Speaker Pro Tem Charlie Walcott: “I would like the call the meeting to order. A few general announcements: First off, no cell phones, tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and everybody please join me in turning off your cell phone.”

“When you rise to speak, please identify yourself and the department, and we will announce the number of good and welfare speakers and the number of minutes allocated to each speaker. At the moment, I have just John Weiss, who may or may not manage to appear at the end of the session.”

“So I would like to begin by calling on David Lipsky to give the University Faculty Committee Report.”

1. UFC REPORT

Professor Dave Lipsky, ILR: “Thank you, Charlie. Since the last senate meeting on October 14th, the UFC has had three meetings. On Wednesday, October 21 Dean Fry and the UFC met with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. Joining the meeting were the two faculty trustees, Rosemary Avery and Ron Ehrenberg. UFC engaged in a candid, but congenial discussion with the trustees about the University’s budget and financial problems, as well as the strategic planning process.”

“We expressed our hope the faculty might be represented at Executive Committee meetings, and Chairman Meinig (sp) assured us faculty trustees were welcome to attend all these meetings. We also pointed out that uncertainty about the future of the university was contributing to a climate of anxiety and insecurity among faculty and staff. The trustees assured us they were aware of the effects of uncertainty and noted that the best way to resolve the uncertainty was to expedite the process of decision-making.

“On Tuesday, October 27, Dean Fry and the UFC met with President Skorton, Provost Fuchs and Professor Edward Lawler, who, as you know, is chairing the strategic planning effort. The UFC once again expressed its concerns about the university’s budget difficulties and the strategic planning process. The president and provost stressed they shared our concern for the welfare of the faculty, and they expressed the hope that our budget problems could be addressed without significantly affecting the core academic functions of the university.”
“The UFC met again on its own on Tuesday, November 3. Once again, members of the UFC and Dean Fry discussed budgetary matters and the strategic planning process. We concluded that it was essential that the faculty senate attempt to influence the decision-making process on those matters, and we discussed various means the senate can use to exercise its influence. For example, the senate might establish an ad hoc faculty body to distill University-wide issues that arise in the strategic planning process. That body could then report to the full senate on its findings.

“Also, if there is a sufficient number of critical issues that emerge before the senate’s next meeting in December, the senate could devote the entire December meeting to a discussion of those issues.

“The UFC thought it might be desirable for the senate to sponsor its own faculty forum to discuss the critical issues likely to arise in the strategic planning process. The UFC invites your comments today on these ideas and your proposals for other means the senate might use to influence the strategic planning process.

“The UFC intends to bring a resolution to this body at its next meeting in December that will incorporate a plan for the senate to influence the strategic planning process and will also include a set of principles the UFC believes should guide the university’s decision-making on these critical matters.”

Speaker Walcott: “Time for one question?”

“I would ask the body for the approval. Everybody in favor of approving the report from the UFC, say aye.

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: Opposed?

It passes. Dean Fry?”

2. **DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT**

Dean of Faculty, William Fry: “Thank you, Charlie. Last time the senate in an unofficial meeting met and discussed the availability of the various task force reports, and that was an issue on the minds of many folks. The provost was present at that meeting, listened to the discussion, and I can assure you there's been a tremendous
amount of discussion in the provost’s office and also among the deans about the availability of those reports.”

“As you all know, the summaries of those reports are on the web, and six cross-cutting reports, and all of the reports are in six binders in the Dean of Faculty office.

“At this time, there have been 27 people who have taken the time to come over and read the reports -- at least some of the task force reports, but they are available, and I think the body appreciates very much the opportunity to review those reports.

“What I wanted to call to your attention to is the fact that there will be a series of discussions concerning the six cross-cutting task force reports. There will be five yet this year, and a sixth on the budget model will happen in January. Next Wednesday is the discussion on student enrollment, and there will be some very important issues discussed at that discussion. I really invite your participation.

“I believe the provost will moderate each of these reports; is that correct?”

Provost Kent Fuchs: “Try to moderate.”

Dean Fry: “The provost will try to moderate each of the reports. He will be present at each of them. There will be a short time for presentation, and I think the majority of the time will be for question and answer. Certainly, you can make your comments or ask your questions at those discussions. The provost will also read e-mail and other messages that are sent to him, so I would invite you, if you have a concern or comment, I would really invite your contribution in that regard.

“And then in a continuing discussion concerning the recommendations from the Governance Committee report from about two years ago, one of the major issues that I saw in that report was the committee felt there was a real need for the faculty to interact with the administration, and I want to tell you that’s happening.

“The UFC, as David just mentioned, is meeting about weekly, about half of the time with the provost or president, and I want to identify some other issues or committees that are meeting with the administration. The Financial Policies Committee has had available to them the budget task report or a draft of that report for some weeks. They have discussed that task force report with the co-chairs of that task force and will continue that discussion.
“They have also met on some personnel issues and provided advice to the administration on those, and those issues are confidential.

“The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has had one meeting with the provost recently, and the provost has requested a second meeting with that group to discuss an academic issue.

“And finally, I have been present at a lot of the provost meetings for planning and some of the president’s staff meetings for planning. Certainly, no one faculty member can speak for all the faculty, but there’s at least one non-administrative faculty member present in many of those meetings. I just wanted to bring your attention to that.

“Then I have a question concerning -- there was a concern we did not have a quorum at the last meeting, so do you need a paper reminder of the senate meetings?

“No. Is e-mail okay?

“And will you come? Great. All right.

“And I’m going to put a plug in for what Joanne Destefano will talk about later. Apparently, there’s opportunity for a really significant contribution to correct our budget problems through procurement. She’s going to describe how that’s happening, but up to $30 million to $40 million can be saved by changing our behavior concerning procurement. That will mean a cultural change for faculty. Hopefully the new, improved e-shop will not be the old, clunky e-shop. Joanne will talk about that, and I’m sure she’ll appreciate feedback on those things.

So, Charlie, that’s my report.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you, sir. Fred Gouldin, for our Committee on Nominations and Elections.”

3. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Associate Dean of Faculty, Fred Gouldin: “I'm reporting for nominations and elections this afternoon. My report will be brief. One, I want to bring the names of three faculty members to your attention. They have all agreed to serve on university committees, and they need your confirmation to actually serve in these committees.
“So we have contacted Charlie Walcott to ask him to be speaker pro tem. We've also asked Mary Pat Brady to serve on elections and nominations. She's in the College of Arts and Sciences. Andrea Parrot has agreed to serve on the University ROTC Relationship Committee; and John Guckenheimer has agreed to serve on FACTA, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Appointments.

“So I think at this point, I should call for a vote of approval of this slate of candidates and your confirmation, so they can begin their service.”

Speaker Walcott: “All in favor of this motion, say aye.”

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: “All opposed?

“Carries.”

Associate Dean Gouldin: “Thank you very much. Just to go on, as a matter of information, and this really has dropped off the bottom, is the following: Professor Kenneth Brown of Mathematics and Arts and Sciences and Professor Bruce Tracy of The Hotel School have agreed to serve on the University Hearing Board Committee. This does not require your approval, but this is only for information. So if there are no questions, thank you very much.”

4. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 14, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Speaker Walcott: “Moving briskly along, I call for the approval of the minutes of the October 14th faculty senate meeting. Do I hear a motion to approve?”

“Please, somebody? Vickie, thank you so much.

“I don't believe they need a second, so everybody willing to approve, say aye.

(AYES)

Speaker Walcott: “Anybody opposed, say nay.

“That one passed, good. We are now coming to a discussion and vote on the resolutions presented at the meeting of the 14th of October, when there was not apparently a quorum.”
5. RESOLUTIONS FOR OCTOBER 14 –
   a. AVAILABILITY OF THE TASK FORCE REPORTS
      i. AVAILABILITY OF THE TASK FORCE REPORTS
      ii. AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF THE TASK FORCE REPORTS
      iii. RESOLUTION ON CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

   “And so how do we proceed, Bill? I don’t see them here on the -- all right. There’s a resolution on the Cornell Climate Action Plan, and I presume there probably is a resolution, and you can read it probably better than I can and faster. I think what I’m going to do is simply call for any discussion on this motion.

   • **Be it therefore resolved** that the Faculty Senate finds that the CAP for the Ithaca Campus is needed to:
     - Achieve the goal of climate neutrality by 2050;
     - Establish interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality, and mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions; and
     - Establish a portfolio of proposed actions that will enable progress toward the goal of climate neutrality, will demonstrate fiscal stewardship and will enhance the University’s research, academic, and outreach missions and programs.
   • **Be it further resolved** that the Faculty Senate commends and supports Cornell University for adopting the Climate Action Plan;
   • **Be it finally resolved** that this resolution be sent to Cornell University President David Skorton as well as the co-chairs of the President’s Climate Commitment Implementation Committee, Professor Tim Fahey and Vice President for Facilities Services Kyu Whang.

   “Seeing no hands, I will ask for a vote of approval. All in favor of this resolution, say aye.

   (AYES)

   “Speaker Walcott: All opposed?

   “I would say it passes unanimously.

   “Moving now to the next one, there is an amendment to the motion on the availability of task force reports. Here it is. And is there any discussion on this amendment?

   “Amendment to Resolution Regarding Availability of the Task Force Reports
• **Whereas** the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principal mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and;
• **Whereas** these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and;
• **Whereas** the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty;
• **Now** therefore be it resolved that the faculty recommends that the task force reports or those parts of those reports which the provost deems to contain viable **responses to the present crisis** be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

“Yes, sir.

“Okay. Thank you for your -- I will take that as a friendly amendment. Is there any further discussion, Dean Fry.

“So a piece of information. This amendment was defeated in a straw vote in October. Seeing no further discussion, I will ask -- call the question, and who is in favor of this motion? Everybody in favor, please say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: All opposed?

“I would say that the ayes have it; but if you want to put up hands, let’s try hands first. In favor of the amendment?

“And opposed?

“So the motion -- the amendment carries. We now move along to the main resolution. So we’re done.

“It’s going the wrong way. Sorry.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We voted on the amendment before.”

“Speaker Walcott: I see. Now we vote on the whole motion. I’m sorry. I was not here last time, so I was not party to the excitement.
“Is there further discussion on this motion? Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this motion actually relevant to anything, or have events passed it by?”

“Speaker Walcott: Dean Fry?”

“Dean Fry: We’ve all wondered about that question. I think a vote by this body would be appropriate at this time, because the sense of the body last time, even though there was not a quorum, was certainly in favor of something like this. So I would encourage us to vote, even though events have indeed passed it by.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? Yes, sir.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- may we get another explanation of what’s going on here. My main worry was that the support was for the -- following this one and there was a great deal of criticism. It’s not clear to me that the vote we just had is actually reflective of all the issues involved in these two.”

“Speaker Walcott: Does somebody who proposed the motion want to try and answer that question?

“Yes, David.”

“Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering: I put the question to the group, is there anyone here on the task force that would object to his or her contribution made public. I agree with you that this vote we just took now is kind of strange, since probably a lot of people didn’t hear the discussion.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? Yes.”

“Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: Last time the resolution only failed because there was not a quorum, but I recall there were only three votes in favor of it, and it was overwhelmingly opposed. People wanted the entire reports and have complete transparency. Those underlined portions could potentially gut the entire resolution and allow the administration to withhold any part of the reports that it didn’t want people to know.
“I think we are really doing something without knowledge of what’s being voted on, and we really should have, Charlie, can we have some kind of explanation of what happened last time and what the alternatives were, before we rushed into a vote.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion?

“Seeing none, are you ready for the question? “So I pose the question; are you in favor of this motion? All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

“The whole motion, as amended.

“Excuse me. One person at a time, please. Is there further discussion? David?”

“Professor Delchamps: Point of order. Anyone who voted in favor of this motion just now may move to reconsider.”

“Speaker Walcott: Does anybody wish to reconsider the motion on the amendment?

“Excuse me?

“Thank you.

“So I guess we have to vote as to whether we are going to reconsider the vote on the amendment.

“We can discuss that. That’s a discussible point. All right. Is there discussion on the idea of reconsidering the vote on the amendment?

“Seeing none, I would call the question, is there -- oh, there is. I'm very sorry.”

“Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: Will we be discussing the pros and cons of the amendment here, then, if we reconsider the amendment? Is that what we're doing?”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes.”

“Professor Calderone: Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes, sir.”
“Where’s our parliamentarian when we need him?”

“Peter, what's the situation?”

“Emeritus Professor Stein: The situation is that I have laryngitis.”

(LAUGHTER)

“Speaker Walcott: Oh, dear.”

“Professor Stein: But at the moment, it’s appropriate for the whole party to vote on whether or not they want to reconsider the motion. If that motion passes to reconsider, then the previous -- you are back to before you decided the election. Then both sides can present the case for or against those words.”

“Speaker Walcott: Thank you very much, Dean Peter Stein.”

“Speaker Walcott: Alright. Is there further discussion on reconsideration? Seeing none, I would like to call the question, and how many are in favor of reconsidering the vote on the amendment? Please say aye or put your hand up.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. How many opposed?

“Okay. Reconsideration wins, clearly, on that one. So now we are back at the beginning.

“And the amendment is before you and is on the table and is now appropriate for discussion. Please.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does the amendment only elude to the underlying portion of this motion? It does. Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we are voting whether to include that in the vote? Okay.”

“Speaker Walcott: Elizabeth?”
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“Professor Elizabeth Sanders: The underlying parts pretty much make the thing moot. The whole idea was to make these reports available to everybody, fully transparent, because they’re enormously important to the future of the university. The addition of the lines -- I forget who offered those, but that essentially says that anything that people in Day Hall want to withhold, they can withhold. So I think it’s meaningless. There’s no transparency, availability of the reports.”

“Does somebody have a record of the vote? I think there were three votes in favor of that, adding that underlying part. And 80 votes against it last time, so what we have done today just seems so extraordinary. Those who heard the full debate last time were overwhelmingly opposed to the addition of these lines, because they limited the power of the senate, and of the faculty generally, to know what’s going on in these self studies.”

“Speaker Walcott Yes.”

“Professor Mary Tabacchi, Hotel: I just have a question. If we vote against this, then what happens?”

“Speaker Walcott: If you vote against it, what happens is that this part is removed from the motion, and the motion returns to its unamended state.”

“Professor Tabacchi: Okay, so if we vote against this, we get to see all the reports. We get to vote for it. Okay, thank you.”

“Speaker Walcott: Yes, sir.”

“Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: We have really important things to do here today and we should get beyond this. I encourage all of you to vote against the amendment and vote for the motion, and then hopefully we can hear the provost address us.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there further discussion? All right. We are now going to vote on the amendment, and all in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand.

All opposed to the amendment, please raise your hand.

Okay. The amendment is defeated. We are back on the original motion. Is there further discussion on the original motion?
Resolution On Task Force Reports

- **Whereas** the creation of a number of Task Forces has been the principal mechanism whereby some members of the faculty have had a role in responding to the present financial crisis, and;
- **Whereas** these Task Forces have now completed their reports and submitted them to the Provost, and;
- **Whereas** the decisions made based upon these reports will affect all members of the faculty;
- **Now therefore be it resolved** that the faculty recommends that the task force reports be submitted at the earliest possible moment for discussion and response by the faculty at large.

*Endorsed by: Eric Cheyfitz, English, Shawkat Toorawa, NES, Kent Goetz, Theatre, Film and Dance and Shelly Feldman, Developmental Sociology*

“Seeing no further discussion, I call the question on the original -- I'm sorry. Nick?”

“Professor Calderone, Entomology: So the concern was about confidentiality, that some people had taken the responsibilities for these task forces under the assumption that they would remain anonymous. Is that a concern?

“I mean, I think that's somewhat of a substantial issue; but could be easily addressed by redacting the names of people who object to having their names. In other words, keeping good faith with the original agreement.”

“Speaker Walcott: Dean Fuchs? Provost Fuchs. I'm sorry.”

(LAUGHTER)

“Provost Kent Fuchs: Sorry to interject myself. So the reports are public. I mean, they are done. They are there. You can go to Bill’s office and read them, the full report. I did have an issue on confidentiality, but the way I addressed that, in specific answer to your question, I gave the authors the opportunity to redact them. Not me, the author. And I felt that was important. There was very little redaction, as far as I could tell. I asked what they redacted; I didn't want to compare them. As far as I could tell, there was little that was redacted. The main concern is not you all. It is our competition, our peers, because this stuff is on the Sun web site, it gets around the world; but the reports are there. Vote as you want, but the reports are there.”

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. We heard the call the question. All in favor of calling the question, say aye.
“Speaker Walcott: All opposed? Okay, we now have the question. All in favor of approving of this motion, say aye.

(AYES)

“Speaker Walcott: Opposed?

“Motion passed.

“We are done. Now, I notice with interest that the Provost Fuchs is not listed, so sir, please.”

6. COMMENTS FORM PROVOST KENT FUCHS

“Provost Kent Fuchs: It’s okay. You ignore me and you promote me to a dean. Thank you. Yes.”

“Thank you all for letting me come. The theme so far has been task force reports and budgets, so I thought I would just continue it and maybe talk for just ten minutes, then open it up to Q&A. I think that’s probably more of what you are interested in. I’ll report on three parts of our planning activity, just to remind you all.

“One part is where we’re working really hard on extracting $90 million from what we are calling administrative operations. This is a target that we have established after six months of working with these external consultants that have told us that we can achieve $90 million. You are going to hear from Vice President Destefano about $30 million of that $90 million that is attributed to procurement. So we are done with that diagnostic phase, and we are now, this week, setting the process to implement the recommendations. It will take several years to actually achieve $90 million in reoccurring savings, and it will take an investment of one-time funds in system software and setting up processes to do that.

“The whole objective, very, very crudely and simply, is to save faculty lines. If we don't save it, the $90 million, it will come out of the faculty lines. We have a $135 million reoccurring problem to solve. This solves most of it. As for the remaining $45 million, I'm very optimistic with my great knowledge about the economy, that the economy is
going to help us with this $45 million. As endowment goes up, that $45 million problem goes down, and parts of it, frankly, we can wait on solving.

“The real issue is this $90 million. So the diagnostic part is done. We are working now in setting up the process. We’ll have an office that will oversee the process, with staff members working full-time on this. We’ll have deans involved, vice presidents involved and others to help us in the administrative savings. And you will hear about the largest piece, the procurement piece. So that’s one-third of what we have done.

“The other part is what you voted on, the task force reports. There are 20 academic task force reports. These reports are not about visions of the future of colleges. They are really about how we can, in a very constrained resource environment, make our units and make the University stronger in these 20 different areas. So as you heard from Bill Fry, I would encourage you to come next week to the first of the open forums. I have decided to manage the communications and input process for six of them. The six that I’m managing are student enrollment, the budget model task force, social sciences, life sciences, management sciences and libraries. I didn't say libraries twice, did I?

“There are forums set up for five of the reports. Not the budget model. That we’ll wait until you come back from the holiday break. This task force has issued an interim report, and I have asked them from the beginning to finish their report by the beginning of January. That one is equally important to any of the other reports.

“So student enrollment is important. It’s next week. It’s what size should our undergraduate student body be? Should we have 3150 undergrads next fall, new students? Should it be larger? Should it be smaller, given that our faculty size, because of the previous budget cuts, will be smaller? It’s an important decision for the future.

“I have my own biases, after reading through that report, but we've opened it up to students. They have a stake in this, and staff as well; but feel free, if you didn’t have a chance to speak, feel free to send me e-mail, provost@cornell, or you can go to the strategic planning web site. There’s a link you can click and send comments as well, on any of them.

“The other 14 reports, I’m asking the authors to manage the communications and for you to send them comments. You can always copy me, but most of them are deans of colleges. There’s also vice president Susan Murphy for Student Academic Services, and I mentioned the budget model task force.
“So I view the month of November and early December as a discussion period for these 20 task force reports, and then we have to begin to make decisions on those that we can, important decisions. We talked about student body. How many libraries should we have, physical libraries across the university? Are there ways that we can keep the core library excellence and yet have reduced investment in our large library operation? That will be discussed as well.

“So important, important discussions on these 20 task force reports. Some of those decisions will just have to be delayed. We might say that student enrollment will stay what it is this coming fall and we'll reconsider it, based on how the economy changes. So don't expect all the decisions to be made in the next few months. That's not wise nor possible.

“The third part of our planning was also mentioned by Dean Fry, and that is the planning for what we want to be as an institution in the future; this document will set our guidelines for the future. I want to remind you that this is totally faculty-driven, which I think is quite a statement by the president and others about the core future of the university being in our hands and your hands, as faculty.

“So let me see if I can read -- if you go to the web site, you will get all the names, but the ones we have announced are the core faculty that -- the center group we are calling the advisory council, so that's Lance Collins from Engineering, Jonathan Culler from English, Sandra Green, History; Martha Haynes, Astronomy; Susan McCouch, Plant Breeding and Genetics; Ed Lawler, ILR; Michael Waldman, Economics.

“In addition to that, we are about to announce four working groups that will provide input into those faculty, a working group on education, a working group on public engagement, a working group on research, scholarship and creativity and a working group on organizational stewardship, basically, all other parts of the university that aren't contained in the three core areas. The total number of faculty and staff and students involved is so far 35 faculty, five students and nine staff.

“The idea is that this fall they are seeking input; then come January, when classes start, Ed Lawler and I will make trips -- not just to this body, but to all the colleges and schools -- telling you all what's in those initial drafts of document. I'm not -- I am involved, I'm not leading it. To get input on what the thinking is feel free to send Ed Lawler, me or the web site input on what you would like to see on the plans for the future, once we get around our current issues on budget.

“I should acknowledge that I'm leading three searches -- maybe not leading, but responsible for three. We expect to make, in a few days, an announcement of the new
vice president for planning and budget. That appointment will be public by Friday or Monday. Then we have an engineering dean search that’s underway. We have nothing to announce yet. We just launched the dean search for CALS, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Ron Seeber is leading that, and Jonathan Siliciano is leading the engineering dean search, and I’m leading the vice president search. I think we have ten minutes for Q&A.

“Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Governor Paterson addressed the state senate and announced potential drastic -- additional cuts, especially towards education, so have we factored that into how it's going to impact us, if those cuts are made?”

“Provost Fuchs: Yeah, we don't know the extent of those yet. Our best -- does this go into the minutes, if I give a number? I would just as soon not give a number in public, because we have a good estimate of what the number will be for this year, which is never good when it’s the middle of the year. We are going to work our hardest to absorb that centrally.

“I am not promising the contract college deans that, but I told them we are going to work our best to absorb that cut, which is a significant cut centrally. What's really important is what's reoccurring and permanent. That never can be absorbed. It will be significant. The state is facing a $10 billion deficit. A large part of our revenues of the state comes from Wall Street, so if that improves, the state revenues improve; but we can certainly assume there's going to be a decrease in state revenues.

“We have ways of offsetting that. In the next two months we’ll have to decide on tuition for our students. On the contract side last year, the highest percentage increases were in the contract side for tuition increases, and part of it was to compensate for what we expected the State would take.

“So I should just tell you all -- and this is frustrating to the trustees -- it's impossible to tightly manage the budget, because we have faculty bringing in grants and contracts on a daily basis, we have students declaring new financial need, we’ve got a state that's unpredictable, but we are worrying and thinking about all those, and I think we'll be okay.

“This $135 million - unless the state gets dramatically worse and they do bad things to the SUNY budget and our budget - I think we're okay with the number we have, but it's a big number. You’re right.

“Yes.”
“Professor Delchamps: I’m curious about the interplay between the college -- these are the academic -- the college task forces and cross-cutting. Say the CALS task force says that this is what we want to do with AEM, and the cross-cutting says this is what we want to do with our business programs.”

“Provost Fuchs: No, it wouldn't say that, would it?”
“Professor Delchamps: Suppose that happened. What would you do? How would you get those things to work out?”

“Provost Fuchs: Just hypothetically, right? You’re absolutely right. There are -- any given task force, some of them actually present different options; like student enrollment, do we do go with the Dartmouth plan, but there’s a set of options with the recommendation. One of the central issues is do we let individual colleges -- this is a fundamental issue going forward -- make decisions that impact other colleges or do we, in the provost office, to be straight-forward, manage that process? “I feel I have to manage the process. I don’t think I’m going to do it perfectly, but we’ll do our very best. In those areas where there’s strong contradictions, it’s likely -- and they affect the institution -- likely, the provost will have to make the final decision. Lots of input, lots of discussion, and that’s a very good example. The example is do we create a name school, a business in CALS, which is the proposal that’s being put forward in one of the task forces, or do we consider one of the alternatives, which would be, for example, creating a one single school of management for undergrad and grad.

“When that gets discussed, and it will be one of the public forums, I’d love to hear your input; but there are many other interesting possibilities as well.

“Did that answer your question, David? So send your complaints to me before and after the decision.

“Anyone else?

“Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mentioned the search is ongoing. In the last several searches, the positions I have been involved in, there’s been a single candidate. Can you comment on this trend and the reasons for it and whether it allows sufficient faculty input in the decision?

“Provost Fuchs: Say the first part? I'm sorry.”
“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the previous three searches I have been involved in for senior positions, there’s been a single candidate.”

“Provost Fuchs: Yes. It’s a good point. So as you will hear with the announcement of the vice president for budget and planning, there is only one public candidate for that position. There were a number -- there was a search committee, as there are for the dean searches, that had a combination of faculty and vice presidents and others for that vice president for budget and planning. There were a good number of people interviewed from around the country and internally.

“We got to the point where there were four candidates that came out of that search that the search committee recommended go forward, some internal, some external. And I decided to stop that process, after getting what I felt was really strong input that there would be one offer, an offer to one person, and I decided not to go forward with having a public process for all four of those candidates.

“This is the vice presidential search, which is different than a dean’s search. I feel that the most important outcome of these processes is that we get the strongest person here. And often, those candidates bring a set of constraints, a set of constraints. So to give you an example on the engineering dean search, this past summer, the candidate was looking at a -- the committee, the search committee, which is primarily engineering faculty, was looking at a sitting dean at another top institution. I went to that institution, met with that person, spent the day with them and invited them to campus, hosted a 4th of July barbecue at my house for that person, but it was not public.

“And I probably would have made an offer to that person, if it looked like it was going to be viable, just based on the strength of that person - National Academy of Engineering member and really strong person. That person's no longer in the picture.

“They have withdrawn. So I’m quite willing to have a process that is public, as long as I think the candidate -- I mean everybody, by public, knows who the candidates are, if I think we'll end up with the strongest pool at the end; but if it means the strongest person's going to drop out because it's a worldwide public search, I'm not going to do it. I'm going to pick the best person. I'll have as much faculty input as I can, but I can't sacrifice the strength of a college or future of a college, just because I want it to be on the web.
“So it’s a compromise there. My ideal is to have four candidates for every search public, everybody gives me input, all the staff, students, and faculty; but if that process is going to compromise a search, I don’t do it.

“Yes.”

“Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences. The process that you have described for restructuring academic programs emphasizes the input of internal stakeholders, faculty, students, staff, administrators and so on, yet we know there are influential stakeholders that may have strong feelings about how we do things. How are you, or are you managing to buffer yourselves from possibly inappropriate influence from stakeholders?”

“Provost Fuchs: Inappropriate influence? I’m distracted by the light. Are you talking about the planning document for the future or the 20 task force reports, or all of it?”

“Professor Pelletier: Any of the restructuring in the coming years.”

“Provost Fuchs: Okay. We actually welcome external input from stakeholders, and our alumni, our friends of the university, sometimes companies, foundations, but they’re not going to be making decisions. Sometimes they have valuable input. I just read a long letter today from a former faculty member who’s no longer here, with a strong opinion about a certain area, and I learned a little bit by reading that; but I don’t think any of us would allow it to be inappropriate. Their suggestions may be inappropriate, but the input will not be inappropriate. That I can promise you.

“Yes.”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There’s also the void for Director of Biotechnology. I’m just curious if there’s also a search for that position as well.”

“Provost Fuchs: Yes, there is. As many of you know -- well, number one, I’m reducing the number of vice provosts. I got more criticism about that. I didn’t know you wanted me to have more vice provosts. I’m willing to hire more, but I just don’t think it’s wise. Each vice provost -- well, I won’t go there. My colleagues in the room will kill me, the vice provost sitting in the back.

“It is true that I eliminated the position -- Steve Kresovich did leave, a valuable colleague and also had a huge impact in the whole Life Sciences initiative over the past ten years. He was the first faculty member hired under that initiative. He served as
leader of the Biotech Institute and the vice provost for Life Sciences. The Biotech Institute director will be filled, and Bob Buhrman is leading that search, so that will be filled.

“Secondly, instead of having a vice provost that reports to me that has $6 million in budget as the Life Sciences Advisory Report suggests, if you all want to read that one, what we are going to do is have a person that works in the vice provost research office who

“There used to be three people working on the research: Bob Buhrman, Joe Burns and Steve Kresovich. Now we just have Bob Buhrman. That's not sustainable, so I'm going to let him add a faculty member from the Life Sciences, but part of that organization. Their domain is all scholarship, all research across the university. It's unlikely they’ll have $6 million in budget.

“Thank you, sir. I'll be back.

“Thank you all.”

“Speaker Walcott: Okay. We are on to the next item. I would like to call on Linda Nicholson and colleagues of her resolution on the Marcellus Shale.”

7. **RESOLUTION ON MARCELLUS SHALE DRILLING**

“Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology & Genetics: So I am thrilled to be here today to bring before you a resolution to this body, the faculty senate. So I, along with four colleagues, Peter Hinkle, Claire Futrell, Ted Clark and Ron Booker bring you resolution that deals with two key issues regarding Marcellus Shale gas drilling: First of all, who at Cornell is given the power to decide whether or not to lease Cornell lands for gas drilling. That’s one issue.”

“The other issue is how Cornell should exert its influence on the State of New York to protect this region from the potential damages that are associated with gas drilling. “So before I go to the resolution itself, I would like to give a little background that might assist us in understanding why we need this resolution and we need it now.

“So first of all, what is natural gas? Natural gas, the main component is methane, just simply CH₄. The burning of methane, the combustion of methane involves or it needs two oxygen molecules and produces, in addition to heat, carbon dioxide and water. So it's a relatively clean form of energy, except for the fact that both methane itself and CO₂, once in the atmosphere, are greenhouse gases, meaning that they absorb
ultraviolet light and dissipate that absorbed energy in the form of heat; therefore, increasing the heat in the atmosphere commonly known as the greenhouse effect.

“So that’s natural gas. It’s methane. And I bring this up, because at the end of my presentation of this methane, I will point out that cows are one of the main sources of greenhouse methane gas in the United States.

“Okay, so you may or may not be aware of the fact that the Northeast United States sits on a massive geologic rock formation called Marcellus Shale; it extends along the Appalachian Range here. It's estimated the Marcellus Shale contains on order of 516 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, an immense amount of energy we are sitting right on top of here.

“So currently, the high energy costs, so we have seen gas prices go up tremendously, so this current increase in gas prices, and also the political need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil has made this enormous gas reserve very tempting for people.

“So in addition to our knowledge of this great reserve, as well as the economics, technology has been geared up to access these trapped gases down deep below the earth, and also Wall Street is more and more accepting of tapping into these unconventional sources of energy, so the financing for this kind of extraction of energy is now available.

“So just to give you an idea or to review, or to give you the picture, if you haven’t seen it before, the way that these gases are proposed to be extracted from the earth is it involves drilling a well vertically and then horizontally; vertically down into the shale deposit, which in this region is 2,000 to 5,000 feet deep, then going horizontally within a mile of that formation.

“So that’s drilled -- water is first mixed with sand and chemicals and then inserted into the well at high pressure, and the idea is that cracks that are already in the shale are widened and larger fissures are created. They are held open by these -- by the suspended sand and chemicals, then the water is extracted again and gas is able to flow through these more open and new fissures into the well and be gathered in storage tanks and then either trucked or piped to the market.

“So the main issue here is the use of a lot of water. This is 3 to 5 million gallons per well. That’s about how much water the city of Ithaca uses in a day. This is fresh water. Also the chemicals mixed with it and what do we do with all that water, because all that needs to be brought back out and then somehow dealt with, so we have recovered
water -- initially, it is stored in a pit on the surface at a well pad, then subsequently, either trucked -- probably trucked or somehow injected back into the earth, so trucked to a treatment plant for processing.

“So here is an aerial view of what a well pad looks like. It occupies three to five acres. It is essentially a cleared industrial area with drill rigs, trucks. Here’s a holding pit, a large holding pit for the wastewater and pipelines that would come to each pad or close by, and then storage tanks as well.

“So it is quite an industrial site. So the hydraulic fracturing method itself requires a large volume of very high-pressured water. This water could be removed from local streams and ponds at no cost to the gas companies, given the current regulations or lack thereof.

“In order to suspend the sand in water, chemicals are added at the level of 1% of the total volume. So it’s 30,000 to 50,000 gallons of toxins that are added to the 3 to 5 million gallons of water. These chemicals, it’s a proprietary formulation. This is not public information or information that is made public; however, we do know that the chemicals do include known carcinogens, endocrine destructors, arsenic, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, benzine, xylene and formaldehyde. So this is not the kind of stuff you want to drink.

“The flowback water is even worse, because after it goes through the shale rock, it absorbs or solubilizes salts and other solids, as well as heavy metals, some of which are radioactive. So in addition to the drilling and chemicals added before injecting, it comes back out with additional toxins.

“So the hydraulic fluid -- fluids associated with those practices are suspected sources of impaired and polluted water in three states; Pennsylvania, Wyoming and Colorado currently.

“So what are the disposal options? We can use existing municipal wastewater treatment plants. There are certainly questions about the feasibility of this. We really should require specifically designed treatment plants in order to remove all those chemicals, some of which we don’t know what they are, because of the proprietary nature of additives; so there’s talk of constructing new plants, and this has a cost associated with it that goes to the municipalities and not necessarily the gas companies. They are talking about the possibility of just injecting those wastewaters deeper into the ground, and so there’s a lot of uncertainty about where the rock formations are stable enough and what is the long-term effects of such practice.
“Two minutes. Okay.

“So some of this comes close to home, even though we don’t have any of this hydraulic fracturing close by. Walter Hang has just submitted a report, where his office has looked at some DEC data and pulled out pretty alarming things. The Village of Cayuga Heights last March accepted 3 million gallons of contaminated drilling wastewater. This was eventually processed incompletely and discharged into Cayuga Lake. So there’s certainly things to be concerned about.

“The aesthetics of area are affected. This is 40 acres per drilling pad. This is in Wyoming, and that’s the level at which things have reached there. Gas lines going in would also add additional surface disruption. Local impacts, a summary would be the consumption of massive amounts of water, what do we do with that; if we get leakage from these pits, if there’s a storm, and we have overspill and things like that; affects on our aquifer, surface disturbance, noises, air quality issues.

“There is current drilling activity; we have wells. They are restricted to vertical wells at the moment in New York. Full scale drilling, hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling is taking place in Pennsylvania already. Permits for horizontal drills in the Marcellus Shale in New York are currently on hold during the development of a supplemental generic environmental impact study that’s currently been in the newspaper. You have probably seen a number of things flying around about that.

“So just to show you, here we are in Tompkins County. There are existing wells around us. These are vertical wells. The horizontal well drilling has the additional issue of compulsory integration of 60% of land within a given unit leased, then you have no choice; they can go underneath your land and tap into -- put those toxic chemicals under your wells, et cetera.

“And this is the current level of leasing in Tompkins County; the important colors are those dark brown here. So if we are not at 60% already in Groton, we are very close to it. This is available for you to see at this website, tompkinscountygasmmap.org.

“Just one quick one -- non-sustainable energy is what we are talking about here. These deposits are 400 million years old. We are bringing them to the surface, burning then, creating CO₂. Cows eat vegetation. Vegetation takes up CO₂. Cows make deposits that are a couple of days old perhaps, and can be put into an anaerobic digester, which meth-anatrophic bacteria can produce methane. The methane can be burned, and we have a nice sustainable cycle.
“We are not limited to tapping into the earth in order to solve our energy crisis problem, and this is being done very successfully in the state of Vermont. There are numerous examples on the web of farms, dairy farms doing this. Okay, so here’s our resolution. Should I read it?”

“Speaker Walcott: Somebody said yes.”

“Professor Nicholson: Okay. So there are four whereases.

**WHEREAS**, it is estimated the geological rock bed known to the Marcellus Shale may contain up to several million cubic feet of natural gas and dramatic increases in the price of crude oil and corresponding need to reduce dependence on foreign oil have resulted in an increase in interest in activity relating to natural gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing.

**WHEREAS** Cornell University is committed to environmental leadership, exemplified by the signing of the American University and College Presidents Climate Commitment by President Skorton.

**WHEREAS** Cornell University has a great responsibility to preserve and protect its natural resources, water resources and quality of life for current and future faculty, staff and students.

**WHEREAS** Cornell University is positioned to take a leadership role on the issue of hydraulic fracturing of the Marcellus Shale, sustainability education and research on water management, soil health, as well as animal and human health and medicine.

**THEREFORE**, be it resolved that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges president David J. Skorton to, number one, establish a committee of faculty, staff, students and alumni empowered with the decision of whether to lease any university-owned lands to natural gas drilling companies.

Two, to urge the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to delay the issuance of permits for gas drilling until such time as New York State has completed all necessary and appropriate studies and has in place an adequately funded, as well as staffed inspection and enforcement program.

Three, to urge New York State to enact a severance tax and adequate permit fees on gas drilling companies to pay the costs of regulation and oversight of drilling and to
mitigate the cost of repairing roadways and resolving environmental impacts, due to drilling.

And four, to urge New York State to require all chemicals and specific formulations of those chemicals intended to be introduced to wells be identified and the information be made public with special notification to local emergency response personnel and health care providers, before use of such chemicals is permitted. That’s our resolution.

“Speaker Walcott: Is there a second?”

“There’s a second.”

“Is there discussion?”

“Professor Davies.”

“Professor Peter Davies, Plant Biology: I would suggest this resolution is excessively weak and we should be doing more than this. In other drilling places, numerous spills have occurred, and the one thing we have in this area is water, and the contamination of our water supplies would be disastrous; not only for individual householders, but -- secondly, methane has leaked up into people’s houses. And while methane in the open environment is no problem, methane in houses has caused sickness.”

“Thirdly -- appear to be exempt from almost all environmental regulations -- should be communication to the State to make sure that our regulations do not exempt these gas companies from such environmental regulations.

“And lastly, previously the law is that anybody more than 1,000 feet from a drilling rig cannot sue a gas company for any damage to their property, water supply or anything. So if anybody lives near one of these and they have to leave their house, they have no recourse whatsoever. We need, as an academic body, to really stand up for this.”

“Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior. I think we have heard an elegant defense of the whereases of this motion. Unfortunately, we haven’t heard anything directed at the motion itself, and I would like to speak to that. And I have to say, I’m against the motion.”

“And much as I agree with the seriousness of the situation and I agree with everything you have presented, I think the motion’s wrong for two reasons. There are two sections of the motion, the first proposes a committee of faculty, students, staff and alumni to
take over the decision from the administration, as to whether or not the university should lease its lands for such a procedure.

“I think we all agree that the university shouldn’t do that, unless it’s found to be absolutely safe and supervised. I agree these are rather improbable things that are going to happen, but ladies and gentlemen, why are we taking this decision out of the hands of the administration, where it belongs, and putting it in the hands of a committee, very unspecified parameters in the committee? I think that’s simply a non-starter. I think it was ill-considered. That’s my first point.

“The second point is that, like it or not, what we are suggesting here is that the President act as a kind of lobbyist, a political lobbyist, because this is a political question, and he take that lobbying to the State and a committee of the State.

“Now, it’s a duty of the senate, I think, to advise the administration and it would be perfectly correct for us to advise the administration on how we thought they should handle their land. It’s quite another thing when we send our president trotting off in the world as a kind of lobbyist for a political program. That is not the duty of this senate. We have many important problems facing us right now that involve the history, the future of the university. This is a diversion.

“If we start down this street, we’re going to turn the university into a kind of a political lobbying situation. We are going to find ourselves -- if we do this, why not talk about things that are also very serious, like the war in Iraq, or the drafting of our -- possible drafting of our children for the armies?

“People, I know that we are all upset about this shale business, but this is not the proper action to take. Thank you.”

“Professor Robert Kay: On behalf of the faculty of the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, I oppose Resolution 1 on the ground it’s premature. We agree with the importance of the particular issue, which is gas production from Marcellus Shale, but also with the importance of addressing it within the more general context of energy policy and interrelated topics.

“We take no position either for or against the development of the Marcellus Shale gas. We simply argue that such decisions should be fully informed on all the relevant considerations and that Cornell should remain an unbiased source of accurate information in the area of energy and environment. The Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, the Cornell Water Resources Institute and the Paleontological
Research Institution stand ready to organize and host a forum on the Marcellus gas play for the benefit of the Cornell community.

“So that’s a statement that we agreed on as a department. And Susan Riha is here from the Water Resources Institute. If specific questions are directed in that direction, I’m sure you would want to talk to her, not me. Thank you.”

“Speaker Walcott: Technically the time for our discussion is up, but we have one good welfare speaker, so I propose we continue for another four minutes, before we bring the matter to a close. Is there further discussion?”

“Professor Robert Oswald from Molecular Medicine. I would like to speak on behalf of the motion. In terms of the first one, the question has been raised whether it’s appropriate to have faculty, staff and students, alumni empowered with the decision. My argument would be that the faculty is where the expertise is, and that’s the reason why the faculty have to be involved in this decision, so I think it’s actually a very good idea.”

“In terms of the question of whether this is just a political issue or whether it’s an issue that directly affects the University, I would argue strongly that this is different from the war in Iraq or the war in Afghanistan. This is something that’s affecting us on a local level. This is going to affect the university directly. This is going to be a factor in the decision whether students want to come to school here, so I think this is a very appropriate topic for the faculty senate. Thank you.”

“Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management: I would like to move to table this motion. We’ve been given 10 to 15 minutes of discussion by a single person, who may be a wonderful person, but I’d like to hear more views on this subject. I would like to know both the costs and the benefits of the actions we are being asked to agree on, and like to think more carefully its implications. It seems to me an academic body doesn’t rush to judgment based on 20 minutes of discussion on an issue as important as this. I would like to table this motion.”

“Speaker Walcott: Is there a second for the motion to table?”

“There’s a second. Okay. Discuss the motion?”

“UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, you cannot discuss.”
“Speaker Walcott: Thank you. So all in favor of -- to motion the table, please raise your hand.

“All opposed to the motion to be tabled -- it is clear the ayes have it. The motion is tabled.

“That brings us to the next part, Joanne DeStefano.”

8. **COMMENTS ON E-SHOP**

“Joanne DeStefano, Vice President, Financial Affairs: Good evening, everyone. Can you hear me?”

“Now can you hear me? Okay.

“Well, how about talking about procurement savings before dinner?

(LAUGHTER)

“I don't know whether the shale or the procurement is more interesting, but I will try to make this quick. As Provost Fuchs mentioned, in the $90 million that we are attempting to save in the administrative areas, $30 million of it has been assigned to procurement. And because procurement is within my area of responsibility, I drew the short straw as leading this initiative, so I was asked today to talk about e-shop, which is a tool that we use in procurement; but I can't talk about the e-shop tool without talking about the real goal of the procurement savings.

“So the $30 million, as you can see from this slide, is a cumulative amount that we'll be saving over time, and the first couple of years, through fiscal year '11, the projection is $7.5 million. Then the next couple of years, there's an additional $16 million; and then finally to the $30 million. The way the consultants have come up with the $30 million is they believe that, without any changes to practices of who and -- who you buy from or what you buy, I should say, that if we can use some different tools, we can have better information and we can save $30 million.

“I am not 100% convinced that we can save $30 million in procurement without making some -- what I'll call behavioral change on campus, but I do believe we can make a good chunk of the savings by putting in some tools and some disciplines into our practice, and I want to talk about that for a second.
“So to get through our -- what I’m calling our Phase 1, which is the first set of savings through fiscal year ’11, we have come up with four goals. One is organizational. The procurement office needs to really be updated, so that the staff can use the tools and make decisions based on the tools. We need to use the e-shop tool, which e-shop, for those of you that aren’t familiar, is an online cataloging system.

“Right now, the suppliers that we have within the e-shop tool, their catalogs are in the system. Only 20% of the purchases using those suppliers that are in the system were actually using the system. So our goal, through fiscal year ’11 is to get the suppliers we have within the system up to 95% compliance. So if the suppliers in the system, we want you to use the system.

“We also have a very low amount -- we negotiate prices with certain vendors, maybe not all the prices within a catalog, but we’ll pick the items that we purchase the most of, and very few people actually use the systems that are in place and the dollar on the items that we have negotiated prices on; so what we would like to see by the end of fiscal year ’11 is a 50% improvement on the buying of items that we have actually negotiated prices on. And we believe that by doing these things, by the end of June, we’ll have saved the first $7.5 million.

“The consultants looked at the savings in both short-term and long-term. Basically, they are saying the short-term, what we are calling near-term -- I am calling that our Phase 1 -- they are basically saying that’s the low-hanging fruit, and they believe that we can save between $7.5 and $10 million. Phases 2 and 3, to get from the $20 million to the $30 million -- the next $20 million worth of savings, we don’t know where that’s going to come from yet. We need to spend some more time, we need more data, and where the data’s going to come from is the the e-shop tool.

“The easy things to do are on the left of this slide, and so the two yellow, the spend aggregation and the vendor negotiation is exactly what we are going to do in Phase 1. Our current procurement system has -- if you order something and you use a purchase order or blanket order, the only information we have in our offices that we bought from Staples and we paid $1,500, we don’t have any data on what you actually purchased. As a result, we don’t have the information to go negotiate better prices. So the e-shop tool takes all your data all the way down to what’s called the SKU number or bar code, so when you use the tool, we know the specific item that you purchased and we can track that data, then we can go out for better pricing.

“The Weill Medical College has implemented e-shop also. They have a different procurement system, but we never realized, until we started comparing our data, how
much overlap and what we actually buy between the two campuses. So we think with better data, if we only have 20% of our data in our system now that we can identify, if we can add our 80%, plus take a look at what Weill Medical College spends, we have much more leverage to negotiate prices.

“Then the further you go in the slide, the more it is for the savings. So right now, we are trying to develop a very strong plan to get the first $8.5 million. In the middle, it talks about limiting discretionary spending. We are seeing that happen already, and we actually saw it happen in fiscal year 2009, that just completed in June, because of the budget situation.

“Travel, for example, was down 20% in general appropriated funds. And that was just -- we had no mandates to reduce travel, but using general appropriated funds, the dollars have already dropped. So we'll see significant savings just in changes being made elsewhere on campus.

“I mentioned organizational improvements. The existing procurement office is very transaction-oriented. We are going to be restructuring the entire office. We are going to move the transactions out, so that the existing staff -- they are very comfortable managing transactions, managing compliance, but not doing the strategic going out and figuring out where we should be focusing on efforts on trying to get better pricing. We hope to have the plan -- we have a rough idea what the plan is. We hope to have it in place and the new staff set up by the end of this fiscal year.

“So again, e-shop has caused some concerns on campus. What e-shop is, it's an electronic tool, a cataloging system from a vendor called Cy Quest, and the best practiced universities -- and Penn is recognized as one of the best practicing universities in procurement; they have used this tool for quite some time. And the amount of data you can get out of this tool, when we purchase through e-shop, is what's going to help us come up with our savings.

“The issue that we have here at Cornell is the e-shop tool was not an institutionally supported system. We recognized the importance of putting in a system that would eventually be able to help us, so we, within my organization, actually eliminated a couple positions a couple years ago, to carve out some funding to actually put the system in.

“So it's in right now, very bare bones, and we know that there are some enhancements and some investment that needs to go into the tool; but we believe if we can put those investments into the tool, we will be able to improve the process, the cost to the University and, hopefully, without having any impact on the faculty or staff.
“So one of the things that will I would like from all of you is comments on your experiences -- and it doesn't have to be today, because we are about out of time, but your experiences with e-shop, so we know where to start prioritizing and targeting the improvements for the tool.

“Any questions?”

“Speaker Walcott:  Thank you, Joanne.  Time for a question, I would say.”

Vice President DeStefano:  Yes.”

“Professor Steve Poole, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.  So we hear a lot about reducing the costs and getting a good price, but the price you pay is only one aspect of the cost.  There's also the cost involved in faculty time, in making the purchase.”

“In many of our experiences, the cost of -- in terms of faculty time is greater than the savings on the price, so I wonder what steps you are going to take to make it more efficient and maybe have a lower limit on the amount that you require to process through e-shop.”

“Vice President DeStefano:  E-shop, if we put it in place correctly, could be very efficient and should be one of the most efficient transaction processes.  That's what we have been told at other institutions that use it and have used it for some time.

“We are -- our processes, because we haven't fully invested in the workflow tool, are not as efficient.  We are going to work with people.  Our goal is to have it not take your time.  Do you have another method that you felt was more efficient, before we put in e-shop?”

“Professor Poole:  PCard.”

“Vice President DeStefano:  PCard, okay.”

“Speaker Walcott:  Thank you very much, Joanne.  If people have further comments .”

“Vice President DeStefano:  Yes, please send me an e-mail.  I'm happy to understand your comments and issues.”

“Speaker Walcott:  Thank you.  Is John Weiss here?  He's not?  That brings us, then, to the end of the meeting, and I suggest we all vote with our feet.”
(LAUGHTER)

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Gouldin
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty