

A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Steve Beer: "I would like to call to order the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate for 2010. I would like to first ask that all people here present turn off or silence their cell phones. There shall be no photos taken or tape recordings made of the proceedings. I ask also that persons who wish to speak, please stand and identify yourself as to department or other administrative unit, and await the arrival of a roving microphone, so that you will be heard better by all those in the room."

"Near the end of the meeting, we have one Good and Welfare speaker, who will address us on the topic of the Statler Club. That is Professor Yuval Grossman. At this point, I'd like to call on Provost Kent Fuchs for a series of presentations having to do with strategic planning and the budget. He has several associates with him and, all told, Provost Fuchs will have 40 minutes, and we will allocate those 40 minutes as he sees fit. And also, hopefully we'll include some time for questions and answers."

2. BUDGET UPDATE

Provost Kent Fuchs: "Thank you. I'm going to hand it off to someone, so thank you. I would like the record to note I asked for 90 minutes, and Dean Fry said you have nothing more worthy to say that would consume 90 minutes, so 40 minutes is what we get."

"We will do three things. My colleague, Paul Streeter, why don't you come up and -- oh, change the slides. I am changing the order here. We'll start not talking about the strategic plan. We will talk about the present, the reality. We will give you a brief update on the status of the budget, where we are in our deficit today, and we'll take about five minutes of presentations and then five minutes of Q&A. And then Paul Streeter will introduce this topic regarding our plans, our ideas around how we change the budget model, specifically how we allocate resources to colleges and vice presidents and others, so a really important topic.

"We will spend about five minutes on presentations, and another five minutes or so -- probably more than that -- 10, 15 minutes of Q&A, and then my colleague, Ed Lawler, will come up and talk about thinking about the future. So three quite different, but interrelated topics.

"So the first part is about the budget status. I wanted to introduce you to someone, and that is our new vice provost -- vice president, excuse me. Almost promoted you-- Vice President for Planning and Budget, Elmira Mangum. Elmira is an adjunct faculty at the Johnson School, has a doctorate degree from SUNY Buffalo and, most recently, had a similar position at the University of North Carolina. So she's joining our team in Planning and Budget, but this presentation will be about Paul Streeter, by Paul Streeter, and we'll talk about the status of the budget and we'll transition into how we are going to talk and think about the way that we allocate resources. So Paul?"

Paul Streeter, Associate Vice President, Planning and Budget: "Thank you. We want to spend a few minutes updating you on our current budget status and what the outlooks look like going into next year. So if you could."

"Just to step back, where we ended in fiscal '09, so last fiscal year -- fiscal year is July 1 through June 30 -- so last fiscal year, we ended the year with an \$88.7 million deficit, a one-year deficit last year. What we were projecting and reporting to you last year, that as we looked at the financial picture over a number of years, over a five-year period, had we done nothing, we were estimating the deficit could grow to \$215 million. That was over a multi-year period; but one year, last year, it was \$88.7 million.

"For the current year, fiscal '10, which ends June 30, we are projecting it to be down to \$62.5 million. That's a current year deficit; but if we don't do anything from this point on, we expect that deficit would grow. So we are by no means out of the woods in terms of actions to solve this, though we are heading in the right direction. Should we decide not to take any actions, it would grow back up into, very conservatively, \$135 million, but certainly well over \$115 million.

"As we look to fiscal '11, our target is to reduce the deficit down to about \$32 million. That's what our target is next year. Again, if we don't take any actions, that deficit next year alone, from what we know today, if we did nothing, would grow from the \$62 million back up into the mid-80s.

"If you go to the next slide, as we look to next year, our revenue picture, which is really the driver on much of this, we have two things going against us in terms of resources. One is that we have -- the trustees have authorized the endowment payout for next year, and it is a decreased net payout. So it is really important to understand -- you may hear things that the market is recovering, you may see it in your personal account, but for managing the endowment, there's always a tail on how quickly we respond in the negative and how quickly we respond in the positive.

"The depth of our endowment loss last year means we are still going to be paying for it next year. We are going to decrease resources from the endowment by 13.7%. So our payout rate is how we express it, and it is going down 13.7%. What that means financially is a loss of resources across the institution -- across the Ithaca campus -- a \$19 million loss of money.

"We also, from what we have learned from the State, are projecting our loss of state funds on a year-to-year basis -- this includes an \$8.7 million loss of state funds we received this year -- but on a year-to-year basis, including the \$8.7 and what we are expecting to receive, the year-to-year change is roughly \$20 million. Much is yet to be settled, but, based on the governor's proposed budget, we are fairly confident it will be in the \$18 to \$20 million range, the loss of revenue.

"The trustees approved tuition increases both at the graduate and undergraduate and professional school level. I am showing you here the net revenue, after we factor in the financial aid cost associated with both those /have a couple things going to the positive on undergraduate tuition, net of financial aid being \$10.3 million; and professional school, \$7.6 million.

"As you know, those monies hit differently across the institution. That is something we'll talk about in the Budget Model Task Force. That's the revenue change. So that's what drives -- when I said on the previous slide we are sitting at a \$62 million deficit this year, and if we were to do nothing, we would project the deficit would grow to the mid-80 range; but we are going to do something. In the expense reduction -- to now talk about how we're reacting to this, there's three big things we are focusing on: One, we are going to reduce our debt obligation in the budget. We are going to pay down some debt that is currently -- the budget needs to support principal and interest for. I will talk about this a little more in a second, but that's one strategy we are doing.

"Second, as you probably heard, we are aggressively pursuing administrative cost savings. You heard in the fall, most likely, about some work being done, diagnostic work by consultants, to help us identify opportunities where we may have savings. We have a series of initiatives underway currently that are aggressively pursuing ideas that are going to drive our budget action-. Work that's supposed to be reported out in a few weeks to help drive how we think about expense reductions next year. That's being aggressively pursued now.

"After that activity, we still think there will probably need to be some level of assigned unit budget reductions, depending on how much we get out of the administrative savings. That is not talking about taking it from the center. That's talking about a

combination of activities in the center and activities in the colleges, but that are in the administrative realm; facilities, IT, HR, finance, things of that sort, but it is not -- not talking about it simply from the center.

"So that's the budget outlook real quickly. We do want to talk about something many of you may have heard about. Over the last year, we have done something that has been called the reserve capture. We've gone out and taken money back from the units, monies that have been held and accumulated over the years, but I wanted to explain how much we did and why we did it, what we needed to do it for and how it is being used.

"We have done this twice now. The second one we are actually just implementing; bills were sent to the colleges earlier this week. For last year, fiscal '09, we pulled back \$75 million of resources from a combination of monies that we were holding in the center and monies that were out in units across campus. It was \$75 million. Fifty million of it was from a single resource; institutionally we have tapped out. Twenty-five million came from units across campus; roughly \$18 million of that came from colleges, roughly \$7 million came from central administrative units. It was an across-the-board reduction, but we pulled back, took control over those resources. And we needed to do it because we had to pay down our line of credit. We were in a deficit position as an institution, we were using borrowed monies to help pay bills. Note -- we have been doing that for a few years, but it had gotten far beyond what we were planning, and we needed to pay down that line of credit.

"So we took \$75 million and essentially went to the bank and paid down the line of credit. That was last year's \$75 million. This year, we're taking back -- taking control of \$100 million. And the distribution of that is roughly \$75 million of that is coming out of central administrative units and campus life; \$25 million of that is coming out of academic units. What we are using that for is we still have to pay back a deficit for last year.

"If you may recall, I said a slide or two ago we ended last year with an \$88 million deficit last year. We have to pay off that deficit for last year. The first 50 of this is paying off what remains of that, what we weren't able to fund last year. So \$50 million gets used to pay back the deficit. The other \$50 million, we are using it in a strategic manner. The \$46 million of it, we are using to pay down debt obligations. Part of our strategy going to fiscal '11 is to pay down debt, relieve our debt burden.

"Think about in your personal situation. If you can relieve your mortgage payment, you give yourself more room out of your income. We are doing that. We are paying down debt. By putting back \$46 million, we can get reduction in our debt service next

year of \$13 million. That's what we are doing and that will buffer reductions out to units, one to one.

"And then the remaining \$4 million, there are some investments we'll need to make in systems that will enable us to make administrative cost savings. So in case you were hearing about cost reserve capture, this is what we have done and why we have done that.

3. BUDGET TASK FORCE REPORT

"So with that, I will move on to the budget task force, if I could. I co-chaired a Budget Model Task Force charged by – co-chair with me is Cathy Dove, sitting on the side. We will take questions in a few moments, but we wanted to report out on this what we had done.

"If you go to this slide, these are the key requirements. This essentially was the charge we were given. That was to consider -- recognize where we are starting from, and that's multiple budget models across campus, at least four major budget models on campus right now. The provost charged us with making recommendations to achieve first a single budget model, so that as we think about how resources and costs are distributed across campus, that we are doing it within one budget model framework. That was the first part of our charge.

"Two that we really had to think about the process that was an open, transparent process. So the campus community, both senior leaders and the community, could have a better understanding of how resources are allocated and how funds flow; to come up with a process that was simple, understandable and predictable.

"An item we talked about a lot in our task force was to make sure we looked at a budget model, developed a budget model that enabled and motivated actions by the faculty, by the colleges that enhanced our academic excellence, that when we thought about the trade-offs and how to frame up a budget model, that we did it, first and foremost trying to improve and enhance academic excellence in mind. That did drive a lot of our conversations.

"I am mixing the charge and objectives of what we were trying to do. One of the objectives we talked about is did we want to be data-driven, so a formula budget model, in which there's not a lot of thought given, let formula drive it; or do we want to be data-informed. This was an important concept for us, to be data-informed. We want to use data. We went to the community, senior administrators to understand data on

how it is informing the budget process, to do it in a transparent manner, but to use it on an information basis, not necessarily the sole driver on how resources are allocated. The concept of data-informed is important in this.

“We talked a lot about the common treatment of revenues and expenses; something that we needed to achieve out of this. I will talk more about that in a second. Then the last two points are about checks and balances, first with the Chief Financial Officer; so recognizing what we are going through currently with our financial situation, there does need to be a check and balance between the provost, who is the person responsible for allocating resources to the campus, with the Chief Financial Officer, who is the person responsible to make sure we maintain the good financial health of institution. So we needed to think about that checks and balance and make sure we designed for that.

“And lastly, going to the point I made earlier about an open and transparent process, we were looking at a budget model that would be an open annual review with senior leadership to understand, one, our financial position and, two, how resources are being allocated and the priorities within that. So I mixed in their requirements we were given as a charge and objectives we were trying to achieve.

“Let me step back for a second, if we could. So to frame up what we were doing, if you could go to the next slide, task force members -- we could probably go past this in the interest of time -- but we had a broad group of representation. Task force process, I want you to understand, we spent a fair amount of time looking at our current budget model, as you would expect. We did research alternative budget models; we did talk to other universities, particularly Penn, University of Michigan, Stanford and Syracuse. There's a mix of budget models across those institutions.

“This work was done -- Kent charged us in June. We reported out on an interim basis in October, and our final report in December. Through that process, we had a series of consultative meetings, particularly with the Financial Policies Committee, faculty senate -- thank Steve Pope and his members. They were helpful to us in the process in the fall of helping us think about issues and giving us reactions to concepts we were thinking about. So the FPC, as well as the deans and vice presidents, we did issue an interim report in October -- which prompted a lot of conversation and led to some significant revisions as we got to our final report.

“If we could go to the next slide. As we see the primary improvements about what I'm going to give you -- some of the major decision points of this model in a second -- wanted you to understand before we go there, what we see is the primary

improvements from what we are recommending. One, we reduced complexity. By getting to one model and greater consistency, we'll significantly reduce the complexity of how folks think about financial operations on campus and how we make decisions going forward. Two, we really do improve the transparency. Reducing the complexity will make it simple to understand and simple to monitor, to make sure that we are in balance and we know where we are at.

"Consistent treatment of key resources. I will talk about a couple of them in a second, but we want consistency in terms of thinking about the type of revenue or type of expense. Right now we tend to think about both the type of revenue and then the organization that's hitting. So is it undergraduate tuition, is it going to a general purpose college or a contract college. We have to think about both dynamics now. We were trying to construct a model that says let's talk about undergraduate tuition or talk about space costs or talk about financial aid costs. So we were trying to get to a common -- and we think we achieved it -- a common treatment based on nature of revenue or nature of expense. Consistent treatment.

"We proposed a model decision that recognizes it from an institutional standpoint, the nature of undergraduate education as more of a shared experience, rather than something particular to the single college. We provided a model -- recommended a model that provides flexibility that can be adaptable to the changing nature of the organization. It is not something that will be stale on day one. We think the framework works and provides flexibility.

"And one of the things we talked to other institutions and spent a lot of time talking internally in the task force, we believe it provides a framework to provide sufficient resources at the institutional level to advance the institution. There's a tension there. How much do the units control, how much does the provost control. Our objective was a framework that allowed decisions to be made; gives a framework for that. We think we have that; that would define enough resources to support priority investments.

"A particular concern by many is to make sure that budget model -- we are talking a model that allocates resources -- works with an appropriate process and governance process, advisory process on how reverse sources should be allocated, that provides an ongoing -- the check and balance realm -- an ongoing control and oversight of whether the process is working to the ends that we believe.

"We did talk a lot -- there's many aspects that a budget model will not solve that are really management issues; so again, please understand what this is. This is a

framework for distributing resources. There are many issues around process and prioritization that have to still be worked out.

"If you could go to the major budget model decisions -- I have alluded to a few -- but we think these are the major items of change we are recommending. First is to pool all undergraduate tuition. At a gross level, that's valued at about \$432 million right now. It gets spread. Some comes to the provost for the general purpose colleges. Those are Architecture Art and Planning, Arts and Sciences and Engineering. For the undergraduate colleges, contract colleges, it flows to them; and to Hotel, it flows to Hotel. What we are recommending, that resources in the first instance be pooled and then be redistributed to those undergraduate colleges on a set of predetermined criteria that would look at the college enrollment as an example -- our committee did not define them out. There's more work to be done -- it would get pooled and then it would get redistributed back to those colleges, again, based on enrollment, teaching, cost of education, priority areas, growing areas, et cetera; but there would be a predefined set of criteria that would redistribute the tuition back out of the undergraduate colleges, and we would redistribute the net of financial aid.

"That is really point Number 1 and 2. That's the data-informed basis. We are not suggesting that be a purely formulaic-driven model, but the data would largely inform that, and everyone would understand the data.

"The third point, common treatment of revenues and expenses. I mentioned that before. One of the things Kent emphasizes is we need to treat like revenues in a similar manner, F&A recoveries being one of those. So facilities and administrative cost recovery on sponsored awards. If you are in a contract college, those monies flow to the deans. If you are in an endowed college or research center, involved with a research center, those monies generally flow to the provost. That causes difficulties, the difference in treatment.

"So as a task force -- Kent would probably say it differently -- but the task force view is our recommendation was it would be treated in the same manner. We had advocated it move out of the colleges, but the first principle is it be treated in the same manner.

"Another example are endowed professorships; the way we manage them is different across the different models. Those in general purpose units; endowed chairs get managed from a central budget standpoint. For those in the designated -- Hotel, Law, and the contract colleges, it gets managed within those colleges. It causes many difficulties in terms of financial administration, in terms of development activities. We want to treat them all the same.

"And space costs was a topic we talked a lot about within our task force, and we advocated the distribution of space costs on some manner; the cost of utilities, maintenance, the cost of building care, that we should align that with the units where it is occurring and put the revenues out in those units, so they can pay those costs as well. "Again, we wanted to treat space costs in a common manner, because currently it is not in a common manner. I talked about providing sufficient resources for the provost. We advocated a concept, what we called an institutional support pool -- or university support pool, I think was the final language. This would be that revenue streams would be taxed. There would be an assessment against it that would provide resources to the provost. We did not determine those assessments within our task force.

"We had talked about that the range of resources is that the provost should have roughly 10 to 15% of -- this is measured on an unrestricted budget basis -- 10 to 15% of the unrestricted budget should be at the provost's ability to advance, the institution, through priority investment; and that the provost needs that kind of decision and resource. As we have talked to other institutions who have looked at budget models in the past, this was the biggest point of emphasis: Make sure you get this balanced right between how much the provost has -- if you want to advance your institution, folks were advocating, we firmly believed in the task force -- the provost needs to have some level of resources to do that. And the mechanism we created or advocating is the creation of this university support pool. Lastly, we advocated the establishment of appropriate governance and oversight structures to go with this. So that's quick, what we talked about. And I'll turn it to Kent, to maybe invite Cathy to join me for questions and answers."

Provost Kent Fuchs: "I was going to make other comments, but time goes quickly. Cathy and Paul were chosen in this because they spent time in leadership positions and also time in administration, so they have a comprehensive view. You saw the list of other members."

"They are having a bunch of public forums about this. Tomorrow, 4:30, Statler Auditorium, there will be over an hour dedicated to this, for anyone that wants to talk with us. Let's open it up for Q&A for a few minutes.

"There were two pieces here. One is the current budget and the other is how we are looking at possibly changing the way we look at allocating resources.

"He's going to answer the questions."

Speaker Beer" "Are there questions? Professor Peter Stein. Wait for microphone, please."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I can see the advantage of a consistent way of doing this thing, and I'm familiar with the fact it's been done in a lot of different ways, but lots of times, inconsistent ways have been worked out over time in a way that makes the system work, and if you do it all of a sudden consistently, there are always winners and losers in each one of these situations. Have you analyzed that and made it public who are the winners and losers in this -- a uniform distribution of resources?"

Provost Fuchs: "This is the bottom line: Every vice president, dean wants to know - will my budget go up or down. I'll take it, Paul and Cathy, to save time."

"The next stage is actually implementing this in the sense of designing it, not actually rolling it out, but designing and going through each of the colleges and vice presidents and other units to see what the impact is. They have not done that yet.

"Based on these guidelines, I could take Physics, for example, or the Art College and make the budget go up or down. There's a lot of flexibility here and a lot of implementation details yet to be proposed. That would be the next stage.

"My objective -- and we are having 22 forums around the budget model and then also the work of Ed Lawler -- is to come to some consensus, get input on the principles that were listed. The major concepts of pooling undergrad tuition, treating F&A the same, endowed professorships held centrally or in the units, those things. Then we'll ask another group to go out and come back with the proposed implementation. Then we'll know who the winners and losers are, but -- I don't like that phrase, but yes, I understand."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "I assume that currently the provost's office has discretionary funds. I mean, is this more or less than you have currently to support the university functions?"

Provost Fuchs: "I don't have a clue. To be honest, I don't know what I have now. That's the problem. That's why we are having the first part of the discussion and the second part. Right now, the provost actually has none. The provost is in the hole a big major way, so it depends on what the tax is, depends on the implementation detail; but one of the good things is the provost's budget will be clear. The provosts will know -- to talk in the third person about the provost -- will know what he or she will have; and secondly, will be very countable, it will be public, and we'll debate about how the

provost should spend her or his money. So we don't know the answer to that. Didn't we start late?

Yes. I think we should do two more questions."

Speaker Beer: "Please identify yourself."

Professor Rosemary Avery: Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis & Management: "I don't see any guiding principles in what you presented that explicitly acknowledged the land grant mission and the difference between the contract colleges and endowed colleges. Can you speak to that issue and how that will be recognized, such that the mission will go forward?"

Paul Streeter: "So we spent a lot of time in the report. The only piece of the state funds that we're talking about -- two things: The state funds right now come in support of the four contract colleges, and they are presented by the provost to those four contract colleges. It comes to the provost and allocated back to the colleges. We are not disrupting that, except for one element, and that one element is that as we value -- recognize the value of undergraduate education as a common experience. We are talking about taking a piece -- the value that we have sized it as is roughly \$24 million -- a piece of the state appropriation and putting it into the undergraduate pool, recognizing the difference in tuition between resident students in the contract colleges, which pay a lower tuition rate, and all other students."

"So we want to create the undergraduate tuition pool to allow all students to be financially valued the same as we distribute it out. Beyond that, the remaining piece of it would get distributed based on what -- we want to develop a methodology that's based on a data-informed and prioritized basis across the four contract colleges to support land grant and research. The whole land grant mission."

Provost Fuchs: "As you will hear from Ed, he's proposing all the colleges adopt the land grant goal. Not the monies, but the goal. One more, then we should move on."

Professor Emeritus Muawia Barazangi: "Muawia Barazangi, from Earth Sciences. I would like to, if you have a quick answer and the wisdom and rationale of board of trustees for the endowment payout. My understanding - endowment is to secure the future of the institution, and this is a crisis of national, international economy, as well as New York State. Why not consider little more payout and continue your managing Cornell the way you are proceeding, to soften the blow and produce the possibility of

more layoff from the staff? What the story? Are you telling us that Law School, it will not be semi-independent -- the Law School completely in your model?"

Provost Fuchs: "Which question should I address? Endowment payment, Paul's the expert; but simply, what percentage of the market value do you think we should pay out? Last year we paid on the 10%, we spend 10%. I think that's a high percentage. We have to be really careful that we don't spend the next generations of resources, so we're down to -- total payout from the endowment for this current year to what, Paul?"

Paul Streeter: "We are spending just under 7%. 6.9% of the current value of the endowment, this year and next year."

Provost Fuchs: "So I would argue we are dropping it to protect the value, but between 8 to 10% of market value. We don't talk about that much, because they are huge numbers, so I would say we are doing that. Law School, come see me later. You and Dean Schwab, yes."

"Thank you. Thanks, Cathy. Thanks, Paul. Ed, could you come up, please? Again, there's a whole hour on this in the Statler Auditorium about 4:30 tomorrow. It's a really important topic. Why don't you introduce the topic?"

4. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Ed Lawler, Professor, ILR: "Hello. I am going to move quickly. Some of you have seen a couple of these slides, I think. Let's go back further. Stop there."

"There's a draft outline -- it is not complete -- of the strategic plan on the web, and I hope you have had a chance to access it. If you haven't, I hope you will and give us feedback. I would like to explain how we got to this point, and then I want to hit a few highlights on the next slide and then review how you can make input.

"I am Ed Lawler. I chair the Strategic Advisory Council; it consists of eight faculty. The listing of the members is on the web site, and there are four working groups consisting of 63 faculty, staff and students around these four areas.

"And here's how we got to this point: The advisory council in October, when we were informed, came up with a series of questions, issues that we gave to the working groups. And then the working groups drilled down deeper and, around the beginning of December, came back to us with input, ideas in the form of informal reports. This group did not come back. We phased in this group later and they are yet to report.

“Later, because we thought these other parts of the plan should be drafted before this group completed its work, we took -- meaning the advisory council -- the feedback from the education public engagement working groups, developed a set of draft objectives and action items, the first draft of what you see on the web, gave it back to those groups.

“Those groups gave us feedback, we revised, we talked to deans, vice presidents, the president, the provost about them, that's how we got to this point. The next step is we are -- meaning the advisory council -- going back through these sections, the sections you see on the web, and we are setting priorities among the objectives in those sections. We are asking which objectives should the University emphasize, stress over the next five years. That's the first step.

“The second step, after we set the objectives for each area, we are going to develop a series of smaller set of initiatives we think the university should focus on in the next five years. That's in a section of the plan -- again, the outline is on the web -- called strategic initiatives.

“That is where we are, and we are also developing a metric section. All of the material, an expanded outline will be available sometime in March, and it will be complete in that sense and it will probably be 50 pages, something like that. And then after that, we'll do another round of feedback with the community, and then we'll draft the text in April. That's April 7th, an all-day retreat we have with the trustees about the outline that we'll be distributing at the next stage.

“So moving on. Highlights. These are some themes in the document, that some will be pretty evident, if you read it, but a couple may not be, and I just -- I want to hit the first one in particular. We are looking at Cornell as a single unit. We assume that the strength -- the fundamental strength and quality of Cornell is grounded and lodged in the colleges, but that Cornell is greater than the sum of its parts. And we are looking at that greater than sum, so to speak. We are focusing on the University as a whole, and looking at cross-cutting issues, themes, and that's our fundamental focus.

“Culture in the support of teaching, that's an important theme, an important item to us. Leadership and research, you will see that also. We are suggesting that the University make concerted efforts in various ways to move more departments into the upper reaches of their professions.

"Embrace public engagement. It is a redefinition of broadening of the outreach mission beyond the contract colleges, but inclusive within them; and we took the term "public engagement" from the President's State of the Union address in October.

"Faculty renewal, that's a big issue for us. Given the coming retirements, nearly half of the faculty at the university are 55 or over. We are looking at a period over the next ten years, obviously, of -- or 15 years, but we don't know when people will retire -- of a substantial need and opportunity to renew the faculty. And diversity and inclusion is also a major theme that runs through the document. The strategy we have is to set explicit targets and hold ourselves accountable for achieving them, and we have articulated an overarching aspiration for the University, strive to become a top-ten research university in the nation, the world over the next ten years or so. Five years is too short, given current circumstances. We think ten years is reasonable.

"And we are in the process of considering, in addition to this aspiration, something about impact or engagement, based on feedback we have gotten in the various meetings that Kent Fuchs and I have been having around campus.

"One more slide. This is how you can make input. Please send out e-mails. Kent Fuchs and I are going around to colleges. Some of you may have attended some of those meetings, and thank you very much. I don't know if there's any time for --"

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. I think the agenda requires that we move ahead, so the next item is the approval of the minutes of the December meeting, December 2009. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Ayes.)

Speaker Beer: "Opposed? Nay?"

"Abstentions? The minutes of the December meeting are approved. I now call on Associate Dean Fred Gouldin to give us the report on nominations and elections."

6. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Associate Dean Fred Gouldin: "I think my report is short and sweet. This is really appointing various people to the committee. So the first slide, Tony Simmons will be on the Financial Policies Committee. The Library Board, Jeremy Braddock will serve on that. Myra Besherooff and Steven Morgan, on the Childcare Committee; and Mary Beth Norton on the Music Committee."

"This is the last one. For the Financial Policy, Institutional Bio-safety Committees - appointments are Rosemary Laurie, David Wilson, Martha Munsler-Chui and Wilfred Patterson. For Institutional Review Board appointments, Jasmine Miller, and Wilfred Patterson is up again -- he's going to be a very busy person -- Alice Eisen, Mary Anne Walker and Sukhoi Pi.

"Finally, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, Susan Bliss and Maurice White. That concludes my report."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. We will now go to several -- to the resolutions on the status of the libraries, and a resolution will be offered by the University Faculty Committee by Professor Howland."

7. RESOLUTIONS ON THE LIBRARY

Emeritus Professor Howard Howland: "Can you hear me? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In the last senate meeting, we passed a motion recommending the provost delay any implementation of the Library Task Force report until the senate has had time to deliberate its findings and the alternatives at the beginning of the spring semester 2010. Accordingly, the UFC and Library Board began looking into the advisability of that report's recommendations."

"So this has two points -- actually two errors -- the first point; on November 24th, the provost chaired an open discussion developed at that meeting. There was a disagreement between the faculty members and library staff about the contents of the report, and here's the correction: The task force report recommended reducing the budget by approximately 11%, and the central library by 3%. I made a late night calculation error and somehow came out with a 17. I appreciate the faculty members who corrected me on that.

"The task force report also recommended placing all the library budget in the hands of the central librarian. On January 5, Charles Brittain, Chair of Classics, sent a letter to Provost Kent Fuchs, sent by 15 chairpersons pointing out the budget had fallen from 8th to 13th place. I lost a little yellow type there. He actually said 9th to 20th place, but subsequent calculations showed it was 8th to 13th, and he made this correction. So, falling to the 13th place among the libraries on the continent and appealing for restoration to the office of the previous year and eventual restoration of the top ten libraries.

Motion

Whereas the Library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest of the University Senate, and the Library Task Force Report recommended the closing of some unspecified number of small libraries to achieve cost reduction goals, and

Whereas the faculty and students of the units served by the small libraries have not been consulted as to the advisability of their closing, and

Whereas there has been a long tradition of locating library materials and reference consultants near the academic workplaces of the various colleges and departments, and it is the faculty and students of the units served by the small libraries of Cornell that are in the best position to assess the academic value of these libraries and the direction their development should take.

Therefore be it resolved that:

- 1. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that none of the small libraries (Ornithology, Veterinary, Entomology, ILR Catherwood, Africana, Johnson Management, Music, Fine Arts, Engineering, Hotel or Law) be closed without first consulting the wishes of faculty and students of the unit that the library serves, assessing the impact on the accreditation of the units concerned, should their library be closed, and at the same time determining that the necessary reduction in costs cannot be achieved by reducing the staff of units of the central libraries (e.g. Library Administration, Information technology, Research and Learning Services, etc.).*
- 2. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the materials budget of the library be restored so as to place Cornell in the ranks of the top ten libraries on the continent.*
- 3. The Senate recommends to the University Administration that the budget supervision of the small libraries be located in the units (laboratory, department or college) that the library serves.*

“So here are the *whereas*’s. First one, simply asserts the senate’s role in overseeing the library. The second one points out the Library Task Force reported closing some unspecified numbers of small libraries to achieve cost reduction goals; and the next one says that the faculty and students of those libraries had not been consulted; and then points out there has been a long tradition of having -- locating library materials and reference consultants near the academic workplaces of various colleges and departments. And it is the faculty and students served by the small libraries that are in the best position to assess the academic value of these libraries and the direction their development should take.

"So next slide. The UFC thought we could put a motion in three parts and vote on those parts separately. I have simply been told that we actually can't do that. We have to vote them holus-bolus; however, we can separate them if we have a suspension of the rules, which requires two-thirds of the body.

"So at the appropriate time, I'll ask for that suspension of the rules and will try to vote them one at a time. We wanted to vote them because they say different things. First says the senate recommends the university administration that the small libraries -- and they are listed there -- not be closed without first consulting the wishes of the faculty and students the library serves, assessing the impact on accreditation of the units concerned and, at the same time, determines the necessary reduction in costs cannot be achieved by reducing the staff of the units of the central libraries. It means some of those central things, library administration, et cetera.

"The second one says the senate recommend to the university administration -- in all cases, when we say university administration, we mean all those people making the decision about closing these libraries -- recommends that the materials budget of the library be preserved to line Cornell in the ranks of the top ten libraries in the continent.

"Senate recommends the university administration to the budget supervision of the small libraries be located in the units, laboratory department that the colleges serve. I want to say a few words about that last portion. We think it's inappropriate and unwise to gather those budgets together in the central budget, library budget. That's because many of these libraries are supported by endowment and donations from donors. Many of them come down -- what used to be line item appropriations from the State, and it would be inappropriate to take those and put them in a different place than where they were intended. I think it's also unwise to do that. It is unwise because, surely, if the donors find out this money isn't really going to the library they thought it was going to; particularly if the library isn't there, you aren't going to get any more money from those donors. Also, the State budget, the legislatures may take notice of that, and you are going to have a reduction in those budgets too.

"So that's the motion that we are presenting."

Speaker Beer: "The motion is on the floor on behalf of the University Faculty Committee, which includes three resolutions."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "They will be, when we --"

Speaker Beer: "Is there any discussion? Professor Norton."

Mary Beth Norton, Chair of Library Board Committee: "On behalf of the University Library Board, I want to present a substitute motion for consideration by the body; that is that motion that was sent out with the agenda for the meeting. I would ask the body to support the substitution of the resolution coming from the Library Board for the one that's been presented by the UFC."

"And my reasons for doing that are the following: First, events have moved very swiftly, and the content of the resolution that's just been presented by the UFC is already out-of-date. That is, it refers to the Library Task Force report on several occasions, but that's already moot. That is, we are two steps beyond the task force report at the moment. The librarian responded to the Library Task Force report with recommendations to the provost. The provost then replied to the university librarian with a charge to her, and she is now operating on the basis of that charge. So what the Library Task Force report that was given over the summer and into the fall, what it said is irrelevant to what's going on now.

"Secondly, reviews are already about to begin of the small libraries under a procedure established by the university librarian. I suppose it is technically true that -- to this very moment, the stakeholders of the small libraries have not yet been formally consulted about what might be done with them; but in fact, procedures are now in place, whereby they will be consulted. Various units are establishing committees of faculty, library staff and undergraduate and graduate students to consider what's to happen with the various small libraries around campus that are at issue. And all of those -- the results of all those reviews under the procedure established by the university librarian will come before the Faculty Library Board.

"Now, in addition, the UFC resolution contains inaccuracies and contradictions. For example, the UFC resolution suggests one of the places that might be cut in the central library administration is the division called Research and Learning Services, but that's the division of the library that contains the subject specialists that are essential to the selection of items and would be therefore essential to the resolution Number 2 of the one that Professor Howland just presented.

"In addition, the UFC resolution assumes central library administrative cuts have not been or are not being considered, which is of course not true, because that's precisely what Bain Consulting has, in fact, recommended; some considerable cuts in the administration of the central library. But more important than those specifics is the fact that as the Library Board resolution that I'm presenting to you states, the Library Board

exists to be the liaison between the faculty and the libraries. There is, in fact, a standing committee of the faculty involved in this, so let us do our job.

"The senate does not have to do our job for us. We can do it. In fact, the Library Board, although we meet normally once a month, has already agreed that if/when the records begin to come in from the various unit libraries, we'll be able to meet more than once a month to consider all of them.

"And as a final part of our resolution states, we are, in fact, perfectly prepared -- I will come to every senate meeting for the rest of the spring, that is the rest of my chairmanship of the board, and report to the senate every time on what's going on. So there's absolutely no reason for the senate at this point to inject itself into the specifics of decisions that frankly have not yet been made.

"I would argue that indeed the UFC resolution is, to some extent, not only outdated, but also premature. So I would hope that senators would vote for the resolution that the Library Board unanimously indeed accepted at its last meeting. Thank you."

Resolution

Whereas the library system at Cornell is essential to the academic mission of the University and thus a proper subject of interest to the Senate; and

Whereas, in the current financial crisis all units of the University are being asked to make substantial cuts to their budgets; and

Whereas, at a forum with the Provost and the University Librarian and subsequently many members of the faculty and staff have expressed their concern over the impact of such cuts on acquisitions of both print and electronic materials and on the continued existence or successful functioning of smaller libraries on campus; and

Whereas, the University Librarian and her staff are currently engaged in a wide-ranging review of library expenditures and policies as a result of the Provost's response to the library's Strategic Plan to implement budgetary cuts; and

Whereas, the Faculty Library Board is appointed by the Senate and directed by Senate legislation "to review and help formulate broad library policy" in conjunction with the University Librarian and to inform the Librarian "of the needs and concerns of the faculty and students";

Be it therefore resolved that:

The Senate directs the Faculty Library Board to work with the University Librarian to ensure that faculty and students from units affected by proposed changes in acquisition policies or library facilities be fully consulted before any significant changes are implemented and to report regularly to the Senate on the development of plans for such changes so that the Senate might then take any further actions it deems appropriate.

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. Just to clarify the parliamentary situation now, we have the motion on the floor by the University Faculty Committee, Professor Norton has offered a substitute motion, and the body will now consider whether to consider the substitute motion or the main motion. So we'll have debate first on the UFC motion versus the substitute. I assume that the two motions are clear. Yes."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "This motion is now on the floor, the substitute motion; so we should talk about the substitute motion first and then go back to the main one."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, I will ask Professor Stein, the parliamentarian, if the senators' interpretation is correct."

Peter Stein: "With all due respect, I don't think so. I think the -- debates the advantages and disadvantages of the two motions, which have equal weight."

Speaker Beer: "So based on advice of the parliamentarian, I think the body will discuss which of the motions to consider at this time. So would anyone like to speak in favor of considering the motion offered by the University Faculty Committee? Gentleman on aisle."

Stuart Bazsefsky, ILR Library: "Stuart Basefsky, a lecturer in human resource studies, School of Industrial Labor Relations and a librarian at the ILR school. The first motion, I would recommend personally that it be passed, and the second one be passed as well. Not as a substitute, because I think they both inform each other."

"And to the notion that the Library Task Force report is moot, I have a question: Have the members of that task force, the faculty members of the task force been notified that that is moot? As far as I know, that task force still exists and, to my knowledge, the faculty members have never been informed that it's moot."

Speaker Beer: "Would a proponent of the Library Board resolution care to speak to the question or to why that motion should be considered rather than the University Faculty Committee's? Professor Cohn?"

Professor Abby Cohn: "I actually don't think the two resolutions as compatible. I think they're contradictory in a number of regards, so I think we each need to then take a position on which one we want to support and why. I strongly endorse the one being put forward by the University Library Board. I'm a bit confused as to where we are, though. Are we discussing to decide which one we are putting forward first, or are we actually discussing the substance of one or the other?"

Speaker Beer: "Any other points? Professor Howland?"

Professor Howland: "Yes. When the UFC met, we thought these two motions were going to be both brought before the faculty, and not as a substitute. I would like to support the position that there is really no contradiction between these motions. They are saying rather different things, however. Ours, I don't think, is meddling in the specifics of the process. We are simply laying down statements as to what we desire, namely the faculty and students will be consulted, that they look to the accreditation question, et cetera."

"So I don't think we should waste time on which one should be discussed. I think just go ahead and discuss what we seem to be discussing anyway and, when the time comes, let's call for the first question on the substitute motion and then on the main motion."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, just for point of information, we have approximately five minutes to consider this matter, and is there -- gentleman in the light blue shirt, please."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: "I think the point, as I see it; we have a faculty group charged with dealing with the library system. Unless there's some compelling reason not to trust them to represent our interests, I think Mary Beth Norton's point about letting them do their work is a good one; and when I look at the UFC motion, I think it's all in good faith and good-hearted, and I pretty much agree with all the points they are making, but it does look a little bit like micromanaging a process from a distance that a standing faculty committee is charged to do as its job."

"So unless I hear a compelling reason not to trust their assertiveness to represent our interest, I would vote in favor of substituting this motion for the UFC motion."

Speaker Beer: "Is the body ready for the substitution of the motion? Let's have a vote on whether to substitute the Library Board motion, which is before you now, as opposed to the University Faculty Committee's motion, which is now before you. Library Board here. All those in favor of substituting the Library Board, please stand."

"Can you count? I should remind you, only senators should be standing at this point. Okay.

"Those opposed to the substitute -- considering the substitute motion, please stand. Those senators abstaining from voting, please stand.

Vote
43 Approve
12 Opposed
1 Abstain

"Okay, it is clear the substitute motion shall now be under consideration. So the substitute motion as offered by the Library Board, which is on the screen in front of you, is now open for debate. The lady in the middle. Wait for the microphone, please."

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: "This is just a question. I always find -- Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department. We never seem to quite discuss things enough before we vote for them, but I don't see any antagonism between the two. The first motion, it seemed, was instructing and pressing the importance of the restoration of the research libraries and the importance of having libraries close to where students are likely to use them, and I just don't see those as antithetical. I wish they could be combined."

"And I'm sorry if we have to see one of them as a substitute for the other, rather than seeing the first as a sort of strong instruction posed to the existing committee. Is there no way to do that?"

Speaker Beer: "The body has voted to consider the substitute motion at this point, and so the initially offered motion by the University Faculty Committee is not under consideration."

Professor Sanders: "So it's this one and nothing, and the first one is lost?"

Speaker Beer: "Not at this meeting. The gentleman in the -- now standing."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "work together?"

Speaker Beer: "Please address the whole body, not an individual member of the body."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "I'm asking you; can you ask her?"

(LAUGHTER)

Speaker Beer: "The speaker would not consider that in order."

"Okay. Is there a speaker that wants to address the motion before us? There's a gentleman very close to the gentleman who just spoke."

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications: "Tarleton Gillespie, Communications Department. There was a question proposed earlier about whether the faculty on the task force had been alerted to its being on the task force. I took the message to be it is moot because it moved on, not because it was rendered irrelevant. I think the committee understood its work ended when the report was delivered. I don't think there's some sort of back-handed process going on."

"I would support the motion for the primary reason that much of the discussion in the task force report about how to go about closing a library, if that was deemed necessary by the provost, included a number of the elements already in the rejected statement, and the Library Board is ready and in a position to ensure those things are taken seriously; accreditation, discussion with faculty and students, and it seems to me that is the process already underway and the university librarian wanted underway and came out of the discussion in the public meeting to make sure it was underway. So I think this motion ensures that our subcommittee is in the right position to watch that process."

Speaker Beer: "At this point, the body has exceeded the time allocated to this issue, but it would be appropriate, if it's the body's wish, to vote on the motion that's before us, which is now on the screen."

"Okay, all those in favor of the Library Board's resolution that's before you on the screens, signify by standing.

I don't think you have to count, but -- all those opposed, please stand.

All those abstaining, all senators abstaining, please stand.

Vote:

55 Approved

0 Opposed

7 Abstained

"The resolution proposed by the Library Board is passed. We'll move on now to a report from the CAPP Committee. Professor Crepet will make that report."

8. CAPP REPORT

9.

Professor Crepet, Chair of CAPP Committee: "I am here to report on the -- what's first? The department or two field change motions? Okay. The department. The CAPP Committee received a proposal to create a new Department of Information Sciences in the faculty of Computer Sciences and Engineering. Anyone who lives in the world today realizes we are in a revolutionary state within our society, and the dimensions of the revolution involve communication and information -- cascade of information we are all experiencing."

"The committee found the proposal to be carefully wrought. We felt that it was -- the proposal reflected what was going on. The proposal is for a trans-collegiate entity that will cope with issues that require attention immediately or that places Cornell University at a competitive disadvantage. I'll talk through the rest.

"All right. They have a graduate field that's functioning as a department now. It's distinguished in every aspect. I believe that -- well, let me say my committee supported it fully after careful deliberation. There was one abstention, only because there was some fear that enough of the affected faculty had not been consulted. I tried to remedy that by active phone interviews, and I found no objection to such a department, and a great deal of support. I believe Geri Gay, who is a member of the Department of Communications in CALS left a letter to read; one of our outstanding information scientists, and I think her opinion is worth hearing. Professor Geri Gay from the Communications Department: I know that Dan Huttenlocher and Claire Carter are here, as well. Jerry just ask -- I can give you the gist. The Communication Department has been supportive of this program for quite a long time. We have seven faculty coexisting and teaching and advising across them, and it's been a really compelling program. It's very successful placement for students into the careers of their choices, and we support -- it's been functioning as a department in parentheses for quite a while and it is ready to be solely."

Professor Crepet: "Anything more specific that Geri wanted to convey? Okay, Dan, would you like to say anything about this?"

Dean Dan Huttenlocher, CIS: "So I just thought I would remind everybody, because it's been quite a while now -- I'm sorry. I'm Dan Huttenlocher in the Computer Science Department and the Johnson Graduate School of Management, the dean of Computing and Information Sciences. I thought it might be useful to remind people there's a long history here, that's in 2003, we had undergraduate majors approved in both CALS and Arts and Sciences. The information science major had full faculty votes in both the

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

colleges in establishing those majors; then a year later in engineering from the ISST major.

"So I wanted to remind everybody, because it's been seven, eight years now, there was very broad faculty deliberation around the educational programs this group is now offering, and to say that Claire Cardie, the director of the program; Eva Tardos, the computer science chair; and Geri Gay, who couldn't be here, are strongly supportive on behalf of their departments and faculties. And we are happy to answer questions."

Professor Crepet: "Let me reiterate the CAPP Committee felt like the proposal grappled with the complexities of having, again, a trans-collegiate entity, and not having one dispersed the faculty and placed us at a great disadvantage by not allowing the intellectual commerce that would be desirable in an area that's a burgeoning significance at this point in time.

"I understand my role here as a chair of CAP is simply to report on our strong support of the proposal, and no more. So I then go to the next two issues, which -- well, what is the procedure here? Should we have discussion? Yes."

Professor Abby Cohn: Abby Cohn, Linguistics. "I am wondering what the budgetary implications are and whether, by virtue of becoming a department, it becomes a tenure granting unit. And I'm also wondering about the current precedence relative to having a department that reports to an entity that's not a college, whether that puts it in the kind of limbo situation that -- what the consequences and potential implications are."

Professor Crepet: "Dan, you want to address that?"

Dean Huttenlocher: "So with respect to budget, there's no budgetary implication. In fact, I think Charlton said, it is already functioning as a de facto department in the fact that CIS is funding a number of faculty positions, administrators, et cetera. That wouldn't change with this proposal."

"Then the question about -- yeah. So there actually is already a department the computer science dean is managing, which is Computer Science. We have a structure there for Computer Science, which this report outlines. We would propose a similar one for Information Science, where the tenure is done -- the departmental level vote is done by the department faculty, so that the faculty member up for tenure isn't put through having to satisfy multiple departments' views; but then the ad hoc review is done jointly by the CIS dean and a college dean.

"In the case of Computer Science, that's always jointly between the CIS Dean and the Engineering Dean, but a single ad hoc review. There would be a similar process here. But in Information Science, because it has a broad set of colleges involved, there might be sometimes different college deans working together with the CIS dean, but -- would always be done jointly with the college dean."

Professor Abby Cohn: "By virtue of granting a unit within the faculty for Computing and Information Sciences, the status of department, we are de facto creating a college. And since that was one of the central issues this body took up a number of years ago, I would want that question addressed, if that is covertly going on."

Professor Crepet: "I don't believe that's covertly going on in the sense that it's the same structure that we already have for Computer Science, and so it's no different than that structure. So it's hard for me to see why it would be something overt. But Kent stood up. Did he have something to say?"

Provost Fuchs: "This is not a move to create a college or a school. These people have tenure in colleges and schools, so this process of having -- for Computer Science Engineering dean, really ran the process and with tight coupling of the CIS dean. It seemed to work well. I was skeptical myself eight years ago, but I'm a fan of it now and support this."

Professor Crepet: "Thanks, Kent. We only have a couple minutes. We have a couple concentration -- one minute now -- concentration changes."

Professor Carl Frank, Physics: "I'm concerned -- I feel singly uninformed on the subject, and I would really wish that the motion could be tabled. I see many physics departments within the university, many biochemistry departments within the university, and I'm not sure this is all a good trend, and I would be very concerned about it in this regard. I would like to learn more about the committee's work before I can responsibly vote on it."

Professor Crepet: "There's no motion on the table. My function here is just informative, to report on our vote on the subject. All right. I have two things -- two changes in -- field change proposals before us. They are very straight-forward. One is in Mechanical Engineering, and essentially proposes concentrations that are de facto in operation today. The next one is in Aerospace Sciences, and it is the same situation. These changes reflect the faculty who are existing now that the former or the current concentrations are way out of date and do not reflect either the faculty or the graduate activities taking place or the recruiting guidelines the departments have in place. So we

pass these unanimously with very little discussion. And that is the end of my report. I am told my time is up."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. I now call on Steve Pope of the Financial Policies Committee for a brief report."

10.9 FPC REPORT

Professor Steve Pope, Chair of the Financial Policies Committee: "Over the last year or so, in response to the university's financial issues, the faculty, through the senate and elsewhere, have made several suggestions on how the faculty can help the situation through some changes; three specifically."

"The first suggestion was for voluntary reductions in faculty salaries. The second was appropriate incentives for early retirement for faculty, and the third was measures to facilitate tenured faculty going to part-time appointments.

"So the Financial Policies Committee is the appropriate body to take these things forward, and so we have considered all these of these, and my purpose here is to tell you the outcome of our considerations.

"So the voluntary salary reduction was considered thoroughly, and there are subtle issues here. Basically, we decided almost unanimously it was not the right thing to do, to suggest that faculty take a voluntary salary reduction. The various issues to do with peer pressure and Cornell's competitive compensation position; however, I will remind you it is possible to donate to the University, including through payroll deduction.

(LAUGHTER)

"The other two issues, namely early retirement and part-time, we discussed again extensively. And mentioning this to the provost, he invited the committee to address him and his meeting of academic deans, which we did, and we brought to that meeting a specific proposal on part-time appointments.

"So we were very pleased with the thorough discussion these proposals received for an hour and a half at this meeting and we had several follow-up discussions with deans. The bottom line is that, as we understand how things work in the University, it turns out that the existing policies and programs are adequate.

"Hopefully -- well, I'm sure the discussions we had led to a greater appreciation for the opportunities of using the existing policies. To be more specific on the part-time policy, there is an existing policy on part-time appointments described in the faculty handbook that allows faculty to go part-time, meaning 50% or more, if it is mutually agreed with a dean, and the benefits and sabbatical accruals are then prorated. The Financial Policies Committee was to add an incentive to provide full benefits and sabbatical accruals. After thorough discussion, the deans were not in favor of this, for reasons we fully understand; some of those being that they can already do this and that there was a cost associated with it and, in their opinion, this is not always the best way to use the resources. So the Financial Policies Committee is completely satisfied with the considerations and appreciates the opportunity to bring these to the Provost and the Deans. Thank you."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. I would like to call on dean of the faculty, Bill Fry, for remarks."

14.10. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

Dean Bill Fry: "Thank you, Steve. I would like, first of all, to publicly congratulate John Muckstadt, our newest Weiss Presidential Fellow. Jack is in the Operations Research and Information Engineering. This award in recognition is one of the most outstanding recognitions the University can give to a faculty member, so we all appreciate his award."

"In the nomination letter, it was described he inspires and motivates both colleagues and students with -- his teaching is clear, methodical, enjoyable and challenging; and his students were wonderfully appreciative of his accomplishment. I think if you teach courses -- at least from my perspective, if you teach courses like the design of manufacturing systems and supply chain management or principles of supply chain mechanics, I think you would indeed have to be inspiring and motivating."

(LAUGHTER)

"Next slide, Steve. So congratulations to Jack. I think I have a few series of announcements. One is that Gannett does not give medical excuses. I think this is a confusion within the faculty. Last year we asked that the faculty not ask Gannett for excuses for students who miss class because of H1N1, but it turns out they haven't produced excuses for some time. So you can't go to Gwannett and have a -- have them verify a student was ill. That is not a possibility.

"I wanted to also say, the 2010 Faculty Handbook is currently online, and there was a confusing statement in this handbook about medical excuses. That statement has been removed in the 2010 version. It's on the University Faculty web site, and it is available virtually.

"I have a few comments about the Statler Club. Many of you know that the lunch has been moved from the basement to the Regent's Lounge in the Statler Hotel. And we'll -- I think you could tell us a little more about that later on. Kent Fuchs has asked me to survey the members of the Statler Club and others about this desirability of how this arrangement is working at the end of the semester, which I will do.

"Additionally, I would like to mention that the Provost has provided some funding through Human Resources to aid networking among faculty across colleges, and one of the first targets would be new faculty coming in to Cornell. I also want to announce that the third Faculty Institute for Diversity will be held June 14th through the 16th. There will be notices available -- you saw a letter already today, announcing that institute.

"Finally, today Kent Fuchs and I, I guess, have appointed the committee, as this Senate requested last time, to assess the Marcellus shale drilling. The goal of that committee is not to make recommendations, but to set up a series of principles by which the President would decide whether to lease Cornell lands for drilling into the Marcellus shale.

"And Steve, that concludes my talk.

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much, Dean Fry. So now we have come to the Good and Welfare section of the meeting, and we have one speaker, Professor Grossman."

12.11.GOOD AND WELFARE

"Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: Thank you very much for letting me speak here. My name is Yuval Grossman, from Physics. I want to talk about the Statler Club. I have five minutes, so I have one minute for four topics. First, let me tell you about the facts as I know them."

"I am kind of new here so I do not know all the history. Second, about why I think it is important that we have a Faculty Club. Third, how I see the near future, and I emphasize, the near future of the club. And the fourth minute, I will spend as to what I think the Senate can do to help and what I hope to gain by coming here.

"Let me start with some facts. As far as I know, since the beginning of the Faculty Club, it was in the Hotel School, and roughly in the last 20 years, it was in the configuration that we had until recently. We had lunch down in the basement and a coffee place on the first floor, and this has been going on for roughly 20 years; probably you know better than I am.

"In the beginning of the semester changes had been carried out. As of now there's no lunch at the basement, and basically this was just kind of notify us of the change. There was not a big discussion between faculty about the move. The move had been done.

"So why do we need a Faculty Club? That is the big issue. I think the point I would like to make is as follows: for our group, I do high energy physics, lunch is crucial in the way we work. It is amazing how we don't have faculty meetings and we don't have group meetings. Everything is done at lunch. We discuss all at lunch: physics, teaching, everything. It is quite interesting that I went back and talked to one of our senior faculty members. I was told that even the idea of big bang inflation came at lunch. I don't know if you know what it is, but it is probably the most important development in cosmology in the last 40 years. It's really, really interesting. In the book of Alan Guth, he said that it all started at lunch by a remark of Henry Tye. I went to Henry and asked him about it, and he said, "Of course, we always go to the Statler."

"My point is that for us lunch is a big deal. It is really an important part of our working day. It is not just "okay, let's go for lunch." Personally, I am trying very hard not to set any appointment around lunch, because lunch is the time that I know it's where we go together as a group.

"We are not the only group. You go the Statler and see several other groups that do the same. It is a time for groups to get together and work. It is part of our life as researchers.

"There are other reasons why I think we need a club. It is not only because our group is using it. I know, and I asked people, and there has been a survey, and people know it is important. I know it's important because it's also on the Provost's list, The B-list, but still on the list. In the long run, we all agree that we want a Faculty Club. We need a Faculty Club.

"Of course the last thing we want to mention is that all other peer institutions, the Ivy League institutions and all the universities that we want to be like, have Faculty Clubs.

"Next I talk about the future of the club, in fact the near future. Right now, the Provost said that he had a lot of other things to do and he got it out of his hands and gave it to the Dean of Faculty.

(LAUGHTER)

"Practically that's what's going on. And on the other hand, basically, the people who hosted the Faculty Club, the Hotel School, as far as I understand, they aren't really eager to have us there. So the point is, that's what the provost said, we need some model, something that would work. So putting 1 plus 1, I see the chances are high that by the end of the semester we are going to have basically nothing that's going to work for us.

"I am really worried. I'm not saying it will happen, but I think if we don't do anything to make it clear that it's very important for us, I think nothing will happen. I want to emphasize here that people work differently. For some people, it is crucial for them to have a library. Some, a lab. For other faculty, it is crucial to have a Faculty Club. I really think it is a part of our things to do.

"That brings me to number four, what I want, what I hope to get from the Senate. Basically, what I hope to get from the Senate, and I don't know how it is done, is to get some support. To show that we come together as a faculty. That we declare that we understand that this is a problem, and that no matter what solution we are going to have, this solution should be something that keeps what we have now for the short-term. I don't want to look for long-term; but next semester, we have to make sure we keep something."

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty