

# MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, February 14, 1996

## 1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Peter C. Stein, Dean of the Faculty: "Happy Valentine's Day. Welcome to the first meeting of the Cornell Faculty Senate. We don't have any traditions, we don't have any rules, we don't have anything; as this is our first meeting. Relying on some precedent to get started, we're using the same room, the same wine, and the same cookies as belonged to the FCR. But beyond that, we don't—as I've said—really have any rules of procedure.

"I wondered whether to have this meeting or not. We don't have an Executive Committee in place, so we don't have an agenda that was approved by anybody. But it seemed worthwhile just to have this meeting at the usual time. We do have some business—to elect a Speaker, first of all. After that, we're going to have the first of what I hope will become a standard feature of the Senate Meetings: When the President and/or the Provost are able to fit this into their schedules, they will come here for a period of fifteen minutes and perhaps make remarks, but hopefully not. [Laughter.] They will hopefully listen to your concerns in free and open discussion—what's called in politics 'Q & A time.' We will have the first of those meetings today.

"The other item is from an ongoing committee. We decided that we probably would want to change a lot of the committee structures, but in the absence of an Executive Committee to think through these matters, the transition document that we passed at the last FCR meeting said we'd continue the committees of the FCR and make them Senate committees until we decide to do otherwise. One of the continuing committees is the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, and they have passed a resolution on grading policies which they bring to you for your consideration. We will not take action on the resolution—because you have clearly not consulted your constituencies—but it seems like it will be worthwhile to get your reactions to it and have some discussion. In the rest of the time, we'll just have a committee of the whole meeting, where you will talk about what it is that's on your mind and what it is you think we ought to do and how you think we ought to proceed."

## 2. ELECTION OF SPEAKER

Dean Stein: "We'll proceed to the first item of business, which is the selection of a Speaker. We have sort of a new tradition in the Senate, which I think is a good one—it's that the positions on the Senate are contested. We have not had a tradition of that in the past for many of the FCR committees and, in particular, for the Speaker. Everyone agreed that it would be a good idea to have you make a choice, so we have two candidates, both of whom would carry out the position of Speaker with great distinction. I thought that I would ask them to stand up, introduce themselves, and make a few remarks. After that, we will have an election. So, in alphabetical order, let me first call on Professor Gottfried."

Professor Herbert Gottfried, Coordinator, Landscape Architecture Program: "This is a position for which I never imagined I would be a candidate, any more than you perhaps imagined you would have a Senate. So I haven't the slightest idea what to say about being the Speaker of this body, since my job would simply be to mediate discussion or be some sort of transmission device among all the motions, amendments, and other things that happen. The last time I did this was running for the class treasurer of Trenton Central High School in 1957—an election which I won. But you should know that my campaign manager was a guy named Charlie who was elected in the class yearbook as the most popular person in the class and the best looking person in the class—plus he was All-State in two sports and lettered in the third. So I think what happened in that election was that the students voted for Charlie and got me.

"I don't have any other qualifications for this job, other than having been the treasurer of the high school class of Trenton, New Jersey. I'm in design, where we teach by analogue, and I tried to think of an analogy that would be fitting. So I'm a rower—a skuller. It is part of my life to know my fore from my starboard and my bow from my stern. If I lose track of any or all four, I know the consequences."

Dean Stein: "I now call on Professor Kay Obendorf."

Professor S. Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel: "I'm Kay Obendorf, and I'm in the Department of Textiles and Apparel. In the last two to four years I've been involved in some committees of University-level faculty governance and served on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council of Representatives, where I met Peter Stein. Now Peter has had some interesting activities and ideas—and I'm not sure why I let him talk me into this—but his other ideas have been very fun and fruitful.

Through faculty governance I got to participate in selecting our President; that was a good choice, I think we would all agree. So, for some reason, I let Peter convince me to say 'yes' for one other adventure. So I would be willing to serve as Speaker if that's your pleasure."

Dean Stein: "Thank you. And now in the best fourth-grade tradition, I will ask both candidates to leave the room. Mr. Provost, would you count this side of the house; Mr. President, would you count this side of the house; and I'll count the middle. Would those voting for Professor Gottfried please stand. And now would those voting for Professor Obendorf please stand. In a very close vote, you have selected Kay Obendorf to be the Speaker." [Candidates enter, followed by applause.]

Speaker Obendorf: "Thank you. I'm dependent on all of you to run an orderly meeting. This morning as I was dropping my husband off at work, he said, 'I hope you get this job if you want it'; and I said, 'I'm not sure.' Professor Gottfried and I had a discussion outside, and we said we weren't sure who the winner would be—the one who got to go back to his office or the one who would have to stay. So thank you for your confidence; I will do my best. Everything is a learning experience, as I tell my sons. Learn from your bad mistakes, and go on."

### **3. APPROVAL OF SUMMARY MINUTES OF DECEMBER 13, 1995 FACULTY COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES MEETING**

Speaker Obendorf: "The next item on the agenda is to approve the summary minutes for the December 13 meeting of the Faculty Council of Representatives. Those are available on the World Wide Web. I don't know how many of you have found that site yet, but I would encourage you to do that, as it will help reduce the amount of paper that has to come out of the Dean of Faculty's Office."

Dean Stein: "Unfortunately, we decided to change the Web Site after sending you the wrong name. The Web Site is now 'Faculty\_senate.' So it's '[http://www.cornell.edu/Faculty\\_senate](http://www.cornell.edu/Faculty_senate).'"

Speaker Obendorf: "We would hope that the new Faculty Senate would have a Web Site with a different name than that which belonged to the FCR. So I think that's a good change, Peter."

"Are we ready to approve the minutes? [Moved/Seconded.] It has been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. Are there any changes, or is there any discussion? If not, all in favor of approving the minutes, please say 'aye'; opposed, 'no.' Well, that went pretty smoothly."

### **4. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**

Speaker Obendorf: "The next item is the question-and-answer session. We have both the President and the Provost here today, so you may address your questions to either of them. I'd also welcome them to say a few words if you'd like them to get you warmed up."

Don M. Randel, Provost: "I only want to welcome this body into being, to congratulate all of us as faculty members for having created it, and to say how much I personally—and how much I know the President and our colleagues in Day Hall—look forward to working with this body in creating the kind of institution that we all want it to be. I hope that this will be a genuine partnership. It will require hard work on both sides to make it work, but we're certainly committed to making that effort on our side. I hope Peter will confirm that we have every intention of continuing to be in close touch with him and with yourselves."

Speaker Obendorf: "In the tradition of the FCR, please identify yourself and your department right before you ask your question."

Isaac Kramnick, Richard J. Schwartz Professor of Government: "Don, can you tell us what our role will be in the shaping of the Sexual Harassment Policy?"

Provost Randel: "It will be, in some degree, a continuation of the role that the FCR began to play. There is a committee, and as a new draft emerges of that policy—which is being created in response to a wide variety of people, including the FCR—you will have access to that in whatever committee structure is devised and will presumably address it in that way. But it will certainly come back to this body."

Speaker Obendorf: "I believe that is the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty."

N. David Mermin, Horace White Professor of Physics: "I've had a feeling in the last couple of weeks that the post-Campaign

rhetoric may be having a bad effect on faculty morale. One reads about an \$80 million windfall and \$250 million more than we had hoped for in the newspapers, for example. But, at the same time, the administration is trying to squeeze blood out of the Arts College in the amount of about a million. Now, I understand this is a complicated issue, but the amount of information available to the faculty about the Campaign at the moment is extremely small. Everything I know about it I have learned from *The Cornell Daily Sun*, *The Ithaca Journal*, and the *Cornell Chronicle*&ndash;and the numbers are not consistent. I could deduce from the article in the *Sun*, for example, that the endowment has gone up, as a result of the Campaign, by \$372 million&ndash;and that involved a calculation. But I think it's the right calculation, because when I added the four other categories they quoted, I got a total of \$1.5 billion. But it wasn't clear to me what any of the other categories meant. And then in the *Workplace* of last week, there was an interview with Fred Rogers where there was this little graph of sources of income&ndash;one of which is 'gifts.' If you look at 'gifts,' they averaged pretty steadily for the last ten years at about \$50 million a year. I multiply that by ten and get \$500 million. So I wonder about the \$1.5 billion total. There's a lot of information floating around, and I was wondering whether you were planning to try to inform the faculty of what actually happened, if anything, with this Campaign."

Provost Randel: "Well, approximately 1.5 billion things happened. There is certainly going to be an effort to explain this in considerable detail&ndash;including some of the kinds of things that you have observed here that are difficult to understand, if you don't have all the pieces of the puzzle. The total amount of the endowment, for example, was misreported in *The New York Times*, of all places, so it just goes to show you what you can count on and what you can't count on. The chart that you were looking at in the *Workplace* was in real dollars and not in inflated dollars, for example. We have, in fact, developed most of the material for this and have talked about it some within the administration and with the relevant Trustee committees, and we will assemble that information into a presentation for the whole community which will try to make clear what was collected where, and so forth.

"A number of things could be said quickly about the Campaign. For one thing, the Campaign went on for more than five years&ndash;there was a pre-Campaign period. For another thing, we have for some time been raising \$150 million dollars a year. So if you count all that into the Campaign, multiply that by five or seven, say, and then subtract that from what was actually raised, you see that the incremental amount is not what one would expect by just hearing the big number. And, of course, a significant part of the addition to the endowment was in the form of professorships raised under a challenge program. Although the list price for a professorship was \$2.0 million, the street price was \$1.25 million&ndash;with the understanding that that \$1.25 million had to be locked up in the bank until it grew to be the full \$2.0 million&ndash;and so we don't get any income from those for the next few years. There are a number of reasons why we don't feel rich even though the Campaign was a very important thing to have done, and we are worlds better off than we would otherwise be.

"One last example of how this works and why it feels the way it does: We could show you, and will, a nice chart of how much we added to the endowment for student financial aid. We all know that student financial aid is one of the most pressing needs that we have in the general context of the budget. You'll see a nice line going up for student financial aid, and you'll see a nice line that goes down for financial aid from federal and state sources. So part of the Campaign was, alas, to fill holes that are being steadily dug for us by other people. But we will lay all of this in front of you in great detail."

Associate Professor Jeffrey G. Scott, Entomology: "Could we have an approximate time frame?"

Provost Randel: "There is some hope that we might actually produce such a thing by next week; the basic pieces are in place."

Professor Emeritus Donald F. Holcomb, Physics: "It seems to me that the people in Albany have lost track of the purpose of public higher education in our society. I'm not now thinking so much of Cornell&ndash;although we are obviously part of it&ndash;but I know of colleagues at the City College of New York who are watching that university system being slowly disassembled. So I'm wondering what, if anything, has been the role of Cornell on the public scene to attempt to educate people as to what the purpose of public higher education is today."

President Hunter R. Rawlings III: "I think you're absolutely right&ndash;that there is a strong sense throughout New York that the purposes of public education really are being lost in a lot of this budget debate that we see every day. Specifically, we have been meeting quite regularly with our colleagues at SUNY to talk about the impact of budget cuts to SUNY within Cornell. Those discussions, as you might imagine, have been difficult. I think it's fair to say that we have not felt satisfied that even within SUNY there is a strong enough recognition of *quality* as the driver of decisions versus other factors such as across-the-board cuts. So we are not satisfied with that conversation we're having, even with SUNY.

"I, as a newcomer to New York, have been surprised at how little public outcry there has been to these massive reductions in funding of public higher education. In fact, I'm shocked at how little reaction there has been in the public. Last year there was a

very large cut of something like \$150 million, and this year it's another \$100 million of public tax funds that were cut from public higher education at the state level. And I don't see much of a public outcry to that.

"So your question is a very good one. First, we've been working very intensively with SUNY on our own relationship—we're not entirely satisfied with that yet. And second, I think we do need to begin to plan a strategy—it will take a long time to implement such a strategy, though—whereby Cornell can have a major role in the public discussion of this issue. We're not prepared to do that, frankly, in the next month or two; I think this is going to take a good long time to develop such a public strategy. But I think it is needed, because I don't see that SUNY is having much impact in the public debate. I'm being very candid about that, but that's what I see."

Professor Donald J. Barr, Human Service Studies: "Back to the Sexual Harassment Policy: Who's going to make the decision on that?"

President Rawlings: "Well, the Administration will make the decision on the final form of that policy. It's our effort, as you are no doubt aware, to have a single policy across all of Cornell. We are committed to that. We'd like to have as much consultation as possible—and there has already been a great deal of consultation. We now have the second draft in preparation; we will have more consultation; and then, frankly, there will be a decision made on what form that set of procedures should take for the campus as a whole."

Professor David B. Wilson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology: "One thing that concerns me greatly is related to what has already been discussed, and that is general faculty morale at Cornell—which I think is getting pretty low, basically. I think there is a real need for some sort of leadership from the top to encourage people that Cornell will, in fact, be here in five years and there will, in fact, be some faculty, and the whole place will not just disappear. There really hasn't been much going on to counteract all of the discouraging news that we've been hearing recently regarding the status of higher education."

President Rawlings: "Well, there is, as you say, some discouraging news. But there's also some very encouraging news—and we see that on a day-by-day basis, so we tend not to be pushed too far in one direction by it. It is important to make certain that people realize that there are good things happening at Cornell, despite the cutbacks and such. The faculty, for example, has been very successful in keeping up a great deal of its research activity. Its grant success—the percentage of grants won versus those applied for—continues to be very high. We do exceptionally well in competition for federal funds. And the Campaign ended on a very high note, despite the fact that, as has been pointed out, you don't see the immediate implications of that. I think it's quite important that we, in fact, do our best to convey a lot of that positive information (as well as the negative). I also think it's important for faculty members to understand what most faculty members across the country have had to undergo in the last few years; it's certainly not unique to Cornell nor New York State. The State of California, for example, has gone through a tremendous upheaval. Those are wonderful institutions in California, but they have gone through one shock after another. The same has been true at many private institutions that have had a very hard time because they don't have very big endowments to maintain their support. Our enrollment, for example, continues to be very healthy; the demand for Cornell continues to be very healthy; the sense of support from our alumni has never been stronger than it is today—and those are all features of the landscape as well."

"I do think we have a lot of work to do in terms of academic planning at Cornell, because we're doing a large number of things here. The question is, 'Can we continue to do such a vast array of things, given the fact that public support for education these days is declining?' I think that's something that we should all be interested in and invest in in terms of the future."

Professor Cutberto Garza, Nutritional Sciences: "As a follow-up to that: As we go through these very difficult times, what are we doing to integrate the endowed and statutory sides? From the faculty perspective, we often view the endowed and statutory faculty pieces as separate and scream at each other, 'Your end of the canoe is sinking!' What we don't realize when we do that is that it is *a* canoe." [Laughter.]

Provost Randel: "This is a subject on which I can speak with evangelical fervor. We must overcome much that has inhibited things that we ought to want to do that derive from the statutory-endowed boundary. Much of that is imposed upon us by the State of New York; they wish to be assured that New York State dollars are spent for specific purposes and so forth. Similarly, we have to assure the parents of students who pay \$20,000 a year to send their kids to endowed that their money is being used appropriately. But we can lick a lot of the bureaucracy and a lot of the internal friction that we have lived with for a long time. If we have the will, we can get out of the mood of saying that certain things cannot be done at Cornell because of the statutory-endowed boundary. That is not the only boundary: the Hotel School has its own fence around it and, similarly, the Johnson School and the Law School. We have spent an incredible amount of energy in this institution figuring out how to pass money back and forth from one to the other and then let that, somehow, dictate our educational and academic needs. I think if

we'd see an application of some of the kind of creativity that's represented in the faculty, we'd be enabled to put academic policy in the driver's seat and keep those bookkeeping methods in line much better.

"I should say one thing in response to a previous remark as well. It is our aim&ndash;we are fully committed to the notion&ndash;that we are going to continue to have good, honest academic fun in this institution by doing some new and exciting things, even in these times. In the case of Biochemistry, within the last 24 hours we have been talking about some specific initiatives to take there. The Materials Science Center affects a lot of people; we are putting new energy into that. Southeast Asian Studies is another field in which there is a range of things that go on. We can't do everything, as the President says, but we do have some resources that we want to invest in areas where we can galvanize the faculty action, where we can bring together new combinations, or where we can move into fields where we ought to be but are not now in.

"The sad fact is that much of what we confront now is not new. Dale Corson, on retiring from the presidency, was asked to write a report about the State of the University and its finances. If you were to read the title page, you would have thought it was written yesterday. It begins by saying, 'Less support in society for higher education. Tuition going up too fast. Faculty salaries going up too slowly.' Et cetera, et cetera; it's the same set of issues. What's required here is an application of imagination and energy. We *will* be here in five years, and we'll be better."

Professor Elizabeth D. Earle, Plant Breeding and Biometry: "There's considerable concern among the faculty about having a substantive review of tenure decisions take place in Day Hall. Would you comment on the rationale for this change in procedures and whether you expect any further changes in how these matters would be handled."

Provost Randel: "I thought everyone understood that it was a ruthless usurpation by the Central Administration of the Faculty's prerogatives. This is a subject that I have discussed with all and sundry&ndash;I've been to a couple of college faculty meetings and meetings of departments, and I've talked with Peter about it at great length. It is my expectation that one of the most fruitful things that could emerge from this body is elaboration and development of a system by which we bring about more uniform standards and more uniformly high ones&ndash;that we see the highest standards in the University prevail broadly, and that that judgment be fundamentally vested in the Faculty recognizing that it does have to have real standards and real teeth in it. The Central Administration is not now doing anything that my predecessors did not themselves do. In fact, the cast of characters is exactly the same but for me. If one goes back to the days of W. Donald Cooke, there are accounts of similar kinds of difficulties and things being turned down by the Central Administration. I think that we must have the ability to insist that everybody become as good as the best of Cornell; but I'm fully prepared to see us develop a system that will include somewhat broader faculty participation than we now seem to encounter."

Associate Professor Kerry H. Cook, Soil, Crop and Atmospheric Sciences: "I'm wondering how firm Cornell's commitment to need-blind admissions is. If that commitment is going to waver, how will the public react, and how will Cornell be affected?"

President Rawlings: "That's a good question. Our commitment is very, very strong to need-blind admissions. We want to maintain that policy. For the foreseeable future, I don't think there will be any problems with maintaining that policy. It does cost us a great deal to maintain, however. And that comes back to the earlier question: Why, after you raise so much money, do you still have financial pressure? That's the way I would characterize it&ndash;we're under financial pressure. We don't have a terrible financial problem; we're not in the red and we're able to maintain our budget, but it's tight. And one of the things making it tight, in addition to the elements Don mentioned earlier, is the fact that to maintain the need-blind admissions policy, we lose a little more money each year. It's the two-percent problem: We don't bring in quite enough revenue to meet the need, so we have to take some of our own money each year to do so. We're committed to it; it's painful financially to have to do it each year, but we do it. I think we're going to need more help&ndash;even more successful fund-raising in the future&ndash;to enable us to do it five years from now and ten years from now and twenty years from now. It's a most difficult thing to maintain within the budget, but we're committed to doing it."

Professor Cook: "So you don't see any wavering of that commitment, and you don't see any need for debate?"

President Rawlings: "No, I don't see any wavering. The only point that I want to make, after saying we're committed, is that it takes money from our budget to do that each year. And each year, it takes a little bit more, because the revenue simply doesn't keep up with the need. It's one of the things that creates the sort of pressure on budgets that we're all familiar with."

Professor Richard E. Schuler, Economics, Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Faculty Trustee: "This is really a follow-up observation and question, in a way, to your response to Kerry's question. With the wind-down of the capital Campaign, I know there's some discussion of whether we maintain the same level of development staff with respect to the views of the future. My observation would be that, during the end of the Campaign, the development staff began to operate more closely with

individual faculty members in terms of exploring their needs and connections with the alumni. I've seen that work very well with other universities and would urge you to consider that form of transition for the future for Cornell."

President Rawlings: "Let me say two things in response. First, you're absolutely right—that model works effectively, and it works very well here, and it did work very well in the Campaign. I personally know quite a few alumni who were drawn to give to Cornell by a faculty member and their interest in the faculty member's work. Having said that, we can't let all faculty members run off individually—without very careful coordination to make sure that we have targeted fund-raising; otherwise, frankly, donors aren't so happy, because they hear from too many different people. So, we have to coordinate it carefully, but I think it works exceptionally well.

"On the first part of your question as to whether there will be changes in the development staff now that the Campaign is over, the answer is 'yes.' Those had been planned, even before the Campaign began. There was a ramping up of development staff for the Campaign and then there will be ramping down at the end of the Campaign—that will, indeed, occur. Now that's unfortunate in some ways, but in other ways, it was planned for and needs to occur within the overall budget."

Dean Stein: "I'd like to thank you, Hunter and Don. I think this has been a very interesting discussion and that a lot of the issues brought up are *the* issues, and I hope that this will be a regular and ongoing part of our meetings."

President Rawlings: "Thank you. I'd like to make just one final comment. I think the fact that the faculty voted for the Senate so overwhelmingly—there was a good turnout in that vote—and that you had people willing to serve on the Senate and on different committees and, as people have told us, even put their names up for competition for the University Faculty Committee—I think all of this is a very good sign that people want to participate. We're eager to participate with you, as Don said earlier; we'd like to make decisions where we have ample opportunity to consult with you. And I hope—this is my last point—that a great part of our discussion will be on academic matters. It is very easy to have bodies such as this one spend most of their time on what I would call 'semi-political' matters—and you all, I think, know what I'm talking about. It's natural; we all want to say something about those matters. They're important. But the most important matters are the academic ones—the choices we're making academically: where we want to go and where we no longer want to go. If we don't reserve the bulk of our time for that, I'm afraid these will be much less productive sessions than they could be otherwise. We're busy and you're busy, and we'd rather spend our time on those central academic matters of the University."

Dean Stein: "I'd just like to make one or two comments to follow up on what got said here. One, in answer to my colleague David Mermin, who wants to know where the money is: I think that's an interesting question. I've been working with the Financial Policies Committee to try to understand that and to put out a report from our perspective. One of the things you discover when you look into this is that the way we as faculty tend to define categories of where the money is and comes from and goes to—those are not the same categories that the people in development come up with. If you just look at those graphs, you don't understand what the words mean. We are trying to translate those words into words that are more meaningful to us."

Professor Mermin: "And when will we get your translation?"

Dean Stein: "As soon as it's done. First I have to learn what everything means, so it will take a little longer than a week.

"And the other thing is that if you rank order all the decisions we make in this University, the ones that really count—you can have all the rest of them—are those concerning which non-tenured faculty members are given tenure and what students we admit to the University. Those are the only real matters that make Cornell a great place or a mediocre place. In one way or another, those issues have been raised here. It's my hope that we as an organization can learn how to contribute to the mechanisms that make those decisions in a way that benefits the University.

"The last thing is that if you haven't signed in outside, please remember to sign in on your way out. If you forget to sign in a couple of times, you get a stern letter from me."

Speaker Obendorf: "I would like to call on Professor Kevin Clinton, a member of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, to introduce a resolution regarding grade reporting."

## **5. RESOLUTION AND DISCUSSION ON GRADE REPORTING**

Professor Kevin Clinton, Classics: "On behalf of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, I'd like to give you some background on this resolution ([Appendix A](#), attached) and an explanation of some of the details.

This procedure for grade reporting has been in operation at many Canadian universities for several years now and was adopted by Dartmouth College in May 1994. It first came to the attention of many of us when it was very briefly discussed at a meeting of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in the fall of 1994. In that meeting, it came up in the context of grade inflation and what may be done about it. It's fairly well known that the percentage of 'A's given at Cornell has been steadily increasing. In fall 1966, they amounted to 16.3 percent of all undergraduate grades. In fall of 1988, they were at 28.0 percent; and in fall of 1994, they were at 34.0 percent. Over a span of nearly 30 years, the percentage of 'A's given out has more than doubled. The rise has come largely at the expense of 'C's and 'D's, which amounted to 39.9 percent in 1966 but only 14.0 percent in 1994.

"There seemed to be a lot of interest in the issue at that meeting and with the way Dartmouth decided to deal with it. The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies took up the matter at meetings over the last three months or so. However, we were not convinced that this grade-reporting procedure would turn out to be a cure for grade inflation. But we did finally think that it had a lot of merit as a way of reporting grades—more meaningfully than is currently done—and that it deserved to be given serious consideration by the University Faculty.

"The advantage of reporting grades in this new way is briefly described in the rationale that accompanies this resolution. The proposal has considerable advantages for both students and instructors. Expanding on the explanation given in the rationale, we would point out that in the current situation, where grades are relatively high, students who take courses with low median grades get grades that seem disproportionately low. But if the median is published on the transcript, a student need not feel so bad about having attained, say, a 'B-' where the median is a 'C+', or in any case, a grade that's close to the median. A student who gets a 'C' in a large course where the median is 'A' will naturally, we hope, not be pleased. But this is precisely the sort of student who should be encouraged to do better, especially in a course where the median is so generous. Furthermore, this more accurate recognition of performance should offer some encouragement to students to take courses that have a relatively low median.

"Although we have no reason to think that this policy will cure grade inflation, the logic of it is as such that it is not likely to encourage grade inflation and may well serve as a damper. At Dartmouth, the overall GPA did go down very slightly last semester—one hundredth of a grade point—after a general increase of about the same amount over the last few years. Coming as it did after several years of increase, it does, at least, look significant. And last year, the new procedure was not in effect for the entire college but only for the freshmen. Although this procedure in itself may not be a cure for grade inflation, it does, at least, have the potential to be of help in dealing with the problem—if departmental or college faculties are interested in bringing about change. The changes that will have to take place, will, most likely, need to take place at the departmental level.

"The second part of this resolution calls for the information on grades to be made public. In the present state of affairs, such information is not easily accessible and therefore is not conducive to discussion. But with the information readily available, it is a bit more likely that discussion will take place. A discussion of the current state of affairs can only be a healthy development.

"Another reason for making the information available is the matter of accuracy. If it is not published, a student group will probably attempt to recreate it by polling students for median grades on their grade reports; and their result may be somewhat inaccurate.

"One concern that came up in our discussions was whether or not the proposed change would promote competitiveness among the students. Of course, we hope that it would promote a certain kind of competitiveness—whereby students strive to improve their performance to the levels of their abilities—but not the prudish sort of competitiveness that is reflected in pages being ripped out of library books, cheating, and sabotaging others' experiments. We were inclined to think that an increase in that sort of act would be unlikely. In fact, we were told by the Dartmouth Registrar that they have not noticed any greater competitiveness of this sort than usual.

"I turn now to details. Why did we choose the median grade instead of the mean or average grade? Although a plausible case can be made for using the mean, we decided in favor of the median because it tends to give a better sense of the distribution of grades. In a class of ten, for example, where the grades are all 'A' except for two very low grades, the low grades have a pronounced effect on the mean, although the median remains 'A.' And these results can be extrapolated to larger classes.

"The course enrollment allows a reader of the transcript to assess how meaningful the roll of grading plays in a course. A class with relatively low enrollment with a high median grade is not unusual, especially among upper-division courses. But in a course with a relatively high enrollment and a high median, the grading is probably not a meaningful part of the course. This is not to say that the course is poor or not worth taking—just that the grading is not a significant component of the course. On the other hand, if you consider the other end, in a course where the enrollment is high and the median grade is low, grading would

be seen to be a serious business.

"The exemption for honors, independent study, and individual research courses has to do with the fact that such courses are often given a single number in a department's office, even though students sign-up individually with different instructors. In effect, a single number refers to several courses, so it would not make sense in these cases to calculate median grades.

"This policy cannot be put into effect immediately, as the present computer program is not capable of handling it, according to the University Registrar, David Yeh. A new system is in development and is expected to be operational in 1998, hence the stipulation in the resolution, 'as soon as technically feasible.' The system, according to David Yeh, would be able to handle the proposed procedure, but it will entail a redesign of the transcript, which is not a trivial matter. The Dartmouth Registrar's Office had only three months to accomplish this, and it was a bit of a scramble. We assume that the additional lead time for Cornell will not put undue pressure on the Registrar's Office. Mr. Yeh has also informed us that it will be relatively easy to make the information publicly available, either through a public server or in some other form, and we could do this fairly soon. So we put a definite date on the implementation of Part 2 of the resolution, believing a year's time would be ample.

"With regard to rounding the median grade down in the event of an exact tie, we did this for practical reasons—to keep the transcript as simple as possible, mainly. Rounding down rather than up, of course, works in favor of the student. Dartmouth does not round the median but puts both medians on the transcript. Calculating the median only once instead of recalculating after resolution of incompletes, et cetera, was done, again, in sake of simplicity.

"So it is now before you: The resolution will allow you to impart significantly more meaning to our transcript grades than they now have. As you know, this lack of meaning in much of our grading has not been lost on the outside world. Some of our peer institutions have now taken steps—both large and small—in an attempt to correct the situation. A couple of years ago, Stanford took what might seem to us a very small step when they restored their failing grade. To them, evidently, it was a momentous step. Recently, Columbia has made a change to its transcript grade-reporting procedures. At the time of Stanford's change, the issue caught the attention of the national press. *The New York Times*, as you may remember, called for universities 'to get their houses in order.' I'm sure if we pass this resolution it will be regarded by the world outside our campus as a very positive sign."

Speaker Obendorf: "The floor is now open for questions or discussion."

Assistant Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "What about multiple sections of the same course? How will they be treated?"

Professor Clinton: "Do they have separate grades?"

Professor Simons: "Yes. They have different teachers as well."

Dean Stein: "Whatever the Registrar calls a 'course,' a median will be established for that course."

Professor Simons: "So for all courses, all students with that course number will be grouped together, even if they have different professors?"

Dean Stein: "Presumably, yes."

Speaker Obendorf: "Let me remind the body that this is for discussion only today; we will not take a vote."

Associate Professor Michael O. Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering: "There are courses in the Engineering School—Engineering 150 in particular—that have 28 sections with 28 different professors, all with the same course number. The fairness of grading would be very difficult to handle.

"The second point I'd like to make is that there's another part that has to go onto this, and that's education of the recruiters that come to campus. There are, unfortunately, arbitrary rules among a number of companies that require a minimum GPA in order to be interviewed by them, which has driven some of the grade inflation in the upper-level courses in the Engineering School, at least."

Associate Professor Leonard W. Lion, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "My concern is that there's a stigma attached with being below the median, no matter where the median is. If a professor judged that all students in his or her class did very well and gave, say, 'B's and 'A's, those who fell below 'B+' would be stigmatized even though their performance was quite good.

That's my concern, and we really haven't dealt with that.

"And I have a question in regard to the overall GPA calculation: Would this be extended to that? In other words, would you have a median GPA for all the classes a student took and include his or her relevant standing?"

Professor Clinton: "No, we didn't contemplate that at all. We're thinking only about the individual courses. You say students would be stigmatized, though."

Professor Thompson: "Do you want to be below the median?"

Professor Clinton: "No, but I'd like to be close to the median, at least. Hopefully this could be a motivating factor."

Professor Frederick M. Ahl, Classics: "Kevin, what would you propose to do in a class of 60 people of whom 20 were taking it pass/fail?"

Professor Clinton: "We're only talking about letter grades."

Professor Ahl: "Right, but this could also skew the perspective of the class."

Professor Clinton: "S/U grades are not calculated into the averages."

Professor Ahl: "That's precisely it. Many students, for example, decide to take a course as an elective if they know they are not going to expend a large amount of effort for the course. They are aware that if they take the course for credit, they may get a less-than-stellar grade. So they will register for the course S/U. And if you don't count 20 out of 60 people in a class who are taking it S/U and whose grades aren't so hot, you will get the impression that the median grade in that class is much higher than it really is. (Now, that's not necessarily to say that the S/U students always don't do that well; sometimes an S/U student will get the equivalent of an 'A' on an exam, but the vast majority of S/U students come in at the 'B' and 'C' levels.)"

Professor Kenneth A. Strike, Education: "In the courses that I teach, there are selection effects that produce very different audiences to courses. One of the courses has a body of students who are much more able on the whole than in the other. But I think my grading standard across these two courses is quite consistent. On the other hand, in the course where the students are on the whole more able, I would suspect that the mean grade is a bit higher. This policy, in fact, seems to me to degrade the value of the achievement of the students who are in your classes, as a consequence of stating the mean."

Professor Peter Schwartz, Textiles and Apparel: "I'd like to add on to Professor Ahl's comment. In his case, he was concerned about not including the S/U grades and that skewing the meaning of the mean. I'm concerned about counting the students who are taking the course S/U in this total number that you're giving. If a sizable percentage are taking the course S/U and a smaller percentage are taking it for a grade and then you report the larger number, the argument that you're talking about bigger classes versus smaller classes may or may not be valid. You say that a median grade in a larger class is somehow different than a median grade in a smaller class. But if half or a significant portion of the students are taking it S/U, and you don't eliminate them from the number of students listed as being in the course, then the median grade is somewhat meaningless. It's like a small class&ndash;if 90 students are taking it S/U, and only ten are taking it for a grade, and you report 100 students with a median grade of 'B-', that may be a problem."

Professor Clinton: "Is that a typical distribution, though?"

Professor Schwartz: "I think it happens in some of the larger elective courses, all across the colleges. It may not happen in freshman courses, but it certainly happens in some of the upper-level courses."

Professor Clinton: "It's conceivable to me that one way of dealing with that would be to state the number of students only taking the course for letter grades."

Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "In your discussions with David Yeh about the upgrading of the Registrar's system, was there any mention on his part of the ability of the new system to, in fact, deal with cross-listed courses? At least twice a year, I teach courses that are cross-listed between History and Women's Studies, and the computer continues to regard them as two separate courses. Under the new system, would the students be melded into one 'class,' or would they remain as two separate courses? I should point out that if I had a course of, shall we say, 15 students with six registered in one way and nine registered in another, the six wouldn't be reported where the nine would. Is the new system going to be capable of dealing with the fact that we have courses that are, in fact, the same course but are listed under different

departments?"

Professor Clinton: "I assume so. It's apparently supposed to be a fairly sophisticated system."

Dean Stein: "A couple of important points have been made. Yes, the program will deal with the cross-listing problem. Presumably, one could choose either option; and that's something that has to be thought through. Also, the S/U problem has been brought up by a number of people; that wasn't thought of by this committee—I think that's fair to say. If I could just speak as someone who supports this resolution, I think that everything everybody has said against the proposal is true, but it certainly is true now that nobody really knows what a grade means at the moment. Grades are individually determined by each faculty member; some people grade hard, and some people grade easily—and that has a certain unfairness to it when one looks at a transcript. It seems to me that this just adds more information for anyone to read as he or she sees fit. Arguing against it on the basis that this information which is honestly presented will be misinterpreted by the outside—I find that claim difficult to support. There's a lot of information now that's being misinterpreted one way or another; this gives more information on the transcript for those who choose to use it."

Professor Gary A. Rendsburg, Near Eastern Studies: "As someone who regularly teaches courses of more than 100 students at the 200-level, I normally get six, seven, maybe at the most ten S/U students, and I don't think it's a major issue as to how to calculate S/U students if we decide to go with this. I would like to state, now that we're moving to the point of debate as opposed to discussion, that I have major ideological oppositions to the resolution to the transcript system that's being proposed. I give my students the speech once or twice each semester that I still am a little bit old-fashioned about this, and I like to think that the purpose of college is for education—with grades as a necessary evil in our lives. I think there's far too much emphasis among the students on their individual grades as it is. As I walk the corridors of my building and hear other students as well talking about the means and saying, 'I was so many points above the standard deviation,' et cetera; they've lost track of the purpose for education. Now I realize that we've just heard the importance of grades to engineering companies that come to recruit students for jobs and things like that; but from an ideological perspective, I would say that this type of grade reporting will only enhance and increase that kind of concern and presence among students. As a Faculty, I think we should be discouraging that type of action instead of encouraging it."

Professor Robert Ascher, Anthropology: "I'd like to agree with Professor Rendsburg. I do know what grades mean. 'A' is excellent, 'B' is good, 'C' is average, 'D' is poor, and 'F' is failing. I have no problem with that. But I also don't think that there has been one iota of evidence presented that this type of resolution—for what it intends to do—will, in fact, affect grade inflation. There's no evidence whatsoever of that here. I am concerned about, in fact, the first line of the rationale, which reads, 'Students will get a more accurate idea of their performance, and they will be assured that users of the transcript will also have this knowledge.' That exactly leads into the kind of thing Professor Rendsburg was talking about. Cornell already has the reputation of having a highly competitive, highly cut-throat kind of student body, and I think this is just going to add to it. I think it would be a very poor move to punish us by, in fact, encouraging bad educational practices."

Professor Clinton: "I would point out that 34 percent of the grades we're now giving out are 'A's.'"

Professor Ascher: "That is the problem of the professors, and it is indeed a serious problem. But I don't think that this resolution answers that; I think that has to be discussed elsewhere—not with a resolution like this."

Professor Clinton: "I'm not saying that it's going to be answered."

Speaker Obendorf: "Please, it would be better if we could keep this to discussion instead of debate."

Assistant Professor J. Ellen Gainor, Theatre Arts: "I'm wondering if there is any evidence of how this type of system impacts students, regarding applications to graduate schools and the like. My concern would be that this might actually skew in certain unforeseen ways the ways the grades are being considered by other institutions."

Professor Clinton: "It's a bit too early to tell, because Dartmouth only put it into effect for the freshman class."

David I. Grossvogel, Goldwin Smith Professor of Comparative Literature and Romance Studies: "It seems to me that what this does is to advertise courses in terms of the grades that the students receive. If there is a tendency among students to look for a course that is going to help them get a job when the interviewers come onto campus, it seems to me that this isn't going to help."

Assistant Professor Anna Marie Smith, Government: "If the concern is grade inflation, I suggest that this information be made

available for professors to be discussed at the departmental level; it does not necessarily have to go onto the student's transcript. We should be looking at this and discussing this among ourselves as colleagues. The rationale and the data as it is being presented are really two different things."

Professor Thompson: "I get very mixed feelings about this. In one of the courses I teach, I'd like to see this. For the other course, I think it's biased, because depending on the year, I may give everyone 'B's, or I may have a broad distribution. Is there any technical feasibility of making it an optional basis on the part of the professor, who would choose which courses this information is offered about?"

Professor Clinton: "I should say that this is the system that's practiced at many Canadian universities and now at Dartmouth, too. A variation on it has just been passed at Columbia about three weeks ago. There they decided to put on the transcript next to the course grade the percentage of 'A's given in the course."

Associate Professor Robert A. Corradino, Physiology: "I have some fundamental issues with the whole concept of grade inflation. We have two numbers, from 1966 and 1994, in which the percentages of 'A's given were 16 and 34 respectively. Aren't there other conclusions possible as to the reason for that percentage going up other than grade inflation? For example: better students, higher SAT scores, higher GPAs from high school, or better teaching? How much of this is departmentally related, if this is grade inflation? And why penalize the whole University if it's just a few departments or one or two schools?"

Professor Clinton: "Well, if you're all prepared to say that Cornell students are twice as better today than they were in 1966. . . ."

Speaker Obendorf: "I can hardly wait until you actually make a decision on this. I'd like to take a couple more comments, and then we'll move on to the new business."

Professor Howard C. Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I must say that I'm a bit shocked and surprised at the unwillingness of the faculty to increase the information on the transcript. I think it's one thing in a philosophy class, where you're trying to really encourage intellectual thought and de-emphasize the grade; but it's quite another when you're certifying people who will be going to medical school and who will be operating on you later. I think in those situations, you would really like to know that the very best people are getting into those schools and doing that—and that people who are basically incompetent are kept out; that's what the grading system contributes to in this situation. Right now, we have a grading system where it's highly skewed to the upper end. It does not distinguish between the very good students; but it distinguishes exquisitely between degrees of badness. All the information in the grading system is down in the 'C's and 'D's; if you get a 'C' or a 'D,' you're really marked, for that's where the information is. That's not what we're trying to do, I think. I would make a plea for this resolution."

Professor Ahl: "Is that why we don't have 'C's in the Graduate School at all?"

Seymour Smidt, Nicholas H. Noyes Professor of Economics and Finance, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I still think that it would help to have more information available, at least to the students. I think it would help if we could add the median of some reference group of the grades those students got in other courses. A number of other people referred to the selectivity. This would help the interpretation of the grades with respect to what that class is like compared to some larger group. That would be very complicated, but I think it could be worked out, at least to provide information to the students. With computer technology, we can be a little more selective; we can give information to students that isn't necessarily reported to the whole world. Basically, I think the students should have control of what gets reported to the whole world; but we should be able to give them more details so they can judge their own progress."

Professor Obendorf: "Well, I hope that you all have lots of good conversations with your constituents on this, and I'm sure that this will be back for some action in the body in the near future. It was a tradition in the body that has been replaced to have a few minutes to cover new business, and I think it's particularly important for you, as a new body, to bring up at this time anything that's of concern to you, because that can be used by the University Faculty Committee in helping to set the agenda for this body. At this time, we're open for comments, concerns, and other statements."

## **6. NEW BUSINESS**

Professor Locksley G.E. Edmondson, Africana Studies: "I'm sorry, but I'm sticking in a footnote to this last discussion. Do we have a time frame for getting this to our departments and getting back to the Senate?"

Dean Stein: "It may well come back at the next meeting. I would say you have a month. We are departmentally based, so you ought to be speaking to your departments about what they think about this and other issues."

Speaker Obendorf: "Yes, since the committee has it already in resolution form, it could come back fairly quickly. Be prepared. Now we're on to other topics."

Professor John M. Abowd, Industrial and Labor Relations: "A question for Peter: What's the status of the committees of which this body might be participating—having to do with campus-wide tenure reviews and campus-wide program evaluation?"

Dean Stein: "Everything's on hold, until we get the University Faculty Committee selected. But it will be selected in a week or so, so I was kind of hoping to have some sense of what it is you want us to be involved in."

Professor Abowd: "Maybe I should follow up. What have you been *invited* to supply faculty leadership on, with regard to what's on hold?"

Dean Stein: "Those questions are open now. There's a proposal for program review that's sitting around waiting for something to happen to it; presumably, it will come to this body. There is, as near as I know, no model for the way that faculty at-large might participate in tenure decisions, but there is a lot of feeling that there should be some way to do it. That remains undesignated, waiting for this body to tackle it. Those are two things that I think are important."

Speaker Obendorf: "If I understand the other part of John's question, it has to do with what committees have been asked to provide faculty members for the specific issues raised."

Dean Stein: "On the specific issues, there's nothing pending."

Professor Lion: "Dean Stein, I'm asking for a statement on what this body should be doing. It would be helpful to me if you could provide us with a mission statement—what the mission of the Senate is, if one exists. If not, I'd like to know your thoughts on what this body is empowered to do and what it is not empowered to do."

Dean Stein: "Well, that one's easy. The mission statement is that this body represents the views of the Faculty to anyone who wants to know what the views of the Faculty are. Its empowerment is educational policy matters that affect more than one college. Grading scheme, for instance, is one example of empowerment. I think that, probably, the most important of these two is to represent the views of the Faculty to the Central Administration."

Professor Ahl: "I was just wondering if any members of the group share one of the main reasons that I got myself involved in the Senate, and that is the concern with the lack of what I call 'downward accountability' within the Administration of Cornell. That is to say, there is a constituency to which the Administration administers but which is not necessarily fully held accountable. This could be a problem with a deanship or with the way other offices are run, for example. I wondered if there were any places within the function of the Senate for ensuring that positions made at upper-level Administration within the individual colleges and in Day Hall would be reviewable in some way by this group in some official manner. I think that's very important to faculty governance to get a foothold on faculty opinions."

Professor Ascher: "Having just read the legislation that established this body, I still find somewhat unclear the relationship between this body and the University Faculty Committee. It almost appears as if the University Faculty Committee is going to go off as a vague construction at the top; I would really like to see some clarification of what that group of nine people does and what we do. Are they, for example, going to be bound to us in making their decisions, or will they pick up issues independently of us? What is the relationship between us and them, in other words?"

Dean Stein: "It's in the process of being defined. The way I see it, that committee will mediate between this body and the Central Administration. That's number one. Number two, they act as an Executive Committee to this body in the usual way. But I certainly think they are bound to this body's decision; there's no doubt about that."

Professor Edmondson: "I know none of you can answer for President Rawlings, but I must express some concern about the distinction I heard him make between us being concerned strictly with academic matters as opposed to political ones. Is sexual harassment political or academic? Is affirmative action political or academic? I do hope that this body will not at all circumscribe its activities to what seems to me to be a narrowing of the agenda in advance of our deliberations from the Administration, which is very activist and very interventionist. I think we should make very clear that we as a faculty have a right not to just address narrow, technical academic issues but anything of concern to us as a faculty in a university community. And I hope the rest of us share that concern."

Professor P.C.T. de Boer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "What's the status of the University Faculty Committee. When is it going to be elected?"

Dean Stein: "It's in the process of being elected. You have all had ballots distributed to you, and some 400 of you have returned them to my office where they're being entered by our able assistant Steven into an Excel file so we can count them. They're counted by the Hare system, and that's pretty complicated. The cut-off date is February 21; they have to be received in my office by then. And on the next day, we will know who the members of the committee are, and we'll call a meeting just as soon as we possibly can."

Assistant Professor Mark Cruvellier, Architecture: "Concerning the University Faculty Committee, I noticed that there were no non-tenured faculty nominations, and I looked in the draft by-laws and did not find a stipulation that members of the University Faculty Committee had to be tenured. I wondered if this group is supposed to be representing the body, how can it do so without having any non-tenured faculty members on it?"

Dean Stein: "That's a good point. There are certainly no stipulations against non-tenured faculty members on the University Faculty Committee. The reason that there were none on the ballot was because the Nominations and Elections Committee, in its wisdom, decided not to nominate any non-tenured people. I sat in on that meeting, and the feeling was that it was too big a burden. We have always had problems with the participation of non-tenured people in faculty governance in the past, because they felt that the pressures on them were too great, and that even the attending of one meeting a month was thought to be considerable pressure. Now, we don't know what's going to happen to the University Faculty Committee. But if it works, it will really be a lot of effort. If it doesn't work, it's not worth being on. The feeling was that it just didn't make sense to ask non-tenured faculty people to take part in the University Faculty Committee with an anticipated major workload. Now, maybe that decision was wrong, but that was the reason why that decision was made."

Professor Cruvellier: "I'd just like to follow up with a comment. Reading through the roster of Faculty Senators, if one counts them up, roughly 80 percent of this body is male—and only 20 percent is female. This is a concern that a number of us had before this body was formed, and if this is going to be a representative body. . . ."

Dean Stein: "My guess is that's representative of the faculty. It may be sad, but I don't believe it is unrepresentative of the faculty at-large."

Professor Emeritus Holcomb: "I'd like to make a response to Professor Ahl's comment on downward-accountability. After-the-fact accountability is much more difficult to affect the course of events than before-the-decision accountability. If the University Faculty Committee works, we will have knowledgeable people at the right place at the right time, before decisions are made, and that will likely be the key to a successful organization."

Joel Porte, Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters: "Could I suggest that, when planning these meetings, a larger, more comfortable room could be found? I'm standing up because my legs could not take the seat-backs. It seems to me that it would raise our spirits by making our bodies more comfortable with a larger room."

Speaker Obendorf: "It's nice to be asked to have a larger room, because we came to the smaller room because of poor attendance. This seems to be a nice direction to be going in."

Dean Stein: "That's a problem I know a lot about. I spent some time thinking about it. We used to meet in Uris Auditorium—and boy, there's a room that's big enough for you. The general feeling among people was that it just didn't feel right. There were a few people in the room who were scattered all over; you couldn't hear anybody; and it was hard to believe that one could establish a sense of community with roughly 75 people in a room that seats 400. It just didn't feel good. We tried to look for a room that held about 150 and that was somehow central on campus—and there wasn't any. We went down the whole list of rooms, and there was no room for 150 that was always available on Wednesday afternoons. Another criterion was that it be the same room. I know my faculty colleagues, and if they're asked to change rooms, they get lost. So it had to be a room that was available all the time. This room was the best we could do, but it does seem a bit small. The only alternative is Uris Auditorium or Schwartz Auditorium in Rockefeller, both of which are large, cavernous rooms that don't feel right."

Professor Porte: "How about Kaufmann Auditorium?"

Dean Stein: "Well, Kaufmann is not central; Kaufmann gets quite far from the Engineering School and from the upper campus. That's the feeling; and maybe it's wrong."

Speaker Obendorf: "I like to see how well we're following the advice on staying on academic matters."

Associate Professor Joseph Laquatra, Design and Environmental Analysis: "I was on the FCR when we met in Ives, and I don't

know whether a similar room is going to be available for us when the Ives construction project is done or not. So this might be temporary; and in the interim, it may be helpful to find a more comfortable room. Even if Uris is too big, it may be a temporary measure if we'll eventually relocate to Ives."

Speaker Obendorf: "Are there any other issues to be raised other than size or location of the room? If not, I want to thank all of you for coming."

Adjourned: 5:50 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Lucey, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty