

Minutes of a
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Interim Speaker, Charles Walcott: "Order. It's a little after 4:30, and I would remind the body that there are no photos, tape recorders, video recorders allowed during the meeting. And please turn off your cell phones. If you wish to say anything, please identify yourself and your department and wait for the microphone, so everybody can hear what you have to say.

"I suggest that in the discussion items, which are coming up, down towards the end of the meeting, that you limit your remarks to no more than two minutes, to allow several speakers. And there are no Good and Welfare speakers at this time, so I have not allocated any time to them.

"That may mean we get out a few minutes early, or we may have a little extra time. So I'd like to begin by having the dean of the faculty, Joe Burns, give a report."

REPORT OF THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, JOSEPH BURNS

Dean Burns: "Thanks very much, Charlie. I'd like to welcome all the members, especially the new members and the alternates, back to this first senate meeting of the 2013-14 semester -- year, rather. And I'd like to thank Charlie for serving as interim speaker. We had a little foul-up that led us to not having a speaker at this time. And of course, I owe a lot to Mike and to Karen and Andrea, the people who actually run the show here. They admirably staff the office and get things done.

"So as always, and we are going to try to continue this term, we try to serve you some Cornell products. So here are things, fruits from Cornell orchards coming in. The plums, the blue plums are actually developed in Geneva, so some of your colleagues made those things. And I find that's important, because it sort of brings us all together, in one way or another. It's right down in there basically. So we'll continue to try to do that.

"As I started last year -- and people tell me they enjoyed it, so let's do it again -- everyone try to introduce themselves to a few of their neighbors. It's sort of like a church. I no longer go to church anymore, but I gather it's sort of like a church thing. You can hug people or whatever. The whole purpose of this is to say I know you're here representing a department, a program; but the thing is, we're

really here to serve Cornell and try and do good things for Cornell. So it's good to know what Cornell does. You could be an undergraduate teacher or graduate research fellow or whatever, doing in the classics or in ornithology, whatever, the land grants side or the endowed side. So we're all in this together, and let's just meet a couple of people around you. So just lean over and say hey, I'm so-and-so. If you know somebody next to you, don't talk to that person.

“Okay, we're not supposed to have too much fun here. So actually last year, during the course of the debate, somebody said I even know somebody in engineering. I met them two meetings ago, and he's against this too. So there's actually a purpose behind this. So just going down, we have done the introductions. We have ongoing appointments, so just telling you about what's going on in the organization right now. We still have a few ongoing appointments and elections going on. That's not withstanding the terrific job that Nominations and Elections have done. We've got more of our seats filled than ever before, I think, in history. So they've done a terrific job.

“I had a foul-up that led to some of these problems, so we're investigating speakers and parliamentarians and committee chairs in a couple of cases, and a few people for governance committee.

“We have good news to bring to you, and that is you may remember a year ago there was a petition, partly started in the faculty senate, to try and encourage the administration to put in more funds into the library. And maybe we're seeing some of the seeds of that right now. According to the Association for Research Libraries, their library investment index, Cornell is now ranked tenth. We had been down in the 20s after always being in the top ten, so we are moving up, but don't get complacent.

“As I understand, a lot of it is due to the provost slipping a little money under the table -- well, not under the table, but we've got new budget model, so not under the table, but sending money over. The reallocation of funds within the library has accounted for some and some donations. So next year is going to be a tough year, but at least we made it back to the top ten, partly because of the enthusiasm for a petition of this organization.

“We are still going to try to run a faculty forum. We did that, I think, with some success last year, talking about MOOCs in the fall and about research libraries in the spring. The UFC and I and Mike have been talking about possible topics for this fall, and there's sort of a pretty amorphous one that is the leader right now,

and that is to discuss something about what it means to be a professor nowadays.

“There are lots of changes that are occurring in the way that tenure is granted, I think a little bit, or they're imminent perhaps. People in New York City saying well, entrepreneurship should count, undergraduate teaching. We don't have any undergraduates down here. Maybe it shouldn't count. We've seen within this group resolutions coming forward from the law school and the business school for different clocks on tenure. We've got distance learning going on. Maybe that's something we have to incorporate.

“I was on a FACTA meeting where someone was partly denied tenure because of not getting research funding. So things are changing, and the faculty ought to be involved in that discussion. And so I'd like to have that as the general topic, but it's still a little ill-formed to make it -- I don't want to say sexy, but I can't think of another word -- make it something people would want to go see and participate in.

“There are also, as we'll see in today's meeting, there are proposals to add titles. As of ten years ago, the Vet School introduced the title of a clinical professor. There are folks who would prefer to have a professor of practice. There are people who would like to have research professors.

“We're about only one of the top 20 research universities to not have the title of research professor. So if there are to be changes like that -- and maybe there should be, maybe there shouldn't be -- the faculty ought to be involved in that. That's what I'd like to encourage, but we'll have to see how that plays out.

“There are other topics that people have talked about. The New York City campus itself might be a topic for a faculty forum to learn more about what's really going on down there. We were shielding from it when it first started out, and we haven't heard much. We're very busy, you know. The issue of open access publishing is another topic that interests some on the UFC. So if you have suggestions, let us know, and we will try to make up our minds within the next couple of weeks on this topic.

“So now we come down here, and more good news, in a sense, if you want to get home early for dinner. We have missing resolutions. That sounds like it's a threatening thing, but it really isn't. We have two resolutions that have gone in different paths, and we'll probably see something from these. We will see

something from these very shortly; but nonetheless, they're examples that I think you should know about. So one is this issue of clinical professors. We have a resolution that's come to CAPP asking for clinical professors and the hotel people with experience, but not necessarily involved in research per se, and we look back at the rules and it requires CAPP review and then a 60-day comment period, which apparently has never been done before by the senate, but we will do it this time.

“So this is going to go into -- not limbo, but it's on the web right now on the dean of the faculty web site for comment. All the senators will get it and will vote on it when it comes back in 60 days and will have seen all the public comment. So it's delayed, but, again, trying to engage the outside community is part of the purpose of that.

“We also have from a large number of senators and non-senators a proposal or resolution for the university to divest from fossil fuel stocks, and this is led by Brian Chabot and David Shalloway. That came in about three weeks ago. And partly the reason we have a little extra time in today's meeting was I thought that would be coming to the senate today. And since it didn't, suddenly we have a little bit more time to discuss these things from last May.

“So what we did was we sent that to the Financial Policy Committee. They had a very -- I wish you all could have participated -- a very interesting discussion back and forth about the pros and cons of the resolution, should it come to the senate now, should other things be done with it, so forth and so on. Very interesting discussion, and the end result was that we'll probably eventually come to the senate; but before that, the drafters of the resolution, the chief investment officer from the university and the FPC are all going to get together in the hopes that the resolution that comes forward will be a little bit better informed. The FPC felt it was a little vague as written. Very worthwhile, but somewhat vague, so we'll have a little bit more definiteness in that proposal. So that's next.

“Next on our agenda, I'm going to give you some observations about what I have seen in the senate, and they're not very profound. I think you've all seen them yourselves. I think university governance here at Cornell needs improvement. I'd like to see the senate and the faculty as a whole and the administration work effectively together and efficiently together. I think that we need the administration to ask for our input and advice sooner, more often, on broader range of subjects, and that they should have faith and patience in our coming back with very informed and valuable advice for them.

"I also think that we have our own faults. Too few of us are engaged in this activity. We need to get out in front of issues. At present, I think that the senate and the faculty as a whole tend to be very reactive, and that doesn't make for good governance. So I think we have our things to do. And we need to seek to have a constructive role in such interactions. So that's my first point here.

"Second point is -- I don't think there's any surprise here either -- these meetings could be better. I don't know how. I'm seeking your advice. We have some ideas. You know, it seems to me just -- this is listening to people on last year's UFC. Everybody's how can we make them better? How can we get better engagement from the audience? How can we get better participation?

"As I said to the UFC, it almost seems like my classes. People in the back with their laptops, people nodding off. You're the UFC too. No. I'm just joking, really. But there's just too few in my classes that participate in the classes. And I find that true here. There are too few that stand up and give their opinions, and I think we need more. We need back and forth. We need somebody saying this side of the case and then somebody from the other side saying it. We need that discussion, if we're going to accomplish things, I believe. I guess that back and forth we call engagement now.

"And I think also another area in which the senate could do a better job is on communication back to their constituencies. This is a representative democracy, but it does request that you bring the concerns of your departments to the senate; and then, when the senate acts, you bring them back. This is what the senate did last week. This is the information that we found out at last month's meeting. And I don't think that that's happening as often. That information is not being transmitted between the constituents and the senators.

"I think that's about it. And as I said, I think I could have done a much better job last year, and I hope to do a better job this year in engaging the faculty committees. We've got very good advice from the financial policy committee, I feel, on this one motion. We have another similarly on the hotel, the CAPP does a terrific job and continuing to do a terrific job. So we need to get them engaged, and that's me reaching out and asking for advice. Anyway, when I went around and asked, and Mike did the same, UFC members did the same to ask folks out there, are the senate meetings working, it was a pretty strong vote that we need to do better, and so I hope we can during the course of the year.

“So let's move on. I wanted to just very quickly go down through the agenda. We are going to have, as part and parcel of that discussion, we are going to have a few minutes from a senior lecturer in ILR who is the leader of the Cornell debate club, which you know is number one in the nation, number one in the world, so he's probably got something to tell us about how we might run better, more effective meetings. So we'll do that in a moment.

“We're going to go through and have an approval of minutes, I hope. Nominations and Elections will come in and tell you what they have been doing over the summer. And then we have two items that come back to discussions that we held back in May: One is, if you remember, following the Ho Plaza incident November 19th, there were two resolutions brought to the senate. One of them from this body asked for the faculty to investigate the handling of that incident by the administration, and that committee reported back here in May. And we will hear the UFC's response to those recommendations.

“We also have a report from the Distance Learning Committee, and Dick Miller and David Delchamps will give that report. And then we don't have any Good and Welfare. Sorry to take up so much time, Charlie.

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you, Dean Burns. We now are going to be instructed on the attributes of effective meetings. Sam Nelson?”

Senior Lecturer, Sam Nelson, School of Industrial and Labor Relations: “Thanks very much for having me here today. I was talking to Dean Burns earlier in the summer. He said well, we have an issue. Our meetings aren't that great. We want to make them better. And that's one area that I'm very interested over in the ILR School and studying. And this group isn't the only one that has sometimes mentioned, hey, our meetings could be better. How can we improve them.

“So I have some suggestions. One of the suggestions is this dignified body is sort of ruled by Robert's Rules of Order. I don't know if you know much about Robert's Rules of Order. The history of it is kind of interesting. General Robert was sent in 1867 to San Francisco, because the fear by the federal government was that San Francisco couldn't run a meeting in 1867, to be an effective governing body. And this was going to be important, because two years later, the Transcontinental Railroad was going to be finished, and people would be arriving more and more to the west.

“And so General Robert was very concerned about making sure the majority got their way and that the minority didn't muck things up. So he made these very efficient rules, what he thought were very efficient rules. Here we are in 2013. I don't know if anybody would call Robert's Rules of Order an efficient way of running a meeting. And one of my favorite books is actually entitled "Breaking Robert's Rules." It's by Lawrence Susskind of Harvard, a collaborative public meetings project, and he points out a few things in his book that I'm going to share with you today about how you can sort of circumvent Robert's Rules, still by playing the rules of General Robert, but maybe run a more effective meeting.

“And some of the advantages of having a more engaged meeting are you feel like you get more done, you feel like you're not wasting your time, and you're more likely to get participation from a wide range of people, not just the same old folks over and over and over. So I passed out -- I hope everybody got it -- a two-page list of a simplified version of Robert's Rules of Order, if you want to participate in a meeting. Like I haven't memorized all 537 pages of Robert's Rules of Order. This is kind of a cheat sheet.

“And so it kind of tells you how you can introduce a motion or do something that you want to do. And it's just two pages, and I find it very effective. You might want to keep it during the course of the year. It might help you.

“The thing I found most interesting about the simplified version of Robert's Rules of Order is that it has four guiding principles. The first one is everyone has the right to participate in discussion, if they wish, before anyone may speak for a second time. I don't think that always happens.

“So that might be like it's always good, before you play a game, to establish the ground rules first. So if you could just remember that -- this will be the only time I speak all year -- if you just could remember that rule, let's try to let everybody speak, and everybody gets a chance to speak if they want to, before someone speaks twice.

“Another guiding principle of Robert's Rules is everyone has the right to know what's going on at all times. That may not always be the case in every meeting. So don't be afraid to ask, hey, what's going on right now? What are we doing? What am I voting on?

“And the third one is only urgent matters may interrupt the speaker, and there's a list of the urgent matters on the back. And then the fourth one is only one

thing, one motion can be discussed at a time. My experience with Robert's Rules of Order is that's when it gets confusing; when people start trying to discuss multiple things at one time and there's several motions being voted on. And if you just do one thing at a time, generally in life, things go a little better. Unfortunately, we all know as faculty members here, it's not always possible, but they do go better.

“So here are my quick little suggestions, and then you'll have an opportunity to ask any questions, if you have one. So the problem is right now is that people don't think these meetings are being run as efficiently as they can, and the audience isn't as engaged in participating as much as they possibly could.

“I believe the cause is not everybody knows how they can participate more or what's allowed and what's not allowed; or maybe they've forgotten how to do it. The answer to the problem, I believe, is to establish these ground rules that I'm about ready to present, and the net benefits, I hope, of the whole procedure will be that it will be a little bit better hopefully down the road.

“So here are the rules I sort of came -- these are not Sam's Rules or anything. You don't have to memorize these. They're just suggestions. The first one is we need to be civil. This is a dignified body. It has a long history, the faculty senate, so try to be civil. Try to listen, try to be polite. Don't make rude comments or noises or anything like that.

“The second one is try to encourage a diversity of participation by doing two things: One, not dominating the discourse with long diatribes, statements, sustained flashes of your own brilliance. That's really not necessary; doesn't generally help.

“And then the second thing is by trying to get others involved. One way to do that is by meeting with people before the meeting or right after the meeting and saying hey, maybe at the next meeting, could you bring up this point? You seem to be interested in that. Try to get the people that don't like to talk that much maybe to participate a little bit.

“And then a third suggestion would be, be willing to talk about issues outside the meeting. This is a very limited period of time that we have here, and if you try to get everything done in the very structured time allocations, it will be a failure. So it would be good if you could talk before and after, maybe in some of

the committees, volunteer for other things. That would really help the meetings be more efficient.

“Respect difference. There's an old saying in debate; it was mentioned before. I coach the debate team here at Cornell. I always tell my students when they first come in, you don't really understand your own position until you understand those of people that disagree with you. So try to respect difference. It seems like a high ideal that the top intellects at Cornell University should strive for.

“Five is try to be constructive, offer help to possibly find consensus and compromises. Consensus requires a lot of heavy lifting. It's not always possible, but if you're in the mind-set hey, maybe we can do it, it might at least make the meeting run a little bit better.

“Six is go for what's called the shared meeting model. There are two main models of communication. I help a lot of people with communication apprehension. They are afraid of public speaking, and they're like I don't know what to do. And almost everybody that's afraid of public speaking has in their mind what's called the performance-based mind-set, which they think of themselves as an actor, and that every word that they're saying is sort of being judged in a critical way, like you would make sure an actor in a Shakespearean play or something.

“People that are the best public speakers are people that use a shared meaning mind-set. They're just trying to get their idea across. And those people have a totally different way of thinking about communication. And so if you have that same sort of mind-set; look, I'm just trying to get my idea across, I'm not putting on a performance here, it does a couple good things. One big thing it does, it avoids the drama that sometimes occurs in big meetings like this. And that's never good, that extra drama.

“And then the second thing that it does is it kind of sets the standard for other people to do the same. And that let's just get our ideas across is the better model. It will help you as a public speaker, but will also help the meeting run more efficiently.

“I would like to say just a couple more. Try to elicit statements -- this is a difficult one. Try to elicit statements, if you are going to make it a statement, try to start your statement with something that's neutral. So if you were going to

propose a motion, try to not have it filled with bling. I move that we remove that terrible individual, blah, blah, blah, more insults, you know.

“Maybe you phrase it like we need to improve something, you know, and maybe not so specific until you get down to the discussion, but if you start out your initial statement with like an attack, generally that makes people defensive. So if you can sort of try to be a little bit sensitive to how you make statements, so that they don't make people react in a sort of defensive way.

“I would also say respect the process. Everybody here, from Dean Burns on down, is trying hard to make it a fair process. And if you don't acknowledge that, it's kind of an insult to them. I know, from my discussions with them, they're trying their hardest to make it a fair process, so please respect that.

“Be flexible. Sometimes you don't get your way all the time at the moment, but you can work towards that. And so if you work towards being flexible, that would be good. And then move on. Sometimes you lose. Sometimes you want to continue to discuss something and everybody else doesn't. Then you have to just move on. It is just the way it works.

“And not everybody wants to move on, and then that can be a problem; but if you're willing to accept that hey, I may have to move on, on a particular issue, I think you will have a more successful series of meetings in this august body.

“So I've done kind of a weird thing. I've come in like the Cornell expert, and I've been here is what you need to do. You all know this usually doesn't work. They're like oh, what does he know. But these are very simple things, and what I hope you do is as the semester goes on and the year goes on, that you refer back to these just very simple things.

“And now that everybody's been inoculated to these ideas, maybe they'll affect your personal behavior, as well as the group as a whole. I hope so. Are there any questions about any of these suggestions or about how to run an effective meeting?”

Speaker Walcott: “We've really run out of time, I'm afraid. Thank you very much.”

Lecturer Nelson: “Stay within your time limits.”

Speaker Walcott: "Okay, we now need to proceed to the minutes of these three meetings. I assume that everybody here has read these minutes carefully and is prepared to approve them. Do I hear any objection to approving all of these minutes?"

"Seeing no objection, I declare the minutes approved. Now we should move on to the next item on the agenda, the report from nominations and elections. Michael?"

REPORT FROM ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL FONTAINE

Professor Fontaine: "Hi, everyone. I'll start with the customary request that if you're interested in a committee or want to get involved, please do submit your name to us, so that we have it. It's always tough to find people, especially who haven't done it before. So at your next department meeting, look left, look right, and see if you think that person might be interested, even if you aren't. And I won't tell them that you sent me the name.

"So we have quite a number of appointments we made. And of course, the work never ends, because some people have all rotated off, but on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty, we have Suzanne Mettler, College of Arts and Sciences.

"Academic Programs and Policies Committee -- that's CAPP -- we have two appointments: Mark Milstein from the Johnson Graduate School of Management, Deborah Starr from the College of Arts and Sciences. EPC, the Educational Policy Committee, Patricia Cassano, College of Human Ecology.

"On FACTA, which is the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenured Appointments, we have five new appointments. I'm not going to read all these names, because I think they're on the slide down there. On Committee on Financial Policies, FPC, two new appointments. On Institutional Biosafety Committee, we have six new appointments. And the Institutional Review Board, we have four new appointments.

"On the University Lectures Committee, three new appointments. On the University Library Board, one new appointment. On the Music Committee, one new appointment. On Nominations and Elections Committee, we have one reappointment. On the Professor-At-Large Committee, that A.D. White Lecture Committee, five new appointments.

“On FCPR, the Faculty Committee on Program Review, we have two appointments. On the University Hearing Board, one new appointment. And the University ROTC Relationships Committee, two new appointments. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Don't we need a motion to approve these? Joe, do we need a -- usually we just have a voice approval of this, so I would like to -- everybody in favor of these appointments will please raise their hand. Anybody opposed? It's unanimous. These are approved. Dean Burns, you're next.”

REPORT ON UFC RESPONSE TO HO PLAZA COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

Dean Burns: “So we have two items that go back to the last meeting of the senate, and my intention here is to merely list what the faculty committee on the Ho Plaza incident reported out and then tell you what the UFC had to say about this. If you'll remember, this is an incident between people supporting Israel and another group endorsing Palestine that had a confrontation on Ho Plaza on November 19th. The University's handling of this confrontation pointed out inconsistencies between the campus code and the university's permit process.

“It's worthwhile in our own conversations here to realize that the campus code, which is subject to revision, is not our responsibility, but rather is the responsibility of the University's Assembly, to which we contribute. And thus, our faculty response that is in this report, as well as the minutes of the May meeting and the minutes of this meeting are strictly advisory to the University's Assembly.

“So at the May meeting, I was asked to please say what the recommendations were or how the UFC handled the recommendations from the full committee and what we decided to do with them. So I will do that here, and my plan is to just summarize each of the five responses.

“I will quickly state the five recommendations, very briefly say what the UFC response to each was, and then give three minutes per recommendation for comments from the Senate. And three is not divisible by two minutes per speaker, so maybe we could even make it one minute per speaker, if we want to get some feedback that you'd like to have the university assembly know about, and then we'll move on.

“These are the five items, five recommendations from our committee; had to do with changes in the employee ID cards. Questions about faculty rights of free expression and so forth versus being considered agents of the university, unless we follow the rules and tell students what to do, if the police request us.

“There was a conflict, which is the major one, I think, between what's written in the campus code, what's on the UUP form. There's an issue about whether amplified sound is any different in terms of freedom of expression, and a recommendation on how event managers should be trained.

“So the first thing that the UFC in its preamble said that we generally endorsed this report and commended the committee for its excellent and balanced document. On the first recommendation, that recommendation stated that the phrase -- and if you want to pull out your ID, in the back it says you must show this identification upon request. It's weird. Not all (Cornell-issued) IDs actually have that, but the vast majority of our IDs have that. And the committee suggested that maybe should not be there.

“We suggest that it should remain on the campus ID cards, but it must be clarified exactly what's meant, under what circumstances should that ID be shown. And the UFC also felt that the university counsel's office should be consulted in any rewrite of this. Does anybody have an opinion on this that they would like to share?

“Okay, let's move on to the second recommendation. Second recommendation -- yes. Why don't we wait, please, Elizabeth. Yes, could you please identify yourself, Elizabeth?”

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government: “Is there not a chance to decide --”

Dean Burns: “You can state your own opinion.”

Professor Sanders: “I don't know what the stages of these contrasting resolutions -- is UFC's position dominant, or --”

Dean Burns: “It is dominant insofar as we are passing these recommendations on to higher up and to different parts. If you want to say I don't agree with this and this ought to come back to the whole senate as a whole, I suppose we could do that.”

Professor Sanders: "...That sentence, or to go with the UFC's."

Dean Burns: "Motions need to be, of course, put out in advance. So if you wish to make a resolution, we'll bring it back to the UFC for consideration."

"The second point was that the UFC believed that the faculty's right to freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and academic freedom should take priority over their responsibility to act as agents of the university."

"So this is coming from the recommendation, and the UFC believes that this should be highlighted in the background training that is given to the university police officers, so that they realize they can't be requesting faculty members to be agents of the university, if faculty members would feel like this is the more important thing to do. Is there anyone who would like to make a comment on this position?"

"The next of these is the committee felt that when the codes and judicial committee of the UA rewrites the campus code, it's important to preserve the ability of groups to assemble spontaneously. And while it is generally desirable to have advance notice of meetings, it should not be mandatory to receive a UPP permit -- that is a use of the university property permit -- in advance of any meetings."

"This is the UFC's position down here. We believe that it is desirable to have an advanced notice, such as you would get by using this permit, but it should not be mandatory. And that's what we're recommending that the UUP say, when they modify this."

"Any comment on that position? Yes. Risa."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, School of Industrial and Labor Relations. "I think this is very much at the heart of the debate and should be recognized that notion of whether demonstrations or other kinds of rallies to actually promote free speech, it should include some sort of advanced notice."

"Even stating it's desirable is taking a position, so I think it should be recognized that this is the UFC's position, as the UFC existed prior to this year that's being passed along to the University Assembly; but it may be that along with what Elizabeth was saying, that some of these are particularly important and perhaps could come back here as resolutions, because it certainly is not the position of the senate. This is a position of the UFC as it existed at that time."

Dean Burns: "Speaker in the back."

David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. "I was on the UFC last year -- I'm not on UFC anymore -- and I sort of disagree with this position actually. And I'll tell you exactly how I disagree with it. My personal view is that a protest is a protest. It's not a bake sale, it's not trust days.

"And the campus code of conduct should make absolutely no reference at all to anything like a UUP or anything. That's my personal opinion. Tempering that is the fact that the campus code is not the faculty's creature. It's the creature of the UA. And anyone here who has ever interacted with the University Assembly, tried to get a change to anything, it's a body, it has opinions, it has a view of its role, and I think it's dangerous for a faculty committee such as the UFC or even the faculty senate to go and say this is how the code should be. I think we can advise them on what we think.

"So I wanted to say that there was sort of a minority report associated with UFC last year, and also that there is that danger that we'll appear arrogant and overbearing if we force our view on them."

Dean Burns: "Is there another comment on the other side?"

Associate Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine: "I am and was on the UFC, and I think I basically support the motion as proposed for the reasons that David mentioned just now. I think there's a real concern from the UA, as I understand it, that they would not be in favor of even perhaps something as mild as this, because of the concerns about disrupting previously organized things.

"And I think this is a very good compromise, which clearly gives people the opportunity to protest at very short notice on issues that they feel are important, but also encourages them, if possible, to notify other people that this is going to happen. There's no advantage to doing that. It's more of a courtesy, and I think this is a good compromise."

Dean Burns: "Is there a final speaker who would like to speak against this motion, against this position? Peter.

Professor Emeritus, Peter Stein, Physics: "I sure believe in free expression, but I've been in a lot of demonstrations in my life, and they almost always were --

there was advance notice. Not on the campus I'm talking about, but in Washington, in New York City, and it's accepted by everybody that while you have a right to make a free statement, you don't have the right of using your voice to obstruct somebody else or some other activity.

“And it's common, and I don't think anyone in the public sector has ever complained about this for police departments in various cities to make sure that the demonstrations don't obstruct traffic, that the demonstrations are not used as a way of depriving someone else of their rights.

“I don't know anything about this particular issue, but the statement that says that everybody has a right to come to any place and make as much noise as they want, I'm not sure that I'm going along with that. I think that it makes a certain amount of sense to have these various demonstrations phased and brought to an appropriate place. Of course, that power shouldn't be such that nobody can hear what you're saying, but to say that anyone can go anywhere in as large a group as they want, I think that to me it goes beyond what's necessary –”

Dean Burns: “Thank you very much. Thank you. I think we have to move on, David. I'm sorry. The next of these, Number 4, deals a little bit with what Peter was talking about, I think. There was an issue about whether or not there should be specific rules for amplified sound.

“And the comment of the UFC on this was that all members maintain that the goal of the final campus code should be to encourage civil discourse that reflects the values of the university community. Most of the UFC members believe that the question of special restrictions on the use of amplified sound should be specifically addressed by the campus codes and judicial committee. Any comment on this?

“Okay, the last of these is that the UFC strongly recommends that event managers receive additional training and safety in crowd management. They further believe that the faculty members should be encouraged to serve as event managers and also to help in the training of these individuals. Any comment on that position? Okay, that's the end of the UFC's response to the recommendations of the committee.”

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISTANCE LEARNING

The Wynn and William Y. Hutchinson Professor of Philosophy, Richard Miller:
“The Distance Learning Committee has the charge of reporting to the provost and the faculty on the exciting prospects and daunting challenges of online distance learning at Cornell, very much including, but by no means limited to consortium-based Massive Open Online Courses.

“We're also given the narrower, more immediate task of organizing the selection of courses for any Cornell-designated MOOC consortium in the 2013-2014 academic year. As Bruce Lewenstein emphasized in presenting the committee and the charge to the senate in May, a primary goal is to provide, as he put it, faculty guidance on how to think about distance learning.

“As part of this process, the dean of the faculty chose its members, subject to the provost's approval, constituting a committee with a faculty majority. Originally 9 of the 13 voting members were non-administrative faculty. As a result of a faculty resignation owing to work pressures elsewhere and a non-faculty addition, 8 of 13 are now non-administrative faculty.

“Faculty senate discussion of controversial questions about distance learning will be vital to meeting our responsibility. To introduce today's discussion, helped by prior consultation with Joe Burns and Dave Delchamps, who is the other senator in the Distance Learning Committee, I will very briefly present an extremely short narrative of past doings and plans, one bit of strong consensus that's already formed and a few of the questions on which we could use your help.

“Our first preliminary meeting was May 14th. Subsequently, Vice Provost Brown was appointed committee chair. On May 21st, the provost announced that Cornell had joined the edX MOOC consortium. Vice Provost Brown shared drafts of the request for proposals to lead to the funding of four edX MOOCs, accepted some of our suggestions for the request and appointed a selection committee, which was drawn from the Distance Learning Committee.

“The request was issued on June 3rd, with a deadline of June 20th. Selection of four proposals out of 14 submissions was announced at our July 2nd meeting. We have had six hour-long meetings since the preliminary meeting, and plan to have seven more from now until December, when our term is supposed to end and we are to issue our final report.

“Although our discussions have often concerned the first request for proposals, a second one, which is to be issued soon, and preliminary explorations of what to ask and how to proceed, a consensus has already emerged on one central topic. Through targeted funding and expanded facilities, Cornell should support a wide range of forms of distance learning, going well beyond edX MOOCs, including interdisciplinary learning modules addressing issues of broad public concern and learning modules providing access to those within a discipline to advanced techniques and recent findings. Some of us also see an important role for whole online courses that are not full-blown edX MOOCs. The commitment to breadth would reflect the diversity of benefits and also the uncertainty of what will work. We just don't know at this stage. Suggestions along these lines from the committee have led to a current draft for the second request for proposals that invites a broad range of innovative shorter forms of distance learning not meant as certifiable courses that are licensable for credit, as well as four more edX MOOCs.

“Here's a list of questions that have seemed important to members of the Distance Learning Committee, which might contribute to senate discussion now, discussion that will help us a great deal in moving forward. First, given their distinctive costs and advantages, what should the balance be in funding and support between edX MOOCs and other forms of distance learning?

“Second, edX MOOCs are estimated to take 200 to 300 hours of faculty time to produce, ten hours a week to administer whenever they are offered. How should losses of on-campus teaching through edX MOOCs be monitored and contained? How should faculty be compensated? What are the consequences for TAships?

“Also, the major ultimate revenue stream foreseen by edX is from the licensing of courses for credit, presumably to non-elite colleges and universities. Is the nationwide impact of this use cause for concern? To what extent should Cornell and the Distance Learning Committee in particular be concerned? Also, what's the right structure for governing the creation and administration of edX MOOCs and other forms of distance learning?

“What structure of intellectual property rights and instructor's prerogative should be imposed?

"I'm going to end with a question of urgent practical importance to the Distance Learning Committee: What plans should guide our work? Here are some possibilities that have occurred.

"Here's one way of moving forward that a number of us think is the way to get a rich document engaged with controversial issues which reflects the sense of the Distance Learning Committee as a whole and we hope reflects strong faculty sentiment as well and reflects disagreement, with reasons behind it, if there is disagreement.

"There could be a series of meetings on reports of working groups on distance learning resources and their allocation; certification, tuition and credit; educational quality and educational benefits; intellectual property rights and faculty prerogatives; and governance of distance learning—there may be other topics as well -- leading to a report drafted by a representative subcommittee for discussion, modification and approval by the whole committee.

"At present, the first three groups have been recruited and will report. A committee with one voting member of the distance learning committee appointed by Vice Provost Brown will provide useful input on the third question of intellectual property rights and prerogatives.

"Another possibility is adding more faculty. Now, there's going to be a need for any new recruit to connect with past work very soon; but as an indication of the problem, no member of the regular faculty is currently on the working group on educational benefits.

"There's a question of how the Distance Learning Committee can best solicit the involvement of faculty outside the committee in the development of distance learning policies. Finally, the term of the committee might be extended to facilitate the final report.

"Dave, would you like to say some things?

"Dave Delchamps will add his observations. Then we very much look forward to discussion of your responses to any of these deep questions about distance learning and then there will be time for further general discussion. And after the further discussion, Dave and I would be delighted to hear from anyone here, for example, by e-mail about these and other questions."

Professor Delchamps: "Since we're the senators on the Distance Learning Committee, we figured we'd be the good liaison between you guys and Distance Learning Committee. I'm only here to talk about one little piece of this whole thing, which was the selection committee, the subcommittee that selected the four Cornell edX MOOCs.

"Our mission was very narrow. All we had to do was take the RFP that the big committee had put together, send it out and get responses within a week or two, and then decide within another week or two what the Cornell edX MOOC -- very short fuse. It was a very fast thing. And we got 14 proposals overall.

"The faculty members -- I don't think you had a slide on this -- the faculty members on this committee were Laura Brown, Thorsten Joachims, Eric Mueller, and Joe Burns and Mike Fontaine and I. I think I covered them all. Staff members, Ted Dodds and Theresa Pettit from Center for Teaching Excellence, and Clare van den Blink from Academic Technologies, and one other that I'm forgetting right now.

"And we had these 14 proposals, and we just decided which ones to go with. And in case you're wondering how we made this decision, there were criteria in the RFP. I did want to mention two things that are kind of important, okay. One thing is in my view important, one thing is that if you teach a well-received course, say, if you're teaching a nice, well-received course at Cornell and you want to turn it into a MOOC, it's not enough to say here's the syllabus to my course; I want to turn this into a MOOC. You really have to think about what happens when you turn a course into a MOOC. You have to think about like student assessment, you have to think about what is it going to mean when I have 3,000 people out there watching my lectures, you know, all that kind of stuff.

"The proposals were really different from each other in how much attention they paid to those kind of issues, and we certainly ended up favoring the proposals that paid a lot of attention to those issues, giving them some thought. Some of them didn't give them thought at all.

"The second thing that I think is important to emphasize, we kept reminding ourselves these are edX MOOCs, taught by Cornell faculty members. They are not Cornell courses, okay. They are MOOCs. They are something else. They're separate from our curriculum. They are not something that, say, CAPP or EPC would want to look at, okay.

“However, one of the courses at least -- two of them. Actually, three of them are actually already offered as bricks and mortar courses at Cornell. I think that Wicker's courses and the Kleinberg-Tardos networks course, and also the relativity and astrophysics course, those are all bricks and mortar courses at Cornell, and they will also teach those as a MOOC alongside the bricks and mortar classes. The kids who take the class in the classroom with professors, with the real live TAs, their experience won't change at all.

“On the other hand, if someone comes up to us -- and this happened with a couple of the proposals, with the course that had been taught online only, so far, and they wanted to scale it up to a MOOC, we thought it was too dangerous to go with something like that, no matter how good the course was for now, because that raises a lot of significant issues.

“If you take a course that's taught online for credit to 50 or 100 students, the students get a fundamentally different experience from the experience they would get, were they taking this thing as a MOOC with 10,000 other people. And there's a slippery slope.

“I always say I don't like slippery slope arguments because if you accept even one of them, you are on a slippery slope to accepting all of them, but there is a danger of conflating these online for credit experiences with a MOOC experience, and blurring the distinction between Cornell online for-credit courses and MOOCs taught by faculty members -- and we think this is going to need a lot of careful thought by faculty committees such as EPC and CAPP and by this body; and therefore, we didn't want to go there so far, at least with this first proposal. And that's all I have to say about the selection process.”

Professor Miller: “So lots of questions. Does anyone have other questions or answers or comments?”

Professor Christine Shoemaker, Civil and Environmental Engineering: “I'm just confused about all these things that do something online. We have eCornell, we have regular courses that have a distance learning component. Shouldn't there be some discussion of how these MOOCs are interacting with that and to what extent they're undermining it? Is that part of what this effort is supposed to look at, or is that going to be dealt with at some other point?”

Professor Miller: "We are a committee on distance learning as a whole, and I think as we looked into this topic, I think the first conclusion -- my first conclusion was in total sympathy with you. I think asking, "What do you think of MOOCs, are you for or against them?" is like asking "What do you think of weather? Are you for or against it?" And if it's distance learning, all the more so.

"So what we're doing is we're trying to distinguish between edX MOOCs (Cornell has a two-year commitment to make eight, which have a very definite format, which has to be certifiable and licensable for credit elsewhere), and MOOCs that eCornell makes, which are for particular audiences, which are typically not student audiences, online courses, which people produce in abundance -- sometimes for credit, sometimes not for credit at Cornell -- and shorter online learning, which could be partly made at Cornell, partly elsewhere. You show students this module. It's in some ways an electronic textbook, and you have face-to-face instruction. The jargon is "hybrid learning."

"I think the way that that distinction coming out is, in our discussion so far, has to do with what should the allocation of targeted resources and facilities be. I think right now we don't see one as undercutting the other as an instructional device, because there's so much online going on. A third of students in the United States take at least one online course for credit. It's really astounding, but resources are limited. So we are talking about what we should recommend in the allocation of resources.

"Sorry to go on, but at first I thought, 'I'm an analytic philosopher. What am I doing on this committee?', but then all these distinctions became important ... so I belong here."

Professor Delchamps: "I would like to add quickly in response to something I heard in your question, the following: That courses at Cornell that are offered online for credit abound. No fewer than 18 courses were offered online for credit last January, for example, during the winter session. ILR got last spring approved a new blended program. They have been offering online only courses for years for credit. eCornell is not a content-creating thing. eCornell is an entity that does production essentially. You give them the content, they put it together in a nice package.

"And as far as these MOOCs and other stuff that the Distance Learning Committee has been talking about, undermining or interfering or whatever with existing online for credit courses at Cornell, we're keeping a bright line between

those two, because they're different animals. These online for-credit courses are things that go through the whole faculty approval process. They are giving Cornell credit, degree credit.

“These are things that don't give Cornell degree credit, at least at this point, and I think you really have to be careful. I'm trying to be careful, as a member of the DLC, to keep them very separate in my mind and remember that we have to maintain that separation.”

The Anne Evans Estabrook Professor of Dispute Resolution, David Lipsky, School of Industrial and Labor Relations: “I think you've done a great job on the report. I commend you for your efforts. I have been involved in distance learning efforts at the university since 1992, when we introduced video teleconferences at the ILR School. I have been involved in many discussions about intellectual property and distance learning.

“I think I understand what that all means in the context of eCornell or in other contexts. I'm not familiar with what it means in the context of edX MOOCs, and I wonder if your committee has formulated a position on that particular matter.”

Professor Delchamps: “There's another subcommittee that Dick didn't mention that's kind of off to the side. It's Pat McClary, John Siliciano and I have been talking about some of these issues around what does the contract constrain people to legally blah, blah, blah. What can Cornell do in the manner of are faculty members allowed to put their lectures up on YouTube and say this is my Cornell course, or can they only put them on YouTube and say this is my course. Can they use the Cornell name?

“And we have ascertained pretty much that it's very loose here, compared to other places. At Stanford, tight policies on that kind of thing. They retain an awful lot of ownership on course content created by faculty in the context of the Stanford jobs; but that ownership, the worry they have about that is mostly about other people -- about their not being able to play with it the way they want in the future, rather than other people using it for purposes.

“They want to make sure that somebody can't come back and say no, we own this now. You, Stanford, can't do this; but we have nothing that elaborate at Cornell. And so my anticipation is that I think it's pretty much the faculty own what they do. It's like writing a book at this point.”

Professor Miller: "EdX MOOCs are a different story. There's a larger question on the committee that I mentioned that Laura Brown appointed that's going to report to us. EdX MOOCs are governed by a contract in effect co-owned by Cornell and edX, with rights strictly assigned.

"What's especially important to the edX model is that they get revenues from third parties. Licensing for credit to other institutions is going to be especially important. Our understanding is that we can decide whether a course is licensed for credit elsewhere or not, but it has to be reasonable in edX's eyes. And the committee, I think, is discussing what the instructors' choices should be."

Associate Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences. "These are all good questions, and I'm sure you'll have more question for your committee to deliberate upon. My question is one of process. This body is supposed to consider issues of educational policy that cross more than one college, and many of the issues that you are going to confront deal with educational policy at Cornell.

"Have we already, without knowing it, given a carte blanche for the committee to move ahead, or are some of your decisions and recommendations going to have to come back here for vote? And if they do, are we, in the words of Al Gore, the relevant controlling authority, or are we simply advisory to the administration on this?"

Professor Delchamps: "I think it goes like this; that one of the reasons I brought up that issue about not approving as one of our initial four MOOCs a course that was offered online only for credit to Cornell students now is that very issue of educational policy. Educational policy has to do with who gets credit, what do they get it for, who grants the credit, that sort of thing. Those are educational policy issues. And if we blur the distinction between edX MOOCs and courses that are offered online for credit, that's when you would get into an educational policy sort of morass.

"Now, what comes out of this committee probably will be much broader than -- as Dick says, much broader than edX MOOCs; I don't know, but relevant things the educational policy has to consider will be relevant to the committee, cross-college policy, deliberative unit and brought to you for sure. And I think there's people on the DLC, including me, who are trying to be really careful about making sure we send to EPC what EPC should see."

Professor Miller: "Could I make a comment on that? I'm sorry to get in the way of what's really important, what happens from the senate. I have perhaps a broader view of the issues we should be directly facing than Dave's, I'm not sure, but I want to describe it. Besides for-credit, I think as responsible educators, there are all sorts of questions.

"For example, the question of what our contribution will be to the process in which so much instruction in colleges is being done online, even though in a recent survey, only 20% of the provosts at higher education institutions said that their faculty thought that online courses were valuable, the other 80% did not, were not willing to say those courses were valuable.

"So I think there will be large questions that I hope the DLC will address. Our charge is as a committee advising the faculty and the provost, and we have a very significant minority of administrators on our committee, so I just don't know, it's beyond me how senate approval would fit into this, but I would hope that we would show you an advanced draft. I'm not sure that's Joe's view, but I hope we'd get feedback from you in this room and perhaps online as well and, if there's are senate resolutions that people would like to have -- I'm thinking of things beyond what Dave said that are specific prerogatives of faculty committees -- I think that would be appropriate. My guess is on the larger issues such as joining edX, the administration's going to decide."

Professor Emeritus Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I'm not a senator; just an interested faculty member who can speak, but not vote. Last May, we had a presentation, and there were seven people who spoke. Six of those people said -- and you can just look at the minutes -- "Slow down. We think this is a matter for the Educational Policy Committee. We don't see the advantage of being first in line. We want this to come back to the Senate and make the decision."

"It is as if, gentlemen, that message somehow didn't get across to the committee. It seems to me it was considered [by the committee] that the people who talked at the last meeting -- and it certainly is true only a minority speak -- that we were somehow the incredible, extreme conservatives. Gentlemen, I don't think that's true, and I think that if you proceed as you are doing, coming and telling us what you are going to do and then saying, 'But we'd like your comments on it' -- I think you're headed for a train wreck eventually.

"I think you've got to back up, I think you've got to speak to the educational policy questions. You've given a very narrow picture of what you think educational policy is. Most of the people in this room, I think, believe that educational policy certainly involves the MOOCs. All I can say is: I hope somehow we come to an understanding before an understanding is impossible."

Professor Miller: "Don't blame us, okay? The edX MOOC contract was just announced to us a week after the vice provost was appointed chair from outside of the committee process. I think the more faculty input, the better. And I wouldn't be surprised there's a recommendation of going slow, for very broad reasons, as you say; not narrow educational policy reasons."

Associate Professor Aija Leiponen, Applied Economics and Management: "I have more questions to add on top of your questions, and the number one is for the committee: What is your articulated motivation for going into MOOCs? Why are we doing it? Is it a financial motivation or is it some other set of motivations? So I was just curious to hear from you what is -- maybe that was discussed in the early meeting, but I think I missed that meeting.

"And the second question is regarding the edX. Do you know about the sort of revenue sharing and labor sharing contract is there? So who does what and how are the revenues going to be shared? What is the sort of financial deal with edX?"

Professor Delchamps: "The contract is pretty elaborate and detailed about that revenue sharing business, and they get the first N thousand over whatever they make, and then we get this little piece. At this point, the provost's office doesn't expect to do anything but at best break even for this first two years, if that, of the edX contract.

"And by the way, the contract is over after two years. So unless we sign a new one with them or with somebody else, we won't have a MOOC consortium contract after two years. How we got there, that really came down from above, I'd say. I'd say the provost set up a committee in the fall, we had a faculty forum, we talked about it at length in September here.

"Joe set up a faculty forum on MOOCs in the Statler -- that was pretty well attended -- video presentations from Daphne Koller and Anant Agarwal from edX, Daphne Koller from Coursera. We talked for a while, and then the provost in consultation with the faculty set up committee that reported back to him in

January, recommending that Cornell join one of the MOOC consortia, and they recommended in particular that we join edX, if we could get a good contract; and if not, then join Coursera.

“We got what they considered to be a good contract with edX, which they signed last spring. So one thing I hear at these meetings sometimes is nobody asked us, and that's just not true. I'm not hearing it from you at all, but we were cut in on this from the beginning, like last September. We had the faculty forum, we had the faculty committee. It was a large faculty committee, working with the provost, led by Eva Tardos, and they made this recommendation. That's why we're here.”

The Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters, Eric Cheyfitz: “David, I really beg to differ with you on that. I think that's disingenuous. I want to just expand a little on what Professor Howland said. These things are supposed to come -- I have two emails from the provost and the president telling me that MOOCs, the overall decision to get into this business -- and that's what they're looking for -- was not educational policy, but clearly it is educational policy.

“And it did not come through the senate, as it should have. So this was something, a top-down decision that was made by the administration, and it's in keeping with the way the administration is making a lot of decisions these days, including its connection to Technion, et cetera, et cetera.

“So that's the first thing. I beg to differ with you on the fact the faculty had input on this. Specialized, hand-picked people had input on it, and those people come from very interested parties in the Engineering School and in Computer Technologies. There's tremendous blowback on this around the country from Humanities people.

“I've made these points before. We're starting a new year. Let me make them again. It's going to undermine in significant ways our graduate students who are looking for jobs, because as soon as you start selling these courses around the country, what happens is you're homogenizing education and you're leaving room to hire adjunct and piecemeal kinds of people.

“So that's the first thing. The Humanities, of course, these are not suited generally for Humanities courses. And also, Dick mentioned in his presentation

that we would be selling these courses, the ones that are MOOCs, right, to non-elite institutions. I believe that's the language you used.

“And in fact, a lot of the critique that's come from around the country is that this is creating a two-tier educational system in which elite people, people with lot of money, can come to Cornell and sit in classes with all of us and get a real education, as we understand it; whereas people who can't afford this kind of education are going to be getting homogenized education online, without real contact with human beings.

“So my objection to this is not that Cornell won't handle this responsibly. Maybe it will. My suggestion is probably it will, in terms of the institution here; but A, we were not consulted as a senate, and B, we're participating in a national movement that ultimately is degrading education.

“The other thing is Georgia Tech is starting a master's, a totally MOOC master's program, and some of the feedback that's come from that is it's not in the end going to cost students less even; that because of the cost of making MOOCs, it's going to cost students just as much as coming to class, sitting with professors, having the kind of contact that leads to an education.

“So I think this whole thing has been imposed from the top, imposed uncritically with the kind of discussion we would hope to have, and that now vis-a-vis what Professor Howland said, we are just asked to sit here and give feedback to a fait accompli.”

Professor Delchamps: “One of the reasons Dick posed this question, I think, is exactly that. I don't think anyone on the DLC wants to see our courses undermining what's going on at San Jose State or whatever. And we were careful, we looked in the contract, we found text that said that Cornell could refuse to allow its edX MOOCs to be used in this way or that way, as long as we had a good reason.

“And I'm hoping that includes not selling them and having all adjuncts teaching kids at San Jose State. I think that that's something a lot of us hope that doesn't happen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: These are serious policies -- not so that we're all now going to hope for the best. I don't think that usually works.

Associate Professor David Pizarro, Psychology: "I've had contact with at least three colleagues at other universities who have done these MOOCs, and they each have fairly strong opinions about how positive they are. I think the only thing I want to say is that all of the concerns that you outlined just now are concerns that are on my mind and I think on the minds of a lot of people; but let's not say it's undermining education unless we have some source of evidence that it is, because I fear that once we start speaking this way, then this claim is made without evidence, and the decision is made, but it's equally likely that the opposing view is a claim that's made with just as little evidence to support it.

"So let's try and see if there's good data on whether or not students' education is undermined. Are there any sort of controlled studies in which a MOOC is proposed in which one certain set of students at the same university take it. All these studies are being done, the data is being collected, but it's not in yet because it's messy.

"So the patience that we're asking them to address the MOOC problem, I think we should have a bit of the same kind of patience and wait for the data to get in, when we are making empirical claims."

Professor Miller: "We have started to look for those studies. So far, we've discovered one respectable study (there's a lot of junk out there put out by institutions with an ax to grind), by Columbia Teachers College, comparing outcomes in community colleges for on the one hand exclusive use of online, on the other hand face-to-face instruction. Exclusive use of online had inferior outcomes, especially for disadvantaged students.

"I asked Suzanne Mettler of the Government Department -- she's about to finish what I think will be an extremely influential book on higher education policy -- if she had encountered any other studies, respectable studies (the protocols, if you have that sort of stomach, would turn your stomach on a lot of cases). She said, "No. That's the only one I found."

"One possibility is "Well, it's all new and we should wait." Notice in a way, it is not all new -- over 6 million students in higher education are taking at least one online course. In many universities, including Syracuse, I believe, and Rutgers, this is a standard way of taking courses, and transcripts do not discriminate between online and non-online courses.

“So maybe we should be hopeful, maybe we should be worried, but that's the state of the evidence, and we all agree that's terribly important, what we've discovered.

Associate Professor Carl Franck, Physics: “Could you clarify, when we say we're selling our courses to other universities, what exactly that means? That that was part of the edX thing.”

Professor Delchamps: “They don't say it, but we've assumed that their primary revenue stream is probably going to be selling these things, licensing these things to places to use however they see fit. Now, however they see fit might not mean to replace faculty members with robots or whatever, or it could just mean as a supplement to a class, or it could mean replacing faculty members with robots or turning the teaching of ethics into a homogenized experience, ethics according to one dude at Harvard, instead of a variety of opinions. And so we've just assumed that's how edX is going to make money, but I don't know. They don't say it explicitly.”

Professor Miller: “Well, it's been more than an assumption. Of course, with initial investments over \$100 million, doing it through having ads for textbooks isn't going to work, but Anant Agarwal, in an interview with "The Chronicle of Higher Education," has said that his hope for getting earnings that get back the investment is ultimately fees from universities for licensing for credit. Notice, not our sale. Who is “we”? In this case it's at our discretion but we have to be reasonable, according to the contract, in refusing.”

Speaker Walcott: “Last question. Risa.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Thanks for coming and giving the report. I think it's really important to try to deal with this through this senate governance process. And so what I wanted to ask and perhaps also suggest, but it really is a question, is just what is the role of the faculty? What is the potential role of the faculty on this committee? Because it seems in a certain way it's really hard for the faculty on the committee, because certain decisions have been made top-down without a very good faculty governance process, as Eric pointed out.

“And so is there something that you can do to actually improve that process? Are there certain things that you can do as faculty to make sure that the EPC really does get involved before decisions are made? Of course, we all know that's really hard to do, because the administration tends to run with things; but

the questions that have been raised about the labor issues in terms of the impact on tenure track faculty and graduate students, the impact on our colleagues, because of the greedy time aspect of putting together these kinds of courses, there have been national questions raised about whether this undermines the potential for getting more public funding to universities.

“These are very big policy questions. I, of course, personally wish they had been addressed first, but I'm wondering, what do you think you can really do to get these basic policy questions discussed and to have them discussed through the governance process using our standing committees?

“And you mentioned also -- I just wanted to address the question of whether there should be additional faculty on this Distance Learning Committee. It might be good to quite consciously put people on who are critical of the process and to also -- I noticed that for tenure track faculty who are not administrators, I don't think there were any women, and that's kind of noticeable. So perhaps there's something you could do to help to promote more diversity on the committee.”

Professor Miller: “There was a resignation of a woman professor. All we can do under our charge is advise, and the advice could certainly be “You're on the wrong track, don't do it;” but a report advising the faculty and the provost, that's what we do. And I think the rest is, in part, up to you.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you very much.”

Professor Delchamps: “One sentence. I'm assuming that when the subgroups, subcommittees that Dick mentioned report back to the main committee and give their reports and we put it together into the big thing, a lot of that report is going to be sending things to faculty committees like CAPP, and EPC in particular, that are within their purview. Well, we haven't done it yet, so I can't know it. Oh, yeah. I'm sure that we will. As sure as I can be, not having done it yet.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you. That is the end of our time, and so I declare the meeting adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)