety of requests to do that by former presidents, by Trustees. It has been adamantly the same - no we won’t do that.”

Professor Ralph Nachman, WCMC: “We all respect your point of view. We don’t lightly suggest a tradition that is so sacred to this campus and to the University at large, be abrogated. This afternoon when we were preparing to come up, we had some time, and I walked into the bookstore. And I picked up Frank Rhodes 2002 book off the shelf, which is titled “The Creation of the Future,” and he comments in there, why Universities can no longer be ivory towers. I look at the proposal that we are presenting before as an attempt to

move this University and certainly the medical school into the twenty-first century by recognizing unusual activities that bear significantly on the social matrix of the world that we live in. Your present University President, David Skorton, refers to this University as a global University. It is a global University. Certainly much of our medicine and health care is a global enterprise. And we think without the meeting many other intellectual achievements that have been referred to that have a major impact on society. Certainly biomedical science and medicine is at a point in time in the twenty-first century where we think an honorary degree would be an appropriate, and I think a significant step forward for a place like this, this University. Whether it should be the beginning of what you call a slippery slope, I think the faculty has to decide. We are in no position to advise you that the same thing should be done in law, business, architecture, etc. What we are saying is biomedical science and medicine has become such a major part of the modern world that it is appropriate and not demeaning to the historical traditions.”

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “My presence here is evidence that I am probably one of the best consumers of medical services in this room. So I am well aware of the progress in the medical world and the lack of progress in the medical world. We have essentially a long tradition here of not having honorary degrees. We respect that tradition. I have never felt dishonored by it. I felt honored by it. I know other good schools do otherwise. I know other good schools do what we do. So why is now the time for exception? I don’t believe it is time for an exception. There is an exception here that I think you were addressing earlier about how you see the world. You just now reiterated it. You are different. We are in an ivory tower. Perhaps, we are not yet in the twenty-first century. That raises hackles but probably not worth responding to you now. You have proposed this. You have put this in the highest tone I think you are capable of getting it to. But unfortunately you have left traces that people have remarked on. You have in fact allowed many things to happen. You start with ‘excellence, extraordinary achievement, distinction,’ but we go to ‘or other appropriate endeavors.’ You can drive anybody through that who has enough money to pay for the truck. ‘Aligning with the missions of the medical college.’ Many people are aligned with the mission of what used to be the Cornell Medical College and is now the Weill Cornell Medical College. I distrust your intentions, not because they aren’t in total what they seem to be, but that we are going to be faced with this thing used for purposes that are more like the other than like the extraordinary achievement. And even if it were achievement, I don’t grant that there is such a distinction here unto yourselves that you are worthy of doing this thing as necessary for you, and the rest of the departments here or fields are not worthy of that. I think we have maintained a fairly good tradition that has not let us astray. And I would not like to be led astray at this point by a proposal that could in fact end up in awarding degrees

to just about anybody who had enough clout to make it worth somebody's while."

Professor Toorawa: I would acknowledge my degree university, a peer Ivy League university to remain unnamed, red and blue. I asked why we gave honorary degrees to the president once, and he was the new president. And he said, its not to confer distinction upon the individual, it's for distinction of ourselves, so that the university somehow acquires distinction by honoring somebody. This seemed to be a watertight answer itself. It was very diplomatic. I'm all for tradition, witness the beard, but I think the big eloquent of the room, which is no longer eloquent because we have named it is, should the university give honorary degrees? I think the way I would like to think about this, and I suggest you all think about this, not with an exception, in which I find exception deeply exceptionable, yet here we are making an exception for one of our units to give an honorary degree to me is deeply troubling in that I too have received many communications from people. This really is troubling to many people on this campus. Why are we making an exception? I have no problem with giving honorary degrees. I have a problem with exceptions. It seems to me what we need to discuss is whether we should start giving honorary degrees or not. Again, I'm all for tradition, but I think this idea of holding on to tradition because it is a tradition is subject to some analysis. It seems to me that we didn't, so for a long time and when I arrived I was told that we did not give honorary degrees because you earned a Cornell degree. There are, by the way, two exceptions. Two honorary degrees were granted. The twenty-first century, I don't buy that particular way of arguing it, because you argued it for the medical center. If you are going to argue it generally, we need to think about ways of honoring people beyond, say the A.D. White Professorship, or the Bartels Lecture or whatever it is we do. It seems to be worthwhile for people to discuss properly, perhaps constitute a committee. Perhaps it involves a lot more people than just the Senators and come up with some kind of resolution and then decide whether the medical school ought to also give degrees. If it were up to me, which it isn't thankfully, what I would like to see is a vigorous discussion and then in deference to the medical school, which has the gumption, I guess, to bring it before the Body, is to allow them to do it first, because after all they are the ones who have the courage to bring it before the body. But it seems to me imperative that we discuss this as a University and that we not make an exception."

Professor Edmonson: "The last speaker preempted most of what I wanted to say. But let me just add a few items here. First of all, I have no problem with honorary degrees at all. I have seen them in universities. I have taught in six or seven. I have no problem with them. Cornell has its tradition. That's the tradition. With regard to this I am worried about making ad hoc decisions for

one department. If this happens today, then two weeks it's department B. Faculty B will not come in tomorrow and not work the day after tomorrow. It opens a hatch, so to speak. Is there a great urgency about this that the decision has to be made today? Is there accompanying urgency that if it is not done today as opposed to the day after tomorrow, will make a difference? Is it premature? I believe as the last speaker mentioned that you should give us an opportunity to revisit tradition. We should not be so steeped in tradition that we can never reconsider, even if we reaffirm it. We should always consider it. I think we should seize this opportunity here that they have a case, a good argued case why we should do it. I am not currently in favor of signing on to it for reasons I have given. But I do hope we will use this opportunity to revisit Cornell's tradition of a thing which one hundred years ago - one hundred years later is a big difference. And whether we had not before considered the suitability of having honor degrees granted, if not, should there be situations where it's specific to departments.

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, Economics ILR. "I am actually going to receive an honorary degree at another university Saturday. There are a number of principles I want to address. The first principle, which several people have articulated is that this, is one university, and we make decisions as a university, not individual colleges. The second principle is that you earn things at Cornell through work at Cornell, not for accomplishments elsewhere. And we won't consider greed and the popular guise at Cornell as the easiest Ivy League college to get into but the hardest to get out of because our students work. And so I think there is a reason for the tradition of not giving honorary degrees, and that reason is that we do not give honorary degrees because the people are not working to get it here. So I would actually like to amend the motion and the amendment would simply be Cornell does not offer honorary degrees."

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: "As an economist I always look at a tradition to see what value it adds. So that is my gauge of the work of a tradition. And several years ago, when this issue was raised initially, I observed that the reason why an honorary degree at Cornell is so highly valued is because there is so few of them. So the number one concern I have is debasing the currency. But I concur wholeheartedly with Professor Ehrenberg's observation. I remember as an undergraduate at Yale getting my bachelor's degree and wondering why all these people were on the stage getting an honorary degree. I was flattered to have some of these notables; that some other people had to do some scholarly work to discover who they were. I went to many other graduations and I must say the first Cornell graduation I came to when I was a faculty member here I found to be the most delightful one I had ever witnessed. One of the reasons is there's only one speaker; that's a tradition. It's the President of the University; that's a tradition. And there are not parades

of honorary degrees. Now, do I think we should not honor the types of colleagues that are enumerated on this at a university? Of course we ought to. That is part of being connected with the real world. But I think we just simply ought to find other venues and other mechanisms to do so than to do it in conjunction with the graduation of the students that have fulfilled all the requirements and obligations. And have worked so very hard."

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I just want to point out two sort of historical facts arising from the alumni, who as we know strenuously objected to President Adams rescinding the policy of not giving out honorary degrees and wrote a petition to the university, which was received by the Board of Trustees and then caused the reversion and went back to the traditional policy of no honorary degrees. From that petition, I want to point out two arguments that they made that seem particularly pertinent to the discussion that we have had so far. One of the arguments singling out only a few alumni for honorary degrees will invite jealousy and dissention in the alumni, bursting the bonds of loyalty among departments and colleges. We have already seen that in this discussion so far. I think it's the basis of a ready-made brawl if the university adopts the motion as it is. For that reason I am also against it.

"The second argument, and the last one I am going cite today, is the alumni noted you need not be reminded how easily men of little culture and even of questionable characters rise to high positions in state and national government. It seems many colleges confer their honors upon such individuals. I will cite just one example. The University of Edinburgh, one of our international peer universities, in 2007 was faced by the revolt of the students who wished them to rescind the degree given to the President of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe. The university looked at their policies and said yes that was probably not a good idea. And they did change their policies and they did rescind their degree. They were not the only university who had awarded that degree. The University of Massachusetts in Boston also gave him a degree. So, I think if you look around even in the Ivy League today you can find examples of very unfortunate awarding of honorary degrees.

Speaker Beer: "I would remind the Body that we have ten minutes before our scheduled adjournment. Are there other questions or points to be offered?"

Professor Delchamps: "I think tradition is important and especially tradition based on the reason we have spoken about. I also think automatically to adhere to tradition is not a good idea, generally. I mean I am going to consider this proposal. I am a little confused by two things. First of all the wording is very uneven in terms of what's required of people. Those three bullets, if you roll back, the sentence right before those says ... all three of the criteria below,

meaning all three of them, so it's an 'and,' not an 'or' in that way. But earlier in the document it is very much an 'or.' And I am quite honestly disturbed by that. I'm really not sure exactly what it is. Is it all three or is at least one of the following. That's the first thing.

"The second thing is and I risk falling victim to your generic policy here. You have distanced yourself admirably from the chair of the Board of Overseers and his point of view on this. That's another reason why I am somewhat ambivalent on the proposal right now. I certainly didn't buy his rationale. On the other hand, he started this effort, and I am just wondering why is it that decisions were made at the faculty level or the educational administrative level to carry the ball across the goal line. I'm not saying that in this different way is the way."

Speaker Beer: "Would you care to respond please. Would you kindly stand?"

Jack Barchas, Chair of Psychiatry at Weill Cornell: "We all appreciate the having a chance to meet with you and to explain proposal. This proposal is not a new proposal. Many of us have felt this way for many years. Stanford was mentioned. I spent twenty-five years at Stanford. I held an endowed chair for seven. I loved the place. But I have also been associated with other universities that do have honorary degrees. And as was appropriately pointed out that the five-man error can be made. If you read through the attached material - I don't know what there was attached and what you received - but the list of honorary degrees that were given in 2007 by our peer institutions, they are a remarkable and wonderful group.

"What we are concerned with is intellectual achievement and creative accomplishments in the enormous number of fields that impact on biomedical science. And, yes some of that is direct biomedical science. Some of it is indirect. Some of us would say that a great economist who has had profound thinking about the medical field would be parse of that type of a program Others would say a great architect or a great pair of architects would be part of that type of program. Or a great lawyer who had profoundly influenced our views on the mentally ill would be part of that.

"I have seen it first hand, not because I received an honorary degree, but it happens that my wife Rosemary Stevens, a great social historian of medicine, was chair of the History and Sociology of Science at Penn for a number of years. And for five years was Dean of Arts and Sciences there. And she happens to be a member of the Institute of Medicine and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has received a number of honorary degrees. And I will tell you it is a wonderful process. It's a wonderful process for the recipient. It's great fun for the trailing spouse. We eat very well. We meet lots of students and lots of

faculty. It's also a very exciting process. There's a very tight bond and a very immediate bond that gets formed in that process. And that's true for the recipient as I mentioned and it's true for the faculty. And the students and the parents love it. It's dramatic. Why do it at graduation - because for whatever reason graduation is always a wonderful exercise, and it fits in that context to honor individuals who are actually making a profound difference for the field.

"Now we recognize that each of the parts of this great University, and I have come to really appreciate and love Cornell as a University, have different approaches. But our particular unit involves twelve hundred faculty. And so it's not a small group of people. It's a very large group of people. All of these, the leadership of ours, all of our chairs, feel that this would be helpful for us, helpful for the institution, helpful for our interaction with our community as well as with the biomedical staff, to be able to award honorary degrees.

"I thank you very much for hearing us and for your patience and for your stability in this process that we have been going through. I think it's been very helpful and we should be thinking about amendments that have been suggested. I thank you."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "I would just like to build on your question, sir, that you asked. When Mr. Weill came up and discussed his ideas about this, he came back and reported to us about the kinds of responses he got. As Dr. Barchas mentioned, we have been talking about this for a number of years. And we decided as a group that if we were going to embrace this kind of notion, we would want to do it as a faculty group. And our senior administration down in New York was behind that. They basically said, "You guys do it. You do it well. And you do it in the best possible manner." I still appreciate very much what Professor Cohn brought out before about tightening up the language in this, so that nobody slips through the cracks. We certainly will do this. And one other issue that has come up this afternoon is this issue why the medical school unit and why in a way that we feel we were special in any manner. And why wasn't this discussed with different representatives from different academic units. Our initial letter came up to the university last summer and we weren't informed in any way that perhaps for political reasons or whatever academic reasons there are that it should be discussed in a university-wide manner and that we should hold off. If we were told to do that and follow that kind of process, we would have. We don't think we are better than the Ag school, than ILR or any other school. We got, based on what we were hearing in New York, from our colleagues in the Northeast in particular, about what was going on that it would be an avenue now to revisit our long tradition. So we started and initiated this at the medical level. If this Body believes that we don't want to do it this way, then



perhaps we should open it up to the whole University to see if it develops any traction. If it doesn't, then we won't waste any more time on it."

Speaker Beer: "As the hour is late we will hear from Associate Dean Anton and then we will consider what to do with the motion."

Professor Anton: "When an organization makes a change in the way it does business it is usually done because there is a problem to solve. You look. There's something wrong. You need to fix it and figure out a way to fix it. So I ask myself what problem are we solving here? Do we feel that we suffer a lack of prestige relative to our peers who do grant honorary degrees? Or, as you said it makes the Commencement more dramatic and spectacular. Do we need to add spice to an otherwise boring Commencement? Or, is it to enhance our posture in the game of competitive fund-raising? Because that's how it was presented to us originally. That third one is the one I can look at and say yes, I can see that this might be the problem and we need to solve it. Otherwise, I can't identify the problem we're solving here."

Vice Provost and Dean Hajjar: "I can speak honestly about it. The faculty committee didn't look at this as a fund-raising vehicle. We set a target of 1.3 billion dollars, and we raised half as it was announced in six months. These are all of the facts. We weren't thinking how can we bring more people to our plate. We were looking about recognition of our institute, our medical school, in the spirit in which it had been done elsewhere and the reasons it had been done elsewhere. Many of our people felt that they were very noble reasons, to basically acknowledge excellence and achievement in our field. So that was our mindset when we started to drill through the different ways to do this. And that's basically the faculty's opinion, and we are the ones that are carrying the ball on this, not senior administration. It was mentioned earlier that more senior administrators should be involved. We certainly could do that. We tried to keep it more in the realm of the faculty."

Professor Frederick Gouldin, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "I ask to say just one thing. I think there are two situations in which you make changes. One is when you see a problem. The other is when you see an opportunity."

Professor Ralph L. Nachman: "The recognition of this is an opportunity to move forward recognizing that field that we are in has a major impact on society in many, many ways."

Speaker Beer: "Are we ready to consider the motion? The motion is before you. All those in favor, signify by raising your right hand. All those opposed. Abstentions. We can have a count."

Motion        Fails

No votes - 47

Yes votes - 4

Abstentions - 6

Meeting adjourned: 6:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

A. Brad Anton

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

**Appendix 1****Resolution on Final Examinations and Other End-of-Semester Exercises**

WHEREAS, the existing legislation on final examinations does not match current practices across the university,

WHEREAS, the Educational Policy Committee after reviewing policy and practice recommends the following changes,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the following text replace the section titled "Final Examinations" that runs from the middle of page 81 to the middle of page 82 in the Faculty Handbook, ending just before the paragraph titled "Return of Exams, Papers, etc."

**Final Examinations and Other End-of-Semester Exercises**

**Advances in pedagogy and variations in practice across fields have broadened the range of commonly used end-of-semester evaluative exercises beyond traditional sit-down final examinations. The rules and guidelines that follow aim to protect students from unreasonable demands on their time while simultaneously providing instructors the flexibility necessary to design evaluative exercises appropriate to their courses.**

**The Academic Calendar sets aside after the last week of classes a four-day study period followed by a eight-day period for final examinations. The Registrar's Office assigns to every course a specific day and time during final-examination period at which time the course's final exam, if any, will take place. The designated final-exam days and times are scheduled carefully to minimize conflicts and spread students' workloads as evenly as possible over the exam period.**

**It is university policy to discourage more than two examinations for a student in one twenty-four hour time period. Members of the faculty are urged to grant student requests for a make-up examination, particularly if their course is the largest of the three involved and thus has the strongest likelihood of offering a makeup for other valid reasons, e.g. a student's illness or a death in a student's family.**

**Legislation of the University Faculty governing study period and final examinations and other end-of-semester exercises is as follows:**

- 1. No final examinations may be given at a time other than the time appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office without prior written permission of the dean of the faculty.**
- 2. No permission will be given, for any reason, to schedule final examinations during the last week of classes or the study period preceding final examinations.**
- 3. Permission will be given by the dean of the faculty to reschedule examinations during the examination period itself if requested in writing by the faculty member, but only on condition that a comparable examination also be given for students who wish to take it at the time the examination was originally scheduled. The faculty member requesting such a change will be responsible for making appropriate arrangements for rooms or other facilities in which to give the examination.**
- 4. The final due date for a take-home final examination can be no earlier than the date appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office without prior written permission of the dean of the faculty.**
- 5. A course that requires a culminating end-of-semester exercise (for example, a paper, project report, final critique, oral presentation, or conference) in lieu of or in addition to a traditional final examination must advertise before the semester begins the nature of the exercise and the associated due date(s).**
- 6. A course that requires a culminating end-of-semester exercise and does not offer a final examination must allow students at least until the date appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office to complete submission of materials associated with the culminating exercise. (For example, a student making a presentation during the last week of classes or during study period will have at least until the scheduled final-exam date to submit a final write-up or equivalent.)**

EPC Approval  
March 31, 2008

*(Note: See following page for text to be replaced.)*

*Extracted from pages 81-82, 2002 Faculty Handbook*

### *Final Examinations*

**The University Faculty long ago established, and has never reversed, the policy that each course should require a final examination or some equivalent exercise (for example, a term paper, project report, final critique, oral presentation, or conference) to be conducted or due during the period set aside for final examinations.**

Although not specifically prohibited, it is university policy to discourage more than two examinations for a student in one twenty-four hour time period and especially on any one day. It is urged that members of the faculty consider student requests for a make-up examination, particularly if their course is the largest of the three involved and thus has the strongest likelihood of offering a makeup for other valid reasons, i.e. illness, death in the family, etc.

Legislation of the University Faculty governing study period and examinations is as follows:

1. No final examinations can be given at a time other than the time appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office without prior written permission of the dean of the faculty.
2. No permission will be given, for any reason, to schedule final examinations during the last week of classes or the designated study period preceding final examinations.
3. Permission will be given by the dean of the faculty to reschedule examinations during the examination period itself if requested in writing by the faculty member, but only on condition that a comparable examination also be given for those students who wish to take it at the time that the examination was originally scheduled.

The faculty member requesting such a change will be responsible for making appropriate arrangements for rooms or other facilities in which to give the examination. This should be done through the Registrar's Office.

4. No tests are allowed during the last week of scheduled classes unless such tests are part of the regular week-by-week course program and are followed by an examination (or the equivalent) in the final examination period.
5. Papers may be required of students during the study period if announced sufficiently far in advance that the student did not have to spend a significant segment of the study period completing them.
6. Faculty can require students to submit papers during the week preceding the study period.
7. Take home examinations should be given to classes well before the end of the regular term and should not be required to be submitted during study period but rather well into the examination period.

Appendix 2**Resolution on Final Examinations and Other End-of-Semester Exercises**

WHEREAS, the existing legislation on final examinations does not match current practices across the university,

WHEREAS, the Educational Policy Committee after reviewing policy and practice recommends the following changes,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the following text replace the section titled "Final Examinations" that runs from the middle of page 81 to the middle of page 82 in the Faculty Handbook, ending just before the paragraph titled "Return of Exams, Papers, etc."

**Final Examinations and Other End-of-Semester Exercises**

**Advances in pedagogy and variations in practice across fields have broadened the range of commonly used end-of-semester evaluative exercises beyond traditional sit-down final examinations. The rules and guidelines that follow aim to protect students from unreasonable demands on their time while simultaneously providing instructors the flexibility necessary to design evaluative exercises appropriate to their courses.**

**The Academic Calendar sets aside after the last week of classes a four-day study period followed by a period for final examinations. The Registrar's Office assigns to every course a specific day and time during final-examination period at which time the course's final exam, if any, will take place. The designated final-exam days and times are scheduled carefully to minimize conflicts and spread students' workloads as evenly as possible over the exam period.**

**It is university policy to discourage more than two examinations for a student in one twenty-four hour time period. Members of the faculty are urged to grant student requests for a make-up examination, particularly if their course is the largest of the three involved and thus has the strongest likelihood of offering a makeup for other valid reasons, e.g. a student's illness or a death in a student's family.**

**Legislation of the University Faculty governing study period and final examinations and other end-of-semester exercises is as follows:**

- 1. No final examinations may be given at a time other than the time appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office without prior written permission of the dean of the faculty.**
- 2. No permission will be given, for any reason, to schedule final examinations during the last week of classes or the study period preceding final examinations.**
- 3. Permission will be given by the dean of the faculty to reschedule examinations during the examination period itself if requested in writing by the faculty member, but only on condition that a comparable examination also be given for students who wish to take it at the time the examination was originally scheduled. The faculty member requesting such a change will be responsible for making appropriate arrangements for rooms or other facilities in which to give the examination.**
- 4. The final due date for a take-home final examination can be no earlier than the date appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office without prior written permission of the dean of the faculty.**
- 5. A course that requires a culminating end-of-semester exercise (for example, a paper, project report, final critique, oral presentation, or conference) in lieu of or in addition to a traditional final examination must advertise at the beginning of the semester the nature of the exercise.**
- 6. A course that requires a culminating end-of-semester exercise and does not offer a final examination must allow students at least until the date appearing on the official examination schedule promulgated by the Registrar's Office to complete submission of materials associated with the culminating exercise. (For example, a student making a presentation during the last week of classes or during study period will have at least until the scheduled final-exam date to submit a final write-up or equivalent.)**

EPC Approval  
March 31, 2008  
Senate Approval  
May 14, 2008

**Appendix 3**

**Motion presented by the University Faculty Committee:**

That Cornell University make an exception to its existing practice and establish an Honorary Doctorate of Medical Sciences degree on behalf of its Medical College unit, subject to the selection criteria and selection process outlined in the May 1, 2008 proposal to the University Faculty.

*May 6, 2008*