

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, February 10, 1999

The Dean of the Faculty, J. Robert Cooke, called the meeting to order and called for the approval of Professor Melissa Hines, Chemistry & Chemical Biology, to serve as Acting Speaker because John Pollak is out of town. Professor Hines was accepted as Acting Speaker and she then called on Dean Cooke for his opening remarks.

1. REMARKS FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY

J. Robert Cooke: "I will move through this quickly, so stop me if you want some detail. We have on our website an explanation of the change in the payroll and what happened to December 31st. Associate Professor Alan McAdams has spent a significant amount of time interacting with faculty members on this. The conclusion is that it was done properly, but if you have questions, he's present and can respond to questions. Otherwise, I'll assume that I can skip on to another topic.

"Next is the faculty hockey team of which I was honored by being asked to be honorary head coach. Here is the list of the people ([Appendix A](#), attached), 2 women and the rest men and 4 or 5 of them are over 50, and let me tell you that it is impressive to see people do that, and I'm completely envious of what they were able to do. They had two games, the first we lost 4 to 3, the second was won 10 to 0. The mayor was the coach for the alumni team. Anyway, it's a great event and I'm indeed honored to have been associated with it. It's lots of fun. I told them that there were two things that I watched enough of professional hockey to know. The first is that you have to be well dressed if you're coaching, and the second is that you have to have an absolute stoic, pan face throughout the game. I almost made the latter one and that was about the extent of my contribution.

"All right, we have two major events scheduled. We worked pretty hard over the break since our last meeting in December at which at the very end you gave us some instruction. You wanted something done on Campus Climate, so we have a major part of this meeting devoted to that. There are two other campus-wide events that I want to call to your attention. The first is a week from today at this regular time. You will recognize that it is scheduled at the backup time for this meeting so that I would have, at least, a hundred people who had that slot on their schedule reserved. It is a forum on the Strategic Plans for Athletics and Physical Education. There's a write-up in the Cornell Chronicle. There will be 30 minutes for a presentation by the Director of Physical Education and Athletics and the Chair of the Faculty Committee on Physical Education and Athletics and some other faculty members from that committee. There will be 45 minutes for prepared questions. We have asked that the Student Assembly, the Employee Assembly, and you to supply questions. I would like those in by tomorrow, if at all possible, because I'd like to share them with the panel so that if they

have to do some homework it'll be possible. We'll also have 15 minutes of questions from the floor in case someone is not part of the planning process. Here are some of the issues that might interest you. There's a call for additional resources. Where does this priority fit among the other priorities of the University? There's a call for a better win/loss record. How will that affect the present/future balance of intramural versus intercollegiate sports? How much of an additional investment will be needed to attract a net improvement in alumni support? Do we know the cost required to produce a program that provides a sense of community and attracts fans? What additional pressures are likely to be made on admissions standards, if we're not going to add athletic scholarship? I would also like to call your attention to how we are already experiencing pressures to lower or change admission procedures. I would unfairly call it lowering the standards; those who are asking for it would not characterize it in that way. There's also a call for an administrative modification on whether intramurals and intercollegiate sports would be handled in a separate program. This, I would repeat, is a draft plan and is for discussion. It does not mean that it will happen. It means that it is under consideration and could happen.

"In connection with today's theme on Campus Climate, we have organized a University-wide Faculty Forum for March 17, which is the week after the March 10 meeting. The title of the session is 'Cornell 1969: Key Issues Then and Now.' It will be built around a scholarly book by Professor Downs from Wisconsin, who was a student here in '69 and who has spent multiple years writing this book. It is being published by Cornell Press and copies will be available for sale at the foyer of Call Auditorium, if you wish to buy it. You will have the first chance to get a copy since it is not yet available to the general public. The participants are President Rawlings; Professor Downs, the author of the book; President Emeritus Dale Corson, who was Provost at the time of the events of '69; Kenneth McClane and Walter LaFeber who were also here; and so was I. In fact, I served as second speaker of the University Senate for the first full year.

"Two more things, quickly, to bring to a close. Bob Harris has agreed to chair a planning group that would develop a dialogue on 'Campus Climate for Students: Diversity and Inclusion.' If everything goes as we expect, it would be done immediately after the break, and we would use the open forum on March 17 as a way of getting the focus on this. Here are the committee members, in case you wish to talk to them ([Appendix B](#), attached). At the next meeting, I will ask Professor Harris to give a more detailed description, as we have those plans in place. At this moment, you need to know that we are imagining a conversation that would take place in every department on campus and we would supply the resources, much as for the Academic Leadership Series. The rest of the plans are still in progress, and Professor Harris will report to you at the next meeting.

"One last thing I should mention is that I had a conversation with a student on the issue of dissection of frogs. I am a late-comer to this conversation. What I proposed is that he

identify the students who feel offended by the labs that they were taking. I will try to arrange a conversation either between the people who teach those labs or other knowledgeable people in the Biological Sciences community, to see whether there is any accommodation needed, whether the issue is widespread or is limited to a small number of people. I will ask that it be studied by a faculty committee, but we will ask them not to report until after I have had a chance to have that conversation so that I can understand what's going on. There are some strongly held beliefs by the students on the one side, who are asking not to use frogs for dissection and, on the other hand, the faculty who assert, which we have long asserted, that the faculty member is responsible for the content of his or her course. So that is a sense of the kind of issues that we'll be dealing with."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, are there any comments or questions for Dean Cooke? Seeing none, before we continue on, I've been asked to remind you of some rules regarding Senate meetings. First is that all members of the University Faculty that are not members of the Senate shall be entitled and encouraged to attend any meeting of the Senate and to participate in debate, but may make no motions or vote. The second is symbolic of the records of meetings and it says that the official record of the meeting shall be kept by the Secretary who may use any means he or she finds appropriate to prepare an accurate record of the proceedings. All other participants, including members or visitors are prohibited from photographing, sound recording, video taping, or using any other electronic means to record the proceedings.

"Okay, so we'll continue on to the next item on the agenda, which is questions and answers for Provost Randel."

2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR THE PROVOST

Provost Don Randel: "If I might report first, briefly, on the latest news from Albany. The good news is that the Chancellor has, in fact, with the permission of the SUNY board, requested the additional funds that will be required to at least make whole the salary agreements that were already negotiated and a number of initiatives as well. They are going to seek something on the order of \$100 million of new resources for SUNY. As you perhaps know, the Governor pushed way down what he was willing to allow for SUNY, and he did not include in his own executive budget any of what SUNY previously had requested -- virtually nothing. Having done that, SUNY can fight back with the legislature, and the legislature seems favorably disposed towards SUNY. Indeed, the questioning of the Chancellor was altogether friendly, more of the nature to animate him to say that the Governor's budget is inadequate, and the legislature needs to help us out. This puts the Chancellor in a slightly difficult position, of course. But he, having announced that he was leaving by the end of the year, felt free to say and his master on the board seem to not have prevented him from saying that, yes, SUNY needs more resources for a variety of things. My guess, although it is only a guess, is

that the legislature will succeed in restoring a good deal of what SUNY had previously planned to ask for and that the Governor will compromise and, having pushed it way down to start with, it will come up to a steady state.

"The SMART New York Initiative thing, which is SUNY, Cornell, etc., has now been scaled back, and all this started at \$50 million a year to create a fund to go after matching grants with, then was \$25 million, and then at the request that was presented yesterday before the legislature, it was down to \$10 million. How much of that would come to Cornell remains to be seen, but it would hardly accomplish anything that we had hoped for originally. I'll keep you abreast of that.

"In the meantime, we are mounting a much bigger grassroots efforts with alumni and friends of the University. We need to engage much more broadly in a kind of retail effort. The process is somewhat different than in the legislature with the legislative committees becoming more publicly called in the budget process. So we have just now developed the letter that will go to lots of Cornell friends to say what they ought to be telling their own representatives, that faculty salaries is the first on that list. There are only four items on that list that we want people to carry the message about. Simultaneously we're trying to do what we can with the executive branch as well. The President and the Chairman of the Board are working on this very steadily. Are there any questions?"

Professor David Rosen, Music: "This is a preamble and a two-part question. Contrary to all expert advice, the Dean of the Arts College proposes to dissolve the Department of Modern Languages and to reassign the teaching of modern languages to the area studies programs, that is, the literature departments. Although one could scarcely guess from the Dean's comments or the discussion at the Arts College meeting last week, this issue would have ramifications for the entire University. Forty-three percent of students who pre-enroll in DML come from outside the Arts College. Here's the question. Do you believe it is appropriate for the Dean of the Arts College to make such a decision unilaterally or do you believe that the stakeholders in other colleges should have a say as well? And do you plan to become involved in this matter?"

Provost Randel: "As for part one, I guess it depends a little bit on what we mean by 'say' and 'have a say'. I have already been involved in conversations with people outside the College who have expressed interest in this, and I'm sure that the College itself is perfectly aware of those conversations. The responsibility for language teaching is primarily that of the Arts College, and the Arts College serves many constituencies not just in language teaching, but in mathematics, and physics and chemistry, and a whole range of other subjects. I'm sure that the College will take account of the needs of the University. Half of what the Arts College teaches is taught to people outside of the Arts college. I think it is mindful of its responsibilities in that regard and I trust the leadership of the College to remain informed and to understand what those needs are."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Question in the back?"

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "Vice Provost Garza sent an e-mail to everybody on February 5th. Are you familiar with the e-mail that talks about the reorganization plans for biology by President Rawlings?"

Provost Randel: "Yes."

Professor Wayne: "It goes on to say that 'This change recognizes recommendations from faculty.' Exactly what do you mean by 'faculty' in this instance?"

Provost Randel: "What change is being discussed?"

Professor Wayne: "Well, as far as I can see, it's talking about the Task Force Report that talked about an advisory committee. It seemed to me that there were a majority of cases where the faculty was against the report."

Provost Randel: "If it's the memo I believe it to be, I'm hardly able to speak for its author entirely. If it's about the constitution of the advisory committee, which has been part of discussion for some time, I believe what Vice Provost Garza is saying is that having talked with faculty about the constitution of that committee, it has been determined that the membership should be somewhat broader than what was first thought. That memo doesn't have to do with discussing the Task Force Report or that set of recommendations."

Professor Wayne: "Given the fact that the decisions that Day Hall seem to make don't represent the majority of the faculty, I'd appreciate either not getting these memos or, if I should continue to get these memos, please define when you say 'faculty,' what you mean by 'faculty.' To do that, I would encourage you to take votes."

Provost Randel: "And I recommend you consult the helpdesk at CIT that can help you arrange a filter on your e-mail, and you won't get anything that you don't want to get."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we have time for one more brief question."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering and Senator-at-Large: "This is just a question on the SMART New York fund that you just mentioned. Is that \$10 million over and above the state appropriation for the Electronic Interconnect Focus Center in Albany and RPI?"

Provost Randel: "Yes, this would be \$10 million in new dollars to be awarded to units in the SUNY system on some more or less competitive basis to use as matching funds for other kinds of projects, all calculated to increase the volume of sponsored research. There are other things such as the one that you mentioned. We have also pursued other

initiatives with the executive and with certain other state agencies which we continue to pursue. The fact is, if you reckon a \$10 million dollar fund, and we as 10% of SUNY got \$1 million of it, that will not do the kinds of things we need to be doing to compete effectively in sponsored research. It will take more than that statewide, but it is a new separate pot of money."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 9, 1999 MEETING

Acting Speaker Hines: "You've all had a chance to review the minutes from the last Senate meeting. Does anyone have any objection to those minutes? If none, I'd like to call for unanimous approval? Then let's accept the minutes and now I'll call on Associate Dean Rasmussen to give the Nominations and Elections Committee report."

4. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "You have already seen this is the call to the meeting. These are the actions of the Nominations and Elections Committee since the last time that the Senate met:

Affirmative Action Committee

Mary Brinton, A&S

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies

Michael Kazarinoff, CHE

Faculty Senate-at-Large

Michael Owren, A&S

Professors-at-Large Selection Committee

Alison Powers, A&S

University Conflicts Committee

Gregory Siskind, Medical College

University Faculty Committee

Peter Schwartz, CHE

"Are there any questions?"

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, if not, then I'll call on Dean of Students, John Ford, to give us a presentation on Campus Climate."

5. PRESENTATION BY DEAN FORD ON CAMPUS CLIMATE

John Ford, Robert W. and Elizabeth C. Staley Dean of Students: " I am on leave this semester working at the University of Chicago as an American Council on Education Fellow . I was delighted to accept Bob Cooke's invitation to speak at this Faculty Senate meeting today because I want to encourage faculty support and participation in efforts to make this a better community for our student body. We must not let differences in gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, class, or race divide our community. Building learning relationships, respect, and friendships across all of these differences merits our attention. But, because of the incidents last fall, my remarks today focus mainly on our commitment to minority students.

"Last semester there was a wave of racial harassment incidents targeted at our students of color. These racist e-mail messages, phone calls, late night street confrontations, and suspected arson attempts provoked fear and outrage on the part of many students, faculty and staff. These events prompted the administration to establish a hot line for harassment incident reporting, improve campus lighting, establish education and staff training programs, and enhance police patrols. Vice Presidents Susan Murphy and Hal Craft and Associate Vice President LeNorman Strong should be commended for their leadership in bringing about these and other campus-wide responses from the administration.

"But as the racial harassment crisis subsides, more faculty leadership is needed to help make this a more cohesive campus community for our diverse student body. Why? Because we need to make sure this is a good place for all of our students. Unfortunately, Cornell is gaining a national reputation as an uninviting place. Let me give you three examples.

"In December I received a call from Moses Jones in the U.S. Justice Department. He said that he had recently received several complaints about racial harassment at Cornell and that he was calling to offer assistance in providing campus education and staff training to prevent and control racial harassment.

"A few days after that, I got a call from a Cornell alum who is a guidance counselor at a New York high school from which Cornell has accepted many graduates. She said that she was getting calls from parents of currently enrolled Cornell students who were asking her if she thought they should take their sons and daughters out of Cornell to protect them from the racial harassment and late night stalking occurring on campus.

These parents also asked her whether the high school was doing the right thing by encouraging qualified minority students to come to Cornell.

"Last week I had lunch with Lucinda Katz, the Director of the University of Chicago Laboratory School, where I was a student from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Lucinda introduced me to several members of her staff, including the placement director who told me that many of their graduates over the years have had difficulties adjusting to racial tensions as students at Cornell because their experience with diversity at the Lab School had been so much better. My own experience at the Lab School gave me a lasting optimism about what can be done to foster and maintain a positive climate for a diverse student body where faculty, staff, and students embrace this as part of their education.

"The need to enhance our national reputation as a university which welcomes our diverse student body is not the only reason for increased faculty support and participation in efforts to improve the campus climate. According to Carol Geary Schneider, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, teaching college students how to function in a diverse society has become essential, not elective.

"A review of the research literature entitled, 'Diversity Works: the Emerging Pattern of How Students Benefit,' was published by the AACU in 1997. That report suggests what works in campus diversity efforts. For example, here are a few excerpts,

'The literature suggests that diversity initiatives positively affect both minority and majority students on campus. Significantly, diversity initiatives have an impact not only on student attitudes and feelings toward intergroup relations on campus, but also on institutional satisfaction, involvement, and academic growth.'

'Mentoring programs, involving both student peers and faculty, consistently result in improved adjustment, retention, and academic success rates for their participants.'

'Specialized student support programs and campus community have been pitted against each other. However, research results suggest that institutional commitment to both contributes to the educational success of all students. These findings underscore the capacity of individuals, groups, and institutions to thrive through acknowledgment of multiple affiliations and identities on campus.'

'Contrary to widespread reports of self-segregation among students of color on campuses, the research finds this pattern more common of white students. Students of color interact more with white students than the reverse.'

'The evidence continues to grow that serious engagement of issues of diversity in the curriculum and in the classroom has a positive impact on attitudes toward racial issues,

on opportunities to interact in deeper ways with those who are different, on cognitive development, and on overall satisfaction and involvement with the institution. These benefits are particularly powerful for white students who have had less opportunity for such engagement.'

"What should we do at Cornell? I suggest that we consider each of the following initiatives. Students should be required to work with people different from themselves in classes or possibly in required discussion groups. We should develop a university-wide diversity course requirement. We should support existing programs, including the ethnic studies programs and the ethnic-theme program houses. We should participate in a new initiative, led by Professor Robert Harris and The Reverend Robert Johnson, that will engage students, faculty, and staff in every department in discussions of race and diversity. A fine example of this was set by the Johnson School's climate survey last spring which led to a day of 'Dialog on Difference' this fall. Both were designed to find out how comfortable various groups were at the School so that efforts could be made to improve the climate.

"Faculty leadership and participation in any or all of these kinds of efforts will follow in Ezra Cornell's footsteps when he said that he wanted Cornell to be a place where African-American students could study and learn, no matter what anyone might say in opposition.

"All of us need to consider these issues and work to help Cornell embrace all of our students. Thank you."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Any brief comments or questions for Dean Ford? If not, then let's move on to the Resolution on Campus Climate and I will ask Kerry Cook of the University Faculty Committee to introduce this resolution."

6. RESOLUTION ON CAMPUS CLIMATE

Associate Professor Kerry Cook, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "At the end of the December meeting, in the Good and Welfare time, I spoke to you on behalf of the UFC to see if you wanted the UFC to pursue ways for the Faculty Senate to contribute to the improvement of the environment for minorities on campus. While there was no dissent in a straw vote to pursue this issue, during the discussion time a couple of senators requested more information about the incidents that have been occurring on campus and about the degrading of the campus climate for diversity. While we didn't feel it was constructive or appropriate for the UFC to become investigators or interpreters of these incidents, steps have been taken to make the information easily available to you, mainly through Dean Cooke's efforts with the University Faculty website, where you can also find out about other faculty-based ways to address the issue. You've just heard Dean Ford's comments that Cornell is getting the reputation as

an unwelcome place for minorities and, speaking for myself, I find that pretty embarrassing and totally unacceptable.

"Because timing was important and because some faculty did not seem to be aware of the incidents on campus, the UFC sent out a letter to the full faculty at the beginning of the semester. You all should have received this letter. The letter draws attention to the campus climate issue, it really defines the campus climate issue for the faculty, alerts the faculty to the problem in a general way, and guides them to the website. It also solicits ideas for faculty involvement.

"Today we are bringing before the Senate a Resolution on Campus Climate. The purpose of the resolution is to express the Faculty Senate's concern for and interest in the intellectual and social environment at Cornell as it relates to diversity. You should all have a copy of the resolution. I'll read through it.

Whereas, Cornell University is committed to providing an environment that permits equal opportunity for all members of the community to fulfill their potential for intellectual and social growth and that also permits the free and open exchange of opinions and ideas, and

Whereas, the use of harassing speech or actions directed against particular individuals or particular groups of individuals on the basis of their race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, or religion is not a legitimate part of that exchange, and damages the trust and mutual respect essential to the well-being of our community,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Cornell Faculty Senate urges the Cornell faculty to play a more active role in ensuring a safe and open campus environment.

"Do I need to ask for unanimous consent?"

Acting Speaker Hines: "Yes, this has been amended, there is a slight change in the original wording, so we need to adopt this. I'd like to ask for unanimous consent of this small word change? Are there any objections? Then we'll adopt the amendment."

Professor Cook: "I'm a little worried when people see this resolution. They might think that it's a bit too much, a bit too apple-pie and motherly. But let me remind you that the faculty silence on these issues has been noted across campus, particularly by the students, and this resolution is being presented as one step in our speaking out to keep or maybe retain an inclusive society at Cornell. It's a bit of a tight rope walk to maintain an open society but I hope that the faculty speaking out through this resolution and in other ways, again, I'll refer you to the website, might help the campus climate for everyone at Cornell. Thank you."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, the motion is on the floor. Are there any questions or comments?"

Professor Ballantyne: "Is there some sort of definition of 'harassing speech or actions'? Is any speech harassing?"

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "I'm on the UFC and we had a discussion about how to word this and there isn't one tight definition of what is harassing. One of the operative pieces here was the direction of the speech or actions toward individuals or groups of individuals as opposed to a notion of general speech that is made at a rally or something. The notion is this derogatory speech or conduct made toward individuals or groups of individuals is both the content, in terms of the derogatory speech, and also the direction towards the particular groups of individuals or particular individuals."

Professor Gordon Teskey, English: "Does this resolution include a campus speech code?"

Professor Cook: "No."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Are there any other questions or comments?"

Associate Professor Walter Mebane, Government: "Again, this issue of harassing speech makes me extremely nervous. Putting things together seems to say that harassing speech, which is quite vaguely defined, means a lot of things and that it should be protected by academic freedom would be undesirable because it is dangerous speech. I don't know if it's open to amend this, but it seems to me that it is very hazardous. 'Harassing' speech will be up to the perceiver and we've all heard of people objecting to contents of lectures because they feel personally insulted or attacked."

Acting Speaker Hines: "According to rules of Faculty Senate, you cannot amend it without sending the amendment out a day in advance."

Dean Cooke: "Unless there's unanimous consent for a change."

Professor Mebane: "Well, I think that this issue of the vagueness of harassment and the movement towards particular groups as opposed to individuals puts this resolution in a very ambiguous and not necessarily positive light. I think that it would be unambiguous and positive to refer to harassing actions directly against individuals, which I think would cover all of the incidents that were complained about and so horrible in the fall. There is some ambiguity about actions versus speech, but I think that there is much less ambiguity for what that would mean. So, I would very much support a resolution that referred to harassing actions directed at particular individuals on the basis of race and sex, but that is too vague."

Professor Lieberwitz: "You know, I think that the concern for free speech and academic freedom is a real one and one that should be taken seriously. It's one that I take

seriously, as well. It seems to me that there are two things to that. One is that we really were focused on the notion of when speech was included, not a general notion of speech that someone might hear at a rally and say, 'Well, I don't like that speech, it's harassing,' as opposed to speech directed at individuals in either a one-on-one, or let's say a one on a small group working together. So that the group reference here is one of individual as opposed to groups in general. So that was the attempt to take it out of the general speech being put out of that route.

"The other thing is that we didn't have any contemplation in our discussion about this leading to a speech code. This is put in there as background to recognize that this kind of speech directed at particular individuals either alone or in a particular group of individuals, really does take away from the notion of a place where people can learn comfortably and safely. The faculty should play a role to be more active in trying to create an environment which would avoid that sort of degradation on either one-on-one or small group kind of basis. So there was an attempt to protect academic freedom and free speech. "

Associate Professor Robert Harris, Africana Studies and Research Center: "I understand Professor Mebane's concern. He seemed to ask for a distinction between individuals and groups. Yet, in some ways, this is in response to situations that occurred in the fall - someone shouting racial epithets at Ujamaa Residential College that were not directed at particular individuals but were directed at the residents of that particular college. This is a situation that has been referred to the Judicial Administrator and is in process. Also, the situation of the fire being set in front of Akwe:kon, again, it's hard to identify that this is a situation threatening against particular individuals, although it was basically directed towards the residents of this house. That's why I think groups of individuals is included here as opposed to just actions or speech directed at identifiable individuals."

Professor Mebane: "I know I'm speaking out of turn, but I understand the intent, I just don't think it's necessary to add the language. All the residents living in that building would be named as targets. The intent here is to protect a targeted minority but the language there could easily be used to suppress or legitimately constitute a suppression of a protest by a minority against harassing acts by larger groups whom they cannot identify."

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I would hope that if we're serious about diversity that we would also address intellectual diversity. I wrote the Provost and also Bob Cooke memos some months ago on intellectual diversity, and never received an answer. It's my experience that this university does not welcome diversity of ideas in many ways. I was introduced to this in a way that I would not have chosen five or six years ago when group of students came to me and asked me to help them deal with what they felt was severe discrimination against them as religious students, and

politically conservative students in the College of Human Ecology. We met four or five times and talked about these issues, and then asked the Dean and the Associate Dean and a couple of department chairs if we could meet with them and discuss these issues. They would not even agree to sit down and talk with us about these issues, and it was not until about nine months later when President Rhodes contacted the Dean that they even agreed to talk with us about intellectual diversity of ideas.

"I think that if we're going to talk about diversity, we're going to have to look at what Universities are about. They're not just about skin color, as important as that is, or other kinds of diversity of people -- they're about diversity of ideas and there is enormous censorship by omission in this university. We make very little effort to get genuine diversity of ideas. Look at departments like government, where we have maybe roughly 30 faculty, and one conservative, Jeremy Rabkin. Where's some attempt to expose our students to some real diversity of ideas? The College of Human Ecology and the department of Human Development and Family Studies is an intellectual disgrace. They were totally closed to the idea of bringing in faculty who were intellectually competent to really bring in some diversity of ideas. But what about the kinds of response from the administration when an issue, I think it was the Cornell Review, was snatched up and then disposed. I think our President got the Sheldon Award that year for precisely that action. I would hope that if we're going to talk about diversity, we talk about it in a way that is fundamental to universities, and that is diversity of ideas. In some significant respect, this university is a very narrow gauged institution and very hostile to certain kinds of intellectual diversity.

"We see it in other respects, such as the SAFC (Student Assembly Finance Commission) funding, which discriminates powerfully against religious groups on campus. The code says that if you're a religious group, you don't get funding. The reasons are that religious groups are often controversial and they try to proselytize -- as if environmental groups and animal rights groups and others do not do the same things.

"I welcome the discussion of diversity in the sense that we have talked about it, but I think that we do have some very serious problems. I would like sometime, Bob and Don Randel and others, even to have the courtesy of a reply to a six-or eight-page memo that I wrote you some months ago on the subject. I would hope that we would extend the discussion because universities are also, and I'm almost embarrassed to say this, but they're also about ideas, and this is a university where it is very, very difficult to get exposed to various kinds of ideas because they're simply not welcomed here and we may very well attempt to see that that happens. Obviously, we're too sophisticated to censor an individual faculty person after that person is here, but we make very little effort to get real diversity of ideas in many departments in this institution. I think in many cases what we call education is more like indoctrination than the kind of vital, lively encountering of different ideas that the university education ought to be."

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research Center: "I sincerely hope that conservatives are not being harassed by bigoted liberals, but this issue isn't about that. It's about harassment. This thing has no implication or any types of sanctions. Even if the Faculty Senate wanted to apply sanctions, there would probably be a problem with it. All it simply says is that in a community like Cornell, which is presumed to be intellectual, open to free exchange of ideas and tolerance, some exercises of free speech are less acceptable than others. You can argue that the people of the Klu Klux Klan have a right to speak, and many people do, but does it mean that we should be silent because of that right and that we still don't find that speech unacceptable? This is only saying that, and I want to say to you that you should try to put yourselves in the position of harassed minorities of living on campus with small children. We do not have an interest in proclaiming racism because we cannot fight it and many people do not realize that. So I'm just saying simply that it is a simple worded document that we find some patterns of speech and behavior not acceptable in this context, and we'll work to try to sensitize the community to reduce it."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Any other questions or comments? Yes?"

Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "I wanted to align myself with the intent of this motion. I was utterly appalled in the fall when I heard about the incidents on campus. I regard my relationship with my students in my classroom as extremely important, and I found it really horrifying that some of these things were going on outside the classroom. I think it's extremely important for the Senate to adopt this resolution and I put my emphasis on the resolution class, and how important it is to urge the faculty to play a more active role in ensuring the safe and open campus environment. I, myself, am more than willing to do that."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Any other questions?"

Professor Teskey: "I would like to see just the resolution at the end rather than the two whereas paragraphs. I share Professor Mebane's concern about the phrase, 'harassing speech.' I can understand that there can be speech which is unacceptable to the community, but it still disturbs me a bit. I teach a course on the Bible in which it could be thought that there are occasionally things that are offensive to blacks, Jews, women, etc. Often, harassing speech can only be defined as 'that to which somebody else takes offense.' Or we could get into an atmosphere where we are attempting to police language, and as a professor of English, I'm nervous about an atmosphere when language becomes policed. Criticized, yes, but policed, no. I'll mention one other incident and that would simply involve a tenure review case, where a letter from a student who was otherwise appreciative of the professor was otherwise disturbed at very coarse language that was occasionally deployed by the professor. We looked at the nature of the course, and realized that the language was being used for good reasons, but the student chose not to discuss it with the professor, from which an interesting

dialogue could have arose, and chose to instead regard it as harassing speech and wrote a letter for a tenure file. So I remain nervous about the phrase 'harassing speech.' I understand what offensive speech is, I've heard it, and it is offensive and disgusting, but I'm nervous about putting that phrase in this document and because it can be abused."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I consider myself a hawk on the issue of free speech and I do remember a year ago or however long ago it was, discussing very similar wording in the course of talking about the sexual harassment vote. And indeed, we had many debates in committee, and possibly on this floor, about a very similar phrase, namely, directed at particular groups, or particular individuals or groups. In fact, I argued against having the groups in there by just this same argument where people said that that extends it to general statements and the harassing speech should be only confined to when individual speech is confined to individual people. As an example, if it's only forbidden against one person, that if you say 'you're stupid and you're stupid, and I don't like either of you' then it would be okay' because you were doing it against two people, and that seemed silly. In that sense, I found myself on the same side of the issue with regard to sexual harassment as Professor Teskey does here. I think that Professor Edmondson hits the nail on the head because this is a very different situation. With the sexual harassment procedure, we were defining what is punishable and what actions would be sanctioned. And it seems to me that this is a very different situation than making a statement on what we think is desirable in a community. There are certain publications, and I won't mention names, that publish things that I think are reprehensible, but I certainly wouldn't stand up to their right to do it because that's part of free speech. Nonetheless if they ask my advice I would say that they were really damaging Cornell by publishing those things that you have a right to publish because you do poison the atmosphere here for a significant and important part of our constituency, and therefore, I would advise you against it. So I have no problem with the wording in this resolution because we are simply stating our opinion that it is unwise and unhealthy for that broader classification of speech, which is legal, for people to do that. I have no hesitation myself for endorsing that view and voting for it."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I'm very concerned by what Peter just said. I think he has opened a door that I would like to see resolutely closed. I strongly support the first and third paragraphs and I can support much of the second paragraph, but not all of it. I don't have any problems with 'actions'; I don't think that we have the right to set fires in front of other people's homes. That has nothing to do with free speech, academic freedom, or what have you. I am concerned about the extension of the harassing speech clause against groups, and I am very concerned about the defense of that, which was just made, that if we can come together as right-minded people about disliking something, we can have a faculty statement on the issue. It isn't exactly punitive, but it will have the Cornell stamp. I really think that's not getting it at all. I'm

inclined to support most of it, but not all of it for reasons presented by Professor Teskey. Thank you."

Dean Cooke: "I just have a comment on parliamentary status, since there seems to be some confusion. The rules are that if you have an amendment, you must send it out to the other members of the Senate 24 hours before. We send ours out a week early, so if you have any changes you want brought before the body, send them to the Dean of the Faculty's office and we will send them out to the Senate so you have knowledge ahead of time. There are several options open to you, and I'm not intending to imply any course of action here, but you can adopt it as is, or you can reject it as is. Or you could send it back to committee if you feel that there are parts that are too objectionable, but you cannot change it."

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, JGSM: "Bob, I think that if we had unanimous consent, we could change it."

Dean Cooke: "Well, if you have unanimous consent, I think you should change it then."

Professor Barry Carpenter, Chemistry and Chemical Biology: "I've been working hard to figure out how this resolution could lead to an inhibition of anybody's free speech. I have been unable to come up with a scenario that could lead to that event, so I wonder if the people who have been objecting to the language on that basis could give me a plausible scenario by which freedom of speech could be inhibited by the passage of this resolution."

Professor Mebane: "I just wanted to say that I don't write plays, so coming up with scenarios is kind of hard. In general, a scenario that could be covered by this resolution would be if you have a student of color who wants to express his/her concern over the poor climate for students of color on campus, who might, in a conversation with a group of racially, ethnically, and gender mixed students, make strong arguments about how he or she feels oppressed by the racist environment, maybe naming some individuals with whom the person has had bad interactions. As a result of that, some of the students in the group hearing this person may protest against some proceeding in general and this resolution would only say that they would feel empowered to respond to that person's complaint by saying, 'I feel oppressed by your saying that there's a racist environment on campus and I'm a member of the group that you think is racist, and so your speech is harassing me.' That's a scenario that concerns me that is not at all contemplated by the intention of this."

Professor Carpenter: "I'm failing to understand how that is at all related to what would actually be resolved."

Professor Mebane: "I'm sorry I assume that then a faculty member would feel obligated or at least encouraged to confront that student of color and say, 'You ought not to complain about the racist environment on campus because your complaint can be considered harassing.' You may laugh at this, but in fact, I've complained about harassment directed at me, in my department, to my own colleagues, and I've received just that response. So it's not far-fetched; it's a reality. So those complaining, may, in fact, be sanctioned for their complaints. I feel extremely powerfully motivated to support an action against and condemning harassing actions. Speaking from personal experience, it is a very damaging thing to have happened in this environment, as it has happened to me, and I'm clinging specifically to the hazards of bringing in challenges to free speech as part of what is an excellent proposal otherwise. In fact, I'm in a quandary as to whether it remains unamended, which I would like to propose unanimous consent for an amendment, if there's an opportunity to do that, whether I would vote for encouraging the resolution despite my qualms about the 'whereas' in the second paragraph."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Are you proposing an amendment to strike that 'groups' clause?"

Professor Mebane: "If I may do that I would like to rewrite the second paragraph to say, 'Whereas the use of harassing actions directed against particular individuals on the basis. . .' I'm sorry I'm too blind to see it. . ."

Acting Speaker Hines: "So you're trying to strike the speech part?"

Professor Mebane: "'Speech or' and 'or particular groups of individuals'."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we've got a resolution to strike 'speech or' and 'or particular groups of individuals,' which we need unanimous consent to be passed. Are there any objections to this amendment? (Some senators objected.) Okay then, this will not pass."

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Physiology: "The problem with this motion, I think is a non sequitur. There's a danger here. If you put a bunch of statements together that say A is true, B is true, and C is true, and then a non sequitur follows about something else, you're asking for trouble. That's the problem here. I'm sorry if I don't see that as the conclusion, 'Therefore be it resolved. . .' as logically following what's above. I think when you stuff a motion full of assertions that people may or may not agree with and then come out with a conclusion which everybody has to agree with, you're in for trouble. I would recommend, since I don't think it's legal to make a motion after having spoken, but I would hope that someone would make a motion to return this to committee."

Professor Donald Barr, Policy Analysis and Management: "I attended the sessions at Akwe:kon and at Ujamaa, and actually, LeNorman Strong and John Ford, the Dean of Students, were there, to hear from students. And I simply want to say that it was one of the most gut-wrenching, difficult, and in some ways, terrifying sessions that I have ever participated in. To hear our students speak, cry, sob, was truly something that I'll never forget. I guess the thing that I'm truly concerned about is that I think we need to talk about what a 'more active' role means. It is an easy thing to write up there, but I think that the gap between the classroom and the residence hall is wide. I think we do need to talk about different things in relation to this involvement. I know I'm not speaking directly to the motion, but I am speaking to its intent. I asking that at one point, we do that. Thank you."

Professor Baer: "In answer to an earlier question about examples, I forget how you phrased it, my concern is also with the harassing speech. If you engage in this, you're acting in an illegitimate way, you're damaging trust and respect that are essential to the community, and those are pretty serious charges. You're becoming illegitimate. You're damaging what's essential to the community and we don't know what this is yet. There's a lot of discussion about harassing speech. We have many, many examples where people have suffered and have been harassed as faculty for having been accused of harassing speech. I don't want to risk being called illegitimate and as damaging to what is essential to this community unless I know a little more about what I'm buying into. I think that's pretty threatening to traditions of free speech and academic freedom that are very important to universities."

Professor Fine: "I'd like to move to return this to committee to be returned to the Senate at its next regular meeting." (Someone seconded.)

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we'll now vote to send this back to committee to bring back next time. All those in favor? Excuse me, is there any debate?"

Professor McAdams: "Can I offer an amendment to this motion?"

Dean Cooke: "A motion to refer?"

Professor McAdams: "I'd like a point of order. I would like to see if there is a parliamentary procedure to have a vote on whether we could have the first and third paragraphs of this voted on as something we can do today to express our outrage about what has been going on on our campus and having the effects which have just been discussed. I think it is absolutely important to do something. We may be looked upon as nit-picking, although all the issues we have been talking about are important. Is there some way that we could go forward with the vote where the first and third paragraphs could be the motion?"

Dean Cooke: "Professor Martin is out of town today, so I'm serving as Acting Parliamentarian, and you may not bring the same question back before the assembly. There was a vote for unanimous consent to delete number 2."

Professor McAdams: "No, to modify it."

Dean Cooke: "Okay."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we're debating whether or not to bring this back to committee."

Associate Professor Michael Shapiro, Communication: "I guess I'm going to vote against the motion to defer this, because we've waited entirely too long to do something about this. I do have a suggestion of how we could reword the second paragraph, to say something like, 'the use of harassing speech or actions solely directed at making people feel unwelcomed on campus' might be a way to satisfy everybody, but maybe not. In any case, I don't think we should put this off."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we are running out of time so are there any more comments? Peter?"

Professor Stein: "Move the question."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Everyone in favor of sending this back to committee, please raise your hand."

Professor McAdams: "I will ask unanimous consent on whether we can vote to approve this resolution embodying only the first and third paragraphs. Deleting the second paragraph. (Some faculty objected.) Fine."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay so now we'll vote on the entire resolution as it is written here. We're voting on the motion as it is written here. All those in favor, please raise your hand. Okay, those opposed? The motion passes. Okay, now we'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the Resolution on the Reformulation of the Minority Education Committee and I'll ask Associate Dean Rasmussen to introduce this."

7. RESOLUTION ON REFORMULATION OF THE MINORITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "You have before you in the packet of materials for the meeting, this resolution. The rationale is the following. That the Faculty Council of Representatives established the Committee on Minority Education in 1976 as a standing committee. At that time, the conditions of minorities on this campus were different than they are today and we also have the situation that the original charge of the committee

includes responsibility for affirmative action and subsequently, the FCR established an Affirmative Action Committee that has that responsibility. So we have a charge of this committee that is already being taken care of by another committee. We also have the task to fill slots on this committee, but it is ambiguous as to what the Minority Education Committee should be doing. The Nominations and Elections Committee decided that the easiest thing to do would be to come to you with the resolution that you have before you and amend the charge to: broaden the charge to go beyond 'special programs' and include the 'overall educational experience' of minority students; and to eliminate the responsibility for affirmative action among faculty so that it's no longer here.

"We also wish to change the composition of the committee. The first part is the standard language that the committee shall be organized under the standard procedures that govern such committees under the Senate. The second part is where the action is, and that is that the committee shall consist not only of 6 active faculty members, but it will also permit emeritus faculty to serve and also to ask for one staff member, two undergraduate students, and one graduate student, and the Dean of Students ex officio to also serve on this committee. The undergraduate students would be selected by the Student Assembly, one from the endowed colleges and one from the statutory colleges, and the graduate student would be selected by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Are there any questions?"

Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "I'd like to question extending the membership to Emeritus members of the faculty. It seems to me that we're trying to encourage the faculty to take an active interest and that it will dilute that if you allow the committee to staff itself with Emeritus faculty. I realize that they may have more time, but I don't think that they have the same degree of involvement or even the same state."

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "The rationale for this was that the Nominations and Elections Committee was aware of a number of Emeritus faculty who had a lot of energy and experience to bring to this and we wanted to tap that source of ideas and involvement as a positive source."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Any questions or comments? Are we ready to vote on this? Can I have a motion to ask the question? Second? All of those in favor of this motion, please raise your hand? All of those opposed? Okay, the motion carries."

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate reaffirms it is important to retain the Committee on Minority Education, and

WHEREAS, conditions for minority students have changed greatly since this committee was first formed, and

WHEREAS, there is duplication of responsibilities of this committee with another committee of the Faculty Senate,

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee on Minority Education be retained as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and its charge modified as described below:

Charge to the Committee

A. Provide continuing oversight of minority education, including not only review of proposed and on-going special programs but also monitoring the overall educational experience of minority students.

B. Make recommendations to the Faculty and Administration where it judges changes are appropriate to improve minority education.

Composition of the Committee

The Committee shall be organized and operate under the Rules and Procedures governing standing committees of the Faculty Senate.

The Committee shall consist of six active or emeritus members of the University Faculty, one staff member, two undergraduate students (one from the statutory colleges and one from the endowed colleges, to be selected by the Student Assembly), one graduate student (to be selected by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly), and the Dean of Students ex officio. The term of service for faculty and staff shall be three years and, for the students, it shall be one year.

"Now we'll move on to Good and Welfare. We do have a full slate, so I'll call on Associate Dean Lynne Abel."

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

Lynne Abel, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Director of Admissions, College of Arts & Sciences: "I'd like to go back to the topic that Dean Cooke introduced before, which is the Strategic Plan for Athletics and Physical Education. I think that Dean Cooke announced the forum, and I would urge you all to take this plan very seriously, to read it, and to think about it and encourage your colleagues to do the same. The plan emphasizes, as Dean Cooke said, developing winning teams, and it is very specific. It wants Cornell to rank consistently in the top three in the Ivy League. It also calls for developing a viable financial model for this endeavor. It doesn't talk much about how much this viable financial model will cost, but it just calls upon us to create one. Further, the plan says very little about developing broad-based programs in physical education and outdoor education. It even recommends that responsibility for those programs be transferred elsewhere. Dean Cooke posed questions such as what

kind of impact this would have on Cornell and how much it would cost. I don't have answers to those questions, but I would like to predict the tendency of those answers. I think it will indeed skew our educational priorities and it will cost a lot of money and so I think it deserves the faculty's consideration. The plan also calls for changes in admissions procedures that really will impact the integrity of those procedures and the colleges' traditional roles in those procedures. We already have a directive that seriously undermines the integrity of admission procedures by creating a special interest group for athletes. The appropriate committee of this body will be considering a resolution on this issue, and some of the colleges are considering it as well. I suspect that the Provost and the President are receiving considerable advice on this issue from Trustees; one might call it pressure. I would urge the faculty to consider this issue as well, and to give the President and the Provost the benefit of its advice."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, the next speaker will be Professor Carol Rosen from Modern Languages."

Associate Professor Carol Rosen, Modern Languages: "I've asked for a minute or two to bring up the issue of dissection choice -- not dissection -- but dissection choice. So we're not talking about the bodies of animals, but the minds of students and their ethical convictions, which must be respected in keeping with the same ideals and banners raised in our discussion today on diversity, tolerance, and respect. We have a significant number of students, who by some beautiful miracle, have grown up to be sensitive to the plight of animals on all fronts. For some, it's a religious conviction while for others it's a secular conviction of ethics. These are people who feel revulsion at the devastation visited upon the meek at the hands of the mighty.

"Now Cornell says to them: 'What's your problem? You don't have to do dissections. You can leave the room. You can take a different course.' Well, that's not enough. I believe that's like saying, 'Look, my prelim is on your religious holiday, but it's important for faculty to be able to design their courses the way they want. Cornell has many fine courses that do not have prelims on your religious holiday, so go take one of them.' There is a better way. I'm told that today there exists excellent high-tech teaching materials such as interactive CD-ROMs that not only provide a quality educational alternative to dissection, but some say, make for a more effective educational experience (besides being less costly over a period of time).

"We need reform in two parts: one is high-quality educational tools available on demand for students who want them. Secondly, create a climate of tolerance and accommodation. Students are young and shy and worried. We need to provide a climate in which they feel comfortable in asking to use the alternatives to dissection for their own private reasons, without fear of being stigmatized or forced to defend their position. This is a resolution asking for those changes. This is not just the voice of the student activists. This is a resolution passed unanimously by the Student Assembly,

representing the entire Cornell student body, on March 26, 1998. It asks for both of those kinds of reform that I mentioned: making quality educational alternatives available and assuring a climate of tolerance in which students can follow their conscience without having to feel like trouble makers.

"Now close to a year after the resolution has been passed, students are asking for our help and our endorsement in achieving the implementation of these issues. I don't know whether this matters, because we do have many issues competing for our attention in the coming meeting, too. But if a resolution comes across this body, please consider lending your support. If any of you want specific information, I think that there are various handouts in the corridor and there are members of Cornell Students for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, a group which has asked me to serve as faculty advisor. This is a position formerly occupied by Professor Carl Sagan, who would undoubtedly be making this speech much better than I can, if he could be here. Thank you."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, we'll now move on to some comments by Howard Howland."

Professor Howland: "Thank you very much. I wish to respond, necessarily briefly, to Professor Rosen's remarks on the Student Assembly resolution regarding student choice in dissection.

"Firstly, it should be noted that all of the introductory biology courses at Cornell do provide students alternatives to dissection. A very small minority of students actually choose to take these alternatives, and laboratory exercises which involve dissection are rated very highly by the vast majority of Cornell students.

"Secondly, in our upper level courses in anatomy and physiology, it is simply not true that there exist 'high quality alternatives to dissection'. If I told you otherwise, I would tell you a lie. The subject of those courses is the animal body and how it works. The abandonment of dissection would mean the abandonment of the courses themselves.

"Thirdly, I would like to point out that of the eleven areas of concentration in the biological sciences at Cornell, only one, animal physiology, requires that their students be proficient in dissection. No student on this campus is being blocked from a career in biology because he or she is unwilling to dissect animals.

"Fourthly, I submit to you that it is fundamental to the principles of academic freedom that the proper judge of the content of courses in the university is the professor teaching that course within the framework provided by the appropriate curriculum committees. I feel confident that the Senate recognizes and will honor this principle.

"In conclusion, I would like to say that the biologists on this campus have been sensitive and responsive to the needs and beliefs of students taking their courses. But we cannot, and will not cheat our students of a proper education to satisfy the unreasonable demands of a vocal minority, and we will not pretend that reality is what it is not. You cannot be a good engineer without studying mathematics. You cannot be a competent classical scholar without studying classical languages, and you cannot be an anatomist or a physiologist without dissecting animals."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay we now have some comments by Professor Charles Walcott."

Professor Charles Walcott, Director, Division of Biological Sciences: "I'd like to simply point out two things. First off, we're very sensitive to this issue of climate and accommodation. We have tried in a number of ways and courses to accommodate these interests and provide alternatives, I won't go into detail, because of this feeling. There are students who are very much upset by dissection and we want to convey the information and be responsible for the information, but we try to find other ways of helping them gather it. But the question of whether there are high-quality educational tools available to substitute for animal dissection is something of which my colleagues and I are not convinced. We have not seen it, but we would be willing to examine such materials, and if they prove to be superior to what we are doing, we would certainly be willing to consider this. Thank you."

Acting Speaker Hines: "Okay, the final comments will be from Professor Clare Fewtrell."

Associate Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine: "The Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee, which I chair, is working on a proposal for a new position to replace the Associate Provost position formerly occupied by Professor Winnie Taylor. Ideas are very much still evolving, but we're hoping to present a draft to the Provost in the next week or two. Currently, we have in mind a position for Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development and we hope to fill it from the faculty at Cornell. The position would require an 80% effort, thus allowing the individual to maintain a 20% effort in his or her department. We propose that the position should have three distinct but complimentary responsibilities. As University Affirmative Action Officer, the Vice Provost would be a leader, spokesperson, and catalyst for the University on all issues related to Affirmative Action. The second major responsibility of the position, as we've indicated to be a 40% effort, would be to increase faculty diversity by developing and improving programs with approaches designed to increase the hiring of women and underrepresented minorities at all levels. We feel that this is a real problem at Cornell right now. A third aspect of this position, which would complement the two that I've mentioned already, would be that the Vice Provost would

develop strategies enhancing the retention of all faculty with particular emphasis on the development of junior faculty and including those of underrepresented groups.

"We're most anxious to get feedback from as many individuals and groups at Cornell as possible and what we're trying to do is to define the ideal position, and then to find the best candidate to fill that position. I strongly encourage you and your colleagues to provide feedback to our committee."

Dean Cooke: "Just ten seconds to remind you that if you have questions that you would like the forum on Athletics and Physical Education to address, that you send them to my office by sometime tomorrow. Thank you."

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

Membership of the Campus Climate Planning Committee

Name Address E-Mail

Michael Brown, SA 111 Hurlburt House mjb55

Kerry Cook, SCAS 110 Bradfield Hall khc6

J. Robert Cooke, DOF 315 Day Hall jrc7

Kate Dealy, Student Trustee 165 Day Hall ksd5

Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Med. C3 125 VMC cmf3

John Ford, DOS 401 WSH jlf7

Cris Gardner, Assemblies 165 Day Hall cg17

Linda Gasser, OHR 158 Ives Hall lsg3

Robert Harris, Afr Ctr - **Chair** 310 Triphammer rlh10

Thomas Hoebbel, EA B162 Comstock tah9

Robert Johnson, CURW - **Vice Chair** 122 Anabel Taylor rlj1

C. J. Lance-Duboscq, EA Level 2B Kroch Libr cjl10

Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ling. 222 Morrill smg9

Jane Mt. Pleasant, SCAS 300 Caldwell jm21

Mary Opperman, OHR 130 Day Hall mgo5

Yurij Pawluk, SA 3162 Cascadilla yop1

Peter Schwartz, Tex/Apparel 201 MVR ps18

Ramon Thomas, GPSA Sage Hall art9

The Faculty Hockey Team

Goalie: Thomas Fox, Professor, Genetics & Development

Defense: David Feldshuh, Professor and Artistic Director, Theatre, Film and Dance

- Frank Wise, Associate Professor, Applied/Engineering Physics
- Harry DeGorter, Associate Professor, ARME
- Dexter Kozen, Professor, Computer Science
- Brian Danforth, Assistant Professor, Entomology
- Ted Weisner, Instructor & Assistant Women's hockey Coach, Athletics

Forwards: Melany Fisk, Visiting Fellow, Natural Resources

- Frances Kozen, Extension Associate, Textiles & Apparel
- Victor Kord, Professor, Art Department
- David Delchamps, Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering
- Jon Kleinberg, Associate Professor, Computer Science
- Daniel McAlister, Assistant Professor, Mechanical/Aerospace Engineering
- Lars Hedin, Associate Professor, Ecology and Systematics
- Brian Earle, Senior Lecturer, Communication
- David Stern, Adjunct Professor, Boyce Thompson, Plant Biology
- Thomas Coleman, Director, Theory Center/Computer Science
- Ronald Ostman, Professor, Communication
- Jeffrey Archibald, Lecturer, Communication
- Wendell Bryce, Director, Planned Giving