

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

March 14, 2001

Speaker Howard Howland: "There are no photos or tape recorders allowed during the meeting. We have one Good and Welfare speaker. I call now on Provost Bidy Martin for remarks and questions."

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST MARTIN

Provost Bidy Martin: "I just talked to Bob Cooke a few minutes ago about what sort of remarks I should make today. We concluded that I should talk just briefly about the Freshman Reading Project that we have been working on this past year. I'll just describe it briefly since our time is limited, and I'll come back to talk to you all about it later on. As you know, last year there was an effort with the North Campus Initiative underway, placing all freshmen on North Campus, to try and come up with what was referred to a common academic experience for freshmen for orientation week and for the beginning of their freshman year. There were suggestions that we institute what were at that time considered to be practical ethics courses that would begin in orientation and run for the first several weeks of the semester. That idea actually went down. I don't know if in flames, but it went down for lack of support. We came up with a different idea this year. It was actually part of my effort to enhance and expand the amount of intellectual exchange we have on campus generally.

"Here's how the two things converge—that is my effort generally to promote more intellectual exchange and the Freshman Reading Project. In December I asked the academic deans to read four books over the holiday break and to come back to the next academic deans' meeting prepared to discuss the four books and to think about which, if any of them, might be appropriate as a reading for freshmen. The four books they read were chosen by the deans based on some ideas they had generated in the group. The deans did read the four books. The deans who couldn't attend the next meeting actually sent book reviews. The academic deans and the Director of the Knight Writing Program attended and selected a book to discuss.

"The book that they chose is Guns, Germs and Steel written by Jarod Diamond. It's a book that was recommended at first in that group by faculty through the Dean of Computer Science. It was also recommended to me as a good read by two of our geneticists on campus and later by one of the members of Neurobiology and Behavior. It's a very ambitious, interdisciplinary book, a very substantial book. It has a number of problems in the views of most people who have read it, as well as great strengths, and for that very reason seems to be a good book to present to freshmen if it's framed correctly. So our intent at this point is to provide freshmen not only with the book to read during the summer, which we will pay for, but also to provide them with materials prepared by staff and teachers, faculty teachers in the Freshman Writing Program, as guides to the reading of the text. We have managed to convince orientation staff to carve out two prime times for academic events for freshmen. We have on the second day of orientation a two hour slot for a Faculty Forum on the book, and the next day of orientation a two hour slot for faculty discussion in small groups with students about the book. I hope you all will be among the faculty who volunteer to participate in the forum and lead the discussions. You are not obligated to do so, obviously, but if you are at all interested, I hope you will contact me. If you don't contact me, I'm sure I'll be contacting you to try and convince you that this will be a not only a good way to interact with new students but also a good thing to do for the university culture as a whole.

"It's part of our effort on North Campus, beginning with the North Campus Project, to provide in orientation and in the beginning of the Freshman Writing Seminars, academic experiences that the students will have in common that they can then discuss in their residence halls and living situations, and that they can discuss with a range of faculty on campus and in a range of courses. If you have any questions, I would be glad to answer them. It's a very sketchy overview. As I said it's an experiment, one about which there has been a great deal of excitement already generated. I have already had a number of faculty volunteers to lead some of the discussions—several from the Vet School actually—faculty who don't get to teach undergraduates all that much. In any case, I'd be happy to try talk about it with any of you at any time."

Professor Nick Calderone, Entomology: "Question. What were the other three books? And will you consider making the book and study guide available to us so that we can also prepare for the discussions?"

Provost Martin: "The answer to the second question is a definite yes. We are going to prepare reading guides to go out when the book goes out, framing the whole exercise for the students so they understand that the point is not to elevate this book or any particular book to any valued status, but simply to give them a common academic experience and to teach them from the beginning that there will be no one perspective on any book of that sort, etc. Yes, those things will be available to everyone who wishes to participate, especially faculty, because we want faculty to lead these discussions. I would like to lead one, as I don't get to teach right now. The President would like to lead one. If enough of you volunteer we could also defer to you and not teach one.

"The first question—what were the other three books? One of the deans had suggested Oliver Sacks' The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat, because Oliver Sacks will be an A. D. White Professor-At-Large in the fall, and we thought that it would be an interesting book to have freshmen read, because they could then attend the lectures that Dr. Sacks will give when he is here. A second book, Diane Ackerman's A Natural History of the Senses, was suggested because she is a local author. The third one suggested was Robert Frank's Winner Take All Society, which was suggested because of its significance, and also because he is a Cornell author. In the end, the group thought that having a Cornell author is probably not the best way to start, because there are so many Cornell authors we could choose. You didn't ask me why we didn't choose the others and I probably couldn't reconstruct the conversation. The only thing I will say is that Guns, Germs and Steel, for all its strengths and all its weaknesses, has a scope which suits Cornell well. It is so concerned with the development of agriculture, food production, and the development of tools, in addition to the development of culture. Although as a humanist I would say its views on the development of culture are among the most problematic, but nonetheless that's no reason not to discuss it. In any case, the book has a scope that is very representative of the kinds of interests and concerns of Cornell faculty and also of the students that we'll be bringing here. For that very reason it seemed like the best choice.

"In future years, if this works well, we would like to use a different process for the choice of the book; in fact get faculty to develop a process whereby faculty could suggest and then they would help make the decision about what would work. There are reasons to be skeptical and concerned about whether this will work well. I'm hoping that as many of you as possible will be willing to give it a try and see how it works. I actually think it has already generated quite a bit of excitement and it will. We have a couple of emeritus faculty who have heard about it who wish to be involved. As I say, we need a lot of faculty to be involved, so I hope you will get in touch with me. Any other questions?"

Unknown: "Could you clarify the timing of the forum?"

Provost Martin: "Yes, the second day of orientation week. It's the day after the students' parents leave. There's convocation . . . look, I can't say when the parents will leave, but they typically leave at the end of the day of convocation. So the very next day from 3:00 until 5:00 in the afternoon, the orientation staff has

given over to an academic program. That would be the day on which we would have the faculty forum where faculty would present a range of views and approaches to the reading of this book. The next day, which is actually the third day of orientation, there is another 2-hour slot between the hours of 3:00 and 5:00 for the small group discussions. Those of you who plan to be back on campus, as I'm sure you all plan to be, at the beginning of orientation week or at least the second day of that week, come forth. I think it will be enjoyable."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you for those remarks. I would like now to call on Dean Cooke for remarks."

2. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE

Professor J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two items briefly just to mention to you. One is on process ([Appendix A - overhead](#)) and one has to do with content. First on process—we are going to be dealing with a resolution coming in a few moments and in case you haven't looked at the process for dealing with the substitute motion, let me just quickly run through that. First there will be a motion coming from CAPP that will be introduced. That will be followed by a substitute resolution, and each one of those can be debated in turn. There is also an amendment to the substitute resolution that is being proposed by the sponsors of the resolution and we'll ask for your consent to make that amendment. Then the floor is open for debate on both resolutions. Then there will be a vote to decide which resolution is before the body. Then it will be opened for further debate and eventually a vote will be taken on whether to adopt.

"There is one additional thing. We have considered this item now for two consecutive meetings. This is something that we adopted on May 10 of last year ([Appendix B - overhead](#)). It has to do with our giving a prompt response. This will in fact be the second regularly scheduled session at which this issue is considered, so we will be obliged to come to a decision.

"Now for the question on content. A few observations on distributed learning ([Appendix C - overhead](#)). This is based on an essay that is printed in the current issue of the [Cornell Magazine](#). It's available at that web site address if you want to read it in detail. But I thought it would be appropriate for me to offer some opinions and I could take questions now, but I will also gladly take questions later. I'm proposing we use the word 'distributed' learning rather than 'distance' learning, because it represents things that happen here on campus as well as remote. I heard one Trustee say that if the student is seated more than eight rows back, it's distance learning. I believe that it has importance for us at Cornell, a profound importance, that it is not a passing fad, that we really are going to be a changed institution at some point in time not too far in the future. We will still protect the right for individual initiative, but I'm urging that if we can, we come to some consensus on the general direction which we think that effort ought to be moving towards. You know we are trying to give everybody a better chance of getting there. Those conversations are still under way, and it's clear from last Thursday that we still have quite a bit of conversation ahead of us before we reach a common point of view.

"We are a research university and I believe seek to be actively engaged with society, and we have done that largely through our research and dealing with students on campus, but in the future we are going to be dealing with a broader class of students. I believe this is going to be an important piece of that puzzle. We need to develop the on-campus infrastructure in a significant way, including sufficient high speed communications so that the classrooms can be used without making a special project out of it, so that it can become a routine part and so that it serves the dormitories, the faculty offices and the people related to Cornell who are off campus here in Ithaca. We should do the best we can to complement the current

commitment to our undergraduates and our graduate students. Residential education should be seen and developed as a supplement not as a competitor for that. I think we should decide that our residential students are the primary audience and that as one member of this body said at the forum last Thursday, 'Think not just of courses but of complements of courses.' A major secondary audience I think should be the alumni of this university. We have a reason to be connected with them, to help with their continuing education, and as one person suggested, we ought to have a maintenance contract with people who want to maintain their intellectual livelihood throughout their careers. In addition to alumni we ought to also allow these materials to be used by the faculty, by Cornell staff and by families so that we are addressing a much broader audience and notice that I'm suggesting things that are not on a credit basis. We actually can defer for some significant period of time the discussion of how to deal with credit.

"As soon as possible our existing formal outreach program should be focused on human resources to get the faculty and staff that will participate in this revolution. Faculty should focus attention upon content and appropriate pedagogy needed for this paradigm to work where the human is more remote from the individual. Then we should focus upon the necessary parts of technology. The technology should be secondary not primary is the point. A third one is that the faculty really should organize its own educational efforts. The forum last Thursday suggested that there is still quite a bit of learning that needs to take place before we can have a really good community discussion of what distance learning does and could be. And it probably should be done on a college-by-college basis. Finally, we should decide on the financial models after we have figured out what it is we want to do, not before we have figured out what we want to do. I see I'm out of time. I will respond to questions by e-mail."

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 14 AND FEBRUARY 21 SENATE MEETINGS

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The chair would now like to call for approval of the minutes of the February 14 and February 21 faculty senate meetings. I ask for unanimous approval. Any corrections? Thank you. The minutes are approved. I would like now to call on the Associate Dean and Secretary, Professor 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: "We have a double barrel. I'd like to show them both at once. While you digest this interesting information, you have all received in your mail an opportunity to suggest folk for the various university committees which the Nominations and Elections Committee appoints people to or offers them for your approval. Please, please, offer some suggestions. We are constantly in need of people for this great variety of committees. We would be most grateful for your suggestions and we would be especially grateful if you would suggest yourself for any of these committees. That's my report."

Report from N&E Committee, March 14, 2001

Faculty Committee on Program Review

William Schulze, CALS

Nominations and Elections Committee

Sandra Siegel, A&S

Curriculum Committee on Diversity

Melissa S Hu

*Michael Charles Kelley

*Maria Cristina Garcia

*Michele M. Moody-Adams

Daniel Henry Usner Jr.

Susan Hills Murphy

*Kathryn Abrams

Uzodinma Enyinnaya Asonye

Thomas Mendez

Nicole Guidotti-Hernandez

Malik Omar Dixon

Marc Edward Rivera

*Faculty Senate Appointments

Search Committee for Dean of Graduate School

*Barbara Baird

*Kaushik Basu

*Joel Brock

Patrick Carr

*Steve Ceci

*William Goldsmith

Harry Greene

Sarah Hale

*Maureen Hanson

*Kevin Kornegay

*Tom Owens

Danuta Shanzer

*David Shmoys

*Dean Robert S. Smith

*Faculty Senate Appointments

Assemblies Committees

Committee on Dining Services

Craig Lundberg, Hotel

Joe Regenstein, CALS

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much, Professor Walcott. I call for unanimous consent to approve the report. Hearing no objections, the report is approved. You have all seen the outline of the procedure we are going to follow. I would like to now call on Professor Terrence Fine, member of the senate and member of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies to move the CAPP resolution."

5. COMPLETION OF WARD CENTER DISCUSSION

RESOLUTION FROM CAPP ON DECOMMISSIONING OF WARD LABORATORY REACTOR

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

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I would like now to call on Professor Jerry Stedinger, CAPP Chair, for a resolution on decommissioning the Ward Laboratory Reactor and he'll describe the resolution."

Professor Jerry Stedinger, Civil and Environmental Engineering and Chair Committee on Academic Programs and Policies: "CAAP is a Committee on Academic Programs and Policies of the Faculty Senate. We were asked to look at this issue and we came up with a resolution ([Appendix D - CAPP Resolution](#)). The Local Advisory Committee (LAC) was asked to review the issue and provide a recommendation. They researched the issue and they reported and listed the key individuals that they interviewed. They invested a great amount of energy and thought in the effort and eventually agreed to a unanimous recommendation. The Faculty Senate had a special meeting to hear a debate. The Local Advisory Committee at that time defended their report and provided additional information and responded to questions. Supporters of the Ward Center provided their rebuttal and they offered data and information related to the Center, including a discussion of possible funding from the Department of Energy.

"CAPP, in reviewing the situation as a body, did not see how it could easily resolve the conflicting claims that occurred. They were based on a lot of details and issues, interpretation of data, and intent of the Department of Energy. To weigh in and support one side or the other would require a large effort and special expertise and research to resolve some of the issues. Such an effort on the part of CAPP and we felt on the part of the Faculty Senate did not seem justified. A qualified and essentially a disinterested

committee had already provided a report, done a lot of research and that effort and their report has been supplemented by the public debate held at the faculty meeting. The Faculty Senate does not need to nor should it try to develop a position on every administrative issue upon which it has the opportunity to comment. At this point, I think we felt that the Ward Center issue was primarily an administrative issue as what to do, given the information, what to do with this particular senate. The Faculty Senate can leave it to the administration to weigh the arguments that have been laid out, to consider the costs of decommissioning the reactor, moving the gamma source or re-licensing the facility and continuing operation for some length of time. These do not reflect major policy decisions upon which the Faculty Senate needs to concern itself. We have provided a forum for debate so the public record is complete and the administration is informed. With that rationale, our recommendation is that the Faculty Senate receive the Local Advisory Committee report together with the written and oral responses from that committee and members of the Ward Center in the expectation that debate sponsored by the Senate will inform the judgement of the administration."

Speaker Howland: "The Chair would like now to call on Professor Francis Kallfelz for a substitute resolution."

Substitute Resolution

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Science: "I would like to move a substitute motion if I may and I will read it for the benefit of those who may not have seen it. The substitute motion is:

"Whereas the WCNS is accomplishing and expanding its mission to provide safe analytical and testing facilities for the education and research activities of faculty, staff, and students at Cornell,

"Whereas the WCNS is an open center available to users from all departments and colleges,

"Whereas its resources are also available to users outside Cornell as part of the public service functions of the University, symbolized by its status as the Land Grant University of the State of New York,

"Whereas the WCNS has an increasing financial base and proposes to reduce its University subsidy from \$200,000 per year to zero effective July 1 of this year,

"Whereas there is an expectation that additional operating revenues for the Center will be forthcoming from the U.S. Department of Energy and NSF,

"Whereas the cost to Cornell University's endowment is estimated to be a least 4 million dollars or more if the TRIGA reactor were to be decommissioned,

"Whereas the Gamma Facility of the WCNS is also heavily used by Cornell researchers, and would cost approximately an additional 3.0 to 4.0 million dollars to relocate:

"Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reaffirms its 1996 recommendation that Cornell University operate the nuclear reactor, gamma cell, and associated analytical facilities as the Ward Center for Nuclear Sciences, and that effective immediately, Cornell University actively support the U.S. Senate authorization bill, S.242 'Department of Energy University Nuclear Science and Engineering Act.'"

Speaker Howland: "Is there a second to the motion?"

Unknown: "Right here."

Professor Francis Kallfelz: "Mr. Speaker, could I move the amendment to the motion?"

Speaker Howland: "Yes."

Professor Francis Kallfelz: "I would like to move an amendment to my motion. Sorry for . . .and the amendment is to delete the second clause after 'therefore be it resolved.' So the motion would therefore be as it was before except it would end after the first clause after 'therefore be it resolved,' in other words 'that the Faculty Senate reaffirms its 1996 recommendation that Cornell University operate the nuclear reactor, gamma cell, and associated analytical facilities as the Ward Center for Nuclear Sciences.'"

[\(Appendix E - Substitute Resolution\)](#)

Speaker Howland: "So the motion is to delete this last paragraph?"

Professor Kallfelz: "That is correct."

Speaker Howland: "Is everybody clear? Do we have unanimous consent to delete? We do."

Professor Kallfelz: "I would just like to speak to the reason for making the substitute motion. Creating the Ward Center, including the mission for it, was recommended to the university administration by the Faculty Senate in 1996. Thus the faculty has a specific connection to and perhaps even a stake in the Center because it was created as a result of the resolution of the faculty. Several times during the past few years the faculty has expressed concern regarding the significance of its role in university governance and has taken steps to try and strengthen its voice in this arena. Given the faculty's role in the creation of the Ward Center and its desire for a stronger voice in university governance, it would seem that the faculty should desire to express its opinion on the continuation of the Center since it is the faculty whose motion created the Center. By adopting the original motion, i.e., to accept the LAC report together with the written and oral responses to it, but to take no further action, the Faculty Senate appears to be in a sense abandoning its already established position relative to its role in the Ward Center. A substitute motion would provide the Faculty Senate with an opportunity to fulfill its original role in the establishment of the Ward Center by either affirming or deciding not to reaffirm its original decision to establish the Center. By its action on this motion, the faculty will be asserting its rightful role in making a recommendation on the issue which therefore in our opinion will better inform the administration as to the sense of the faculty on this issue rather than just receiving the LAC report."

Speaker Howland: "So both motions are now open for discussion."

Professor James Burlitch, Chemistry and Chemical Biology: "I would like to just take a couple of minutes to try to answer a question that was raised early on in this discussion, namely how it is that people of good conscience and well-meaning efforts can come to such differing conclusions about this matter. First, I would like to just remind you of the objectives of the Ward Center for Nuclear Sciences. They come in three parts, but let's just take them one at a time. This one is the main one 'to provide safe analytical and testing facilities' and I stress here 'in support of the research and education activities.' The 'in support of' is the crucial clause, whereas an excerpt from finding six of the LAC report it says that 'no tenured or tenure track faculty member expresses a willingness to expend time and energy to expand the capabilities of the reactor.' Now it seems to me that there is a great difference in using such a facility and expanding it in some way, which really requires the skills of a nuclear engineer. The users of the facilities are varied. As you can see from a page taken from the recent report, it goes all the way from geological sciences to art history and material science, and most of these people are not nuclear engineers. They are simply users of the facility. They would not be expected to change the facility or make a major change in it, no more than somebody would change the electron microscope facility. We have a director for the facility to make these changes, and that director has been busy with a variety of efforts to raise funds to bring in new capabilities to that facility. As you can see in just this last year there's a very large increase. These will have major impacts.

"The second issue has to do with the resources available outside. The LAC report doesn't really address this issue; it wasn't charged with that issue. Does it matter to you or to anyone here whether these many companies that use this facility and I list a few of them here and many of them have written strong support letters, does it matter that Cornell matters to them? It does to me. It should to you. It apparently didn't to the committee, because they weren't charged with looking at that issue.

"Finally, 'faculty, research staff, graduate and undergraduate student will have access'—will have access—that means you can come in with your problem. You don't have to be a member; you don't have to have any money; you can come in with your problem, and you will be helped with it. There is a cultural difference here in this Center than in virtually any center that I know of. You don't have to be a card-carrying, paying member to use these facilities and that's the way we want to keep it.

"So, I submit that the reason we came to very different conclusions is because that committee was looking at first only a very small portion of the problem, namely the effect on the academic program, part one, and secondly, I think the committee ignored the culture and did not place, as I would, a high value on the diversity of activities that go on at the Center."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Another speaker?"

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "I'd like to support the CAPP motion. It's a remarkable motion, because CAPP is proposing that the faculty should trust the administration. I think this is exactly why we have an administration that looks at the university as a whole. The issue here is much too complex for me personally to understand it. There is plainly a facility that has some academic value. There is clearly a facility that uses some resources and takes opportunity costs from other parts of the university. I think this is why we have a provost and why we have a president and why we make sure that they are people with academic backgrounds and academic understandings, so that they may weigh these things, take the evidence in balance and make decisions on behalf of the university. So I do not know what the right thing for the Ward Center is, but I do think the people best placed to make the decision are the central administration."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you."

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I trust the administration; I'm from the Johnson School. (LAUGHTER) I sat next to Terry Fine; I trust Terry, but I think that the faculty has a responsibility here. We've got a problem. If I were in the administration I would have great difficulty. There is a formally constituted committee that unanimously voted to do something. That is a faculty input to the administration. If we follow the CAPP motion, I read it as a de-facto support of decommissioning of this facility. I'm puzzled by the same things that others are puzzled by and that is how can we have two such differing interpretations of the facts. I'm also puzzled by why Cornell University would want to turn down what looks like a very large amount of money and an activity which is widely used by the university and by people outside. I really do worry if we follow the CAPP motion, that in effect what that is doing is supporting the formal committee that has been commissioned. One of the reasons I say that is because I've heard the informal discussions that my fellow faculty members have carried on at lunch. They say, 'Since I don't know and since there is a formal committee, then I would go with the formal committee.' Well, I think we've learned an awful lot that is very different from what the formal committee said, and I think that we are abdicating our duty if we don't take a position that says one way or the other. Frankly, I think that the evidence that I have seen suggests to me as someone from the School of Management that it's in our interest to continue the operation of this facility."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Professor Baer?"

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I had a somewhat similar reaction. Obviously, I'm not competent to weigh the technical factors, but just the materials that have been presented, particularly the costs of decommissioning or relocating as over against the annual budget, there seems to be an enormous disconnect in the report between those costs and what we've heard and the recommendation. It just does not quite figure. I've been trying to ask myself— is there some hidden agenda, is there something going on here that hasn't been shared, is this to some extent ideological? I started out leaning in favor of closing it and have changed my mind as I've heard the debate and seen the reports. So far, it seems to me there is very little in the formal report, looking at all the figures and looking at the possibility that nuclear things may become more important in terms of energy and all sorts of things, but again I'm not competent to judge that. I just don't follow what has happened. There is a kind of disconnect, and so far the arguments in favor of keeping it open have seemed much more persuasive."

Speaker Howland: "Perhaps someone from the other side of the issue? Professor Stein?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I'd like to address a couple of things. First, the question of faculty governance, which is closest to my heart in this matter. I think that the 1996 resolution, which I remember quite well, as it is being presented by Professor Kallfelz is not quite the way I remember it. Let me try to give you my story. I don't think there was any enormous sense in the body that passed that of support for the Ward Nuclear Lab Center. This was brought to the Senate by the administration, I believe by Norm Scott, as a way of operating because the Dean of Engineering decided that he didn't want to have a department of nuclear engineering. When he brought it to the faculty committee at that time, there was a lot of skepticism about it. A lot of people on the faculty committee said, 'No, I think we should close it. You have to close things sometimes when we're not doing it anymore.' The issue was that it was only with some reluctance that the CAPP committee recommended this to the Senate. The reluctance was because people felt this would be a drain on resources which was not appropriate since the Dean of Engineering who had the fundamental responsibility for deciding about those things had decided he did not want to keep this facility going any more.

"What happened then is that the resolution that got passed said (I should have brought it with me, but I didn't) that we support the continued operation of this Center under the condition that, it was very firm, under the condition that it not cost the university any money after three years time. "

Professor Robert Kay, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "That's not right."

Professor Stein: "Well, I remember that."

Speaker Howland: "Please let the speaker finish. You will have your opportunity."

Professor Stein: "Well, actually I looked it up so I would welcome a correction on it at this point. I did look it up and it said that after three years that it would not require any more financial contribution from the university other than that that was provided by the deans of the colleges in order to support it. OK? That was my memory of it. I do remember that this was a compromise between people who wanted to close it and people who wanted to give it a chance to see if it could be made self-supporting. So that time period expired some time ago, a year and a half ago or something like that. I don't think it's fair to say that this Senate took a strong position for the long-term continuation of the Ward Nuclear Laboratory. That's number one.

"Number two, about faculty governance. I don't know anything about this, but I'll bet you I know the words better than most of the people in this room and I sat and listened, and I couldn't tell one thing or the other. People put up transparencies, then people put up other transparencies, and even if you understand it, it

doesn't make any sense. (LAUGHTER) I know a lot of the people on that LAC committee, and they are people who are scientists, people whose judgement I have respect for, people I have worked with, and they spent a lot of time on this. Frankly, I think that the future of faculty governance is not done any service by asking a committee of valued faculty members and experts to spend a lot of time looking at an issue and then come back with a report. . . and we have no particular reason to believe that the people who wrote that report had any bias. It's obvious that the people who want to continue it have a bias; they have an interest in it, so they want to argue to continue it. That's clear; that's fine. But, nevertheless, they do have that bias. So I think it's a little bit dangerous to actually make a decision. I find it hard to believe that people on the LAC would want to go into another issue of importance to the university if in fact we overturn their judgement without really having substantial reasons to do so."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Peter. Here and then here."

Professor J. S. Butler, Policy, Analysis and Management: "I'm in Policy, Analysis and Management; I'm not even an actual scientist. No, I'm not involved in research on that. I have a couple of points I want to make. First of all, many speakers have referred to the committee working hard on the report and thinking about it. That's correct. Now I have been at Cornell only two years, but I have been in faculty governance at the university where I was before for fifteen years before that. Committees work hard on issues, but they are instrumentalities of the body. Their recommendations may be rejected. It happens from time to time. It is not a rejection of governance. It is the nature of the legislative process. Committees do the best they can. Their recommendations may be rejected. That is OK. I feel it is my responsibility to think about whether I wish to reject this recommendation. The answer is that, having listened to everything, I do wish to reject the committee's recommendation, and I support the substitute motion. I think it would be difficult for the Senate to evaluate overall whether the Philosophy Department or the research on disability programs in which I am involved in my department on net would be a good thing to do; this is always a complicated issue. But we have a committee report that says that it should be decommissioned and to fail to respond to that I agree would come too close in my opinion to supporting decommissioning. I support the substitute motion."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Kay."

Professor Robert Kay: "Professor Stein did correct the wording that he initially said no university support. He stated it correctly the second time, so I'm satisfied."

Speaker Howland: "I'm trying to be fair with the little time we have. Does anyone from the CAPP committee side want to speak?"

Professor Barry Carpenter, Chemistry and Chemical Biology and a member of the LAC: "I want to address Professor McAdams' questions about the cost, because this keeps coming up. People keep saying, 'What about this 4 million dollars for decommissioning? Why on earth didn't the LAC consider that?' The answer is because that's the cost that's going to have to be paid anyway. Whether it's paid now or twenty years from now, when it may be more than 4 million dollars, didn't seem to be material. As far as the great windfall of money coming from Washington—first of all, we thought the probability of that actually materializing was very low, but even if it did, many of us thought that Cornell had an explicit policy against pork and it seemed to be oinking as loudly as anything that any of us had heard. I, at least, would not want to accept something just because it was in a Senate bill rather than because it made any scientific sense to the university. Would you?"

Dr. Kenan Unlu, Director of the Ward Center: "Just to point out that right now on the Senate floor, there is not just one, but two bills. One was just introduced March 7 by Senator Domenici and eleven of his

colleagues from both parties. This is a nuclear education and research fund. This particular one is named the Nuclear Energy Supply and Assurance Act of 2001 and the other one is the Department of Energy Nuclear Science and Engineering Act. These two bills have not mentioned one single university. This is open to all universities, and these are all peer-reviewed research grants or other grants available for these two bills. So therefore I don't know how we define 'pork.' I'm not familiar with that terminology much, but certainly this is not 'pork' at all. This particular bill that has been introduced has not just the 4 million dollars coming to university programs, but an additional three more sections under which we could get funding. The Nuclear Energy Research Institute, \$60 million, this is for fiscal year 2002, and Nuclear Energy Technologies Study for Generation for Nuclear Research Reactors. Certainly our colleagues in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering will get some funding from this one. Also the last one which is the research support written for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that's certain that we are eligible and we will get some funds. These are all peer-reviewed and open to all universities, not just Cornell, Michigan or MIT."

Speaker Howland: "Next?"

Professor Manfred Lindau, Applied and Engineering Physics: "I would like to say something very specific to this point, because I think Cornell does not have any more a core in nuclear science and engineering. There are very specific reasons for this, but if there is a new situation, then I think Cornell might reconsider that point. That's not something that I think is going to be discussed by the Senate - whether Cornell should have a program in nuclear science and engineering. I think that's a situation that we have here. So I think I will support the CAPP motion because those sorts of considerations are not up to the Senate to make a judgement."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical and Computer Engineering, At-Large Member: "I think I understand a little better why there is so much polarity on this issue. I think it comes down to the fact that the people in the Ward Center have been going from the Senate resolution of what their mission was, and I think the LAC was working primarily with the charge that we see from the Vice President's office, which did not necessarily intersect with what the Senate proposed. I think everybody is trying to be honest and so forth, but I do think there is a major disconnect between what the Senate envisioned and what the committee looked at. It's evident from what the Senate envisioned that there would not be a Nuclear Engineering Department; there would not be professors appointed in the reactor, but that would be given to a director. Yet, the committee placed major emphasis on that. In the letter that the administration sent to DOE, it was mentioned that the site of the reactor is a prime piece of real estate that could be used for other purposes. That was obviously not a concern of the Senate in establishing this facility. So I think there were different kinds of considerations. I agree that there was an intersection on the financial issues, which I think was in both parts. As I look at the Senate resolution, it seems to me that the people in the Ward Center have done a very good job of trying to follow what they thought their mission was from the Senate. I feel comfortable about supporting the alternative resolution, because I believe that they have worked to satisfy the original Senate intent. It may well be, however, that other considerations which concern the administration, such as the real estate and so forth, would cause the administration to decide 'no.' After all, they can make any decision they want, no matter what the Senate decides."

Speaker Howland: "I want to close this in about three minutes. Do we have one on the CAPP side?"

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: "I speak in favor of the alternative resolution, because of the following reasons. I think it's an open center; it's of interest to Cornell and upstate people; it doesn't need any more money from Cornell from July 1; it's on a growth curve; it expects substantial addition to outside funding, and I do not agree that it's pork, because it will be peer-reviewed. Their activities are not immoral or dangerous, and I think creating something is always harder. Destroying something is easier. So I am in favor of keeping it."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Professor Fine?"

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "This issue has vexed me greatly for a while now. I'm particularly concerned about the standing of the Senate in this. In this, I probably agree with Professor Stein, even though I'm having a little problem with his 'even when you understand it, it doesn't make any sense.' (LAUGHTER) I wrote it down, and I'm going to have to think about that too. It's true that this issue came through CAPP originally. It was for that reason that I was one of the people who thought that it should go back through CAPP again. That is—we were there recommending its creation; we should be involved with any attempt to destroy it. However, I have become more and more convinced from the debate that the issues are really not within our scope. When I see things about the funding, when I see things about the technology, this is not what this body is about.

It's true CAPP has brought recommendations. I mean I remember bringing you a recommendations about Asian religions of which I knew nothing, and I'm not sure how much more some of you know about that, but the fact was, CAPP had done its job to see if there was controversy on that issue. It had been proposed to us; we asked if there were other opinions opposing it; there were not; we brought it forward. This is another matter altogether. We're in a welter of issues on which I personally don't know what the answer is. I'm not sure that at this point it's our concern. Now what have we done? I think we have done more than just put a rubber stamp to the LAC report, because I think there has been a lot sound criticism of the LAC report. I think we have heard in detail from people who are opposed to it in its conclusion and on this matter. I would hope that that is in fact part of the record that we generated, and that is part of the record that I hope the administration (and by the way, I don't think they are particularly my allies in most things), but in this case I think we have contributed to their education in a very significant way. I don't think it is an open and shut matter one way or the other, and I hope that they would not think that at this point, that they've seen enough argument in front of this body that says keep it open. On the other hand, I do not feel that it is our role to make a decision of that kind at this point, so in that sense, yes I am begging off. I'm saying we've done our job in the Senate. We have illuminated the issue, but now let us pass it on. I don't think we are ready to make that decision."

Speaker Howland: "One last comment here."

Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding and At-Large Member: "I would like to support the kinds of comments that Terry Fine has been making. I see in a letter that senators got from Professor Kuniholm there is a remark that 'there has been faculty concern in the past several years with the top-down management style from Day Hall, and I think it is high time that the Faculty Senate stand up for a program that has merit.' I feel that if we allow the administration to make the decision in this case, it is not accepting a top-down management style, but rather that the faculty, through the Senate, has illuminated the issue substantially for the administration and that we can expect that they will have considered these points. It's not a case where they make a decision and then we hear about it afterwards and have to respond."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Due to the limitations of time, I would like now to ask for a vote on Professor Kallfelz's motion. His motion is the substitute motion, which you have seen, for the CAPP motion. So if you vote yes on this motion, you are voting for Professor Kallfelz's motion, to make it the pending motion. Is that all clear? All those in favor of Professor Kallfelz's motion, raise your hand. I think we are going to need a count here. All those opposed? Professor Kallfelz's motion passes as I see it, but if anybody wants a count . . ."

Unknown: "I'd like a count."

Speaker Howland: "OK, again. All those for Professor Kallfelz's motion, raise your hand. Bob, would you help

count? OK, now all those opposed to Professor Kallfelz's motion, please raise your hand. I remind you that you should be a senator to be voting. Abstentions please. So we have 34 for Professor Kallfelz's motion, 23 against and 8 abstentions. Professor Kallfelz's motion is the main motion on the floor. We have a minute or so if anyone wants to add something to it and then we'll pass to a vote."

Professor Robert Kay, Geological Sciences: "I would just like to answer a question that came up from Professor Lindau having to do with productivity at the Center, and this is follow-up on what was said at the second meeting from last month. I have actually a publication that just went out to 17,000 members of the Geological Society of America. I have not opened it up, because I just received it in the mail today. This has over 500 analyses in it, of course not listed, but graphed, that were done at Ward Center, and I submit that this an important aspect of Ward Center to put data in support of papers that go out to the world."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Back to you, Sir."

Professor Eugene Madsen, Microbiology Department: "I would like to come up in favor of Professor Kallfelz's motion. It's simply based on philosophical issues. I listened to both sides and came away completely convinced by each of them. I couldn't resolve the impasse. In my personal life, the only way I can resolve such impasses is to make a choice to either wait to get more information so that the balance will tip or choose the one that does the least damage. I think that the Ward Center has been here for a long time. It has a positive tradition on campus. It might as well continue, given the difficulty of making the case."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Are you ready now to move to the vote?"

Professor Barry Carpenter: "I'd like to respond to that last point, because it seems to me that that is the very reason that faculty are not taken seriously. That if one says let's take the comfortable decision, that means the faculty cannot be trusted to take difficult decisions. That is not a direction in which I want to go."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. We must move now to the vote. The main motion is Professor Kallfelz's motion. So you have the motion before you. All those in favor of the motion, which is Professor Kallfelz's motion, raise your hand. All those opposed? I think Professor Kallfelz's motion passed, but we had better count. For Professor Kallfelz's motion, raise your hand please. Against the motion, raise your hand please. Abstentions, please. We have 36 for the motion, 19 against and 8 abstentions. Thank you very much everyone for that very orderly discussion. The Chair would like now to call on Vice Provost Robert Richardson for a report on Cornell's Compliance Initiatives."

6. REPORT ON CORNELL'S COMPLIANCE INITIATIVES

Professor Robert Richardson, Vice Provost: "I have come to the Senate to bring up what will be everybody's favorite subject—compliance with federal regulations, and I apologize for having to do that. There are issues that come to us that we ultimately have little choice but to agree with. Many of you have told me that the primary purpose of the central administration is to protect the university from egregious federal regulations, and in fact we put a lot of effort into that. Let me get closer to the point. There is increasingly a climate (and I don't think it has anything to do with which party is in power) of careful scrutiny of activities at universities. For example, we have had eight audits in the last fiscal year. And at any time there is a group of auditors on the campus examining things that are going on. And most of them we pass very well, with flying colors, because of very careful work done in both Sponsored Programs and the Division of Financial Affairs."

"There is a new set of regulations, some of which you are aware of and have been in effect, but are modifications related to training of faculty, students, post-docs and the research community. They primarily

come from the Public Health Service. What we have coming down the road, and thankfully we have had a reprieve on exactly how we have to go about doing this, is a requirement that we offer to all researchers a series of courses in the responsible conduct of research and keep records that everyone has completed the courses. There are nine of them on their original list. They have one on data management and acquisition, a second one is mentor-trainee relationships, a third on publication practices and responsible authorship, a fourth one on peer review, a fifth on collaborative science, a sixth one on human subjects, a seventh on research involving animals, an eighth on research integrity (or misconduct), and a ninth one on conflict of interest and commitment.

"The original discussion on this was quite draconian. All faculty, staff, post-docs, graduate students and undergraduate students would have to take these courses, and we would have to have records of it. There have been gradual softenings of how this set of regulations will be enforced as a consequence of interaction with the university community. Then because the Office of Research Integrity did not completely follow the rules on a public comment period, the enforcement is suspended for a while. (LAUGHTER) For those of you who get NIH grants, there are already courses that are taken and you can't get the money unless you have a certificate that you have completed the course on research involving animals and on human subjects. All of you should be familiar with some of the conflict of interest and commitment regulations that we have and that we would have to move in the direction of courses. We have gotten a reprieve, but something of this sort is down the road and faces us. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency and OSHA are requiring health and safety courses and many of you have taken some of the health and safety courses in research buildings.

"The most straightforward way of doing something that could be useful for all of us is to figure out a way to be able to take the courses with computers and keep the records with computers. There is a committee that is a sub-committee of the University Conflicts Committee that Bob Cooke has helped appoint. This is a group that has graciously considered, and has met several times to consider, these issues—to figure out what is the most effective way Cornell can respond to this in a real sense, so that it isn't just sitting through some objectionable sort of regulations and going through the motions if we have to do it. I'm very grateful for these people who have agreed to serve on the committee, Klaus Beyenbach, Biomedical Sciences, Ken Birman, Computer Science, Joe Calvo, Microbiology, Bruce Ganem, Chemistry and Chemical Biology, James Garbarino in Human Development, Mike Isaacson in Applied and Engineering Physics, and Vicki Meyers-Wallen in Biomedical Sciences. That's the early warning, and I think that when we face it, we want to have a [plan]. I would like to solicit your suggestions as much as possible on the most effective way of doing this.

"We have some hope that the regulations will be written so that we can determine who the target audiences are for taking these courses, but we will have to keep records of it. We want to think of the most useful way it can be done. I want to point out that on these subjects—these courses—many departments cover all these issues in graduate student orientation courses. Bruce Ganem pointed out a very elegant course that I think I would like to sit in on that Roald Hoffmann offers to chemistry graduate students on essentially the issues of the data acquisition and mentorship and publication practices, etc. These subjects have not been widely neglected on campus, but we have to figure out a sensible way to institutionalize it."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much Professor Richardson. The Chair would like now to call on Vice President Susan Murphy to discuss in general terms the administration concerning faculty involvement in the living and learning environment now under construction on campus.

7. GOOD AND WELFARE

Susan Murphy, Vice-President, Student and Academic Services: "Thank you very much. Dean Cooke asked if I might come and respond to a question posed by a faculty member about how we are seeking involvement of the faculty in the Residential Initiative. Five years ago when the Residential Initiative was launched, we set as a goal for ourselves. The goal was to provide a range of activities for our undergraduates to support the central mission of educating students in the broadest sense by creating an environment where the lives of students inside and outside the classroom form a cohesive experience with each part positively reinforcing the other. At the core of that is the Residential Initiative, which is looking for ways to bring the life of learning into the place where students are living as well as the life of living into the world of faculty. We did not start at this discussion at the point of zero. When I first became Vice President five years ago we did a survey across the Division of Student and Academic Services to see how many members of the academic community were involved with students outside of the classroom. We came up with almost one third of the academic community that were either advising an organization, serving as team advisors in athletics, faculty in residence, or faculty fellows involved in a variety of ways with career services, religious life, etc. What we are trying to do within the Residential Initiative is to find ways to formalize that in the lives of students as well as within the lives of the faculty. I would like to touch just briefly on the three parts of the Residential Initiative.

The first is North Campus. That is under construction; we are on time and under budget for the new residences to open, and also the new community commons. For those of you who are dining discussion leaders, you will be happy to know that within the community commons we will be providing private dining spaces to try to encourage student and faculty groups to come together as part of an exchange program. Many of you do that now in the Market Place Eatery in Robert Purcell, but it's difficult given the noise and the general activity level. We are looking for you to think about ways you can use the many facilities on North Campus. The Freshman Writing Seminar will be offering seminars in conference rooms in North Campus. We would welcome faculty freshmen advising to take place on the site of North Campus. Within the year we will be creating a freshman resource center in the space that was once occupied by Balch Dining, which will be used as a place for both teaching and advising and to provide a center for faculty to locate themselves if they wish on North Campus, which will be the home of the students. You have heard today from Bidy Martin talking about changes that we are trying to bring to bear on orientation. Those of you who are freshman advisors and are faculty fellows and faculty in residence, we welcome your presence as early as Friday of move-in day. It sends a very strong message to our parents and our students when the faculty are here to greet them, not just the students who are helping them unload the car. In the North Campus we will be continuing to evolve ideas, as we continue to think about some of the changes in the freshman experience that will engage faculty. We welcome any of your suggestions as we move along.

"On West Campus you have heard discussion about the development of a 'house system'—the conversion of our existing structures, which were built as prototypical freshmen residences on a temporary basis in 1950 and of course are still with us in the year 2001. Isaac Kramnick has chaired a committee that has recommended a transformation of West Campus. We have appointed a West Campus House Council on which there are eleven faculty members serving. I have the names from the nomination process from the Faculty Senate. That group now has four different sub-committees; one focusing on academic programs, one on student services, one on the house operations and one on the transition as we move to that. Those sub-committees involve another eleven faculty. Isaac and I would be delighted to come and speak to any of your departments or in any of your colleges about the changes we envision in West Campus, because this will be a faculty-led residential experience with staff support. This is a very different model than we have had traditionally at Cornell, which has been staff-led with faculty support. Of course, student self-governance will be critical.

"The third part of the Residential Initiative speaks to the Greek system. The Greek system preceded all of

our formal residences at Cornell because we had a founding president who didn't believe in residence halls. So upon our opening, we had six fraternities. It continues to involve about 30% of our students; it houses 15% of them. The Greek system developed a strategic plan that actually preceded the Residential Initiative. That strategic plan calls for every fraternity and sorority to have a faculty advisor. We are not there yet, but we are working toward that and would welcome any of your participation in that activity. Kent Hubbell is now chairing a committee that is revisiting the Greek strategic plan to try to position it now in light of the residential initiative. So my brief message to you today is that we are looking for ways to continue conversations in smaller groups about the changes that we see. I dare say over the next five to seven years, the residential experience for Cornell undergraduates will be fundamentally changed, and for that to work, the faculty need to be engaged with us in a serious and substantive way. I am pleased to say that they have been and continue to be through the many task forces and committees that we have underway. With that if there is time, I would be happy to address any questions."

Speaker Howland: "There is indeed time. Any questions for Vice President Murphy?"

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: "Do you envision courses taking place in the residence halls?"

Vice President Murphy: "Yes, we do envision courses taking place. As I mentioned, on the North Campus we already have some of our rooms that are being built scheduled for the Freshman Writing Seminar, and we would hope that that would continue on a go-forward basis. We look forward to working with some of the key departments that teach freshman courses about how we can use our facilities on North Campus, in particular for the review sessions that may occur at night as a way of making it more convenient for students to access those. On West Campus, in each of the five houses The vision for West Campus is to create five living-learning houses that will be led by a faculty dean, have a house director, and have a dining facility within each house, very much like a college model that many of our peers have had in one form or another. Also in those houses will be seminar rooms where we would expect courses to be offered, either for students who are of the house, if that seems to be appropriate, or of that broader community in using that facility. There will also be study space, computer space, a mini library kind of space in those houses and we will also be providing an apartment for visiting faculty members in the house system. We have already begun formal conversations with Porus Olpadwala and the A.D. White Faculty Program in hopes that we can formalize that process."

Professor Peter Loucks, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "Susan, do you have the money for the West Campus Initiative?"

Vice President Murphy: "The West Campus Initiative, Peter, is not all identified. We did receive, as you may remember, a \$100 million anonymous gift a year ago fall, so that is in place. We don't have the final budget for the West Campus, although we anticipate that it will be in the \$200 million range—that is facilities and program—to help support the academic initiatives as well. That second 100 million would be a fund-raising priority for the institution. The North Campus Initiative, which is the \$65 million investment, has been fully funded by Campus Life and so will be its own financing. The Greek system will be paying its own bills for any physical changes that they would be making to their facilities."

Speaker Howland: "Additional questions? Yes, over here."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering and At-Large Member: "Just a quick question on the last one. I thought Cornell owned most of the houses."

Vice President Murphy: "No, on the fraternities and sororities, there are 65 chapters in the system, 55 of

whom have houses. We own 17 of them, so the vast majority are privately owned. One could look at that as saying that we give a lot of free beds for students by that ownership. There is a plus factor in that many of them take very seriously their responsibility for the houses. The down side is that we don't have control over them. One of the intents of the strategic plan was to set some standards for what a fraternity or sorority must do from the physical upkeep of their house, a fiscal management as well as a program, for them to continue to receive recognition from the university. We know they have some work to do on some of their houses."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "'Greek autonomy' is a phrase that a lot of the student assembly and trustee candidates were running on this year. I would like to know what your interpretation of that phrase is and whether you think it might mean that a lot of the Greeks want faculty out of their homes?"

Vice President Murphy: "What do I think they mean by 'Greek autonomy'? I have not had a direct conversation, so I will give you my supposition. The philosophy of self-governance has been at the heart of our Greek system from, if you will, the beginning. It is something that we believe quite strongly in. There are some universities that have taken over their Greek systems, own all the properties and tell them exactly how they should live their lives, very similar to a residence hall setting. There are other universities that have pushed the Greek system entirely to the side, saying they are independent organizations. We don't even recognize them as student groups; we want nothing to do with them—sort of out of sight out of mind. Cornell has taken a middle position—more of a partnership. We, you all recognize, have a bit of an ethical responsibility, because we have a third of our students involved in them and 15% of our students are living in those houses. So we don't tell them exactly how to do everything, but we also don't ignore them entirely.

"I think where the students were preaching for Greek autonomy, they still chafe at the strategic plan that they were part of writing, because it has set standards and we do now measure every single chapter, every year against those standards and grade them. Those that do well actually will get monetary recognition. Ultimately, if we have chapters over a period of years that fail, haven't figured out or have a strategic plan, they risk losing recognition. That does have some impact on their access to resources on the campus. There has also been much conversation when you hear that phrase related to the alcohol policy. The Greek system has written a socially responsible use of alcohol policy. The national sororities have taken a very harsh line that is making lives fairly difficult for our students right now in terms of places to have parties. I think the fact that we are concerned about having safe environments—we require them for example to have a caterer; we require them to have sober monitors; we require them to live within the rules of how many people they can have at an event—they see as a violation of Greek autonomy. I don't frankly think it has to do with the faculty out of their lives. I think it's really more the administrative control, not the faculty fellow at all."

Professor Jonathan Ochshorn, Architecture: "I can understand the idea of having freshman courses in an area where all the freshmen are living. Can you explain the rationale for having courses or seminars outside the central campus in residences where only a certain portion of students are living, say West Campus?"

Vice President Murphy: "I think there are two rationales for it. One would be as I mentioned in the first description of courses for courses that in fact may engage students within that house. The structure of the houses will not be college specific, and it may be that there will be a faculty dean as well as a series of faculty associates. They may wish to offer a course that, because they have gotten to know the students, those students are particularly interested in taking that course, and it sort of brings the academic experience right in the heart of where they are living. That course would not be restricted to other students but might have a particular target that you would end up attracting those students.

"I think, secondly, while we housed by the 1800's students in the residences on West Campus, when you take the Greek community that literally surrounds the West Campus as well as several of the apartments that go down from West Campus, the student presence in that area is actually quite a bit larger. So while it's away from the academic part where faculty offices may be, in fact again for the faculty who will be house deans or faculty associates, they will have office space down there that they will wish to use. It may be a natural extension.

"The third point would be to just try to introduce the academic experience where they live so the metaphor of the gorges and Libe Slope become a little less as demarcations of their lives."

Professor Peter Kuniholm, History of Art: "I wouldn't mind seeing the university take more of a hand in the running or management of those dormitories. I speak as a member of the Cayuga Heights Fire Company. I'm probably one of the few male faculty members who spent an entire night at a sorority. Somebody threw some cigarette butts into a mattress at Sigma Delta Tau, and it took us nine hours to put it out. Some of those things are firetraps, folks, and they are pigpens. They may get them all fixed up for guest day and all that sort of stuff, but if you walk into Sigma Tau or some of these others without warning—my God, what a mess! They have short-circuited the fire alarm system and turned things off and all kinds of ridiculous things. It is just plain sub-standard, and I think your being proactive in this would be wonderful for the kids."

Vice President Murphy: "Well, we are trying to move in that direction. You should know that when we have alumni on the campus, we are trying to encourage their engagement with their houses. We often will do house tours, and we affectionately call it 'the good, the bad and the ugly'. We can show them all three kinds. You are absolutely right. Some of the houses deserve to be condemned; we are frankly working with Cayuga Heights and the city for them to take more proactive roles in monitoring the houses for certificates of occupancy, because as non-university property we don't have the authority or control but the city does. Yet the reality is if we kick those students, if you will, out in the street, we have to worry about them. So the basic structure of the strategic plan is designed to do that—to put some of those parameters. I dare say that the overall initiative around West Campus will raise the bar for the Greek system. We will end up seeing that they will have to compete or they will not be able to fill the houses, that they will close. In fact, that makes the Greek system nervous, but that's OK."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne: "Just a clarification. Will the courses that are offered by the house deans and their faculty associates be approved by some process in their departments and colleges?"

Vice President Murphy: "Absolutely. They would go through the entire regular academic process. I was giving it as a suggestion, but we would expect no separate course approval process at all for that. We do look forward to any ideas and participation, and if you invite us to come into your departments, we will be happy to do so. Thank you very much."

Speaker Howland: "The Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment."

SO MOVED

Speaker Howland: "Adjourned."

Meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty