

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Speaker: "We have one Good and Welfare speaker. Is the Provost here? I think I'll just call on the Dean first."

1. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE.

Professor J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "We have a very busy agenda, so I want to make my remarks rather briefly. The first is to call your attention to a University Faculty Forum, 'Beyond eCornell', which will be on a Thursday, not a Wednesday. We normally have these on Wednesdays, but we had to change it and reschedule it for Thursday, March 8. You will hear more about it later, but I wanted to get it on your calendars as soon as I could.

"We've had some discussion about faculty legislation which requires that the period from 4:25 p.m. each weekday through 7:30 p.m. remain free of scheduled formal course work to allow students to participate in team sports and marching band and various other kinds of student activities. We have had some problems come from that. The legislation says that the dean of the college has the authority to allow exceptions if you can really only offer the course during that time or if there is another section, students can choose some other time of the day that they would be able to fit into that period. I will be asking the Registrar's Office to not formally list the courses in that section unless the dean of the college has actually given explicit approval for it. We have a substantial number of courses that have sort of slipped into that slot, so the dean does have the prerogative and judgment call to make exceptions.

"There is another problem for students and that is review sessions. When the faculty try to oblige the students by offering a review session before a prelim and they try to figure out when to hold it, obviously 4:30 and later is the time most students don't have formal commitments. That really puts the students in a bind who have some kind of commitment to a larger group and are torn between participating in a review session or missing their prior commitments that we are trying to honor. So that is a real dilemma, and here are the suggestions we are making for trying resolve that, and they are suggestions. We suggest holding review sessions during the regular class period if you have an evening prelim, rather than covering new material and the second is to try to find other times in which you could handle review sessions without compromising the students. We have looked at the list of when people are attending class, and I'll send you a mailing with the actual data in it of how many people are engaged at 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and so on. The last session in the afternoon before the free time, the 3:25 to 4:30 slot, is one that has relatively few conflicts, maybe not as few as 8:00 a.m. but maybe a little more attractive as a place that you would start in trying to find a time that the students could gather at one point. Saturday morning of course is also a legitimate class time. I'll send some information about this, but I want to call it to your attention and ask your assistance. I'll come back to this topic later; that is in terms of being approved.

We may have a continuation of this meeting, if we need it, with the discussion of Ward Center. Under Good and Welfare, I'll ask your advice on whether you would in fact attend one if I called it."

Speaker Howland: Thank you, Dean Cooke. I would like now to call on Provost Biddy Martin for remarks."

2. REMARKS AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST MARTIN.

Provost Biddy Martin: "My remarks really constitute an update on our various dean searches. Most of you, I hope, know that we are currently conducting a search for a new Dean of Engineering. We have several outside prospects, several internal candidates, and the search committee will have completed its preliminary discussions with the prospects within ten days. At that point, we'll be able to release the names of a short list of candidates who will be visiting campus. So for those of you who are waiting with baited breath to find out what we are going to do next—it won't be long now.

"The search committee for a new Dean of the Graduate School met for the first time this past week, and we are now soliciting nominations from all of you for a new Dean of the Graduate School. Please feel free, if you haven't already received an email message from me soliciting your suggestions, to send me an email with nominations. Please feel free to nominate yourselves. (LAUGHTER) That's not meant to be a joke. (MORE LAUGHTER).

"In addition to the two dean searches, we have three deans who are currently in their fourth year and for whom we are now gearing up to do reappointment reviews. And depending on what college you reside in, you will be hearing from us about these reappointment reviews for deans of three of our colleges in the next couple of weeks.

"That was a not-very-exciting update. I can also tell you that I spent one of my days the week before last visiting extension sites and grew to appreciate, even more than I did from my reading, some of the extraordinary things that are going on in Cooperative Extension. I would be happy to answer any questions you have about any of the other ways in which I have been spending my time."

Speaker Howland: "Questions."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "Last summer you and President Rawlings announced a major new faculty salary improvement initiative. I wanted to ask how you are expecting the statutory colleges to cover this. Is the university going to assist in any way or should this be viewed as an unfunded mandate?"

Provost Martin: "It should certainly not be viewed as an unfunded mandate. Will the university help? Yes, in various ways. One of the ways in which the statutory colleges will be helped, as will the endowed colleges, is by virtue of the increase the Trustees approved in the payout. There are not as many endowed funds on the statutory side as on the endowed side, obviously, but you will be helped by those means. In addition, we have been meeting with the deans of the contract colleges, as we now call them. Those deans have themselves developed a range of ways of funding the salary program. We are now considering what tuition policies we'll have to set in order to make sure that we can do what they won't be able to do with their own funds, with state funds, and with the endowment payout. Those decisions, the final decision about tuition increases, will have to be put to the Trustees in March. So we are closing in on the decision about tuition increases. The salary program will go forward and be funded."

Professor Earle: "But mostly within the colleges out of their existing budgets."

Provost Martin: "And what the state has provided in pay increases."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 13, 2000 FACULTY SENATE MEETING.

Speaker Howland: "Additional questions? Seeing none, we thank you very much. I would like to now call for approval of the minutes of the December 13, 2000 Faculty Senate Meeting. Hearing no objections, they are unanimously approved. I would like now to call on the Associate Dean and Secretary Charles Walcott for a Nominations and Elections Committee report."

4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. We have a number of suggestions, but the first thing I would like to do is report to you all that Bob Cooke has been overwhelmingly re-elected by the Faculty Senate to another two year term. (APPLAUSE) Thank you very much.

"There is a list for a Dean of Students Search Committee and you have all this but let me show them to you. You can see the Nominations and Elections Committee has been hard at work twisting arms (I mean getting volunteers) for a wide variety of committees. That is my report."

REPORT OF NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

February 14, 2001

The University Faculty Senate has voted overwhelmingly to extend the term of J. Robert Cooke as Dean of the University Faculty through 6/30/03. The recommendation has been forwarded to the President and the Board of Trustees for confirmation.

Dean of Students Search Committee

Patty Ard

Patrick Carr

Walter Cohen

Raymond Dalton

Edna Dugan

Jennifer Gerner

Timothy Healey

*Tom Hirschl

Catherine Holmes

Sean MacKay

*Alan Mathios

Kira Moriah

Susan Murphy

Porus Olpadwala

Janet Shortall

LeNorman Strong

David Yeh

*Appointed by the Faculty Senate

Faculty Subcommittee on Responsible Conduct of Research

Klaus Beyenbach, Vet.

Kenneth Birman, CS

Joseph Calvo, CALS

Bruce Ganem, A&S

James Garbarino, A&S

Michael Isaacson, Engr.

Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Vet.

Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty

Alan Bell, CALS, Chair, spring term

Educational Policy Committee

Susan Piliero, CALS, Chair, spring term

Financial Policies Committee

Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR

Max Pfeffer, CALS, Chair, spring term

David Lipsky, ILR, Vice Chair, spring term

Local Advisory Committee

Hector Abruna, A&S

Michael Kotlikoff, Vet.

James Thorp, Engr., Chair, spring term

Faculty Committee on Program Review

Stephen Hamilton, CHE, Chair

University Faculty Committee

Kay Obendorf, CHE

Danuta Shanzer, A&S

University Lectures Committee

Will Provine, A&S

ASSEMBLIES COMMITTEES

Campus Planning Committee

Peter Trowbridge, CALS

Codes and Judicial Committee

James Gross, ILR

Ellis Loew, Vet.

CURW Advisory Board

Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR

Minority Affairs

Gustavo Aguirre, Vet.

Transportation Advisory Committee

William Lesser, CALS

David Wyatt, A&S

University Hearing Board

Moncrieff Cochran, CHE

Martha Fineman, Law

Rolph Pendall, AAP

Jeffrey Rachlinski, Law

Steven Vavasis, CS

University Review Board

Sandra Greene, A&S

Norm Scott, CALS

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I call now for unanimous consent to accept the report. Hearing no objections, it is accepted. I would like now to call on Professor William Fry, Taskforce Chair and W. Donald Cooke, Subcommittee Chair, for a progress report on Professorial Titles Taskforce."

5. PROGRESS REPORT ON PROFESSORIAL TITLES TASKFORCE.

Professor William Fry, Plant Pathology and Taskforce Chair: "I have two minutes, Don Cooke has two minutes and then there are two minutes for discussion, so this is going to be very short. Bob Cooke commissioned a taskforce in the fall semester. It is a fairly broad-spectrum taskforce ([Appendix A](#)). You have that list in your call to the meeting today. One of the first activities that the taskforce did was to look at the kinds of motivations for the creation of the taskforce. It is clear that Bob had received comment from academic deans that there was a need for greater flexibility with titles in the university. Some of the rationale for that need was that Cornell was at a disadvantage both in attracting and in retaining some very competent people who contribute significantly to the university. Some persons who are currently here are facing a significant competitive disadvantage with their current title in terms of competing for grants. In some colleges there is a changing expectation of what professors do and the amount that they do. A motivation that the taskforce added was that there are persons who are in non-professorial categories that need some protection. So those are a series of motivations that we identified for doing this investigation. Additionally, many of us have seen Bob Cooke's complex slide identifying the aging of the faculty. That is absolutely happening; there is a reduced hiring of younger faculty. There are some senior faculty who wish not to retire because they might be at a competitive disadvantage with title if the title is "emeritus" as opposed to "professor." That is an issue that might cause some faculty to not retire. That is one of our motivations.

"The taskforce identified two emphases: one is role of some senior faculty (Don Cooke will give you an update on that now.). We have investigated professorial titles and the task force is very aware of the several failed attempts to previously expand professorial titles. And we have deferred to a later date the consideration of lecturers. I guess I can stop. Professor Cooke."

Professor Emeritus Donald Cooke, Chemistry: "I'm chair of a very small committee looking at the question of the decline in the number of assistant professors in the Endowed College. New appointments - it has gone from 42 eight years ago to 18 last year, so it is a worrisome decline. Obviously, we will reach a steady state situation some time in the future where that number will go back up, but we are looking at the question of increasing the number of part-time senior faculty members and some of the questions about that kind of situation. We have only met twice; we have reached no conclusions; we are just discussing the issues at the moment. The other question had to do with the title of retired professors. Emeritus Professor is an illustrious title; there is no question about that. The only thing is some of the funding agencies look at it in a somewhat different way than we look at it, so we are looking at that question. There is a 'Graduate School' title, member of the graduate faculty of ... say, chemistry. Maybe that is adequate, but we are going to have a look at it."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. Questions?"

Professor Fry: "These are what the activities of the total taskforce have been. We are currently aware of the different titles that are in use and the rationale for them. We've been looking at some draft proposals from various colleges, looking at the motivation for those—the rationale, implications to tenure. If there are potential recommendations coming from this taskforce, we do plan on a faculty forum. The timing of that is completely unknown at this point. There are others members of the taskforce here."

Speaker Howland: "Questions? In the back."

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR and Economics: "Don, I would like to just suggest to you that the title 'graduate school professor' was adopted after a model at the University of California system. The last Nobel Prize winner in Economics was a graduate school professor and I think if you just contact them, you'll get a good sense of whether or not that title has hurt people who happen to be in search for grants."

Speaker Howland: "Additional questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. I'd like now to call on Professor Terrance Fine, committee member, and Professor Jerry Stedinger, Chair, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies for a resolution on creating a Graduate Field of Horticulture."

6. RESOLUTION ON CREATING A GRADUATE FIELD OF HORTICULTURE

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "So moved."

Professor Jerry Stedinger, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies: "I'm Jerry Stedinger, serving as Chair on the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, and we got a request to consider the formation of a Graduate Field of Horticulture ([Appendix B](#)). It is combining three existing fields into one field, so as to be stronger in terms of research opportunities and curriculum. Two departments on the Cornell campus have also merged; there is a separate campus in Geneva. The move is supported overwhelmingly by the faculty in the departments and in the field. We found no reason not to recommend this, so we recommend it to you. If everybody agrees, I'll be out of here in less than five minutes."

Speaker Howland: "Discussion? Questions? It looks like we are ready for a vote. All those in favor of the resolution say, 'aye'."

"AYE."

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? It passes unanimously. Thank you very much. I would like now to call on Professor Steven Shiffrin, member of the Interim Committee for a resolution to establish a Faculty Online Forum."

7. RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A FACULTY ONLINE FORUM

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School and member of the Interim Committee: "I've been given one minute for this which I think is a testimony to how controversial this is and how curious you might be about it. There is a resolution before you ([Appendix C](#)) which has been prompted by an initiative of Dean Cooke to have an online forum for issues of interest to the faculty that might have been on the agenda or might not have been on the agenda. That is before you. There has been a committee that has been administering a beta version of this, and that committee has debated issues about who should get access, what the content

should be, what should be excluded, defamatory statements, grievances, things of that ilk. I have a three-page handout that indicates the results of what the committee has decided. I would suggest you look at it, that if you have complaints about it that you post it on the online forum."

LAUGHTER

Professor Shiffrin: "And we can go from there. All that is before you now is to formalize what essentially has been going on so far. Any questions?"

Speaker Howland: "Any discussion?"

Professor Shiffrin: "Here's the handout."

Speaker Howland: "Seeing no questions, all those in favor of the resolution that is posted before you say, 'aye'."

AYE.

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? The resolution passes unanimously. Thank you. The Chair would like now to call on Professor Douglas Gurak, committee member, and Professor Susan Piliero, Committee Chair for a resolution on the academic calendar through 2004-2005 and a report from the Educational Policy Committee."

8. RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC CALENDAR THROUGH 2004-2005 AND REPORT FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Professor Douglas Gurak, Rural Sociology, and member of the Educational Policy Committee: "I serve on the committee with Terry Fine. I'm very thankful for his example. I move..."

LAUGHTER

Associate Professor Susan Piliero, Education and Chair of the Educational Policy Committee: "So the resolution in front of you ([Appendix D](#)) is to adopt the calendar as proposed, that you already have, and adopt the calendar for 2002-2005. I would like to give you a little background on this calendar.

"The Educational Policy Committee was approached by the Student Assembly to take up various issues regarding the academic calendar. We asked them to prioritize their list of concerns, and their number one priority turned out to be the issue of classes on Labor Day. So we went around and around about how we could, or whether we should, not have classes on Labor Day to honor the holiday in a particular manner, and we came up with three actual possibilities. One would be keep the status quo, to continue to have classes on Labor Day. Another would be to continue to hold classes on Labor Day with no change to the current calendar, but whenever feasible encourage faculty to allow students to make up the class or to do activities in lieu of class or something like that, with obvious exceptions, for example science labs or other multi-section courses. The third resolution that we considered was to give Labor Day off and move the Labor Day schedule to the Wednesday before classes.

'We spent considerable time talking about this and gathering input from various constituencies. Various members of the committee also went to the Student Assembly, the University Assembly, and the GPSA (Graduate and Professional Student Assembly), and they had various reasons for liking one or the other. In

general, the idea of sort of having it if you can or if it is not essential, not having it and doing something else, just seemed very messy to most people. The whole notion of what is an essential class became an actual interesting topic of debate. The Labor Day classes became the most interesting because the whole reason for having Labor Day off became this sort of emotional trigger point. People felt very strongly about it one way or the other. In the end, to make a long story short, the student assembly, as you may have noticed in the Cornell Sun, voted rather solidly to continue to support the calendar and drop its Labor Day issue. They decided that we had done sufficient research to show that it was a very complex issue. So they have voted to accept it too. So I put the resolution before you to accept the academic calendar."

Speaker Howland: "Discussion? Professor Stein?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I remember in the recent past, not too distant past, that there was a lot of student discussion and interest in Martin Luther King Day and whether that ought to be made a holiday. And I remember it doesn't happen very often, but in some years you have classes on Martin Luther King Day. Did you consider that?"

Professor Piliero: "Yes, we tried to look at the entire calendar year and what the implications would be for giving Labor Day off. Certainly, if you cancel classes on Labor Day, it would set a precedent for canceling on say, Veterans' Day, Martin Luther King Day, and other days. Plus we had worked out what seemed to be a fairly amicable solution for Martin Luther King Day by having programming in lieu of canceling classes. We decided that canceling classes was not the only way one could honor a particular day. We used that as a model for this. Of course, I should point out that the School of Industrial and Labor Relations is doing things to honor Labor Day independently of what the university decides to do about canceling classes or not."

Professor Steven Shiffrin: "I just had an observation about the timing of spring break. About which the only thing one knows for sure is that Cornell's spring break will be at a different time than that of the Ithaca City School District, the Lansing School District and other school districts. I'm also told that's true of Ithaca College. I'm just curious if there is any attempt to try to coordinate, because it strikes me that parents of children in the Ithaca City School District, the Lansing School District, etc. who teach at Cornell or are on the staff, would have interest in that."

Professor Piliero: "One of the issues that came up with the Student Assembly is that if they gave in on the Labor Day thing would that mean that they were sort of dead-in-the-water in terms of other changes to the calendar, most notably that long stretch between the beginning of classes and spring break. We have not declared the discussion over, but there are other pressing issues in front of the Educational Policy Committee. So for now, in order to let business happen, we are suggesting that the academic calendar be approved but we are taking a look at that. One of the problems clearly is the particular scheduling difficulties of courses that offer labs every day. If you take a couple of days off here in a week, for some courses, like science courses, basically they have to shut down their labs the whole week. The other thing is sort of a culture here in the university that if you have a couple of days off for some students that is sort of a signal that we have a week off."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Piliero: "We don't want to encourage that. So we are trying to address the culture of the university, plus the other issues."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I think our time is almost up. Are you ready to move? Questions? Good, hearing no objections, all those in favor of the motion say, 'aye'."

AYE.

Speaker Howland: "Opposed?"

NAY.

Speaker Howland: " Two nays. Thank you very much. The motion is passed. I would like now to call on Professor James Thorp, Chair of the Local Advisory Committee for the report on the Ward Center."

9. REPORT ON WARD LAB

Professor James Thorp, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Chair of the Local Advisory Committee, for the review of Ward Center: "I'll try to be even faster, as I know that there are a lot of people who want to discuss this. I'm not going to read ([Appendix E - overheads](#)) any of this to you, but I want to point out to you that among other things when Bob Richardson charged us with the study, he recognized that there was an overdue report. So there are two issues, one is that there was supposed to be a review in 1998-99 and second that the relicensing of the Ward reactor by the NRC was scheduled for November 2003. He wanted answers so that he could act on them in time. The criteria we used for the evaluation are sort of rank-ordered in that the most important issues are at the top, the current and potential future faculty involvement in the center, the role the center plays in graduate and undergraduate training, but the other issues are things that do matter in terms of cost, other uses of the facility...

"The process was to talk to all of the people who had some involvement from the Director of the Center to some of the principal users. We also visited the Ward Center and looked at all of the equipment that was there, and we had a presentation from John Silcox and Jack Lowe about the details of the funding. We then interviewed 30 faculty members who had been identified as being involved as potential users of the Ward Center. In addition we tried to contact people who were mentioned in the 1996 report which created the Ward Center. The persons interviewed, the questions we asked, the items for discussion are all in the appendix of the review. We also received a lot of input solicited from users of the center, from people outside — the directors of other similar facilities — and from the Department of Energy (and I want to talk a little bit more about the details of that). The list of the people who wrote the letters is in the report and the letters themselves are now available on the web page.

"On December 20, three of us met with two representatives of the Department of Energy. The background to this is that there had been a meeting of engineering deans in September of 2000 where DOE's concern with the closing of many university reactors was expressed, and there were some suggestions that DOE had to do something more to keep these centers going. When they came here, they told us that it was probably appropriate that some of these centers be closed, but that they wanted to keep quality institutions like Cornell going. They wanted to try and figure out what they could do to make that happen. As a result of that conversation, there is more correspondence then with DOE that is also on the web page. Most recently a bill has been introduced in the Senate that has to do with funding of programs in Nuclear Science and Engineering which might (and I think might is the right word) have some impact on funding. In addition we talked repeatedly and didn't vote until very close to having to produce the minutes. We spent a great deal of time trying to gather information.

"These are our findings and I would like to speak a little bit to them; there are longer rationales in the document. Everything that is now going to be mentioned has two sides and we talked to people of differing opinions on everything. With the possible exception of the first almost no one close to the reactor had any concern about safety. Any mention of safety came from people who really had little information. It is true, however, that we recognize that money will be involved in maintaining that safety record into the future,

that things have to be upgraded and maintained. We conclude that at the present there is not a substantial academic research presence in the field of nuclear fission engineering. I'm not talking about all other areas but in nuclear fission. You may recall that the 1996 creation of the Center was because the Engineering College had eliminated the program in nuclear science and engineering. Of the five faculty who were then a part of the program, only three are still here, and they are in different departments. The graduate field still exists and it has six members, but only two of those six members do research having to do with fission engineering or with fission products. So there are few graduate students in the area. No compelling case has been found for a strong connection between the reactor and Cornell's future involvement in nuclear engineering. Two of the top four nuclear engineering programs in the country by *US News and World Report* do not have reactors. Four of the top fourteen do not. The difference of opinion of course--DOE feels it's nice to have students actually view the reactor. Reactors are being closed around the country. Twenty-eight of the original sixty university reactors remain. Berkeley and Illinois have either decommissioned or put their reactors into mothballs. Michigan announced in the fall that they were going to decommission their reactor. MIT is apparently one that DOE is frightened about although I have heard no announcement about what they are intending to do.

"Finally the cost--the cost was not foremost in the LAC's mind but it is an issue and is something we have to talk about. We came up with one set of figures, but Dr. Unlu and his correspondence with DOE came up with a slightly different figure, that the net cost to Cornell last year to operate the Ward Center was \$470,000. The estimated decommissioning cost that we have obtained by getting a very detailed study from Illinois and looking at an annual letter Cornell sends to the Department of Energy is 4.01 million dollars. Now we have been cautioned that these estimates increase, and there is evidence that at Georgia Tech and Texas that by the time they finished, prices were higher. Considerable time elapsed at Texas and Georgia Tech did it all in one year, because the reactor was deemed a threat by terrorists to the Olympics. So they did the whole process in a year which undoubtedly added to the expense. I think I covered all of that.

"The final conclusion--given the situation, we can not conclude that the TRIGA reactor is having a major impact as a user facility at Cornell. Now there are users, and our recommendation is that something be done to help them through this period. But when we talked to some of the users, the lack of fees, the easy access and the helpful staff were given as reasons why they were using the reactor. If there were extensive fees, many of them suggested they would use it a lot less. We can identify no tenure track or tenured faculty who are willing to make commitments to expanding or enlarging the facility. Of course that's a 'catch 22' because no one is being hired in the Engineering College in the area. So our ultimate conclusion is that the ^{60}Co source, which is used by more than half of the users more than half of the hours, which is not as expensive to maintain, be continued and be kept somewhere on campus for the kind of use it now enjoys, but that we decommission the TRIGA reactor and phase out the center activities. We recommend the administration be proactive in addressing the problems of the current users and the staff, and we recommend that the ^{60}Co source be maintained at an appropriate local facility. These recommendations are independent of the time frame of the decommissioning or removal of fuel from the reactor. There are other members of the committee present. Hopefully, I have saved you some time."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I'd like to call now on Dr. Unlu."

Dr. Kenan Unlu, MSE and Director of the Ward Center for Nuclear Science: "We have only five minutes, so therefore I would like to point out two things. One is that you should have a copy of the report which is over here and also excerpts from the support letters that is also listed in the back, but there is a copy over here, too. Some of you this morning got a letter from DOE, but if you don't have it, a copy is over there. Obviously, there are a lot of things to talk about, not just the report but the presentation, but we don't have time for that. I would like to call on Professor Kuniholm to make a few comments."

Professor Peter Kuniholm, History of Art: "We are limited to four minutes to try to do what ten faculty members did over six months. The mission statement for the Ward Center is the one that was written by this faculty senate some years back and it's on page one of the annual report of Dr. Unlu which you either have in your hand or is available on these tables. The status of the research program at the Ward Lab is that the faculty have existing facilities which some people use. There are two facilities, which are in the process of being developed, which will be available Dr. Unlu hopes later this year and there are other ones that are in the process of happening. The notion is to have a facility where people can walk in off the campus and use the Ward Lab without wasting time. The people who are using the lab are not engineers by and large, they are from all over the university which is what the center was established to do—that is to say that it is not an engineering facility per se; it's a university wide facility for all of us. We went from under 10 faculty members at the time of Dave Clark's death several years ago to 17, and when I was in the lab yesterday, there were 21 dosimeters on the shelf indicating current users of the establishment. There is some course involved.

"The bill which was referred to by the previous speaker which is on the Senate floor at the moment, Senate Bill 245, completely dwarfs what Dr. Unlu was sent out to do when he came here two and a half years ago. His job was to improve the facilities, increase the budget and bring in users from both inside and outside the campus. This was the state of affairs of federal funding at the time of Dave Clark's death (\$3,000); this was Dr. Unlu's first year (\$29,000); of his second year (\$421,000), this year (\$623,000), and these are proposals which ought to be on top of that indicating these are things that are in the works (\$971,000 pending). We are asking the Feds for serious money. Our land grant mission statement includes servicing corporations from upstate New York. You can see some of them right here who use the place and pay money for doing it. Now the thing about this Senate Bill 245, which is a bipartisan bill on the floor of the US Senate, this has a bundle in there, almost \$240 million over the next five years. This bottom block of items here is for the university reactors which currently exist and there is about \$120 million for the fourteen or fifteen active university reactors in this country. Dr. Unlu wrote to Magwood at DOE; there is a letter from him which came in today—Dr. Unlu's estimate was that we ought to be able to qualify for something in the order of \$1.6 million a year from this Bill. We asked whether this was a reasonable estimate; Magwood said "yes" and put his name on it and said that Unlu was more or less on target as to his expectations.

"Now why are we coming to such an extraordinarily different point of view from what the Local Advisory Committee did? Why could people who, as the Dean said, are of good will and intelligence come to such radically different conclusions. One bunch saying, "Close it"; the other one saying, "Keep it open". I would suggest is that what we are really trying to do here is maintain a facility that does things that are way outside the purview of engineering. I would suggest that the most interesting single thing is what Professor

Kallfelz is up to in the Veterinary College. Would you say something as to what you do?"

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Science: "Thank you very much for the opportunity to say a few words. I would just really like to address one of the comments made in the report of the Local Advisory Committee, and that's found at the bottom of the third bullet on page five under Faculty and Administration Inputs. At the bottom of that third bullet they say that one of the reasons for recommending closure is that because of the absence of a local medical school and possible scientific uncertainties, neutron capture therapy is unlikely to be successful at Cornell. Just a minor correction--we do, in fact, have a local medical school--it's the College of Veterinary Medicine that exists at the East end of campus. Since we are way at the east end of campus, I'm not surprised that some people are not aware of the subject, although Professor Thorp did find me up there to talk about this issue. Another issue is that the College of Veterinary Medicine has recently initiated a major new program in comparative oncology. "Comparative" meaning studying tumors and cancers that bear similarity between and among animals and people. Specifically there are many tumors in dogs and cats that indeed are occurring in the human population. Dr. Unlu, Dr. Rod Page, the head of the program of comparative oncology, and I are working towards developing, in fact, a neutron capture therapy program here at Cornell to study modalities for studying tumors in animals in our veterinary teaching hospitals and also modalities that would be of possible benefit to the human population as well."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you both."

Professor Kuniholm: "One sentence. We would like to request the Dean of the Faculty to hold an extra session of this group next week to iron out the differences between the two reports you just heard. One, which says, "trash it." One, which says, "For God's sake, keep it open. We would like to talk it over with more time than just five minutes."

Speaker Howland: "Discussion?"

Professor Richard Durst, Food Science & Technology, Geneva: "What is the alternative if this facility is closed down as far as alternate places where the investigators can go to have these kinds of analyses done or operations done?"

Professor Kuniholm: "I can respond to that. The nearest facility is Penn State. I am working with gold which has 2.7 days half life. That is some very fast driving to get there and back."

Speaker Howland: "Would the committee like to comment on that?"

Professor Persis Drell Physics: "There are other reactors waiting for applications to be done. There are also commercial firms where one can do this type of analysis."

Speaker Howland: "Additional comments?"

Dr. Kenan Unlu: "There are some other facilities around. However, the nuclear research

reactor is not just for neutron activation analysis; currently this is the most powerful steady state neutron source available. Right now, our reactor is the only operating research reactor in New York State. Also only three are active throughout the entire Northeast, so I would like to make that point."

Speaker Howland: "In the back, Sir?"

Professor Robert Gilbert, Veterinary College: "The point is in support of Dr. Kallfelz's comments. We were successful in recruiting a new faculty member last year and one of the factors which made Cornell an exciting destination was the potential to collaborate on neutron capture therapy with this group. It is important for some faculty members."

Professor J. S. Butler, Human Ecology: "There is no chance I'll ever use a nuclear reactor. However, I'm certainly perplexed by the two reports and I personally don't want to make any decision at the moment on the basis of this. But I would want to be reassured personally that closing it is not being motivated by the fear which nuclear reactors cause in some people as I don't think that would be a sensible way to make policy for Cornell."

Professor Peter Stein Physics: "It seems to me that the question really is a financial one. I mean everything is good, but the question is — is it \$400,000 good? Of course, if you spend \$400,000 unrecovered on this, it means you are spending \$400,000 less on something else. One way of gauging that, if indeed it is important to the Veterinary Medicine College, then I suppose one measure of how important it is, is how much money are they willing to contribute to run it. I know it's a mercenary way to look at it, but it is very hard to balance benefits and costs without having some way to exchange the two. Dollars are often used in that way to measure someone's value of a particular benefit that something gives."

Speaker Howland: "I'll recognize one more speaker. Who had their hand up? It was you, sir, yes. Very briefly, please."

Professor Manfred Lindau, Applied & Engineering Physics: "As I understand it this is not a matter that there will be a renewal of nuclear engineering, but it's just a service for other purposes, so if it acts as a kind of resource for various research projects, I wanted to ask if a list of publications is available somewhere about what has been performed at this center."

Speaker Howland: "A very brief yes or no."

Dr. Unlu: "Yes."

Speaker Howland: "I'm sorry our time is up on this discussion. We'll have an opportunity to talk about an adjourned meeting. I would now like to call on Professor Charles Walcott, Local Advisory Committee, for a report on Research Support for Environmental Science and Engineering at Cornell."

10. REPORT ON RESEARCH SUPORT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING AT CORNELL

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior, and member Local Advisory Committee: "Thank you. We were asked by the Vice Provost for Research to examine the question of whether Cornell and all of its various interests in environmental science and research was optimally situated to extract the maximum amount of money from the various federal granting agencies for research. In going about this, the Local Advisory Committee, fanned out across campus. We identified about 70 faculty or so whom we knew of (and from various contacts) were involved in environmental matters. We conversed with them about their opinions about how Cornell was organized for research support and in general the feeling was that there was not a good, effective organization that was in place to get maximum federal support. We asked them about the Center for the Environment, which is an obvious focal point, and the general feeling amongst the faculty we talked to was that that had not been an effective tool for garnering research support for various programs. Indeed we were told one or two instances where the Center had gone in competition with activities of various individual departments. This is not to say that the Center is not doing good things. We simply looked at one piece of the element and this piece was the research support. We found that the faculty by-and-large was not excited about the general arrangements.

"The question then was what could you do that would be any better? The general suggestion was that we needed a more faculty driven enterprise; we needed an enterprise that brought faculty from the various colleges and groups that were interested in environmental issues together to try and see if there were more effective ways of garnering research support. We felt that such a committee or such a group would be fine but that it needed then some kind of an executive officer or director, and that is basically what we recommended. The details are all in the report. Before I end, I would like to emphasize one very critical thing—we did not look at nor did we consider the issues of extension, outreach or education in the environment. These are the activities that really form the centerpiece of what the Center for the Environment is currently engaged in. We simply asked the narrow question of how is it serving the research community, and the conclusion we came to was that it was not serving the research community well. That is not to say that it isn't doing wonderful things in these other areas; we simply don't know. Please do not misunderstand that this is a report being critical of the Center; it is simply saying that it is not doing the job

that we feel needs to be done to catalyze research in environmental sciences."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Comments?"

Professor Charles Geisler, Rural Sociology: "I wonder if the emphasis on research in the report wasn't even narrower than the general research domain which it characterized. It seems in your report to focus on engineering research. Another fact that interests me is that the questions in the interviews from those I've talked to (I wasn't personally interviewed), but I had the impression from who were interviewed that they were asked more or less along the lines that you've said--what the Center for the Environment provided them. It seems to me that other disciplines have received benefits that perhaps weren't covered. I'm thinking about toxicology, water resources, and several other areas of extraordinary competency and research as well as extension and outreach. So I'm very glad you put the emphasis on at the end that you did that there is a much bigger institution here than this report covered, because I feel the tone of it is unnecessarily negative."

Speaker Howland: "Additional comments? Questions? I'm sorry, in the back; I didn't see you. Speak loudly please."

Professor Naomi Altman, Biometrics: "I guess--I also was not part of this survey or report--but my feeling is that probably what we need here is something on the same scale as the genomics initiative in terms of research in environmental science. I think the question needs to be asked whether the Center for the Environment is structured or capable in its current incarnation of appointments and stuff. It shouldn't be a criticism of what it is doing, but a question of what it is that we at Cornell need. The question is what do we at Cornell need to move forward in what has been and will be a very exciting area?"

Speaker Howland: "Additional comments or questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. We'll pass on to the next item. I would like now to call on Professor William Arms of the Provost Advisory Committee on Distance Learning for a Resolution on Initiating a Review of Copyright Policy."

11. RESOLUTION ON INITIATING A REVIEW OF COPYRIGHT POLICY

Professor William Arms, Computer Science and Provost Advisory Committee on Distance Learning: "You have the resolution in front of you ([Appendix F](#)). The Committee on Distance Learning, one of the things we found ourselves looking at was copyright. In particular copyrighting course materials, and the more we looked at the university policy, the more we came to the conclusion that times have changed and the university copyright policy doesn't really fit academic life today. It's one of those topics one always hesitates to even mention in public, but we felt we ought to, and so what we have done is that we have been in contact with both the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty. This is a resolution asking the Dean of the Faculty to work with the Provost in setting up a process to look at the whole university copyright policy in the light of everything that has changed over the last ten years.

"The committee also came up with four principles which from our viewpoint seem to be appropriate for the future and I stress that is from our viewpoint. I would expect the review to come up with new ideas and new concepts, and maybe to find recommendations which are not the same as our four points. The four points, the four general principles, are here. The first one, which is at the bottom of this overhead, point number one is probably the most fundamental. The policy as written divides the world into two things--one is things that are in traditional media like paper and those things that are encoded, to use the rather quaint term--as if they were completely different. As we all know nowadays the fact that this is on my word processor or this is on paper is a trivial difference. We think that is fundamentally contrary to sensible policies. So that is principle number one. Principle number two is taken verbatim from the preamble to the

present policy, and it basically talks about the academic tradition that the creators of works have control over the intellectual output resulting from their research. By the way, one of the issues that is going to come up in the review is—here we are thinking of this thing as faculty, the current policy is good on students but it doesn't say creative work by other members of the university. The last point basically says when the university puts resources in, it should get something back. We are more and more dealing with things where many people are involved and the fact that the current policy does not talk about multiple creation, including individuals at the university, and I really think it's a weakness in the policy. So we are not asking for anything other than the faculty requesting the Dean to work with the Provost in setting up a process to review this.

Speaker Howland: "Right. The motion before you says, the operative sentence is, I believe, as a basis for this review, the Faculty Senate endorses these four general principles which have just been outlined. Are we all set? Questions? Discussion on this point? Yes."

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: "Number four talks about 'when the university contributes substantial resources . . . it has the right to share in the control and returns. To be considered substantial, the contribution should be significantly beyond the normal level of support . . .' That's a little hazy. Could you clarify that a little bit in terms of what the normal level of support is and what constitutes more than the normal level of support?"

Professor Arms: "I would not like to attempt to clarify detailed wording at this point. It is something that is bad in the current project. It basically says that the Provost can make rules to clarify this area."

Provost Martin: "Very good."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Arms: "I wouldn't like to stand in front of you and do wordsmithing. This is a difficult point."

Professor Joe Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering: "I happen to have presided over the process ten years ago which resulted in the current policy, and I wholeheartedly support the principles which are enumerated here, particularly the one that the control should be independent of whether it's encoded or whether it's on paper. And I will say that the principles, which are here, are the same principles that the faculty committee, working ten years ago, also came up with. The question which was asked was the question which the university counsel's office used to kill which was how do you determine what is unusual use? We used the term 'extraordinary.' My answer is—you let the department chairman or the dean determine that. You decentralize that decision. I think it has to be done that way. I think it's a workable policy."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I think we have reached the limit of our time for discussion. Are you ready for a motion? All those in favor of the motion say, 'aye'."

AYE.

Speaker Howland: "Opposed? It passes unanimously. Thank you very much. I would like now to call on Professor Peter Stein, immediate past Chair, for a progress report on Faculty Committee on Program Review."

12. PROGRESS REPORT ON FACULTY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW

Professor Peter Stein, Physics and immediate past Chair, Faculty Committee on Program Review: "Until December of this year, I was chairman of the Faculty Committee on Program Review for, it's hard to count,

but something like four years. The Faculty Committee on Program Review was formed by, what the Soviets used to call, a correlation of forces. Several things came together at the same time, and one of them was Hunter Rawlings coming to be President of Cornell. There were several other initiatives that were already going on which resulted in a document, which I think was probably the first document passed by the senate, entitled *Program Review at Cornell*, which set up the Faculty Committee on Program Review. The general principle is that all programs have to be reviewed on a seven to ten year time table. The discussion in the faculty senate at that time was extremely controversial. There were a substantial number of people who got up and argued that this was a terrible idea, that the notion of one-size-fits-all was a bad one at this diverse university, and that people ought to do program reviews when they or their deans thought that they should be done and that we had no particular reason to legislate over that. The answer at that time was—there's a new President, and he wants to do it, so if we don't want to legislate over it, he'll do it another way. About two thirds of the people bought that argument, and we set up the Faculty Committee on Program Review. So it has been going since that time, and the committee felt this was an appropriate time to give you a report.

"Report item number one is if you want to make friends and influence people, let me tell you that chairmanship of the Faculty Committee on Program Review is not the right course to follow. We accumulate on that committee criticism like fleas. To a first approximation—telling a department chair that we are going to have a program review is like telling a student that there is going to be an unexpected final. The answer always comes back the same, with one or two exceptions, this is not the year for it; it ought to be done, if at all, two years from now. The departments went into this reluctantly. I've seen all of the programs reviews that we have done up until the first of the year, and there have been thirty that have been completed. There are about forty more which are in progress, and the total number of units to be reviewed is something more than one hundred, something like one hundred and ten. Roughly, we have reviewed a third of them; there is a third in the works, and a third of the units have not been started all.

"Of these thirty units, I just wanted to tell you what my observations were, having reviewed it. Obviously, it's highly confidential and so I'm not going to name any units. Whatever observations I will give you are obviously very personal, and there is no way that you can decide whether they are valid or not, because I am not going to tie the observations to certain departments. For what it's worth, this is what I saw. First off, let me tell you about those thirty reviews. They were, in case you care, two of were in Vet, five of them were in Arts and Sciences, eleven in CALS, one in Human Ecology, three in Engineering, seven in the Division of Biological Sciences, since deceased, and two in university wide centers. So that's how the thirty broke up.

"As I said, the number of people who actually support the concept, outside of Day Hall, of universal reviews is pretty small. I happen to be one of those people; I think it's a good idea, but most people do not think it's a good idea. The kinds of things that I heard from people are things like this. I've heard, for instance, from many deans who don't support it that it's a waste of time; it costs money. (It costs, I forget, about \$5,000 a review or something like that. I think that's roughly the cost of it.) We know what the situation is, we don't need some outside experts to come in and tell us. If there are problems in a department, we know about it, and we really don't need somebody else to tell us. It takes a lot of work; it takes a lot of effort; faculty members have more important things to do than write volumes and volumes of pieces of paper about a review. I've heard that. I've heard from deans that an outside review is useless because all that happens is that people from the outside come in; they're friends of the faculty members in the department in general, because most fields are small. They come in loyal to their specialty, rather than loyal to the university, and you can figure out what their advice is going to be. Give us four more lines and we'll be the greatest department in the world.

I've heard from certain departments that outside reviews are really a dean's way of getting . . . a dean

throws the review and can stack it, and it's a dean's way of reeking his or her havoc on the particular department. The dean wants to get rid of a department, so they get a group of people to come and they pose the questions in such a way that the answer is to get rid of the department. The worst comment that we heard was from department chairs (and I heard this a lot) that really what a department is is people get together; they get excited; they write something down; outside team comes in; they write a big report. There are all kinds of paper. I mean a review, you know, is about so thick when you write down everything people write. Then where does it go? It goes up on a shelf someplace, and that's the last you hear of it, and it's just a total waste of energy. For people who have been at Cornell as long as I have been, you know that this is not an unusual thing to hear that a report gets written, gets filed in what John Wiesenfeld used to call, binder heaven.

"So we were sensitive to all of these things. We tried to construct a process that answered all of these complaints, and I won't go into telling you how it's done, but the outside review team is not chosen by any person. Part of the members come from the department; part of the members come from people (the dean solicits their opinion of people) in that field outside the university. The Faculty Committee on Program Review looks carefully at all of the people that the dean proposes, and then that's the choice and often comes back to the dean and says, 'We don't like this particular group. We're unhappy that we don't recognize the schools that people come from. We think that people reviewing Cornell ought to come from schools that we think are more prestigious.' The whole point of this is to try to avoid what we call the 'Sweetheart Review,' which is where your friends come in and tell the dean to give them more lines and the 'Nefarious Dean Review' where the dean has some people come in to try to make a department do something that it doesn't want to do. My own feeling is that that has been very successful. I have not seen a single example, I must say, of a dean who was either wise enough or evil enough to be able to structure reviews that come up with a certain answer. I've seen 'Sweetheart Reviews,' but I think maybe only one or two of them. We have avoided that.

"The concern that they end up in binder heaven is something that we have addressed also, and we will see how successful it is. I honestly don't know how successful it is. What happens at the end of a review is that the outside team writes a review report and then the question is what happens to it. What we have tried to do is that we have asked the outside review team to write a report which can have a lot of general verbiage in it, but it ought to end up with specific bulleted or numbered recommendations—that the department should do this; the dean should do this; the provost should do that. Then it asks, I think insists is the right word, that both the department chair and the dean write a document to us which specifically says what the department chair and the dean will do with each one of these recommendations. The answer may be ignored, because we don't think it's the right recommendation, and nobody believes that an outside team ought to be running this university, but at least the recommendation that has been made will be responded to by the dean and the department. They will say what they will do. The final piece of the process is that the committee writes a closed letter to the Provost that summarizes in one page (a maximum of one page). There have been none that are one page but there have been none that have been more than two pages, so the maximum one page works pretty well; it means two. What this one page does is summarize, not in an evaluative manner, because we don't understand all of these things, but we say this is the review; these are the people that came; this is their affiliation; they made twenty-eight recommendations, twenty of which were accepted by the department and the dean and will be done; there was disagreement on these particular items. We just lay out for the Provost what the major items of disagreement were, so that she can do what she wills with that. At least it doesn't lay there with nobody seeing it— that an outside review team came in and said, 'You ought to hire somebody else in this particular specialty; the field has moved blah, blah, blah,' and the dean says, 'I don't think so.' And that's the end of it, and nobody sees it. OK?

"It's hard to say what happens after it gets to the Provost. I've heard that the Provost and the President find

these very valuable, and, in fact, I know of one or two cases where some action flowed from that at the Provost's level. So I honestly can't say one way or the other, but at least we do furnish that information in a readable form so that someone can understand what the result is.

"The . . . yeah, I know I'm talking too long; I always talk too long. Of these thirty reviews, I would like to characterize it this way. I went through the list, and I checked off the ones I thought were useful in some sense, and it wasn't the majority of them. By the way, what I mean as useful, is that it changed something in the department, that it wasn't just a department that said, 'we're doing this', and the review team said 'that look's pretty good', you know, and everybody went away feeling good. There's nothing wrong with that, but it's not clear you accomplished much. There were, however, other reviews which spanned the range. I saw a review that said, 'This department doesn't realize how good it is. It has a sense of inferiority, and it's a lot better.' That is an important thing for a department to hear. I saw other reviews that were damning; it made me feel ill to read these things. These were situations where everybody knew that there was something wrong, but until it gets written down on a piece of paper, saying that this is not a department of the quality that Cornell University should have. It's very hard to act on. My guess is, again this is just my opinion, that seven to eight of these reviews ended up with some kind of action which made a difference in some way. The difference in one case was major, in several other cases was semi-major, like reorganization within a college. In the other cases, it brought to light a festering problem that everybody knew about or serious issues that had been overlooked. That's my report."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. Questions?"

Professor Thomas Brenna, Nutritional Sciences: "Do you think that is a good return on investment? Those changes—do you think that's a good return on all the work that went in?"

Professor Stein: "It's hard to say whether it's a good return. There are a couple of other returns on investment, which really are hard to quantify. Beyond that seven or eight, I can point to two examples I know of where the actual discussion that the department went through in writing the self-study . . . several people in the department and one of the deans said that this is the best thing that ever happened to that department. To have to sit down and write a coherent story about what it is that they were doing, and that it actually caused some kind of reorganization of the way they thought of themselves. There are other departments where it's a morale boost. We have tried to organize it in such a way as to eliminate the boilerplate that people have to go through. There's a lot of boilerplate, but mostly it's something that can be done by departmental administrators."

Speaker Howland: "One here and one here."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering. "Peter, your description of the correlation of forces that brought into it being mentioned only one individual as a major force. I think it was even a much larger force in the correlation of forces that brought it into being and that was the then Dean of the Faculty."

Peter Stein: "Who was that?"

LAUGHTER

Professor Ballantyne: "Peter, I think you have partially answered my question. I take it that there would be at least one, perhaps more deans, who agree that something useful came of the process."

Professor Kallfelz: "One point of information. Is this the official report of the committee?"

Professor Stein: "Yes."

Professor Andrew Ramage, History of Art: "I should like to make a comment. I'm one of the non-confidential, dean-stacking, wreaking havoc people. Our review is still in progress, and we have not had any reply from the dean. I think the process is flawed. There is room for undue influence, as you laughed off. There's suspicion of predetermined outcome, as also laughed off. There's neglected timetable, which is unconscionable, and there is moving ahead before the process is complete which is worse than unconscionable. Evicting a department from its hundred year partial occupation, let us say Classics, not just part of History, from Goldwin Smith is a disgusting act! I wish to be on record as pointing at the Dean of Arts and Sciences as causing this upset."

Professor Stein: "May I respond to at least half of that? The unconscionable length of time?"

Speaker Howland: "Please."

Professor Stein: "The unconscionable length of time—I'm not referring just to the History of Art review but to many others. That has been one of the serious problems. We have had a lot of unconscionable lengths of time. We had several cases where it took the dean essentially a year to act on something that had come in, before the dean was able to answer it. The committee has limited power to get these things. Some deans are better than others about complying with the timetables. I'm not going to name any deans, and I'm not particularly talking about your case. I'm talking in general, but that has really been one of the problems that we don't always get a response in what we consider a timely fashion. In more than one case, we had to speak to the President about the problem that we have had."

Professor Ramage: "What about the executive action before?"

Professor Stein: "The executive action before has nothing to do with the review. That's the province of the dean."

Professor Ramage: "But it's based on the review."

Professor Stein: "I'm conscious of that particular review. I know the committee tried as hard as it could to make sure that the interests of the department were represented in the choosing of that outside review team."

Professor Ted Clark: "Does the Provost's office respond formally to every review? That is, if a department, if everything is hunky-dory, do you still respond to the department as part of the review process?"

Provost Martin: "I haven't yet had much of an opportunity to develop a habit. I think I will, because I like habits. I think it would be nice if I were to respond to the good ones as well as the less good ones. So I will try to do that."

Professor Stein: "I think that would be a good idea. In the past that was not the case with the Provost's office."

Provost Martin: "By the way, I should say that the limit of one page on the report I get was the decision made by someone else."

Professor Stein: "By my committee, yes."

Provost Martin: "Because I didn't want people to think I was unable to read more than a page."

Professor Stein: "It was your predecessor that had that problem."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Robert Connelly, Math: "What was the criteria for choosing which departments to review?"

Professor Stein: "Ah. The criterion for choosing which departments was complicated, but it started off by a tremendous interest in the Biological Sciences on the part of the university administration. So that was the first focus. Is Ron Ehrenberg still there in the back? Ron Ehrenberg at the time was Vice-Provost and was very interested in the Biological Sciences and in Economics, and that directed the original thrust. Then we decided that the Life Sciences were the right thing, and we believe that was a good idea to try to have reviews in like areas going on at the same time. Whether or not that's proven to be important is yet to be seen. So we tried to make a schedule that started out, first with the Life Sciences and then with the Social Sciences and then with the Humanities. Then in addition to that, the committee was always open to a dean saying that he would like to review this department out of order, and we would say, 'sure,' trying to serve the interests of the dean. In one case, which I will not sit down before talking about, a department came to us, the Physics Department, and said, 'Could we please be reviewed ahead of time, because we think it's a good idea.' I must say that was the only time we heard that."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "Does the legislation that established the review process call for a reevaluation or a reauthorization after some period of time?"

Professor Stein: "I don't remember. I don't think so, but I may be wrong."

Speaker Howland: "OK. Thank you very much Professor Stein. We pass now to Good and Welfare. The Chair would like to recognize Professor Elaine Wethington."

13. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SUBJECTS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Professor Elaine Wethington, Human Development, and Chair of Committee on Human Subjects Educational Program: "I'll be brief, as brief as I can possibly be. The National Institutes of Health implemented a requirement for mandatory education of investigators and key personnel on all NIH funded research as of October 1, 2000. ([Appendix G.](#)) No university in the country can continue to accept funds from NIH until it has assured the National Institutes of Health that key personnel on those grants have received appropriate training. Covered by this mandatory education requirement are all key personnel named on the funded proposal, and also all new personnel must get training before working with human subjects and assurances have to go in on a yearly basis as the grant is renewed. In response to the need to have an education program available by October 1 and our early valentine to the Cornell faculty, the University Committee on Human Subjects has put on the web an educational site to train people, key personnel, graduate students and others on the use of human subjects in research. Members of the faculty, key personnel and staff who are named as key personnel on all federal funds, not just NIH now, must complete this training within the next year in order to continue to accept federal funds for their research. We are also asking ... I want to ask you as Chair of the University Committee on Human Subjects, since in the year 2003 all university research, whether funded by the federal government or not, will be covered by a mandatory education requirement on human subjects, that we all begin now to get education in the use of human subjects.

"Just to show you briefly what our site looks like—This site was imported from the University of Minnesota and unlike the National Institutes of Health site, it is specifically written for researchers in social and behavioral research. The site provides an overview of the human subjects research process, the different

components of the informed consent process (what steps have to be followed in order to assure that the steps which are mandated by the federal government are followed), a checklist which we ask investigators to follow when reporting to us, and what the consent process for their projects will look like. There is a listing of the actual approval requirements, continuing review of the projects that involve the use of human subjects and a test (this is a special valentine) of twenty questions to test your understanding of what you've just seen. Successful responses to the quiz are kept on a database maintained by the Office of Sponsored Programs and at present are used to assure NIH and other federal agencies that the mandatory education requirements have been met. Are there any questions? Thank you. The program has been there since October 1; we would like it to be used more extensively."

Professor Linda Nowak, Molecular Medicine: "Can you give the Cornell web site address?"

Professor Wethington: "It's on the Office of Sponsored Programs web site. If you go to the home page of the Office of Sponsored Programs, we're the second announcement in red. We're easy to find. Thank you."

Web URL: < <http://www.osp.cornell.edu/HSCompliance/index.html>>

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen that . . . oh, I'm sorry. Professor Cooke."

Dean Cooke: "The significance of the debate on the Ward Center deserves more time than the twenty minutes we could allocate to it for this meeting. We do plan to have it on the agenda for the next month's meeting. We don't know how full that agenda will be, but I wanted to raise the possibility with you of whether we should call an adjourned meeting of the Senate, a non-voting meeting, because a week's notice is pretty difficult to have a quorum. I'm suggesting that we have a non-voting meeting one week from today in this room provided you are interested and think that would be a useful exercise. I would like the Chair to get a straw vote to give me some advice as to whether we should proceed with that."

Speaker Howland: "Yes, would those who would attend such a meeting please raise their hand? It looks like a significant number, I would say. So we will have a meeting."

Professor Kuniholm: "Coming to meetings and getting started in five or ten minutes is rough. I do urge you, if you haven't grabbed one yet, to take a look at these handouts that you have before you and then the Dean's web site which has all of these things in full if you want to read every painful word."

Speaker Howland: "The meeting is adjourned."

Adjourned 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Walcott

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty