Minutes of a  
Meeting of the Faculty Senate  
May, 12, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: “I would like to call to order the University Faculty Senate meeting for May 2010. I would like to note that the clock on the wall may look beautiful, but it’s nonfunctional, but I will try to keep track of time with my atomic watch. I would like to remind the people present to please turn off their cell phones or silence them, and there will be no recording, graphically or with tape recorders, of the proceedings here. We ask that people who speak, please stand and identify yourself as to department or other administrative unit.”

“Since our parliamentarian Peter Stein is away this week, I have asked Mary Beth Norton to act as parliamentarian for the purposes of this meeting, and she’s graciously agreed to do so. So first item of business is a report from the Nomination and Elections Committee, being given by the associate dean of the faculty, Fred Gouldin. Fred?”

2. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS  
Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary: “Good afternoon. My report is relatively short. First I want to report on the results of the faculty elections. So for faculty trustee, Nelson Hairston of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology has won that election. For Nominations and Elections Committee, S.K. Obendorf of Fiber Science and Apparel Design and John Sipple of Education. For the University Faculty Committee, Clare Fewtrell of Molecular Medicine; David Delchamps of Electrical and Computer Engineering; Don Hartill of Physics and Kent Goetz, Theater, Film and Dance.

“Then the following are appointed by nominations and elections: Maria Fernandez is appointed an A.D. White professor at large; David Feldshuh of Theater, Film and Dance is also appointed an A.D. professor at large; and finally, Natalie Mahowald of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences.

“Finally, for the Library Board Committee, Mary Beth Norton has been appointed for -- my notes say here one more year; and Ileen DeVault has been appointed to replace Clete Daniel. That completes my report.

“Any questions -- yes. The dean. I have been corrected. So these are not A.D. White professors, but rather faculty members that have been appointed to serve on that committee as members at large. Thank you very much.”
Speaker Beer: “Is there a motion to accept the report? Thank you. All those in favor of accepting the report from the Nominations and Election Committee, signify by saying "aye.

“(AYES)
Speaker Beer: Opposed, nay?
The report is accepted without question.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “Thank you. Without objection. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. Next I would like to call on Professor Mary Beth Norton for a report on the Library Board.”

3. LIBRARY BOARD REPORT
Professor Norton: “Thanks. Just the explanation of my appointment for one more year to the Library Board, it was basically decided that since the unit library reviews have started and I have been chair, it would be easiest if I continued as chair for one more year, so that’s why I am being appointed for one more year.

“On the Entomology Library issues, I’d say that in the last meeting of Library Board, we considered a report recommending the closing of the Entomology Library in Comstock Hall and moving of the books to Mann Library. I should say the initial report from the CALS administration and from the librarians was to close the library immediately or more or less immediately, sooner rather than later.

“There was a good deal of response from the faculty, input from students and faculty, and so we did not actually receive the report that called for it to be immediately closed. The report we received had been modified and amended after that report, and it called for the closing of the library after a one to two-year period of implementation.

“Basically, the problem is that to maintain the library in Comstock Hall would require a very large capital expenditure, which the CALS administration was unwilling to put out and which the Entomology Department could not fund on its own. So we agreed with the report, and there were many valuable possible things in it; for example, the much greater access to the Entomology collection, which currently is available for consultation only 40 hours a week, but movement to Mann Library means it can be consulted 104 hours a week. That is all the hours the Mann Library is open. The board unanimously accepted the recommendation that the Entomology library be closed as a separate unit and we recommended that to the librarian. She accepted our report, she
recommended it to the provost, and the provost has already decided to implement that. So that is actually in place.

“I will say that one of the results of the input was that there will be digitization of the major reference works so that members of the Entomology faculty and graduate students and undergraduates can still consult the kinds of images that they need next to, shall we say insect specimens that were brought in, which was one of their major concerns, that those images that are now in reference books in the library would be moved over to Mann and would be separated from the insect collection itself. This seems to be able to be resolved by the use of extensive digitization. That is going to happen over the next one to two years, and this task force will be deciding what books need to be digitized. That can be done for about the same amount of money that it would cost to have a library staffed for that period of time.

“We have already received a preliminary report on the Engineering library. It is a unanimous report. We haven't had a chance to talk about it yet, so I would prefer not to go into the details. We will be doing that. We will have two more meetings with the Library Board before everyone disperses for the summer. That's the end of my report, but I'd be happy to answer questions. Should I say that Jeff Scott, the Chair of Entomology, and I and Anne Kenney all came to the UFC meeting to talk about the library situation.”

Speaker Beer: “We have a couple minutes, if there are questions for Professor Norton. Could you wait for the microphone to arrive and then please stand, identify yourself as to name and department.”

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology Department. “I have a question about the library’s policy on archiving. So when all this is moved over to Mann, do volumes have to be accessed on a -- with a certain frequency and, if not, are they then moved to some other distant storage?”

Professor Norton: “No. We were assured the Entomology volumes moved to Mann would stay in Mann; would not go to the annex, for example. I know there was a concern a lot of them would go to the annex. That is not true. We were told repeatedly there's plenty of room in Mann Library to integrate the Entomology collection. And there's no rule. The library doesn't have a rule as to how many times things have to circulate or they have to go to the annex. That's not part of the decision about what goes to the annex.”

Professor Calderone: “Thank you very much.”
Emeritus Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior: “Thank you. I just had a question about the Engineering library. I am sorry you're not at a position to tell us what happened.”

Professor Norton: “I guess I can tell you what the recommendation was.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “That would be nice.”

Professor Norton: “To close it. To keep it as a study space, but to move the books somewhere else.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “So then my question, it was a unanimous report and I would like to know, was it like the Entomology report that was first decided and then presented to the faculty, or was it a more.”

Professor Norton: “No. It was done unified from the beginning. The paperwork that we got, undergraduate, graduate students, faculty, librarians, everybody was involved in making the decision from the beginning.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “Thank you.”

Professor Norton: “Yes.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Norton. I think we’ve been advised there’s a representative from the "Cornell Chronicle" here who would like to record the proceedings. This is a change in our rules, and it would require a two-thirds vote, affirmative vote by senators of the body in order to allow that, since one of our standing rules is there should be no recording. And photography. Just photography. Okay. Visual recording, shall we say. Okay.”

“Okay, the photographer states he wants to take just a couple shots. I presume that would be especially of the dean of the faculty. That being said --

(LAUGHTER)

“Is there any discussion on this issue? Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of suspending the rules to allow for visual recording of some of the proceedings of today’s senate meeting, please signify by saying aye. (AYES)

“Opposed, "nay"? Abstentions?
“You are unanimously granted permission to photograph the proceeding. I now call on Professor at Large Abby Cohn to present a resolution on advising.”

4. **RESOLUTION ON ADVISING**
Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: “Hello. So at the very end of our last Senate meeting, Klaus Beyenback from Biomedical Sciences shared some concerns during Good and Welfare, and we then had a brief discussion about concerns. And the resolution that I’m presenting is something that I originally -- Kathy Gleason and I drafted and circulated to a number of bodies and got input; and then in its final form, we are happy to present this resolution, which has also been endorsed by a number of members of this body, as well as Klaus and a couple other people. So I wanted to give a little background how that discussion evolved, and then present what we think is just a very kind of simple resolution.

“Both Kathy and I were struck by the fact that in many ways, Klaus's remarks, I think, resonated with us. And there are many, many issues that were raised in Klaus's remarks, but one thing that came up was how we do undergraduate advising and whether we do or don't have sufficiently effective tools to do that; and how we set those goals and expectations.

“And since that time -- Kathy is a member of the Student Mental Health Committee; is that correct? Council, okay -- consulted with some of the people in the administration who are very directly involved in these matters, and both Kathy and I consulted with associate deans in our respective colleges and we also met with Laura Brown, who is currently the voice provost for undergraduate education.

“And based on the ideas we had and the input we got, we've come up with this resolution. And let me go through the resolution and touch upon a couple points and then open it for discussion. So whereas the faculty are deeply concerned about recent events, both as events in and of themselves and as indications of how we are functioning as an educational community; whereas a critical part of the undergraduate experience is academic advising and the most effective advising takes place in face-to-face meetings at least once a semester; whereas recent changes resulted in faculty advisers not having a mechanism to compel advisees to visit them before pre-enrolling and before making other changes to their schedules, such as taking over-hours.

“Be it resolved the senate asks the vice provost for undergraduate education, working together with the university registrar and the associate deans for undergraduate education of each college, to establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising, including face-to-face meetings.
“So I would like to make a couple of brief comments. One is that it’s very clear to us -- and we hope this is reflected in the language -- that we don't anticipate there being a one-size-fits-all solution that will work in every college. The idea is that we’re hoping to bring both the administrators who are most centrally involved with these issues, the associate deans of the respective colleges, and faculty who are concerned to think about how do we establish or reestablish shared expectations with the porosity and flexibility for the specific solutions to be college-specific.

“In terms of mechanisms, one of the things that came up, and some of us bemoan and some of us think is great, is the fact we no longer have pin numbers. Some of us think, well, back in the good old days, I was able to see my advisees. Other people think, phew, I don't have to use this antiquated program that wasn't working.

“It is true that in PeopleSoft, there’s a mechanism where you can basically block your students out from pre-enrolling, but there are a couple issues here: One is, at least in Arts and Sciences, there are no set expectations now about how to use that tool. So it may be that we have tools available that we are not effectively using; but the other thing is my understanding is that that blocks students out completely. They can’t go in and play around with their schedule and kind of have something like a mocked up schedule to discuss with their advisor when they come in for a meeting.

“So what we are able to do with the current technology may or may not be exactly what we need, but the bottom line is much, much more basic: We do not want the technology to be driving how we decide and how we do advising. So what we want to do is foster a more substantive discussion about what our goals are collectively and how best to realize them.

“And I was very pleased in our meeting with Laura Brown to find out that she feels that she, in her monthly meetings with the associate deans, has already established a very effective conversation and put on the agenda for the fall the question of advising; so she's very open to thinking about how do we draw more faculty input into that conversation.

“And she also made a very specific invitation. She would very much welcome specific suggestions from any of us about how to make advising more effective and also, for example, how to foster greater accessibility between the faculty and the students. So she would welcome e-mails starting now on any of those questions. So I think I'll stop here.”
Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Professor Cohn. The resolution is now open for discussion. And following discussion, we'll vote on the resolution as presented by Professor Cohn. Is there anyone who has a comment or would like to voice an opinion on the resolution as presented by the several people named at the bottom of the slide?”

**WHEREAS** the faculty are deeply concerned about recent events, both as events in and of themselves and as indications of how we are functioning as an educational community

**WHEREAS** a critical part of the undergraduate experience is academic advising and the most effective advising takes place in face to face meetings at least once a semester

**WHEREAS** recent changes have resulted in faculty advisors not having mechanisms to compel advisees to visit them before pre-enrolling and before making other changes to their schedules (such as takeover-hours)

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

The Senate ask the vice provost for undergraduate education working together with the university registrar and the associate deans for undergraduate education of each college to establish shared advising expectations and mechanisms to support effective faculty advising including face to face meetings.

Submitted by:

Klaus Werner
Eric Cheyfitz
Abby Cohn
Jane Fajans
Clare Fewtrell
Kathy Gleason
Ellis Loew
Marilyn Migiel
Satya Mohanty
Elizabeth Sanders
Michael Tomlan
Shawkat Toorawa
Charles Van Loan

Speaker Beer: “Are you ready for the vote? Okay. We’ll vote on the resolution, which is on the screen before you. All those in favor, please signify by standing. Now, only senators may stand in this situation. We should have a count, yes, please.

“Okay, those who stood for the resolution, please be seated. And those in opposition to the resolution, please stand. One gentleman -- are you a senator, sir?
“Only senators may stand to signify non-approval.

“Any abstentions, please stand. One abstention. So the vote passes overwhelmingly by 60, 0, 1.”

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2010 FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

Speaker Beer. “So now we'll move on to consider the minutes of the April 2010 University Faculty Senate meeting. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes as distributed?

“Very good. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the April meeting, signify by saying aye. (AYES). In opposition, nay? Abstentions?

“Unanimously approved.

“We'll now proceed to a discussion or presentation of student climate by Professor Murphy and Janet Corson-Rikert.”

6. **REPORT FROM SUSAN MURPHY AND JANET CORSON-RIKERT REGARDING STUDENT CLIMATE**

Vice President Susan Murphy: “Thank you very much, and I thank Dean Fry for the invitation for us to come have a conversation with you today. Obviously, this year has been an extraordinary year for Cornell and an extraordinarily sad and difficult year with a total of ten student deaths since our opening weekend, six of which were by suicide; this following three-and-a-half years of no suicides among our undergraduate student body. And I will also say there were three nonstudent, students on leave who also died, who affected our community, because many of them still had close contacts with students here on the campus.

“So we have faced an extraordinary challenge. And you could imagine, as difficult as it was for any of us, quote, adults, for students of an age group who think they are invincible, it was particularly difficult. So I am delighted that Bill's given us a chance to come talk with you a bit about our whole approach and issues with the mental health and/or illness of our students, because suicide, frankly, is but the tip of the iceberg. What Dr. Corson-Rikert will do today, I hope, is give you a sense of what's happening at Cornell, what's happening in the national scene, why this feels different than it did 20 or 30 years ago, it is indeed different, and then to invite conversation with you very much akin to the resolution that you just passed. President Skorton has asked Provost
“Fuchs and Dean Fry and me to lead a conversation with the campus around the student experience, and we are obviously looking at issues around student life. There are issues around the clinical services we provide students and issues related to the broader experience that our students have. And this is not a one-time conversation, but rather the beginning of a discussion.

“So with that, I would like to invite Janet Corson-Rikert forward. Janet serves as the Executive Director of the University Health Services, otherwise known as Gannett, for her to talk about our student mental health. Janet?”

Janet Corson-Rikert, Executive Director of University Health Services: “Good afternoon. I am pleased to have been invited to talk with you today. As Susan says, this has been a very difficult year for Gannett and for the campus. Needless to say, at Gannett, we feel it particularly strongly, since our business is trying to take care of students, starting with H1N1 in the fall, through this crisis this spring. It has been extremely difficult, and each of these ten losses of our students has been absolutely devastating, so I’m pleased to be here and hope this will be part of an ongoing partnership with you as we all think together about what we can do to address, from a campus-wide point of view, the mental health of our students.

“So this graph you see here really depicts what’s happened in terms of our visits for counseling services since 1996, for the people who can’t see that from where you are, up to the current time. What that really shows is that we’ve seen almost a tripling of our demand for mental health services over that period of time. During that same period, we have also seen an increase in the acuity and complexity of the mental health problems we are seeing, so this has been an extremely challenging phenomenon for us to keep on top of.

“We have worked very hard with lots of support in the university administration to try to keep up with this. I think we’ve done pretty well in terms of emergency and urgent needs, where we are constantly challenged as in what we call routine concerns that are anything but for many of our students.

“We have overhauled our systems, our operations, we’ve added staff, we’ve done all kinds of things to try to get the students in who need to be seen; but by about mid-semester, we always start running into problems, no matter how many people we’ve added to our staff, where the number of intake appointments that we have to have doubles or triples, and the number of people that we need to refer into the community increases significantly, beyond those who are happy to do so to those who would much rather stay on campus.
“So why is this, a concern? Our access here, as we know, is extremely important. We have data that suggests that risk of suicide decreases about six fold for students who are actually seen in counseling services. What I should add is this experience that you see here is not unique to Cornell. This is a trend that my colleagues are seeing all over the country. In fact, if you move to the next slide, we’ve seen now about 14% of the student body in a given year in our mental health services. Some of our peers are seeing considerably more, just to flip those up. Doesn't mean they are all doing that, but what this just shows you is, I think, an idea of what the demand is for services, if you have the resources available.

“So this is something, frankly, that we have been aware of for a number of years. Harvard and MIT did major evaluations of mental health on campus after they had major crises several years ago and identified a target of about 18% penetration; we call it percentage of students using services. So we know we have probably a way to go in reaching the students who need to be seen.

“In fact, if you look at that graph, it shows the increase in demand. What that registers as much as anything is the increase in our staffing and the capacity of our staffing to see, so that if you added staff faster, that would be an even steeper slope.

“So we also know a little bit about, as Susan said, what’s beneath the tip of the iceberg here for us, which is mental health functioning. Through survey, showing you some data here from the unrolled student survey of 2005, we can see that about 40% of students have really quite significant strugglings that they believe impact their academic functioning during the course of a year. We know from other data that about half of those probably have some kind of diagnosable mental health condition and, as you can see here, underrepresented minority. And I would add international students as well have an even higher burden of concern related to both societal and cultural issues and their adjustment to this place. This data is also replicated very closely by the National College Health Association data. Again, very consistent across different universities, across the country.

“So obviously, the most devastating end of the spectrum is suicide. What we know from surveys also, in this case the National College Health Assessment, is that about one in ten students seriously considered suicide over the course of the year, and about 1.3%, a little over 1%, actually attempt suicide. Again, that data is very consistent between schools, so we are not an outlier in that.

“As you are all aware, Cornell has a particular reputation relative to suicide. For many decades, students have referred to "gorging out;" the administration’s office dealt with
questions regularly about a reputation for suicide that Cornell has. In fact, that reputation has not been founded in the data, if you look back over a decade or two of our statistics. We run about like the national average for higher education, which is about 7.5 to 8 suicides per 100,000 students per year. We would expect one to two suicides per year. We had been getting that.

“In fact, the three-and-a-half years leading up to this year were, in fact, very good years for us. We had no suicides, which was, I'm sure, the best stretch there’s been in a very long time; but unfortunately for us, our beautiful gorges provide a public mechanism for suicide, and the public suicides add a big challenge for us. Not only do they bring notoriety amongst our student body and amongst the students applying to colleges all over the country, they also add risk for contagion, which is the phenomenon of one person's suicide being influenced by awareness of another suicide. If suicides are in the privacy of home, overdoses or whatever, often we will not even hear they are suicides in the general public. In this environment, everybody knows.

“And unfortunately, as you know, this spring, with a cluster we had with three suicides in one month off bridges and gorge edges. We had what is called a cluster, which is three or more suicides in a very short period of time. And a combination of the close cluster there and the rapidly increasing communications technology, we had media, national media coverage around this that we have never experienced as an institution before; and what expert consultants tell us is we will never be the same really as a result of that, at least not for a very long number of years, that the national reputation will follow us. If we have another suicide, we'll have national attention to that again. So what that means is that our student body, our community remain at higher risk for suicide as a result of that.

“So what are we doing about it? You are aware of barriers. I am not going to focus on that one today -- and immediate means restriction -- but to talk about clinical services a little bit. This is something, as you could see from that graph, we worked on very hard over the last number of years. We have significantly increased our staff, we have worked hard on the integration of medical and mental health services, because much higher percentages of students seek help through medical services through a given year; so we want to catch students wherever we can.

“We do screening in all our medical visits for depression, so we have done a lot there; but we also felt that was not sufficient, that we really need to think about the entire community, including those students who are not coming to see us.
“So what we started doing back about 2000, 2001, was we identified a couple of counseling staff which we devoted full-time to actually working on a consultative basis, with advising offices and with faculty and staff who were worried on the front lines about students that aren’t necessarily seeing us.

“We also in 2004 started up the Council on Mental Health and Welfare that was just mentioned here, which was an attempt to get together student leaders, student services professionals and faculty to think together about sources of risk, how we might mitigate that risk and increase support for vulnerable students on campus. And that work has really led to some changes in collaboration with members of this group, undoubtedly, around best practices for faculty in academic areas for identifying students in at-risk times or demonstrating evidence of risk.

“We have also been working toward developing a really educated and caring community here. And there are two different initiatives mentioned here: The notice and respond effort, as we have developed with donor money, a DVD that runs through a scenario of faculty dealing with a student evidently in distress, which we facilitate.

“Tim Marchell is one of our facilitators, and Greg Eells, so try to run through with faculty members what some issues that come up and what some of the resources are that are available to them, which has been very well-received. I think Tim has been to almost all of the departments in Engineering now with very positive feedback.

“Spear-headed by the student dean’s office was developed a faculty handbook, which had significant contributions from Gannett, from other student services professionals and from many faculty talking about the best practices they have devised during their time teaching. And we have a copy of that here, if anybody would like to look at it later.

“So we have been asked along the way what role do academic practices have in stress and in suicide in particular, and the answer, of course, is certainly they relate to stress; however, they are only one factor. The influence is really exerted in the context of internal and external factors, including individual make-up of a student, their mental health situation, their personality, the expectations they themselves have, their families have, the support that’s available to them, either personally or on campus. And those interacting factors can produce a varying level of stress here, but what is really relevant for all of you to remember is that when you are looking at those internal, environmental, external, contextual factors, at any given time in any of your classes, there are a significant percentage of students who are at that moment or chronically
operating at a level of stress and vulnerability that requires very little to tip them into a more difficult condition.

“So your opportunities really are in the areas of thinking about where does the stress need to be, where is it part of academic rigor and where is it really not adding value, but adding risk. And also, down in this lower area, we are focused on mental health support, and I hope we'll be able to work a little more on the resilience issue, but the support area is very much a shared opportunity amongst us and you, and we hope we will have opportunities to continue to think about these issues.

“We would welcome any comments or questions. We are involved in an ongoing conversation in response to the crisis of the spring. We took a number of immediate measures. We've also been looking at things to do up through June 4th, as we end this semester, and now we are on to some of the longer-term strategy. The advising resolution you passed is a partnership that's a part of that.”

Speaker Beer: “We have about eight or ten minutes for questions and discussion following the presentation. Please wait for a microphone carried by Cindy or Karen.”

Professor John Weiss, History Department. “I am reaching a little to a presentation made to our department several years ago about this problem, and one of the things that was mentioned there was a connection between the alcoholism problem and the use of alcohol. And I recently have been involved and, in fact, looking at some solutions that have been proposed, including the one called the social norms approach, which apparently has not been really fully experimented with or attempted at Cornell yet; although, as far as I know, briefly. That is about it.

“So I'm interested in knowing how the problem is being studied in the sense of the connection with alcoholism and alcohol use, which is a more general problem than one of mental health and suicide, and so are they in separate committees or are they regularly associated together? How does that work?”

Vice President Murphy: “Let me talk about the structure, John, then I would like Janet to talk about the medical aspect, or Tim Marchell. We do have a President’s Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs as well as the Council on Mental Health and Welfare. Both of those report to a group called the Executive Committee of Campus Health and Safety. So we try in that committee to pull together the issues. They are clearly related, and there are a number of us that sit on both councils.
“We, in fact, did use a social norms approach here, and I’ll let Tim talk a little more about it. We know that alcohol can create impulsivity and we know suicide is related to impulsivity. So there continue to be a number of strategies coming this year.

“Together, with the leadership of Tim and Kent Hubbell, we’ll be looking in particular at trying to identify students who are in our first year residence halls presenting signs of dependence on alcohol in a more assertive way than we have done in the past. We are in partnership, conversations with the Greek system and changes we are asking them to make. We have changed our policies about notifying families related to alcohol and partnering with the judicial administrator, because that we know to make a difference; but perhaps Janet or Tim could say a word about how these are connected.”

Janet Corson-Rikert: “Let me say a quick word. I will pass this to Tim Marchell. Tim is our Director of Mental Health Initiatives, and we do include alcohol and other drugs under mental health; very much related and interactive, so I appreciate that question.”

“Tim Marchell, Director of Mental Health, Gannett: “Our approach to alcohol problems, as part of our comprehensive approach to mental health, includes strategies that target individuals that are at high risk of both substance abuse problems and/or mental health problems. The social norms strategy, in a nutshell, is based on the finding that students often overestimate the amount of drinking that is done by their peers and that they may tend to conform to an imaginary peer group or peer norm. So correcting those misperceptions can be an effective strategy in reducing student drinking.

“What we have found is the most effective application of that is to use it in the context of our brief alcohol screening and intervention program with students that have been found in violation of the campus alcohol policy. So approximately 400 to 500 students a year go through that program called Basics. In that, we correct misperceptions, using data that we have collected, and that intervention overall has been shown to be effective in reducing high-risk drinking and negative consequence.

“And the social norms dimension of that is an important part of it; but we are also concerned about the students unable to moderate their drinking, so we are trying to identify students who have developed alcoholism or dependency on alcohol, depending on how you would term that, and those are students that we provide more intensive engagement with referrals to community resources and oftentimes leaves of absence because they are unable to enter into recovery while they are still students actively on campus. So they’ll often get treatment and come back after a period of absence.
“Then we are also looking broadly at the overall climate on campus around alcohol, trying to examine access issues. The more access there is to alcohol, the more consumption and harm there. So we are looking at that, as well as working with our Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other questions for the experts on mental health? Lady near the front. Wait for the microphone, please.”

Professor Mary Tabacchi, Hotel School. “I don't know if it’s a question for you or a question for my colleagues. I find that some of my students that struggle the most with what appears to be mental health issues are people who can't seem to plan, so that at exam time or close to the end of the semester or mid-term, these tendencies to be really emotionally upset happen then.

“And I don't know if there's something we could do as a faculty or some suggestion you have for us to help students -- I mean, you can't make them plan. I mean, but planning and time management is a big issue here, and I don’t know how to address it. Maybe someone else does.”

Vice President Murphy: “I would just support some of what you are saying, Mary. I think we do know the time management aspect of students, students who don’t succeed here are those -- not because they are uncapable, unless we have an illness that sets in, but because they frankly haven’t learned how to study or don’t know how to plan their time. So this is a good reminder for us, as we partner with our colleagues in learning strategy centers and the TADCON center, what we may do to enhance our time.”

Janet Corson-Rickert: “I might just add to that, we really don't know all the answers to why we are seeing so many more students really requesting mental health services. Part of it is clearly the decrease in stigma associated with getting mental health care and part of it is related, I think, to the better medications that now allow students who never would have made it here before to be here.

“So we’ve got a much more diverse student body relative to health now than we have had before, just like we have more diversity in race and ethnicity. So that has implications; but I also wanted to add that technology and what part that has in the stress of our students, and probably you too -- it affects me -- the pace at which we communicate with each other, the turn-around that’s expected, the amount of time these students spend communicating with each other and being distracted by communication is something that really needs more research done on, I believe, in relation to what we
are seeing on college campuses. So if any of you are interested in that topic, we'd love to partner with you.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on. Thank you very much for your presentation and the response. I would like to now call on David Delchamps for a report from the Educational College Policy Committee on Academic Integrity.”

7. REPORT FROM EPC (ACADEMIC INTEGRITY)
Professor David Delchamps: “Okay. I’m reporting for the Educational Policy Committee. We had a great group this year and had some really good discussions about academic integrity. And what I want to talk about today is just the very edge of the iceberg, not maybe the tip, but the edge, one facet of it.

“There is all kinds of different academic integrity issues. There is the code, there’s students’ knowledge of the code, faculty knowledge of the code, reluctance to proceed, all that sort of thing. I want to talk about one thing. I want to talk about plagiarism and specifically about plagiarism detection software. And what I’m trying to do by bringing this up is to get reactions from you folks, get buy-in or for you to bring up things we haven’t thought about, before we decide whether to move forward.

“So let me give you background. Obviously, plagiarism is a huge problem. Last year in one department, in the Arts College, for example, 15% of their honors graduates lost their departmental honors because they were found guilty of plagiarism. Fifteen percent in a very large arts department. Now, that’s pretty disturbing, and lots of other places, where people write papers. I’m not talking about problem sets and stuff in engineering, but papers, plagiarism is a problem.

“So there exists plagiarism detection software out there. There's one particular package, one particular company who are essentially the elephant in the room, and they are called Turnitin. I believe the Johnson School uses it now. Last fall, EPC had some preliminary information that people had talked on FABIT, the Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology, about Turnitin. There were lingering legal issues of various kinds about copyright on student papers submitted to Turnitin, to see if they plagiarized about personally identifying information.

“Apparently, these issues have been resolved to the satisfaction of University Counsel, so the question arises as to whether Cornell should proceed with making Turnitin more widely available to faculty to use. No one's talking about forcing you to use it. So the EPC invited Evan Cooch from Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technology, who happens to be here today, to our April meeting, and he gave what I thought was a
very convincing presentation about Turnitin; convincing in the sense it convinced me and other members of EPC it was probably a good idea to move ahead on this.

“What move ahead means is essentially get an ad hoc group together to scope it out, figure out the devilish details we have to resolve; for example, students signing waiver forms, et cetera, and does everyone have to sign the waiver. It’s going to cost a lot of money to the University; and therefore, we want to make sure there’s faculty buy-in on this; people are actually going to use it -- it does dovetail seamlessly with Blackboard, at least that’s my understanding -- and whether faculty are going to use it, whether faculty favor going ahead with this and, I think, a strong statement from the faculty, they probably think it is a good idea to have it in place is what we’ll need to enable this project not to be reimagined preemptively, if you know what I mean. Is that a good phrase, Susan? (LAUGHTER)

“Okay. Now, Turnitin -- plagiarism is not a laughing matter. Turnitin is an enforcement tool, but not just an enforcement tool and it is not just a deterrent tool. We think there’s possibly a learning side to this. Students could actually learn a little more about what plagiarism is. What is plagiarism in the 21st Century? A lot of students don’t really know.

“I read an article in "The Sun" where a student participating in a project called The Art Collider referred to "this digital age where there's no authorship to anything." Okay, now, whether students think that, really think it in a rational way, I don't know. I would bet that fairly few do, but they have grown up in an atmosphere where that's the case, authors are dead, we are text flow free. And I think having them learn that authorship is not dead is something we could get out of this.

“Evan is here to answer your technical questions. He is the, as he puts it, the computer wienie in the audience. So what do you think about this? Do people have comments or ‘over my dead body,’ or ‘yes, we should go ahead’?”

Speaker Beer: “We have four or five minutes to deal with this matter. Karen, could you come to Professor Cohn?”

Professor Cohn: “Briefly, Cornell had subscribed to Turnitin when Isaac Kramnick was Vice Provost. Lynne Abel and I were involved in the conversation. He said, "Oh, let's sign up." And it got canceled because university counsel objected.

“So I'm glad to hear those objections are no longer there, but if I'm remembering correctly, the way -- it sort of does two things that we can't do with just a Google search.
Everything that gets submitted to it becomes part of the database that we then have access to, and I assume the confidentiality issues and copyright issues have to do with how those mechanisms were done; but I am assuming that’s still the case and I think it’s important for people to realize that. We are asking our students to submit their work and make it become part of this collective database that we also then benefit from.

“The other thing that I think it was supposed to be able to do was that it accessed the deep web in a way that we can’t, by having access to various paper mills and so on that we don’t have access to. So if you wanted to comment on those points.”

Professor Delchamps: “I believe both the things you said are correct. Evan? Is that -- was Abby stating things accurately?”

Professor Evan Cooch, Natural Resources: “Yeah, I mean, both those points have been addressed. I mean, everybody in this room appreciates the speed with which technology is developing, so even experiences a few years ago with Turnitin probably doesn’t entirely condition our thinking about it right now. The technology in terms of that system, plus also the ability of students to do things is changing extremely rapidly.

“So to deal with the two points you raised, my understanding in the conversations that we have had -- and we, being the FABIT, the Faculty Advisory Board on IT, with counsel’s office -- that most of the issues that were of concern with Turnitin and equivalent kind of companies have either been dealt with or are likely to be surmountable. And I don’t pretend to understand all the nuances of legalese that counsel’s office has to delve into, but their basic view is that it’s all workable; we can make this happen at Cornell and we wouldn’t get in any trouble and that, by and large, any specific nuances for certain kinds of courses like what do you do for required courses if a student refuses and so on could be dealt with.

“The technical thing you mentioned in your second point is really the value added with Turnitin. There’s no way that we, as individual faculty, are going to be able to take individual papers, even if they are electronic, and we’re able to cut and paste and search and do what Turnitin or equivalent companies can do. They can do the Google search, but they can also access the repository of all these paper mills that are out there. And the challenge with Turnitin -- and I think David alluded to this -- you have to decide as a faculty, if you choose for your course to implement it, what do you mean by plagiarism? How many words in a sentence have to match before you want the red flag to be ticked? I mean, this is a complex conceptual and pedagogical issue. There are technological solutions, but by tuning the software one way or another, I could catch everyone or catch nobody. So how this gets implemented for individual courses or
departments or whatever granular level you want to get to is really what would need to be evaluated in some kind of scoping.

“I think the issue David is addressing in principle; is this something the University should pursue, before we get down to the weeds and how do you implement it and some of the subtleties that are important, but maybe something that are better left until the scoping phase.”

Speaker Beer: “We have time for a brief question from Professor Walcott. “

Emeritus Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior. “There are two ways of using this system. One way, as a faculty member, you simply run all the papers you get through it, and that becomes kind of the professor making the judgment. Another way to use it, which I learned about from a high school teacher who was here for a conference a while back, is to ask your students to submit their papers to Turnitin and give them to you, already labeled by Turnitin and marked as to whether there’s any plagiarism there. That has the great virtue of being an educational experience, rather than just a punitive experience. So there are these two possibilities, and I think it’s a very powerful tool which should be explored.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. I think we have to move on.”

Professor Delchamps: “Can I say one more thing? If you want to weigh in on this one way or the other and you didn't have a chance to speak, please feel free to e-mail me at dfd1@cornell.edu.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much. So we'll move on to Professor Carl Franck, to present a resolution on academic integrity.”

8. **RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (STATEMENT ON CORNELL APPLICATION FORMS)**

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Thank you very much. I would like to preface my remarks by explaining that the action of bringing this resolution to you in the senate has been in coordination with parallel activity in the Cornell Office of Undergraduate Admissions. This morning, Assistant Dean Arthur Smith raised the proposal we are considering with the representatives of the administrative offices of the various colleges, as well as Jason Locke, who has overall responsibility for Cornell applications, and Doris Davis, Associate Provost for Admissions and Enrollment.”
“They returned with support for a modified version of our proposal. At least two of our resolution sponsors and I regard their modification as a significant improvement of our proposal. The modification is as follows: rather than propose that the question our resolution poses be placed in Cornell applications, it be posed to students who have been accepted to Cornell.

“Before moving the resolution be so amended, I first introduce the resolution as it currently stands. We sponsoring senators from across the university propose Cornell should include the following question as part of applications to its undergraduate colleges: If you attend Cornell, do you agree to abide by Cornell’s code of academic integrity?

“What is the AI code? The code says students are expected to never misrepresent the work of others as their own and not to assist another student in doing so. What is the problem with academic integrity at Cornell? Aside from the damage that is done in the form of dishonestly and intellectual theft, the suspicion that students can be cheaters promotes distrust and disrespect in student-teacher relationships, and instructors are deflected from what they came to Cornell to do in order to foil cheating and prosecute academic integrity violation cases.

“Why do we have such problems? I believe this is partly due to a lack of awareness of AI. In my college, Arts and Sciences, students are introduced to the code in their weekend of orientation in a whirlwind of competing information. We have students that are missed who, at their core, are dishonest.

“How does the resolution address the issue? By asking students in their applications whether they would follow the AI code, we are alerting them to the code itself. We are saying it helps define what it means to be a student at Cornell. So suppose an applicant doesn’t support the code, but checks the box indicating they do? I’m hoping they will ask the question, do I really want to attend a school that puts this much emphasis on academic integrity. On the other hand, the question might well encourage many more students to think more positively of Cornell.

“This is our core idea, an effort to re-brand Cornell; however, some of you might object, as a faculty member in my department, David Mermin, did strenuously, that to ask such a question would treat the students like children and potentially chase away top students we wish to recruit. I think that our code is excellent and one worthy of respect by our students.
“I wish we didn’t have to ask this question, but our circumstances demand it. A petition drive in support of such a question on applications has had very strong support in my department. 13 faculty and 17 graduate students signed it. A number mentioned the pride they feel over the AI system they experienced as students in contrast to their frustration over AI as teachers here.

“We, the sponsors of this resolution, feel it is an important issue for us to consider in this university-wide body. We do it in parallel with Arts and Sciences Dean Arthur Smith’s effort within the Committee of Admission Deans from across the university to introduce such a question as part of the matriculation process for the 2011-2012 academic year.

“We heartily look forward to your insights into this matter, especially those that result from the reactions that you receive from your various departments.”

Whereas, as a center of learning and inquiry, Cornell is proud of its Code of Academic Integrity.

Whereas, violations of the Code reduce the intellectual vitality of the University by deflecting instructors away from teaching and sow distrust in teacher-student relationships. (For example, Robert Lieberman, a Senior Lecturer in Physics, recalls that as an undergraduate here in 1958, exams were not necessarily proctored — that is, a proctor was free to step out of the exam room. By contrast, instructors now need to watch students take exams after checking their identity.)

Whereas, in an effort to strengthen academic integrity at Cornell, the following proposed resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider has emerged from discussions with the office of advising and admissions of the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty and graduate students of the Physics Department.

Therefore, The Senate resolves that the following question should be added to the application forms for Cornell’s various undergraduate degree programs:

If you attend Cornell do you agree to abide by Cornell’s Code of Academic Integrity as given at: http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html?

Submitted by:

Carl Franck, Senator, Physics
Terrill Cool, Senator, Applied & Engineering Physics
Ephrahim Garcia, Senator, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Linda Nicholson, Senator, Molecular Biology & Genetics
Shawkat Toorawa, Senator, Near Eastern Studies

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much for introducing the resolution, which is now open for discussion. The gentleman close to the middle. One moment for the microphone, please.”

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. “While I agree with the sentiments of motion, I don't think the wording is appropriate in that you are setting up a phony question; you are going to have to give the students an answer yes or no. It is obvious that no one will answer no. I think it's so disingenuous to ask the question. I know that proposing amendments is not in order, but let me say that the people who are going to implement this, if it is passed, I hope they would use alternative wording such as "in submitting this application, I agree to abide by the code of academic integrity.”

Professor Franck: “Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman near the front.”

Professor Dick Durst, CAPE: “I think it's unrealistic to think that a student who does not have integrity is going to be bothered by this kind of a statement.

(LAUGHTER)

“So I mean, they are quite willing to say oh, I will abide by it, but knowing in the back of their mind if there's a way I can get around it, I will.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other -- would the mover like --.”

Professor Franck: “Just to respond, the effort here is to distinguish Cornell from other schools in that respect.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Any other points to be made? Are we ready to consider the question? Professor Cohn, in the front.”

Professor Cohn: “I guess I'm still sort of confused. I'm confused by what the next steps would be. And you also alluded to the fact there had been a proposed revision to this, so I'm not quite sure what I'm voting on, not knowing what's coming next.”
Professor Franck: “It is my hope that we’ll be able to do, as I have done in physics, and canvass our department, find their opinion on this. In the way of amendment that would reflect this very strong encouragement we have just gotten from the various representatives of admissions departments, I would argue that we'll come back with a revised, amended resolution that would reflect their opinion as to what would be practical. Mainly, this would be something to be asked as a question to be asked before matriculation at Cornell. You have been accepted to Cornell. Do you agree to this. Goes in with do you agree to pay your bills.”

Speaker Beer: “The speaker wishes to clarify the situation a bit. I don't think the senate has the power to compel a change on the application. We might recommend to those in charge of writing the applications to include the question that the movers suggest.”

Professor Cohn: “So I'm really having trouble figuring out what it means for me to vote yes or no or abstain.”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Department of Communication. “This is a very quick one. So part of benefit of this is that the link is in there in the application and it might encourage people to read it. I just wonder if the application has that somewhere, where there's sort of encouragement to read. I like the statement version, but I could see value in having a special place to say there's a value to looking at this; but I don't know if it has that somewhere already, here's our code, if you want to read it, click on this link.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: In the American Indian program. I would like to make a motion we table this until the fall.”

Speaker Beer: “So the motion has been made to essentially postpone consideration of this motion until the first meeting in the fall semester. This is a non-debatable motion; and therefore, we will now vote. In order to pass, this vote requires a majority of the senators voting to vote affirmatively and then the motion will be tabled.”

Professor Norton: “I believe a motion like this would require a second.”

Speaker Beer: “One moment, please. A question on parliamentary procedure from the associate dean.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Second the motion.”

Speaker Beer: “Motion has been seconded. You still have a question? Parliamentarian, would you --.”
Professor Norton: “Motion to postpone is debatable.”

Speaker Beer: “As the speaker understood the motion, it’s to postpone to the next meeting, which will be in September.”

Professor Norton: “Postpone to a certain time. What’s undebatable is if you are laying it on the table.”

Speaker Beer: “So considering the ruling of the parliamentarian, we can debate this for a few moments. We don’t have many moments.”

Professor Norton: “The chair interpreted it as a motion to postpone indefinitely.”
Speaker Beer: “I believe the mover suggested to postpone it until the fall. Is that incorrect?”

Professor Cohn: “He said table it.”

Speaker Beer: “So is your intention to kill the motion? For the purpose of killing it?

Unidentified Speaker: “No. For the purpose of putting it on the table –“

Speaker Beer: “If the motion is tabled, it can come off the table at the next meeting. Okay. So all those in favor -- parliamentarian, may I call for a vote on tabling the motion?

“All those in favor of tabling the motion, please stand. Senators only. Okay, those wishing not to table the motion, please stand. Those abstaining from the vote to table? So the vote is overwhelmingly to table.”

Dean Fry: “43 to table, 4 no's and 4 abstentions.”

Speaker Beer: “42, 4, 4. The motion is tabled. We will now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a resolution to be presented by Professor Lawless.”

9. **RESOLUTION** REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS

Professor Harry Lawless, Food Science: “Thank you. This is a updated version of a resolution that was passed by the CALS Faculty Senate two months ago and was penned originally by Professor William Lesser from AEM, and it was written in the
spirit of encouraging communication and transparency, which is like home, mom and apple pie -- we all like those -- and perhaps to discourage this administration or future administrations from using what might be termed a pocket veto or what my lawyer likes to refer to as letting something whither on the vine, and also to encourage a public response.

Resolution:

WHEREAS all of Cornell University is undergoing a profound reimagining process which requires the full informed commitment of all the University community, and

WHEREAS the Organizational Stewardship Task Force report emphasizes the importance of shared governance and collaborative decision making with a commitment to open communication and transparency, and

RECOGNIZING that the feedback loop from faculty to the several levels of administration remain unclear to the extent that there is no evident mandate for an administration response to faculty standing committee resolutions and recommendations nor is there a readily accessible source for follow-up information on recommendations made and actions taken or not, and further

RECOGNIZING that final decision making authority at Cornell University resides with the Board of Trustees, the President, the Provost and the deans and their designees as delineated in the University charter and other applicable documents, and moreover

RECOGNIZING that standing faculty committees' decisions and recommendations are to be interpreted as recommendations to University or college level administrators as indicated by the nature of the recommendation, then let it be

RESOLVED that when a representative faculty committee (such as the Faculty Senate of the University or a College) makes a recommendation they will identify the recipient who is expected to respond (such as the official who constituted a committee). The recipient individual or his/her designee should send a formal response within 30 days indicating whether the recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part, with a justification for the decision reached. The recommendations, responses and explanations should be posted within 30 days to a newly-created web page accessible by the university community to contain all committee recommendations submitted, together with the decisions made and justifications for those decisions.
Sponsors:
Harry Lawless
Elizabeth Earle
“And so I’m not going to bother to read this, since you are all literate, but I will read the
resolved, that when a representative faculty committee such as the faculty senate of the
university or college makes a recommendation, they will identify the recipient -- now,
that’s kind of a new addition, under the suggestion of the president and provost as
communicated to me by the dean of the faculty; is that correct? And they felt that was
important for good communication -- who is expected to respond, such as the official
constituted committee, the recipient individual or his/her designee should send a
formal response within 30 days -- that was the second suggestion made at the last
faculty senate meeting to make a specific time period -- indicating whether the
recommendation was accepted or rejected in whole or in part, with a justification for the
decision.

“The recommendations, responses and explanation should be posted within 30 days to
a newly created web page accessible by the unit community to contain all
recommendations submitted together with justifications for those decisions. And so
without further commentary, I will entertain questions or discussion.”

Speaker Beer: “Resolution is now open for discussion. Any comments for support or
non-support? The gentleman --.”

Emeritus Professor Howland: “I support the motion, and I think the president and
provost support the motion. I think there’s great agreement on this, that when the
university is contacted and when it’s contacted specifically not in vague terms, that the
university administration should respond, and this is a well-thought-out motion that
will get us that.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Just to be fair, is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition to the resolution? Yes, there’s --.”

Professor Michael Todd, Operations Research and Information Engineering. “Not
really in opposition. I am just sort of wondering how we define what the
representative faculty committee is. Presumably, this does not include tenured
committees and so forth, so I’m not sure how to make it clear that this is sort of policy-
type decisions or recommendations to the administration, rather than internal things.”
Professor Lawless: “We have, in fact, struggled with that definition, and the current wording has been something of a modification from the original, which identified the faculty senate as a standing committee, which it really isn't. I suppose that we could have further clarification of that, if someone is a better wordsmith than the current contributors.

“The idea was that if someone constitutes a committee, like ad hoc committee to look into drilling of the Marcellus Shale on Cornell property, that such committee would make recommendations that would then engender a response. And this is merely communicating to the administration that the faculty, as a body, has an expectation that they will respond and do so publicly with some degree of justification for their decisions.”

Speaker Beer: “Any comments? The gentleman on the aisle.”

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: “I think this is excellent, and I realize and recognize the climate that’s generated this kind of recommendation, but I think the previous speaker’s comment is important. "Representative faculty committee" is just too vague. I serve on a confidential faculty committee, and there’s no way -- the language as stated would compel that committee to -- compel the provost to disclose his decisions and that just would not work, so I don’t think it’s a question of wordsmith. I think it’s a question of coming up with language that describes the committee that you mean and excludes the committees that couldn’t be included, such as tenure and other confidential committees; but I support it completely, except that it needs to be stated more clearly.”

Professor Lawless: “I would just like to perhaps argue with the verb "compel." We did change the wording from the verb "must" to "should," indicating that we recognize that the faculty cannot compel the administration to do anything. Professor Lesser is in the rear; and would you care to comment, sir?”

Professor Bill Lesser, Applied Economics and Management. “Thank you, Harry, for presenting this. The intent of using the word "representative" in this instance was to refer to committees in which the bodies present there represent a larger identified group around the university, whether it be your departments as you are formally elected; others are appointed by departments or schools or groups of that nature.

“I think if we are talking about ad hoc tenure committees and so on, I think the individuals, although they may represent the broader university community, don’t necessarily respond to represent any particular group within the university, and that's
the intent. However, if we wish to modify it by saying something to the effect that as long as it doesn't deal with confidentiality issues, perhaps that would help clarify the matter. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “I think we have to move on. Are you ready for the vote?”

Professor Lesser: “One more question.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department. “You could put in when a representative faculty committee not bound by rules of confidentiality, for example, the gentleman in the back suggested, and that would seem so cover the issue.

“I also wanted to add this was a recommendation made by the governance committee, to have specific responses from the university administration to resolutions. Specifically we were talking about faculty senate; but obviously, it could extend itself to college, certain college bodies, but I think it's that proviso about confidentiality were added, that would do the trick.”

Speaker Beer: “The last speaker suggests an amendment, which would be substantive, and that is not in order; so in order to include such an amendment, it would be appropriate to send a resolution to a committee for reconfiguration for consideration later. So I think at this point.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Since there seems to be some problem with the language, can we move to table this, and then.”

Speaker Beer: “Yes.”

Professor Cheyfitz: “That seems to be my job today, doesn't it?

(LAUGHTER)

“If there's anything else that wants to be tabled, I'm here to handle it.”

Speaker Beer: “You are moving to table?”

Professor Cheyfitz: “Yeah, then we can modify it appropriately.”

Speaker Beer: “The resolution has been tabled and seconded? Okay, all those in favor of tabling this resolution, please signify by saying "aye."
Opposed, "nay"?

Abstentions? Aye?"

“The motion to table clearly carries. So we now have two tabled motions to consider next year. Now we'll move on to the report of the Committee On Academic Programs and Policy, being given by Thomas Cleland.”

10. REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES
Professor Thomas Cleland, Psychology: “Thank you. So I’m here representing representing the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies of this body. We were asked last December to review the procedures of the Biology Curriculum Transition Committee, which was charged with implementing large-scale changes in the curriculum within the major and extending out into the services and coursework provided by biology to other colleges and departments. Because it is inherently cross-college, its falls within our committee's purview, so our committee in response to this charge, we interviewed the chairs of these committees and also the authors of the original resolution which requested a degree of transparency in this transition committee, which that claimant had considered insufficient.

“In our findings, we also interviewed the two task forces' chairs. These task forces were the actual sources of the recommended policy changes that guided the changes in the curriculum, which the transition committee was implementing. I'll refer to those -- I probably won't refer to them, but they are the Biology Task Force, which inherited, to a certain degree, some of the resolutions of a predecessor, a CALS task force limited to that college.

“Our findings in brief are that while it would have been appropriate for the Biology Task Force to send this by CAPP during their deliberations which were published in February 2008, we have reviewed the proposal and find there’s no negative impact on the academic programs of any of the colleges that rely upon services of the biology programs.

“In reviewing in detail, including the interviews with students and faculty department heads, open meetings and town halls, we found the actual proceedings of that committee to be exemplary in terms of their openness and integration into the community.
“Our second finding is that the Biology Curriculum Transition Committee is largely an implementation committee simply implementing these resolutions as published in February 2008, and has been doing so without imposing any substantial changes that might require or compel a review by us or the faculty senate in general. I'd be happy to take any questions or detailed clarifications.”

Speaker Beer: “Take a minute or two for questions. Seeing none, we'll move on.”

Professor Cleland: “Thank you very much.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you. Now call on Professor Dennis Miller for a report on behalf of the University Faculty Committee.”

11. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE

Professor Dennis Miller, Food Science: “Thank you. I think as you all know, one of the main functions of the University Faculty Committee is to set the agenda for the faculty in the meetings, so you have already seen what we discussed in our last two meetings. I'll mention we met two times since the last faculty senate meeting; first on April 22nd, and second on May 4th.

“At our April 22nd meeting, President Skorton and Provost Fuchs joined us, and the main topic for the discussion at that meeting with the president and the provost was the undergraduate climate at Cornell and recent student suicides, and we've already heard a good deal about that this afternoon. I just point out that the president really thanked us for expressing our concern about this issue and he said that it really is an appropriate and important issue for the faculty to be involved with.

“Couple of things that were discussed during that meeting that we haven't discussed today was, one, the reasons for putting up the fences, and the president mentioned that there is evidence that if you take away the means for committing suicide, that can be an effective means of preventing suicides; and therefore, that was one of the rationales for putting up the fences, and also the contagion issue. The fact we already had some suicides this year made it particularly appropriate, in the president’s view, to make that decision, even though it was somewhat controversial.

“We talked a little bit about how we can reduce student stress, and we've already heard some of that this afternoon relating to advising, and that was discussed. A couple other points that were brought up were eliminating evening exams. There's some anecdotal
evidence that evening exams are particularly stressful for students. That's an idea that came up.

“Another one would be making it easier for students to transfer from one department to another. Apparently it is somewhat difficult for students to transfer to another department, particularly if it's in a different college; so one idea would be to make that a little bit easier.

“Another thing the president emphasized that I think was emphasized today was that it's becoming increasingly more difficult to get admitted to Cornell, and so we are admitting students that have already been under a lot of stress in high school, just getting themselves here, so they come in with a certain level of stress. So we discussed these issues. I think it was a very fruitful discussion; however, the UFC really did not come up with any recommendations on the issue at this time.

“For the May 4th meeting, Anne Kenney, the university librarian, Mary Beth Norton, the Chair of the Library Board, and Jeff Scott, Chair of Entomology joined us, and we discussed many of the issues that Mary Beth Norton brought up earlier in the meeting today. So I don't really need to go over those. I just might mention that Jeff Scott, the Chair of Entomology did point out that there was some disagreement among the Entomology faculty with the closing of the Entomology Library, and he mentioned that approximately half of the faculty was opposed to that decision, and so I just thought I should mention that; but again, the UFC decided not to make a recommendation regarding this issue at this time.

“So basically, that's the report. I would be happy to answer any questions, if anyone has any.”

Speaker Beer: “We have time for half-a-minute question and answer. Seeing none, we’ll turn to the Dean of the Faculty Bill Fry for remarks.”

12. REPORT FROM DEAN OF FACULTY
William Fry, Dean of Faculty: “Thank you, Steve. The first thing I'd like to do is thank the senate for, I think, a very effective and substantive year. I think the senate is an important body within the university. It's looked to for advice and response from the university administration, as well as our colleagues. And I think we've done a fine job. We have dealt with substantive issues, and I appreciate that very much. Thank you very much.
“What I’d like to do next is just to say a few things. Many of you read the editorial in "The Sun" last Thursday. David Delchamps sent it to me so I could see it. The title was "Teach Your Students Well," and it called on the faculty to deal with the issue of student suicides.

“I attempted to respond to that editorial. I have not seen my response in "The Sun," so I guess it’s not there, but what I said was that in fact some faculty had reached out to their students via e-mail or personally in class, as I have had responses from both faculty and students who appreciated that very much. I’ve also seen comment from faculty and students who did not and who missed -- thought that they should have done it.

“The article called for advising to be reviewed, and I mentioned that in fact the senate was going to be dealing with an issue resolution on advising in that response, and I’m glad that we did that today. Then it also said that the academic calendar needs to be reviewed. And that process, I’m happy to say, is started. A committee is being formed. We have some members who have agreed to be on the committee. It’s going to be a huge task, and I hope it will be somewhat successful.

“Next I am asked to write an annual report. It goes into the May meeting of the trustees, and I just wanted to just review some of the things I put into this report this year. We taught at least 4,472 courses, at least 437,000 credit hours. We contributed more than 7,000 articles. We don’t know exactly how many more. I don’t know how many books you all wrote. I would love to learn that. We have spent at least $480 million in FY 09 on research. Our new sponsored awards, as of the end of April, are more than $280 million, and there are several awards pending. The university welcomed eight new members to the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, or the American Philosophical Society. And congratulations to those eight new members. “Also pointed out that the faculty are heavily involved in a lot of things in addition to teaching, research and outreach. There are 105 senators. At least 60 are here today, because I counted you. We have 26 committees involving 320 faculty, and some of those committees have been really busy this year. You heard David Delchamps, EPC has been very busy; the Financial Policies Committee has been busy; UFC meets two or three times a month. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty’s been busy. Mary Beth and the Library Board has been busy, the Local Advisory Council, the Institutional Review Board, the Institutional Biosafety Committee and FACTA have all had tremendous jobs this year, and there are others as well.

“Not only that, but at least 29 faculty were involved in the strategic planning led by Ed Lawler, the reimagining task forces, the cross-university reimagining task forces have
involved 140 faculty. And the reaccreditation process, which we will hear more about next year, has involved at least 29 faculty.

“And then finally, I wanted to say that I think the response to the suicides is a really important topic for us, and I'm glad that we are looking at the academic climate within the University. Finally, in relation to the issue that Tom Cleland identified, I did meet with the academic deans last Tuesday, I guess it was, and I pointed out to the deans that one of the functions of the university faculty, according to the bylaws, is to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit and to not forget about the Committee On Academic Programs and Policies. So I did that. I hope that made some impact. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to take one or two. Comments.”

Speaker Beer: “Seeing no questions, I think it's appropriate to thank Dean Fry and his staff and the University Faculty Committee for putting together these many, many issues for consideration by the senate. And I believe our time for adjournment has arrived, so motion to adjourn is appropriate.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “So moved.”

Speaker Beer: “All those in favor? (AYES)
Meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM

Respectfully submitted
Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty