MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009

Speaker Steven Beer: "I call the University Faculty Senate March 2009 meeting. I sense that the quorum is not yet present but we will conduct some business before that happens. First, I would like to remind everyone to please turn off or silence your cell phones. In addition I ask that the speakers please rise and identify themselves with their name and affiliation or department. At this point we have no good and welfare speakers. I would like to call on the Dean of Faculty, William Fry for remarks."

1.   REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Dean of Faculty, William Fry: "My comments concern three topics, the first two of which are related. First, I want to discuss the budget situation and provide some personal insight to the deliberations. Second, I'd like to discuss the strategic planning initiative that will begin later this semester. Third, I'd like to make just a brief comment relating to the report from the Committee on Faculty Governance.

"First, here are some comments on the budget. The President spoke on Monday to the faculty and the Provost spoke last month to the Senate on the fiscal situation facing the university. These numbers are important and I'll repeat them here just in case someone does not have the full picture. We have a structural deficit (spending more than we have) of \$100M. This deficit will be eliminated by a \$50M reduction in budget in FY10, and another \$50M in FY11. The reduction for FY10 has already been identified. There is also a \$35M deficit because of increased undergraduate financial aid. This deficit is being funded by withdrawing \$35M (annually) from the endowment. There also an annual shortfall of \$80M because of decreased value of the endowment. This deficit will be eliminated in three years by reducing the endowment payout over each of the next three years. Finally, there is a line of credit debt estimated to approach \$150M. The first payment of that debt (\$75M) is being paid by using 'reserves' - \$50M from the Provost and \$25M from the colleges. The mechanism to repay the rest of the debt has not yet been specified.

"The first set of budget corrections have been across the board, and the Provost has stipulated that the next set of budget corrections will be strategic. He has asked for ideas from a variety of sources including the faculty. Provost Fuchs has met with members of the UFC, the FPC, and the Faculty Trustees several times to discuss an approach. In response, the UFC, the FPC and the Faculty Trustees have made suggestions as to how to structure the strategic planning process. A paper copy of our suggestion is on the front table.

"We suggested two levels of task forces. First, there needs to be an overarching task force that receives all suggestions from other task forces. This overarching task force will make recommendations to the Provost. We suggested that this task force be comprised of some faculty, some vice presidents, some vice provosts, and some deans. Second, we suggested that there be a series of specific task forces. Some of these task forces will be college-bases, but there should also be some university wide task forces. These various more specific task forces will make recommendations to the overarching task force. The composition of these task forces should reflect the topic. Some topics to be addressed by the more specific university wide task forces should consider academic structure of the university, size of the university, revenue enhancement, cross-college allocation structures (i.e. accessory instruction etc) and shared/duplicated services.

"Finally, I want to report that the UFC has made some slow progress in considering the recommendations from the Committee to Review Faculty Governance (submitted in spring 2007). The UFC and members of the Faculty Governance Committee will meet this semester to evaluate the recommendations on which the UFC has not yet come to some decision.

"Mr. Speaker, this concludes my report and if there's time I'd be happy to respond to questions."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR and Faculty Senator-at-Large: "With regard to those that are recommending specific task forces, I was particularly concerned about a comment President Skorton made with regard to something like 50 lecturers that might be cut over three years and he didn't say just by attrition. There was also the issue of non-renewed contracts so it seems to me that there is a serious issue of potential layoffs of non-tenure-track faculty. I like the recommendation of having these task forces but there is a very particular concern about the non-tenure-track faculty and their vulnerability. I think we really should pay attention to that and also in terms of the composition of the committees that we should include non-tenure-track faculty as well. You may have already thought of that."

Speaker Beer: "We have to move on with the agenda, so thank you very much, Dean Fry. I now call on Professor Rod Dietert for a report from the University Faculty Committee. Before Professor Dietert reports I would like to remind all Senators that you need to sign in, on the attendance sheet in the front. At this point, we lack a quorum, so if anyone, any Senators are present and haven't signed in, please do so now."

2.   REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Rodney Dietert, Microbiology and Immunology, Senator-at-Large and also UFC member: "This is also the formal UFC report. It really just elaborates on several

points that Dean Fry made. There are three topics to cover: First, is really old business. As you may recall, at the February Faculty Senate meeting, we asked the senators for their discussions and ideas concerning the reporting and distribution of Senate minutes. Based on those discussions, the UFC has decided not to pursue that further at this time. The status quo seems to be very much embraced among senators and we're very content to put that aside with no plans to bring forward any resolutions unless were asked to do that by you.

"Second: the second topic is one that has engaged many of us aggressively recently. That is budgetary planning. The UFC has been involved, as Dean Fry has indicated, there has been a lot of activity in the last four weeks. We started on February 17 with our meeting with the Provost where he again asked us for input into the structure that you now see in terms of the task force. We then met with the Financial Policies Committee on February 23 and that has been followed on Tuesday, March 3, last week, with the Financial Policies Committee, the faculty trustees, the provost, and the president all involved across the meeting. Subsequently, Wednesday, March 3 we met with the trustees, including our faculty trustees as well for that evening meeting, so we really have a lot of activity in terms of meetings that we need, to try to ensure that we could help the provost and president with structure that provides from the faculty input in a timely fashion with the right expertise for some of the decisions to be made, particularly for FY11.

"So this is in the process and I think you see some of these results now that the Provost sent to us on the task force, our committee and faculty of the Financial Planning Committee and the faculty treasury were involved in this issue along with the administration.

The third topic that Dean Fry mentioned is our desire to pursue the recommendations of the Faculty Governance Committee for consideration so we could develop and bring to you, topics for consideration and to that end, we are requesting a joint meeting with the faculty governance committee. I think we've done the easy, obvious tasks. Now we're down to some things that either may be in place or maybe more challenging and we're going to meet with them to gather more information in terms of learning how to procede with you. That is the extent of my report. I don't know if there's time for questions."

Speaker Beer: "I think we have time for one question. None? Thank you very much Professor Dietert. Are there any Senators who failed to sign and when they arrived? If so, please sign in now. Before we consider the adoption of the approval of the minutes I think we will move to the next item on the agenda, a report from Professor John Hermanson, Chair of the University Faculty Library Board concerning open source publishing."

3. **REPORT FROM THE LIRARY BOARD ON OPEN SOURCE PUBLISHING**

Associate Professor John Hermanson, Biomedical Sciences: "Thank you for inviting us. I represent the Library Board. We have been meeting about a number of issues this year and budgetary issues are facing the library in a big way. Anne Kenney, the university librarian, in regards to open access publications, has approached us. The only way to strongly put this is the current model of faculty publishing is not sustainable. University libraries are facing above inflationary levels of cost increases per year, especially for science journals, subscriptions, and they are trying to find ways to deal with this. And hopefully now the Ivy leagues plus (the Ivy Leagues plus a number of other distinguished universities) are in consultation to try to set aside money and mechanisms whereby we can experiment with the idea of open access publishing in a way that it might have a chance of success. This is not a done deal. I think it's important to say that. Discussion is going on in Anne Kenney's office in the Provost's office in terms of whether or not some money can be set aside to do this.

"This goes back to the resolution concerning scholarly publishing by this body in 2005, which essentially endorses the idea of faculty participating in publishing and open access rather than restricted access. The Library, like all of us, will be facing at least a 5% budget cut this year. I believe they are impacted in some of the materials they are purchasing and so this is something that Anne Kenney is extremely interested in addressing so she approached us with the idea of possibly approving the expenditure this year of $25,000 perhaps to be matched by the provost, perhaps putting together a pool which could be available to the faculty of the University if they were to submit their work to the open access publication. In this sense if you haven't done this before, essentially you are invited to submit your material and essentially there's an application fee or processing fee that goes along with this. However when you are done with the process and you see a publication resulting the copyright is essentially held by you. You have access to the material. The students have access to the material and it is more freely available through electronic means.

"Basically we are looking at right now at about a $50,000 pool. We don't know if that is enough. From the previous experiences we have been discussing initially, it's probably more than is necessary because there are a number of open access journals already available to faculty to publish in and they are relatively low in terms of volume submission they have seen.

"The Library Board, on the advice from the 2005 Senate resolution, following on some discussion about members of the board, but also any of the people who had been involved in a task force that studied this and this goes back to 2004. This is something that may be worth experimenting. Questions, of course, come up - how do you judge who gets to publish? So what if there is a run of this money? Do we take the front row for example and say your work is better than people in the back row? How would that

$50K be allocated? Will it be sufficient? And so is it too early to say we have a committee that will address this issue, the question is certainly where this is going. This may be very important in terms of the assistant professors coming up for tenure if they're being encouraged to publish in open access -- will that affect their impact factor. Something like that may be relevant to this committee for that reason. Would our funds be sufficient? Will there be more money in the coffers? We don't know. So anyway, at this point, this is presented to you early to begin a discussion, to remind you of the activity that's going on here back in 2004 to 2005. It has really been brought to the forefront.

"Right now the Library Board is going to keep pursuing this. We are in discussions with the librarians to bring in some speakers; to bring in some people who might actually speak with this body in the next month or two and tell you what's on the table. Again this is the Ivy plus and Kenny's comment was a think we are the only Ivies who doesn't participate in this and yet given the current climate, economically we need to be very careful about what's going on. So again monies not spent have been allocated and this is under discussion and this is something that Dean of faculty thought was important to bring to your attention. So, here are a few bullets to think about and if you have questions, we will be happy to answer them."

Speaker Beer: "We might be able to take one question?"

Professor David Levitsky, Nutritional Sciences: "Any idea of the percent of publications currently from faculty using the open access forum?"

Professor Hermanson: "I can't give you a number but it's relatively low. In many of the journals that I know I read that I recall I published in, you can now elect to submit your material and it's accepted. You can elect to fork over several thousand dollars -- -- it varies from person to person by what we're seeing is how many people are taking that step. They might take that $2000 and spend it on a graduate student. I think one of the issues that the provost at various universities are looking at, is there a way that we can make this more appealing to a larger group of universities in the way that will get the attention of the publishing houses so they may be more willing to join this initiative. I think I've heard a number that I'll say here, it's something like a 19% increase in profits this year."

4.   APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Beer: "We are now going to consider the minutes of the meeting held on February 11, 2009. All those in favor of approving those minutes signify by saying aye. Opposed? The minutes are approved and now I would like to call on the Associate Dean of the faculty, Brad Anton, for a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

5. **NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Brad Anton: "I don't have much to report. We had hoped to have our slate of candidates ready for faculty elections for this meeting but I was inexcusably unable to get that work done. I have contacted everyone by telephone so we should have the slate ready to send to everyone by e-mail, I'm hoping within the next few days or by next week. I am going to ask for your help in filling some positions in the University Assembly. We have historically had trouble filling the faculty slots of the University Assembly and right now we have them nearly filled but we are going to be losing several people at the end of this semester. We will have four vacancies there. The University Assembly is the one governing body on campus that brings together students, faculty, and staff to address issues of common interest, most recently they were engaged together rewriting the campus code of conduct. The University Assembly intends to rewrite its own charter. There is also a university sustainability committee that they will be participating in and so there are some items of interest here. Also President Skorton has shown new willingness in engaging the University assembly in campus affairs and to respect the opinions of the University assembly, so there is more reason than ever to be involved. Any of you are interested in participating in the University Assembly or have colleagues that would be appropriate, please send those recommendations to me."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much Associate Dean Anton. I would like to now call on Medha Devare to report on VIVO."

6. **VIVO REPORT**

Deputy Provost David Harris: "I am just going to introduce this segment briefly by way of saying that I am really excited that we have moved to the point where we are. We were here about a year ago, some of you may recall talking about this project. It is an effort to bring information about faculty across the entire University, to make it accessible to folks looking for research collaborators, looking for courts of interest to people now looking at projects that could support, to make it easier for media to find experts for stories and other things and we said we would come back and present this group with an update. That is where we are now. I just want to say briefly, that is especially important in the current financial climate to have something that allows us to be more efficient for the use of the University and just one example is student.

"Unfortunately we have had to end many services this year. That means students will not have as many professors available in their own department and the system makes it easier for them to find exciting classes across the University. Medha will tell you a lot more about it. She and John Corson-Rickert from Mann library have taken the leads."

Dr. Medha Devare, Mann Library: "David mentioned a little bit of what we were trying to do. I should go ahead and say that it is a simple point of access right now, to provide perspective of Cornell University. That includes Weill Cornell. Our data on Weill Cornell is a little out of date. We are working with them on where we can get more information in a more timely way, to keep things current so you will be able to search across not just across the Geneva and Ithaca campuses but also Weill Cornell. Currently, VIVO includes all of the faculty and academic appointment books. Basically VIVO includes everybody at Cornell except nonexempt people, undergraduate students and graduate students. We are working on getting nonexempt's in; there is some question about grads and other students but that is down the road. I just wanted to do a quick walk-through. I don't know how many of you are familiar with VIVO and I don't know how many of you have seen it in its previous incarnation, which was more of a life sciences tool. It has now broadened beyond that. Just a real quick introduction to it. This is the homepage. The URL is vivo.cornell.edu or vivo.library.cornell.edu. You can get to it various ways. If you Google VIVO Cornell, you will get there.

"At the top level, you will see people, academic units and events, seminars and research. You can browse those on your own; I don't want to spend too much time right now, as I don't have that much time. On the right-hand side here you will see upcoming seminars. We try to get seminars across campus in here. We are working right now on that manually but we will soon be working with the University calendar so we will be getting stuff pulled from there.

"The research I wanted to quickly show you and then do just a couple of searches. Research areas have research facilities organized by core laboratories, a list of facilities to help you find what you're looking for. But this is of special interest I think because all along we had heard that there wasn't any easy way for people to know who is working in a certain area in the world for instance. So we tried to take a stab at then and, while this is not by any means accurate, well it's mostly accurate. If I click on a continent here and if I look at Africa for instance, a preliminary list of people who have identified themselves somehow, somewhere within their research description or their faculty reporting mechanism as having expertise in Africa or having a project, and that's how the information gets there. As I said it is by no means complete because it depends on our getting that stuff, on having it on your profiles or knowing it in some fashion or another. That is an interesting thing in what we hope to move to very soon, I want to show this to you really quickly, it's not available right now, it is a test right now, let me show you what we are hoping in the future to have.

"For instance if I wanted to know who was working in Brazil, we would want to implement this side of the map and if I click on this, I get a list of faculty who have identified themselves as working in Brazil. We want to move to a less clunky view overall. We have been approaching that gradually with the profiles of people we have and the homepage really but we haven't addressed a lot of our other information that

we will be using. I just wanted to show you that as a way of showing where you might want to go with this.

"So if I go back to the homepage, I will let you go in and browse and if you do find anything that strikes you as odd or something about your profile that doesn't strike you as correct you can send and e-mail and we will correct it. I wanted to do a quick search and -- is there anything anyone particularly would like me to search for or should I bet that I have a couple of search options I can just look for? Okay, "epidemiology" or "epidemio*" which will get you more. It is a truncated ending but it's a broad search approach. So when I do a search like this in VIVO, it allows me to show you what I have been trying to make. It does allow you to look across the entire campus. The first thing you see is the faculty organizations. If you're looking for people, you see people from across the board here. So there's somebody at Weill, somebody in Geneva. There is somebody in EE and so on and so you see that spectrum of people to deal with this at one glance. So quickly you can find collaborators. You can find people who you might be interested in. I can go in here now and look at a profile and I already talked to Bill Fry in advance so I am picking on him and we will look at his profile.

"So that's what VIVO looks like. You might look at this and Bill might look at this and say well where is all this coming from.   It is coming from a variety of different sources. The basic idea of VIVO is to be an integrator of data. A typical university, and ours is a typical university, has sources of data all over the place, and all of this information exists as public information but it's very hard to find. You very rarely can actually get it all together in one place and that's what we're trying to do. We are trying to be that integrator. We are trying to get this information into a database all over campus, HR being one of them, so that's how we keep our information current.   It is like getting regular updates from HR. We get information from faculty reporting systems. For instance this information on Bill Fry comes from the CALS faculty-reporting forum. A lot of the colleges have recently decided to go with that in the faculty reporting system and we already mapped their data elements to that. We will very quickly be getting that information in here. The idea is that you don't necessarily have to do updates to multiple places. It is going to be done in one place. We will get it by whatever mechanism, various mechanisms, and we'll make it available for people, others who want to use this stuff.   That is the basic idea behind it.

"If you look at Bill's profile there are affiliations, which will tell you which faculty appointment, is in it and so on so forth. You go further down there's research XXX reported to CALS and that's been brought in here. Their research areas reported to CALS are in here. This spans communities because again people will look at these things and say that's management. Who else is doing this at Cornell? So you can click on that and you will see a list of those who can do that. It is a quick way of creating those mini communities in finding out again record focus, on domestic focus, impact

statements, courses he teaches – and again that comes from a database, of course database. Service backgrounds and all this other stuff, publications.

"Grants and publications are a little bit behind so if you look at your profile and you see that my latest grants and publications aren't in here that's because we are working on it. We are trying to get recent publications etc. If you are Cornell faculty member, Cornell community member, you should be able to just click the link to get to the article very quickly it is our hope in the end. The thing that we have implemented to make it easier for people who want to go and self edit, for instance colleges who don't have a faculty reporting system, we have implemented a self-editing system and what I'm going to do is really quickly, to login as myself and show you how it's done, to show you how easily this can be done.

"I will try to do this with an approximation is on the top right-hand corner. I just type in my net ID and password and this is just for administrators and editors essentially, people won't be able to do this. I want to go back into my profile now.

"You'll see something that looks like this and all of a sudden you'll seeing edit statements next to your stuff. So I can go in and say okay I want to edit and I want to add something more or correct something in my thing and it should be very easy to do. You could even use the HTML source if you know how to do that or this is an easier way to do it and I'm just going to say "blah blah". I then say "save change" and it should show up like this. Then you can go back and take out. So I'm going to make myself ahead of something – I will make myself the Head of the something, all I do is select from a list, and pretty soon these functions are very large but we're working on some awesome features, I can enter this and easy as that I am on the net. That is really dangerous.

"You will notice when you go in here, there are some things that the edits do not show. That is because it is coming from a database of records that we don't want people to go in there and start putting in whatever they please because HR has a record of what your primary affiliation is that's where we're getting it from. Similarly if you go down to research and you look at the primary investigator, there is no edit button there and that's because that comes from OSP, the office of sponsored programs warehouse. Further down, if you go into teaching, there should be courses taught; if you have courses taught that would not be editable either because that's also be coming from a database record. So if you go in and wonder why certain things are not editable, that's why. We are getting them from somewhere else, from a more authoritative source. So to keep current, if we want to keep things accurate. This is why they are working like that.

"This is sort of a quick update on VIVO is an integrator. You can now see how it's an integrator of things. It's bringing data and from a variety of different places. It is also a

disseminator and that's something working on right now. Let me show you a couple of examples of the disseminator capability.

"One the elective programs in life science. This is a relatively new portal and driven entirely by data from Google and it does some really neat things. A task force has worked on this to identify, they're something like 39 fields in the life sciences department. They sat down and grouped them by six broad areas. You go to apply to biology for instance, you will get a list of graduate fields that are considered to be in applied biology and these are not mutually exclusive. There is entomology for instance, could be here or could be in some other area. When you look at this, you see a list of faculty and then you see their research areas. We try to keep it very brief so that when I look at agricultural biotechnology, you can see this. I can click on this research area in the community shows me which faculty members have identified that as being their research area. So that's kind of a neat thing. The other thing people might like is this tab then again leverages VIVO. I click agricultural biotechnology and say which graduate field deals with this. For an incoming student this becomes really powerful is driven entirely off the data from VIVO. We are anticipating that this will be the case more and more. We are being approached more and more by folks, by potential consumers, all over campus who say hey you got it why should I need to rebuild it? To show me what you've got and we're trying to put that in place.

"I think some departments within CALS have also included links to their CALS research profiles. So that's another way this is being interpreted. The idea behind it is to try to integrate data make it available to everyone and hopefully this will be done sufficiently system and cut costs for department and other units. I should mention we have departments and other academic units. We also have centers and institutes and other such things. We're interested in trying to model Cornell's webpage is not an easy job for all kinds of little issues but if you look at this and you do have strong feelings one way or another do let us know. We want to hear and want to correct whatever it is that you are having problems with."

Speaker Beer: "I think we have time for two minutes' worth of questions. Are there any questions on VIVO?"

Dean Fry: "Where do you get the photographs?"

Dr. Devare: "The photographs are sort of a bug-a-boo. We get what we can off the web and sometimes people have old photographs and sometimes there are recent ones and we just click on them. We hope that people write to us and say hey, how about this picture instead. That is one of the functionalities that we have in common."

Speaker Beer: "One other question."

Assistant Professor Tarelton Gillespie, Communication: "We are in the process of doing faculty activity reports. Is this another place where this information could be?"

Dr. Devare: "You are talking about the academic insight? That is what I mentioned the faculty recording system and actually CALS has adopted this and I think AP, Johnson, Hotel, ILR are going to adopt it very shortly. Engineering is probably going to adopt it. There are a number of colleges that have decided to go with this vendor, it's an outside vendor, and we've made sure we could map to the public information. We are not interested in anything that is at all sensitive. That is not our job. So we're getting information that's publicly available. CALS is actually closest for editing for faculty, not anything that we have asked for but that was a decision that was made by the data folks."

Professor Gillespie: "So that means that in the CALS that none of that information will be editable?"

Dr. Devare: "No I am afraid not. You know if you really want to edit it, write to me and I'll get stuff in. We expect to have the active updates increase pretty soon. We have already mapped it is working very well and should be in shortly."

Speaker Beer: "I would like to call on George Hoffstaetter for a report from Educational Policy Committee."

7. REPORT FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Associate Professor George Hoffstaetter, Physics, and Chair, Educational Policy Committee: "The Educational Policy Committee is engaged in a slight change of the academic calendar. The reason is that the orientation week will be shortened by one day. That is a done deal and because of that, there are various options of change to consider. We have asked this Senate and various groups from the University for input. For example we sent e-mails or letters to the deans, directors, department chairs, the vice-president and provost and to you. We also sent a letter to the student assembly and we have received some responses but we didn't get enough responses so I encourage you once more to go back to your divisions and departments to discuss the matter and get back to us no later than March 23 because we want to have our next meeting on March 26 and in order to discuss the subject we need to define whether there is a consensus or at least one very strong opinion of how we should change this.

"Let me go to the various options. First of all, because orientation is shorter by one day, it seems natural to start teaching one day earlier. That would mean that when we started on Wednesday rather than on a Thursday. That would be good because the fall semester is already shorter than the spring semester. The spring semester is 14 full

weeks long. The fall semester is 14 for weeks minus Saturday but then minus Monday and Tuesday and now Wednesday. So we are two and half days shorter in the fall. We have identified the following options.

"First add the extra Wednesday and take no additional day off. That would be good of course because the semester would have more length but the problem is that there are various other concerns for example take Labor Day. It is especially good for people who have children who would have a hard time trying to find childcare that day. It would be bad especially for large lab classes who would teach various subgroups of the class of different days. If you take Monday away a group that meets on Monday, we would be eliminating a whole week of classes for them. Another reason why Labor Day is that this creates a very long weekend just after instruction has started and allows for greater amounts of time for nefarious social activities such as drinking. We could eliminate that problem with Monday lab therefore teaching by making Labor Day free but teach the Monday classes on the previous Friday. We thought that that would not only be good for the lab but also an intelligent move for him the students.

"Another issue is that some TA education sections are on Friday. One could take the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off. This way students student have more travel time to get home to their families. More students would be tempted to take Monday and Tuesday off and leave during the weekend before Thanksgiving. Another advantage may be that this frees up only half a day because break starts at 1:00pm Wednesday.

"We could make fall break longer by one day. That would be really good because it aligns fall break more with the fall break of the school districts and again this is for families with childcare. There are many other options as I said. You should take this to your units and discuss this and get back to me no later than March 23. I am going to tell you a little bit about the responses received so far. This is an extremely unscientific survey. First all, the numbers are really small. But also the responses that are behind the numbers are very varied and I just increase each number by one when I got any public indication of any option so these numbers don't really count.

"The responses received are characterized as follows:

	For	Against
No additional day off	3	
Labor day off	8	3
Labor day with Monday classes on Friday		2
Wednesday before Thanksgiving off	9	
Make fall break one day longer	5	1
Cancel fall break and start after Labor Day	2	
Larger changes of the calendar needed	2	
MLK day should be considered	2	

"No one wants to teach one more day. Some of you want to take Labor Day off but a few thought it wasn't such a good idea.   Some would like Labor Day with Monday off and hold classes on Friday before. Wednesday before Thanksgiving off seemed to be the most favored option or make fall break longer by one day there is a little bit of interest there. They are two people who want more changes. They want to cancel fall break and start after Labor Day. Two more people said that much larger changes need to be considered and one person wanted to start to eliminate evening prelims altogether. One person pointed out that Oxford teaches only teaching 24 weeks but the rest of us are teaching 30. So there are a few wanted to consider much larger changes.

"From this you get a slight indication; you can generally see that we don't have enough input to say what idea would be favored. No constituency has voiced a uniform strong opinion any opinions on the subject of changing one day of the academic calendar are very diverse. So given that background we look forward to hearing from you before the next Senate meeting which is April 8. We will meet just before the April meeting and try to determine from the added input which of these options is strongly favored by faculty. We intend to recommend a resolution. "

Speaker Beer: "We have seven minutes for questions and discussion. Lady in the front."

Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "I didn't realize you wanted numbers, the numbers of how many faculty said each thing? We have not had a faculty meeting so I'm just gathering individual responses. The thing I found interesting would be the arguments. I would like to suggest that they're a couple of arguments that seem very strong and one is the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and almost everybody said that students aren't there anyway so teaching is a farce. I happen to share that because of the phenomena of giving a lecture to two people. The people who were in favor of the Labor Day off are very strong on an issue of a family-friendly policy so it seems to me there are two kinds of arguments that are arising at least in our department rising up to the top. Do we want to be family-friendly or do we want to look at how the students vote with their feet?"

Professor Hoffstaetter: "I would like to respond to that because at least one person pointed out that the Thanksgiving break is probably more important for the students families so that has something to do with being family-friendly especially in times where psychological problems abound getting the students a break in time to go home for Thanksgiving.   It is important to them."

Professor Emeritus Walter Lynn, Ombudsman and former Dean of Faculty: "In earlier days, we always wrestled with two things. Number one there are statutory

requirements in terms of the number of weeks we are required to have classes which seems to be ignored in this resolution. The fall has always been a problem. Spring is the one that we always manage to meet in our calendar responsibilities but I just wonder whether somebody has checked with New York State to see how many weeks we are required to give classes."

Professor Georg Hoffstaetter: "In response to that, of course we are meeting the requirement also in the fall and we are doing it by counting the study period of instruction so it does not change that situation in any way because they are adding one day."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman in the blue shirt."

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "Walter, I was chair of the Educational Policy Committee previously and we did check into that exact thing and we decided that it was legal. My comment on this resolution having been chair of the Education Policy Committee is that I just wanted to mention a little history here. The Labor Day issue predates the existence of this extra day to play with. For many, many years, the ILR School went on strike every Labor Day -- they didn't have classes that day -- as a kind of a protest. Labor Day is a family issue case. There is no day care in Ithaca on Labor Day. Zero. I hear that from my colleagues who have children. I have to drive somewhere the day before Thanksgiving and that would be an issue for me, but Labor Day is before this extra day of labor. The Educational Policy Committee had been talking with Kent Hubbell and people like that because of Labor Day to try to get a day off orientation. Finally they managed to say okay we could give up the day's orientation. The reason they did it was because we wanted that so we could take Labor Day. Well then all of a sudden all these other options were on the table. Now I won't deny that that these are all valid ideas, but where those new options came from, I'm not really sure. When I was chair of the Education Policy Committee, I just thought that once we got that day off orientation, Labor Day would be taken off and we could figure out how to fix the classes so they worked okay. That is my comment."

Professor Hoffstaetter: "Additional options were added in the discussions."

Speaker Beer: "Professor Cohn."

Associate Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "I would like to raise two points. One is I think there are other very compelling reasons in favor of taking Labor Day off. It is a federal legal holiday. It is one of only two federal legal holidays that Cornell respects and does not count as a hidden holiday for its staff. It makes teaching that day very complicated. I have had days where I was supposed to teach and the elevator in the building was locked and there were disabled students unable to get in and attend their

classes. We teach, not because it's a legal teaching day, but by convention. I find that highly anomalous. I think those arguments need to be weighed in, not just the family-friendly one which I also find very compelling. The other thing is, I am curious to know how the decision is going to be made. If you want a reasonable sample, then I suggest that all faculty be polled and given the opportunity to voice their individual opinion and then count those opinions. If you, as a committee, feel that you will make a policy decision that is purely advisory than that may not be necessary but I think by suggesting, for example, that eight is few and three against is many, we highlights the fact that we do need a more systematic way to affect this."

Speaker Beer: "Gentlemen on the side."

Edward Lawler, Martin Catherwood Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, and former Dean of the ILR School: "This issue has come up quite often when I was dean and I would like to point out several issues involving the information, in a larger context and it is symbolic and important to having Labor Day off.   I would just like to point out two major points and its symbolic importance. New York State is a state that celebrates Labor Day as a holiday. I think it is time that this institution took the opportunity to celebrate and acknowledge Labor Day in a way that is consistent with value and tradition in a larger context of the operation of the University."

Professor Arms: "The Computer Science Department has some of the youngest faculty of any department and also the department is struggling to have more women on the faculty. I made two discoveries. One is that we are expecting three new children within the next nine months and the other is that for the faculty members who have young children, they really consider this to be a major problem."

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman in red."

Professor Calderone, Entomology: "I think that the argument for Labor Day is very powerful, historically, politically, etc., as is your argument the day before Thanksgiving. That is also a very strong argument. Maybe you could consider taking both days off. We are getting one day back on Wednesday but if you have another way to get another day back somewhere, half-day somewhere else, then we would have like issues."

Speaker Beer: "Has the committee considered two days off?

Professor Cohn: One and one half days.

Professor Hoffstaetter: "One more thing I'd like to talk about but we haven't talked about very much is that I think these two points make larger changes because of our families but maybe we need more changes.

"We consider ourselves making recommendations not making policy changes. We need to do something here more doable."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much for bringing this controversial issue. Now I would like to call on Senator-at-large Abby Cohn for moving the resolution concerning construction and renovation of buildings."

8.   RESOLUTION CONCERNING CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Professor Cohn: "I present to you a resolution (Appendix 1) regarding decision-making and funding of construction endorsed by 13 members of this body. Do I need to move the resolution? Yes. I move the resolution. Seconded. We all are acutely aware, Cornell is facing an immediate 5% permanent budget cut next year and discussion of further cuts to come, depending on the arithmetic, 5 to 12% and this is impacting all aspects of our operations, our faculty, our staffing and/or grad programs and so forth. So we are all facing these immediate consequences. Secondly, I would like to highlight the fact that, that was discussed by President Skorton in his remarks on Monday that actually, while a significant portion of this situation is due to the drop in our endowment -- to the order of 70 or $80 million and it gets worse by the day. I think it was $70 million Monday and its $80 million today, President Skorton also acknowledged that $100 million of the deficit is due to what he refers to as a structural deficit. We are to understand that the structural deficit as being discussed today by Dean Fry relates to over-commitment and over expenditures in a number of areas, critically including the very extensive construction that we have done on the campus in recent years. I would also like to acknowledge that, while we have this issue with funding or construction and have relied heavily on debt financing, we also have some other very compelling and strong goals and objectives, including the decision to increase financial aid at this critical moment and the goals to have new campus-wide initiatives relative to our carbon footprint. I would like to turn now to the resolution itself.

"In fitting with the president and the provost commitments to transparency and accountability, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to adopt a new policy for governing the construction and renovation of all buildings, the Full Disclosure Policy, that requires a comprehensive plan for securing the funding of the construction and operation of each building before the construction begins, and that this plan for financing each building should be made available in advance to the campus community.

"In addition, consistent with the announced construction pause, we call upon President Skorton and the University Trustees to evaluate the financial status of ongoing construction projects, and if a comprehensive plan for the funding of the project has not

yet been established to delay the construction timetable until an acceptable plan for financing is in place.

"We believe that these two points complement the steps already taken by the president and central administration in terms of the construction pause now extended until June 30, 2009, as well as the proposed strategic planning initiative to be undertaken by the Provost's office. We also feel that the step should be taken in the broader context of long-term campus goals, including sustainability, and so we further call upon President Skorton and the university trustees to enforce a strict standards for the energy efficiency in the design of new buildings and renovations of existing buildings to reduce future operating costs, and in addition, to reflect the increased public concern about the energy security and climate change and to facilitate the transition to a carbon-neutral campus.

"So let me take a moment to spell out a little more explicitly what we have in mind when we call for a full disclosure policy and to highlight why we feel that transparency in this particular arena is so critical. Let me share an example. I am concerned by the legal notice that appeared in the Ithaca Journal March 2, 2009, announcing tax-free bonds under the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York for up to $575 million. The notice refers to a host of capital projects, some completed; others underway and yet others still in the planning stage currently subjected to the construction pause. In communications that I had earlier this week with both Vice President Steve Golding and Provost Fuchs both have confirmed that this is completely separate from the $500 million in taxable bonds that was recently approved by the Board of Trustees and was discussed by President Skorton in a memo to us. As I understand from Provost Fuchs that this notice refers to "a September 2007 board approved resolution for projects that were underway or planned at that time."   These projects that are completed or underway are presumably part of the structural deficit referred to by President Skorton on Monday.

"But I am both concerned and confused by the inclusion of a number of projects still at the planning stage such as the Milstein building, the Humanities building, Gates Hall, Central campus parking and so forth which as described by Vice President Golding in the Sun on February 10, 2009 are indeed subject to the construction pause. What I would like to know and what I believe as faculty we have the right to know, is what portion of these bonds are anticipated for projects in the planning stages?

"I am concerned by the implication that these future projects may be funded through renewed debt financing, as suggested by this notice. It seems odd to me that – at this juncture, when we are making major cuts to our core programs, in terms of faculty and staff positions -- that we would be considering any significant debt financing for future construction on the order of magnitude suggested by this notice. I have written and shared these concerns with Provost Fuchs and Vice President Steve Golding and have not gotten a reply to those questions.

"Again as stated by Vice President Golding in the Sun, there are two criteria for both projects subject to the pause being released: 'A capital project must be deemed critical either to the mission of the university or life and safety of the campus community, and it must have an approved funding plan with the appropriate resources identified and available.'

"What our resolution calls for is that the basis for these decisions, that is the basis for defining that some future construction meets these two criteria, being made public. Furthermore as I suggested in a recent communication to Dean Fry, we also need direct faculty representation on the strategic planning bodies making these decisions, in particular, the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee as well as any strategic planning committees now being formed and in both cases, these individuals should be named through the Elections & Nominations Committee. We believe that the increased faculty representation and critical decision-making bodies will further the goals of transparency and accountability that both President Skorton and Provost Fuchs have embraced."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much Senator Cohn for moving the resolution and speaking to it. We will now debate the resolution. First we will hear from a member of the faculty who may be opposed to the resolution is on the floor for discussion."

Professor Arms: "I would like to speak against the motion. I have been on the Faculty Senate now for 10 years. The Faculty Senate has typically not concerned itself with the university's budgets and trade-offs and there's a good reason for this. University budgets are very complex. I have spent 17 years on the budget committees at Dartmouth and Carnegie Mellon which are simpler universities than this and still complex to know that all decisions are very complicated trade-offs between academic programs, capital, short-term, various sources of funding, and so forth. It typically takes a new member of the committee about a year to get up to speed so that they understand the trade-offs and can make sensible contributions to University budgets. Now we are in a financial crisis and it's absolutely appropriate that the Faculty Senate get involved but we should do it the right way. We should do it in the way that was described by Bill Fry in his introductory remarks. Some members of the faculty should make the time commitment to really get involved in the process and really understand the budgets. It means that some people would have less time for teaching, less time for research, but they will be in a position that they can really contribute in a sensible balanced manner. I think the worst thing we can do is the shotgun approach in which we grab on an issue, get carried away by rhetoric, and try to force opinions based on limited knowledge of the situation. This is after all, what drove California to bankruptcy and I hope that we can support the process described by the Dean of Faculty and keep away from the shotgun solutions."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Is there a speaker in favor of the resolution?"

Associate Professor Martin Hatch, Music: "I just want to say that this resolution is in fact helping to clarify certain issues of policy that Professor Arms has said are complex and; if we're now worried about being driven to the brink of bankruptcy, I think the resolution is trying to say that the difficult situation we're in may have been caused at least in part, by questionable processes that were put in place and that created imbalances. A more open system would have alleviated this."

Speaker Beer: "Is there another speaker who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution?"

Professor Richard Talman, Physics: "As I read the motion, we are asked to give a vote of no-confidence in the administration.   Now, in ordinary times it is really appropriate to have a measure of antagonism controversy between the administration and faculty. But in hard times, it is a time for solidarity. I think I am opposed very much the same reasons as the first speaker. A second motion for example, to get the detail, is why we call it locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. Now the administration is as aware as we are of these things but we are not more qualified and in fact they are more qualified than we are to plan these financial issues."

Speaker Beer: "Is there another person other than Professor Cohn to speak in favor?"

Professor Timothy Mount, Applied Economics and Management: This seems to me a statement that we ought to return to the way things used to be. This is just a question of a two-way interaction with faculty decisions that really affect the academic program and the university for many years to come. Buildings last a long time and I think that this was much more open and discussed than it has been over the past 10 years, so I disagree that we have any qualms with the current administration but I think that we were concerned that the faculty were cut out of these decisions in previous administrations."

Speaker Beer: Is there another person who wishes to speak in opposition with the motion is on the floor?"

Associate Professor David Grubb, Materials Science and Engineering: "I would just like to remark on the previous resolution. This resolution is much more sensible than it was in previous iteration but is still not particularly clear. It says: 'There will be a comprehensive plan. If there is not a comprehensive plan, there has to be an acceptable plan.' What does this mean?   It is also a mixture of two paragraphs of extreme fiscal responsibility and a third one of fiscal irresponsibility and saying 'we must enforce strict standards of energy efficiency with no regard to cost.'   I just think it's a mishmash and it is just people venting against the administration."

Speaker Beer: "Is there another person who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution question."

Professor Cohn: "I just want to respond directly to a couple of points. I myself, and I believe I speak for all of the endorsers of this resolution in no way see this as a vote of no-confidence of the administration. In fact we see it as highly consistent with the commitments that both the President and Provost have made to greater transparency. We are trying to frame how that might happen. We have intentionally rewritten it precisely because we felt that there were things in the earlier resolution that were not realistic. But that is not what is on the floor before us. What is on the floor before us are the three points we have raised here and I would like to suggest that we are talking about life long energy decisions here. What I mean when I say, by full disclosure, is the kind of numbers, for example the Dean of Architecture, Art, and Planning put before us last time when he said that roughly of debt financing, roughly $10 million will be borne by AAP and the remainder, $10 million plus, will be borne by the general operating expense of the University. Those are the kinds of numbers were talking about. We are not talking about second-guessing the administration. We are talking about how we can work together with the administration to move forward in a constructive way, in light of, I believe some poor decisions, and not sufficiently transparent decisions that have been made in the past."

Speaker Beer: "As a point of reference, the speaker observes that there are, in addition to Senator Cohn, 12 other members of the faculty in support of this resolution as it was presented to the Faculty Senate. Is there another member of the faculty who wishes to speak in opposition to the resolution of the floor?"

Quiet Man in the Back, AAP: "I just want to comment a little bit about the back-and-forth going on. Some of the aspects, some things were talking about is the aspect of transparency is very important, particularly in light of where we are with our economy and the situations about the funding, etc. we are facing. Some of the things that I have been thinking myself grappling with are information about the funding, the building, etc. I think the Dean has tried to give the college and faculty very, very good information. He has done that on several occasions, presenting this to the entire college. The college itself is set up with committees. I am just a little puzzled in the sense that I feel like I need more information about the financial aspects and I think it would be good if somehow we could have more of that, actually even before we vote on this resolution, before we do this again. I say that because I think there are still financial aspects and today with what Senator Cohn brings to the floor. That is a new thing for me. Each month, each week things are happening and we're finding out new and different information continually about the finances. With regard to what the resolution is talking about, again, the overall transparency aspect has been very good. I don't think we need to be in the business of micromanaging what takes place with these

construction situations. I would agree with the gentleman from computer science and these are very complicated financial aspects and that is partly where I stand on this and I've been speaking with different individuals who have gotten different information. One aspect, what I felt I knew about Milstein for instance, and what is it exactly we talking about these aspects have been transparent. They have been looked at and they were approved, the debt financing and so on and so on. I was not on any of those committees but I have tried to be a faculty senate, think it's my responsibility to try to find out, to talk to other faculty to find as much as I could but those aspects. And we know from our last meeting, that there were a lot of issues and when the Dean was here he explained what that was so again I almost feel like if I had some of those other players to talk more about it, I think I would feel better one way or the other by the resolutions, and I'm still not quite sure how I feel."

Speaker Beer: "The speaker advises the body that the Senate rules require that the Senate adjourn at 6:00pm sharp. It seems that we have another 4 1/2 minutes to discuss this motion on the floor. The question has been called, is there a second? We will now vote on whether the question shall be called. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Nay. The question has been called so we will go directly to a consideration of the resolution, which is on the floor, which has three aspects. You see the first one now and now you see the other two. All those in favor of the resolution as presented, signify by saying aye. Those opposed, nay. The speaker is in doubt, so I will ask those who are in favor to please stand and remain standing until the Dean and Associate dean have counted. Those opposed, please stand. I call now for exemptions, Senators would have refrained from voting. Three.

The resolution passes by a vote of 27 in favor and 23 opposed, and three exemptions. The resolution has been adopted by consensus. We have no good and welfare speaker on tap, therefore the Senate adjourns."

Meeting adjourned: 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Anton
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty