

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

April 11, 2001

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Speaker: "There are no photos or tape recorders allowed during the meeting. We have one Good and Welfare speaker. I call now on Dean Cooke for remarks."

1. REMARKS BY DEAN COOKE

Professor J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "I have two announcements and then a brief introduction to a topic that you will have a chance to debate later in the afternoon. One is that the Conflict of Interest forms have been sent out. You can respond to Part I online. If you are required to do Part II, that's being done on paper. If you haven't received information already (you should have), but if you haven't and don't in a week or so, please let us know, because the scheduling of this was to overlap with the income tax dates so that when you had your records together for one purpose you could use it for another. I have a second announcement which is that we have a streaming video tape of the University Faculty Forum on Distributed Learning that we held in Alumni Auditorium, and it is posted on our web site if you would like to see it. If you missed it and would like to get a summary of the presentations—the video of the presentations and an audio of the questions from the audience are available online.

"Let me very quickly deal with the discussion of Senior Professor to give you some sense of this. This is an initiative that started with the faculty; namely it is something FAC initiated as opposed to something initiated by the university administration. It is intended as an approach to a problem that will be sympathetic and constructive for both the faculty and the administration by providing an additional option, and it would be discretionary so that it is not anything that will be imposed on anybody who does not choose to do it. The administration would not have the right to impose it nor would the individual have the right to impose it; it would have to be by mutual consent that you think it is a constructive step in your career.

"I sent you an e-mail, and I will just quickly highlight some of those. We have a long tradition of growing our own faculty. Some institutions, in contrast, hire senior people. Most of the Cornell faculty hired are young Ph.D's, who are then developed. This produces a degree of bonding with the university, but it also has a lot of other valuable attributes. There are several things that are going on at one time that have to be reconciled. One is that we have a need for continual self-renewal for the institution. That is, as new fields emerge, we need to have people who have trained more recently and in other fields as they are emerging. We have a sabbatical program that allows some people to make transitions from areas, but there are many pressures for people not to do this. Once you have an established grant program going it is so much easier to stay in the same area than it is to switch mid-career. Financial realities—the size of the university faculty has been set as fixed for the foreseeable future because of the cost involved. Uncapping of the retirement age—the federal act that the universities were given had a late implementation period because of the tenure system, but that has kicked in now, and I'll show you the data very quickly which indicates that uncapping the retirement has had an impact on the age profile of the faculty. The other thing that we value greatly is the institution's commitment to tenure for an indefinite period. I think we are on a collision course, and I'm

urging us to take some initiative to figure out what should be done to correct the problem before someone else decides to correct it for us.

"A proposed solution is for active full professors having some extended period of association with the university to be able to go on active part-time appointment. I say after some substantial period, because it is not a recommendation for younger faculty, who might be tempted to go off and create companies and become entrepreneurs and do other things that would be disruptive if done in mid-career. So that was the reason for that limitation. We value tenure and do not wish to forfeit it, and this proposal provides a scheme that will allow you to continue to have tenure for its protection and for the status that it confers. It would be optional for both parties, not an entitlement and not a mandatory rank, so it is something you could easily ignore with impunity. Also, if you encourage people to go part-time at some point in their career, it would allow the university to then commit that money for hiring young faculty for a longer-term commitment. In order to do that you need be assured that the money doesn't go away, because those are long-term career commitments.

"Here is the most disturbing part. Here is the number of faculty under 35 years for age from 1982–17 years worth of change ([Overhead - Appendix A](#)). Both the endowed and statutory have gone down in a rather marked trend. The endowed had a lift and a drop again. Statutory has started up but I have reason to believe that is going to turn around, and that is a trend that is going to continue, either remain stable or flatten. Here is a list of the number of people, trends of faculty age 60 and over ([Overhead - Appendix B](#)), and this shows that indeed the endowed university is on an upper trend. It may at some point plateau and there is some hint that it might. But at the moment, it is a very significant upper trend. The statutory, on the other hand, has a drop, and that was due to a very aggressive buy-out program. The State of New York mandated a reduction in the number of faculty who have long-term commitments on the budget of the state. It also shows up, and under the young faculty; it is not only older faculty, but younger faculty are also being clipped. This is for 70 and over ([Overhead - Appendix C](#)), so that despite the phased retirement program, it has not stopped the expected growth in that category. Finally, here is putting older and younger on the same page ([Overhead - Appendix D](#)), the same axis, so you've got some sense of scale. The trends are going in directions that are not compatible in the long run. I'll stop at that. The actual debate on this item will occur during the agenda items."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Dean Cooke."

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: "A quick question. When you say 60 in that year . . .?"

Dean Cooke: "Sixty or older in that year. And one other thing I should say, this is not an attempt to address non-productive or low productivity faculty. This is totally discretionary; it does not have a secondary, hidden motive. This is to provide options."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. The Chair would like to call on Provost Biddy Martin for remarks and to answer questions."

2. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST MARTIN

Provost Biddy Martin: "My remarks consist primarily of updates. You know that we are in the midst of a search for Dean of Engineering; we had several candidates on campus. We currently have the last outside candidate, at least we believe so, on campus today. The search for a new dean of the graduate school is also

ongoing. We are now beginning the process of interviewing the candidates. It is an internal search, as you know, so it will obviously be one of your colleagues. The search committee will meet late into the night tonight and early tomorrow morning in our effort to speed up the process and get the initial interviews done by the end of this week. If you have any questions about either search, feel free to ask.

"There are a number of other things which concern those of us who are in this room, and I can say, for example, regarding the decision about the Ward Reactor only that we haven't yet received the final recommendation of Vice Provost Richardson, and when we do, we will begin to see what we need in addition in order to proceed to a decision. By we, I mean the President and I. You got an update in the mailings to this group, an announcement or follow-up to an announcement about the Qatar program which we will discuss a little bit more today.

"What I would like to stress as my concluding remark or emphasis—excuse my inarticulateness; it has been a long day already and it is about to get a lot longer. I would really like to urge you to volunteer to participate in the entering student book project. All the deans are out trying to get faculty to agree to lead discussions during orientation week about Guns, Germs and Steel by Jarod Diamond. I think it is an excellent idea, even for those people who don't like this project, who don't like the idea of it, to lead the discussions. We are going to subject ourselves to your ideas after we try this in the fall—your ideas, your criticisms potentially, or your support for this particular project. So those of you who think it might not be a great idea should also subject yourselves to the possibility that it could be a good idea by agreeing to lead the discussions. Does that seem rational to you? Good. It would cost 2 hours of your time on the third day of orientation between 3:30 and 5:30. You would be leading a discussion that involves 15 new students and you will have an upper class student, because a lot of our upper class students have declared themselves interested in participating in these discussions. You would have an upper class student to help facilitate the discussion and get the students organized. You would be paired with such a student, and we already have a lot of student volunteers. We don't have enough faculty volunteers, but I know we will have, probably after this meeting. You can send word of your willingness to participate to your dean or you can send it directly to me or both. I really will appreciate it if you will agree to participate. Peter Stein has a question."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "Just a comment and a suggestion. At various times I have heard these exhortations and said, 'Hey, that sounds like a good idea,' and have gone away and forgotten about it. May I suggest that you send an e-mail to all faculty members telling them exactly what the dates are and what the commitment is, so that it's right there in front of you and all you have to do click and say 'OK.'"

Provost Martin: "Well that's good. I sort of automatically implied that since 'yes' would be good . . . (LAUGHTER) . . . Yes, that's a good idea, Peter, and actually I have sent such an e-mail to the deans who are going to be sending the announcement to you all. Have you all heard from your deans? Some have and some have not, but you will be hearing from your dean with precisely that information and the possibility of a simple reply saying 'yes' to this idea. I really think we are going to enjoy it. We are going to enjoy it even if we enjoy it because we argue with each other about its merits. Even Herb Deinert and I, from the same wonderful German Studies Department, disagree, and that's not going to prevent Herb from doing it. Is it Herb?"

LAUGHTER.

Provost Martin: "All right. I'm sorry. I just needed to allow myself a little humor today. Obviously you don't have to do it, but I would really appreciate it if you would give it a try. I'll take questions if you have any?"

Professor Christopher Minkowski, Asian Studies: "I wondered if the Provost could update us on what the Board of Trustees has been up to with the athletic program which I read about in the latest communication

regarding funding for athletics on campus which was a subject we discussed in the Senate last year and made some recommendations."

Provost Martin: "What are the Board of Trustees up to? Gee, let me just say something that will sort of answer your question, but not directly in those terms. There is a sort of mini campaign to raise funds for athletics—athletic facilities primarily. The campaign had a sort of quiet building phase which met to some extent the goals that had been set for that phase and is now about to go into a more public phase. What I can say about the decision to do such a campaign, especially given the faculty sentiment about it, is that it was decided before I came on. That would have the virtue of being true, but it's a cop out.

"There is an enormous need to improve some of our facilities, both for intramural and varsity sports. However, those of us who read the Bowen and Schulman book or heard James Schulman speak yesterday about the game of life and the problem of athletics, not only in our Big Ten sports (out of which some of us came) but also in the Ivy League. We have pretty strong feelings about the problems of over emphasizing athletics. What we have done this year in response to the fact that at least a relatively small campaign in athletics is going forward, what we have done is ensure that the fund raising priorities for the next five years are heavily weighted on the academic side. The development staff assures us that those donors interested in supporting athletic facilities are not the same donors to whom we would go by and large for the academic priorities. I can't say too much and wouldn't want to say too much at this moment, except that I think the over-emphasis on athletics in the culture generally, even in the Ivy League and even at Cornell, where we don't compete all that well in some sports with our peers in the Ivy League, is a serious problem that the faculty, administrators and trustees all need to begin discussing in some depth, using the Bowen/Schulman book or other materials. That would be my view, though I am a big sports fan. I am a major sports fan, but everything has its limits."

Professor Martin Lindau, Applied Physics: "I was wondering on the dean search. It is my impression that there was one spectrum of candidates which would present distinct strengths and some of these have gone out. Is there any intent to replace them with additional candidates?"

Provost Martin: "Well, Martin, what a good question. It's not yet entirely clear. For those of you who don't know, we had one prospect, one candidate, who had agreed to come to campus for an interview, and the minute he announced his interest in Cornell to his Provost at Illinois, which has one of the biggest engineering colleges in the country, the Provost made him Dean of Engineering at Illinois. So it's plain that at least we have good taste, and the other candidate who withdrew, withdrew for reasons that are still not clear to us, and we have not been able to have a discussion with Larry McIntire. Will we therefore include more candidates? We are considering it. The search committee is not going to reach a decision until the last candidate of that initial group chosen to come to campus has come through, and we have had a chance not only to meet and talk among ourselves but also to get feedback from Engineering faculty. I'm still looking for those cards and letters to come through from the Engineering faculty. I'm getting a few more. I know a lot of you were going to wait until the end, when you have seen all the candidates and then write, but it's always also a good idea to record your views about the individuals as they come through."

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 14 SENATE MEETING

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. The Chair would like now to call for approval of the minutes of the March 14 Faculty Senate Meeting. Hearing no objections, they are unanimously approved. The Chair would now like to call on Associate Dean and Secretary Charles Walcott for a Nominations and Elections Committee Report."

4. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "Mr. Speaker. Before I present these to you, I would like, first of all, to thank everybody here who kindly sent in suggestions for nominations for all the various and assorted committees. The Nominations and Elections Committee is working hard trying to fill the veritable plethora of faculty committees that there are. These are the slate of candidates for At-Large members of the Faculty Senate from the tenured ranks, from the non-tenured ranks, some suggestions for Nominations and Elections and then, quickly, for the University Faculty Committee. This then gets sent around in a mail ballot as I recollect to the faculty to be considered. So you will have a chance to elect or not these folk.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

SLATE OF CANDIDATES

(All terms commence July 1, 2001)

AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE (tenured) - 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Donald Farley, J. Levis Preston Professor of Engineering

John M. Guckenheimer, Professor, Mathematics

Risa L. Lieberwitz, Associate Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

Timothy D. Mount, Professor, Applied Economics & Management

AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE (non-tenured) - 1 vacancy, 3-year term

Bernd Blossey, Assistant Professor, Natural Resources

Jocelyn Rose, Assistant Professor, Plant Biology

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE - 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Anne V. Adams, Associate Professor, Africana Studies and Research Center

Robert Connelly, Professor, Mathematics

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE - 3 vacancies, 3-year terms

Elizabeth D. Earle, Professor and Chair, Plant Breeding

Douglas B. Fitchen, Professor, Physics and LASSP

Risa L. Lieberwitz, Associate Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

Danuta R. Shanzer, Professor, Classics and Director, Medieval Studies

Katherine V. Stone, Law, and A. E. Estabrook Professor in Dispute Resolution, ILR

Winthrop Wetherbee, Avalon Foundation Professor in the Humanities

Next we come to the matter of the Speaker of the Faculty Senate who is to be re-appointed for a two-year term. I am pleased to report that Professor Howland has been prevailed upon in strong ways to continue his yeoman service, and however we do invite additional nominations which can be made from the floor, if anybody would like to so make them, and then this too will be submitted to a mail ballot."

Speaker Howland: "Are there any nominations from the floor."

Professor Walcott: "Hearing none I'm afraid it will be a tight election."

LAUGHTER.

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Walcott. So we are now going to have a preliminary discussion about creating a Senior Professor title. I would like to call on W. Donald Cooke, Chair of the Subcommittee of the Professorial Titles Committee. There are additional people who may wish to contribute to the discussion with Professor Cooke—Professor Robert Foote, Professor Richard Schuler, Professor Danuta Shanzer, and Professor Kenneth Torrance."

5. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ABOUT CREATING SENIOR PROFESSOR TITLE

Professor Emeritus W. Donald Cooke, Chemistry and Chair of the Subcommittee of Professorial Titles Committee: "I don't think Howie is going to have to worry about time, the Dean has already told you everything I was going to tell you and then some more. In fact, Howie even introduced my committee, which was another thing I was going to do.

"One thing that hasn't come up is some of the background on part-time appointments. There are about 65 tenured faculty members on part-time appointments. Thirty of those are a wide variety of part-time appointments for different purposes, usually as faculty members, and the other thirty-five are in phased retirement. Of those thirty-five, thirty-three have appointments half-time, and there are only two that have more than half-time, none less than half-time. Seventy-five percent of those on phased retirement teach one term and have the other term off. That raises some difficulties because it's hard to apportion things like undergraduate advising and graduate advising if the professor is only available one term. That is a problem; also department committee work doesn't work well with a person on one term.

"We do not have a proposal at the moment. We have met with the deans; we have talked to department chairs to get input. The one input we are missing before we move ahead is the faculty's, and that's why we are here today. Here again, I'm just going to repeat everything that Bob said. Just again to emphasize that this is a faculty endeavor. Bob already told you that. Here is what we are trying to do. We are seeking ways to make part-time appointments more attractive for senior faculty in order to release funds for new appointments. Now we cannot guarantee that funds that will be released will go to new faculty. It's hard for us, the faculty, to establish priorities. For example, in Engineering, the funds will revert to the department, but they have their own priorities, new faculty may not be it, but that's what we hope will happen.

(Overhead - Appendix E).

"Even though we have no proposal, we have certain ground rules. Here are the ground rules. The proposals will come from the faculty and have to be faculty initiated. They do require the approval of the department and the college. Once agreed upon a certain percentage of time, that cannot be increased, because hopefully the money is committed to new faculty. I hope you will give us some of your advice, your feelings about part-time appointments in general, and that's why we are here. My committee is here to listen to you, and I hope that you will tell us something."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Stein."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "Just a piece of institutional memory. I'm surprised that you say that the Faculty Senate has not spoken on this matter, because they have spoken on this matter. Approximately five years ago, Professor Ehrenberg can correct me, but it was about five years ago when he was Vice President, he brought to the faculty a proposal and part of that proposal . . . actually it didn't come from his committee, but it went through a faculty committee, and the faculty committee then recommended to the full Senate that we create a part-time tenured appointment for the very same purpose. That was passed, I think, overwhelmingly by the Senate, and the Senate, to my knowledge, never received either an acknowledgement or a rejection or any comment from the central administration. So this body has in fact expressed itself on this issue."

Professor Cooke: "I don't know what I said to lead you to think that. I'm well aware of what happened. I think we haven't gotten input from the faculty on what we are about—to look at new ways of doing this sort of thing. We are not going to change the phased retirement at all. For example, there is a five-year limit on phased retirement. That may be a problem."

Professor Stein: "I'm sorry, just to correct the record. The Senate approved precisely the proposal that you are suggesting, namely that in addition to phased retirement, that there should be an option for tenured faculty members to go half-time without any limit of period, retain their tenure, and that they wouldn't step back up to full-time again. Ron, am I right?"

Speaker Howland: "Professor Ehrenberg."

Professor Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR: "I was not sufficiently placed in the administration that I was ever allowed to make public statements about proposals which were not forthcoming, but I do want to say that there was a specific reason why there was the fixed limit. That is that the fixed limit is less attractive than not having the fixed limit. When you set up a program in which people can go part-time (which by the way anyone can do now at any time in the university, so all we are doing here is calling attention to it to senior faculty and saying you should push for this), there are three things that can happen.

"The first thing that can happen is that people who would stay on beyond age 70 or other ages full-time can now go part-time, and that's a benefit to the university. On the other hand, the numbers that you have just given me about the number of people who are on phased retirement suggest, when I compare with Bob Cooke's statistics in his report, that most of the people above age 70 are on phased retirement. So the line in Bob's report that phased retirement isn't working doesn't seem clear. So the first thing that can happen is that you can encourage people who would have stayed full-time to go part-time, and that can free up some funds. The second thing that can happen is that you would encourage people who would have retired earlier to stay longer, because now they can do that for a longer period of time. The third thing that could happen is that you could encourage people who took phased retirement or who were thinking of taking phased retirement, and instead say, 'Why do that? This other option clearly dominates.'

"So in thinking about this, it is something that the administration is going to have to think very, very carefully about. The other point that I would make is that the demographics of the faculty both here and nation-wide is such that there is going to be an enormous state of retirement. It's not just at Cornell, but all over this country, and the real problem is where are we going to find young faculty to replace them. Part of the benefit, now speaking on the other side of the proposal that you have put forth, is that I think, and I've written on this, that we may want to encourage older faculty to stay around for longer than would otherwise be the case, because we are going to need them for teaching."

Dean Cooke: "To respond to Professor Stein's question. There is a fundamental difference. The previous speaker just indicated that the previous program, phased retirement, had a coercive nature. It was intended to have people leave. This program is not trying to coerce anyone; it is trying to make options available, and second that the other program, which is not being proposed for change, has a five-year limitation, and you must give up your tenured status within the five-year period or you're not allowed in the program. This would not have that restriction."

Professor Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel: "I'm not sure that we know how effective the phased retirement that we have in effect is, and I think before we do this, we should talk with the various people who are in the dean's office negotiating these phased retirements. I was given instructions to speak against this, because there is at least one dean that thinks this will hamper the effect of the previous program in negotiating these phased retirements. I think I was supposed to say three things and I only remembered two. The second one is that some of the things that are in the programs are not allowed by SUNY, and so these programs need to be checked for the contract colleges."

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "We have talked to the two deans who represent thirty-two of the thirty-five phased retirements, so we have done that part."

Professor Obendorf: "Well, at least you have one dean asking her colleague to speak against this. I think you should speak to all the deans who are negotiating things to see how this proposal would affect their ability to negotiate the phased retirements."

Professor Danuta Shanzer, Classics: "One thing that we were also exploring in this suggestion that's important and I think distinguishes it from the other program is the nature of the title itself. I guess, particularly for scientists, it can be a problem getting a grant if you are labeled emeritus professor, so we were exploring having a different title. There is a title 'Graduate School Professor' that you can get in your graduate field if your field votes it for you, but that's for five years, but it's apparently not an official title. So this would provide another flexible option that would allow you to continue your research, not get a possibly debilitating title of emeritus or emerita but be called Senior Professor instead."

Professor Naomi Altman, Biometrics: "I really only have a question. Is this meant only for people who are already eligible to retire, and if not, then how does moving to this title effect one's eligibility to retire?"

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "I don't see any effect at all, unless I'm missing a point somewhere."

Professor Altman: "I don't know what the contracts say at Cornell, but in many places the contract says so many years of full-time appointment in the position prior to retirement or the maximum of your salary over some time."

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "That certainly is not true at Cornell."

Professor Gary Rendsburg, Near Eastern Studies: "In the phased retirement program, that we just heard,

many faculty members choose to teach one semester and have the second semester off. Is it the understanding that in this proposal that that would not be an option, at least not on a regular basis, that you would be teaching as a regular faculty member with your sabbaticals? If you had had two courses, you would teach one? Instead of advising ten students, you would advise five, or would that other option still be there?"

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "I think that deans would have to be conscious of those kinds of difficulties in these negotiations. But we have not formulated what the conditions will look like. We want to hear what the faculty has to say."

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I think it's fair to say that the one thing we learned, something that the administration knows all along, is every corner of this university is different. What satisfies the needs and particular desires of faculty and administrators in Engineering may be quite different from the Humanities. So if there is one bulwark that seems to be guiding us, it is to try and provide as flexible a set of guidelines as possible. I think that's one reason why we haven't come up with a final recommendation to give you at this early stage. We feel a need to talk to an awful lot more faculty, so that we can accommodate the interests as flexibly as possible."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "What isn't clear to me is why anyone would elect to go on phased retirement if this option were available. Could you clarify that?"

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "Yes, it may be that the one possibility would be that they could not teach one term only."

Professor Douglas Fitchen, Physics: "Just a related comment. There is a little different policy on fringe benefits I think for phased retirement."

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "Yes, there is."

Professor Douglas Fitchen, Physics: "Your retirement and other things are covered as if you were at full-time salary."

Speaker Howland: "There, and then Professor Stein."

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: "As you know, many universities in the nation tried different approaches to this problem. The bottom line is that without financial incentive, it's not working. Are you thinking of specific financial incentives to make this program work?"

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "That is not in the charge to the committee. A buy-out program is not something that we feel that we can discuss."

Professor Stein: "I'm a little confused about what would be accomplished if you did make such a program and it was passed by this body and agreed to by the administration, because in the end as you say it's not an entitlement. It's mutual consent, so one could do this now by mutual consent. There is nothing that would forbid a dean and a faculty member from agreeing mutually that they would do this, and in fact that has taken place apparently with some people on the campus. I just don't quite understand how it fits in."

Professor W. Donald Cooke: "It may have to do with benefits. In phased retirement people have full-time benefits for half-time service. With ordinary kinds of part-time arrangements that's generally not true."

Dean Cooke: "Comments to the two previous speakers. One is that there are people who have the energy to

do entrepreneurial activities, so it's not a matter of the university buying them out, but a matter of people having the opportunity in their career to do other things. The other question was why isn't what we have now sufficient? The answer is look at the number of young, assistant professor appointments, and that's the problem that has to be dealt with. What we have now has not allowed us to overcome that problem."

Speaker Howland: "About 30 seconds."

Professor Kay Obendorf: "That does remind me of the third item which is the age being used for the category. There is some belief that many people after they are finishing post-docs and so forth may already be 32 or so. You should look at the assistant professor ranks and change that age range for that younger group because of the number of post doctoral associates and people coming into the pool later."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The Chair would like to now call on Provost Biddy Martin again for a discussion of the medical college initiative."

6. DISCUSSION OF A MEDICAL COLLEGE INITIATIVE

Provost Biddy Martin: "I don't have a lot to say about this, and I will pass the buck to three of my colleagues. You have probably read in one newspaper or the other by now that the Weill Cornell Medical College has opened or will open a medical college in Qatar in the Middle East. That is a project on which the Provost of the Medical College and the Board of Overseers of the Medical College have been working for some time, with some assistance from the University Counsel's Office.

"I have asked Jim Mingle to be here today so that he can answer questions that I couldn't possibly answer, because I haven't been involved in the way he has. It affects Cornell concretely only insofar that we may be asked to approve and provide teachers for pre-medical courses that will be offered in Qatar. Those courses will be approved through the same mechanism we use for all extramural granting of credit, that is through the Office of Continuing Education, with approvals of instructors and courses having to be granted by specific departments and then by the Educational Policy Committees of the relevant college. We are not inventing any new mechanism for the purpose of helping the Medical College provide pre-medical courses in Qatar, but we will cooperate in the same way we would cooperate were we asked to approve extramural credits in some other venue. I've asked Glenn Altschuler, as I often do for various issues, to be here today to answer any questions you might have about that, but I think most of you probably understand adequately how extramural credit operates here at Cornell. David Robertshaw is here from our Vet School. Professor Robertshaw is going to be located in Qatar as the Associate Dean for pre-medical education. Dan Alonso who is currently Associate Dean at the Medical College is going to be Dean of the Medical College in Qatar, and he has been up here to talk with members of the administration, with Bob Cooke. Tony Gotto, the Provost and Dean of the Medical College, came to meet with the UFC, as you read in your notes, to talk about the project and to explain how the project originated which was actually Tony Gotto's own interest in international medical education and a discussion he had, I believe, with a congress person who encouraged him to get interested in the efforts in Qatar to build an education city. Some people have compared what the Qatarees are interested in doing to what is going on in Singapore where higher education for an entire region is being provided in a particular locale in that region. I'm going to have David Robertshaw, Jim Mingle and Glenn Altschuler answer any questions you have unless you decide for some reason you wish to address them specifically to me. I think you will be able to get better answers from the other three, but I would be glad to respond to any concerns that you have that you would like to address to me. As I said to the UFC several times, this is the business of a different Provost, the Provost of the Weill Cornell Medical College and not this Provost."

Professor Ehrenberg: "I was just curious if the payment of the undisclosed sum of money is going to go to the Medical College or the university as a whole?"

Provost Martin: "For the record, what do you think? The Medical School."

LAUGHTER.

Provost Martin: "Jim and David, do you want to come and Glenn do you want to come to the front and be ready for . . ."

Prof. Altschuler: "I think we should scatter, so the shots can't get to us all at the same time."

Unknown: "Does anybody know the correct pronunciation of the country?"

Unknown: "It's called 'cutter'. I would refer to it a 'Ka-tar', but with the emphasis on 'ka' and not 'ar'."

Prof. Altschuler: "I know in Yiddish it's pronounced 'cutter'."

Professor David Robertshaw, Biomedical Sciences: "I'll give you another one—it's 'cat-are'. That's the way the English say it, and since the English had a presence there 1971, I asked specifically at dinner the other night how the locals pronounce it and they said 'cat-are.'"

Unknown: "Make sure it makes it into the minutes."

Professor Richard Durst, Food Science and Technology, Geneva: "Irrespective, of how it is pronounced, Why was this particular country selected for this program?"

James Mingle, University Counsel: "Well, the country through Congresswoman Kelly who represents the area of West Chester, New York. She was over presiding with another congresswoman as an observer of municipal elections where for the first time women participated in Qatar elections. Anyway, while she was over there the Sheika, who is the wife of the Emir and chair of the Qatar Foundation which we are going to be dealing with, asked if she would be an intermediary and approach Dean Gotto to see if Cornell Medical College would be interested in this undertaking, and that's how it got started.

"Then we went over to Qatar last May, a contingent including Dr. Robertshaw and I, Dean Gotto and Dean Alonso. We had an initial meeting with them to examine the basic outline of what the proposal was and to really pin down assurances on their part, before we conducted an examination of due diligence whether we would indeed be interested, that there were some fundamental principles to which they would agree. They are committed to devote a good portion of their natural gas and oil wealth to building educational programs, and not surprisingly they felt that to import something that American universities excel at, to import educational programs under an agreement of this sort, would be the way to go. They could afford it; they were interested in it, and Dean Gotto was interested in exploring it."

Professor Martin Lindau, Applied Physics: "From all I read it wasn't clear to me what the incentive was for Cornell to actually get into this activity, and I would like to hear something about this. In many cases, when you have money available, you try to convince yourself that it would be in the interest of Cornell to expand in the direction you think that you want to go in, and from what I've read so far, I didn't get a picture of that. Can you give me any idea?"

Professor David Robertshaw: "One of the most significant components to this was what we call nowadays 'globalization.' That is with modern communications, the whole world has contracted and this affords an

opportunity for the Medical College now to have a presence in another country, to extend both its teaching and its research and have access to another region of the world. This isn't just that country, it's that region of the world where there are unique and specific medical problems which provide the setting and material. Other than the fact that they can afford to pay for it, there is this extension of higher education on an international basis. It's part of something that is just emerging. If you look in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* on the web page today, they focus on that. So it's part of a movement in that general direction."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I have known about this for several months, at least a little bit of it, because the University Faculty Committee was given some information about and I hope the people on the UFC will share their opinions. It's hard to argue against the expansion of medical education. It is hard to argue for the feeling of having been sold to any buyer who has sufficient money. It has led me to have very negative feelings about our Trustees. I understand much of this was done in secrecy. Much of it was done by the Executive Committee of the Trustees without the full Board being involved in the negotiations. Between their desire to distort our system with eCornell, because they thought they would make some money, which apparently is not really the most successful venture in the world, and now this effort to extend our hand into a part of the world where there are probably all sorts of political issues, our name has been sold; our name has been transferred. What we have here is that this is really the Medical School, it's not us. In so far as I can divorce myself from the Medical School, I feel good. In so far as I feel that it's still part of Cornell University, I feel quite bad about this. I think it's basically a matter of having the money and buying a piece of Cornell."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Walcott?"

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: "One of the issues, it seems to me, that the University Faculty Senate needs to have some concern about, needs to understand perhaps a little better, is how the two-year curriculum is going to be managed and how we can be assured as faculty members that the quality of the instruction is comparable to that which we would expect of Cornell-Ithaca or extension pseudo-pods in various directions, like the Isle of Shoals and other places. In many of those cases we approve through all the usual channels the courses and then often faculty go and have a look and make sure that they really are up to snuff. That becomes a little more difficult due to the logistics of this one. I just wondered if you would comment a little bit about how you see recruiting faculty to come in and teach these basic science courses and how it will interface with what the departments here in Cornell-Ithaca are doing."

Professor Altschuler, American Studies and Dean, Continuing Education: "Let me speak to that, Charlie, if I might. As you know, there are quite a number of examples of courses that are taught outside of Ithaca that carry Cornell credit. The procedures that are always followed involve a departmental evaluating both the course itself and its suitability to be taught in a particular site and explicit approval of the faculty member who is teaching the course, either through the identification of a Cornell faculty member or through the appointment of an adjunct or other faculty member to do so. All of these kinds of courses go through the School of Continuing Education and Summer Session when it is extramurally given, and that will certainly be the case with the courses in Qatar.

"It is my expectation and David Robertshaw can speak to this, that the departments that are likely to be involved in a pre-med program (we know it will be biology, physics, chemistry, and perhaps mathematics) will have an opportunity to inspect the facility, to look at the labs that are going to be utilized for these courses, and no appointment of faculty will be made outside of the existing process of departmental vetting and approval and no course will be offered that is not pre-approved by that faculty member. So it's likely, unless a department is not exercising due diligence that both the facilities will be inspected and then re-inspected after a period of time to make sure that they are still up to the quality that is desired, and the approval of faculty will be an ongoing process.

"I read through the comments of the Faculty Senate Committee, and I think there are some very important concerns that have been raised about the impact on campus to departments of recruitment of existing faculty and what that will mean and so forth. Here we really need to look to departments to be the ones and they should be—to be the guarantors both of the quality of instruction outside of Ithaca and the maintenance of quality, diversity and depth of offers on campus. There is nothing, at least procedurally, presented by this proposal that is different from the kinds of things that we do fairly routinely right now. I've looked at it from as many angles as I can and at the moment have not been able to see anything that would give me a concern around those kinds of things. It seems to me that it's very important to monitor the activity over time, and just make sure that both the quality is maintained and the impact, should there be an impact, on instruction in Ithaca is noted and assessed."

Professor Barazangi, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: 'I think we have, my group, the largest Middle East, North Africa earth science program in the United States. We deal all the way from Morocco to Algeria to Egypt to Saudi Arabia to Oman, Kuwait, Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, and Iran. I'm certainly against this move. I will tell you why. This region is not a haven of democracy, and Qatar will certainly use this to their advantage. Obviously I echo what Terry Fine said. It is clear why it happened in Qatar not in Bangladesh, for example. Let me say the following. You will not be able to control the quality of undergraduates entering the program. You will have major difficulty in putting the quality that you demand from, say, a person like my daughter who went to Ithaca College. You will have a hard time.

"I know the University of Qatar and other university systems in the whole region extremely well, and I know what I am talking about. More importantly, what you want is de facto now, so let it be, but please listen to the following. Do not let them use this as another oppressive means for women. Use it in your statement or published articles that 70% of the student body will be from Qatar. I can predict, if you are not careful, that most of these will be women. These countries will not allow women to go abroad for higher education for different reasons, a rationale that I will not go into here. I predict this will be a mechanism to keep Qatar ladies so that they are trained as a doctor to benefit their people and keep it there. This Sheika that you mention, that's the kind of mentality they have there. I really strongly advise you to be careful about this point and not to use this move as part of the oppression of women in the Middle East."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, and University Faculty Committee: "I want to follow up some of those comments as well. I have two main concerns I want to address, and I think it would also be good to hear some responses in terms of some of the thoughts that perhaps the people who looked into this program, a positive thing, have had about this. I also want to assert first that regardless of the undergraduate degree, or the undergraduate credit issued, we have an interest in this for some of the reasons that have been stated already. That is—what happens with Cornell in other parts of the world or in the U.S. reflects on us, and we are concerned about the reputation of this university.

"My two concerns have to do first with regard to human rights questions. I believe there is a real problem of irresponsibility with regard to placing Cornell students, faculty and administration into a setting that may endanger their rights and potentially their safety. Second, the point with regards to the conflict of interest question, that is, a conflict of interest on the part of the Medical College that results from complete dependence of Cornell on the Qatar Foundation for its funding.

"Let me make just a couple of comments on the first issue. This is Cornell University in another country; this is not simply sending students abroad to study at another university. This is Cornell in Qatar. Doing that means that Cornell holds out to the students and the faculty who will be going to Qatar that this is a Cornell sponsored program, one in which they should expect to have the rights and the experience similar to what they would have here at the Medical College. However, the reality is that Cornell is doing this in a country that has human rights abuses. My evidence on that is from the U.S. State Department report from February

2001, so that's virtually yesterday. With regard to religion, for example, there's no constitutional protection for freedom of religion. The government officially prohibits public worship by non-Muslims. It tolerates services conducted privately with prior notification to the authorities, and this is a particular concern for Jews, Hindus and Buddhists, because the government has given de facto official recognition for religious worship by Catholic, Anglican and Orthodox churches. With regard to speech and assembly and association, there is no legal provision for academic freedom in Qatar. The government severely limits freedom of assembly. It does not permit political demonstrations except for ones against Israel. It does not allow political parties or membership in international professional organizations critical of the government or any other Arab government. There is more on that which I don't have time to go through. With regard to women, the legal system is lenient for a man found guilty of so called crimes of honor, a euphemism, as the State Department says, that refers to violent assault against a woman for perceived immodesty or defiant behavior, even though they say such honor killings are rare. There is no independent women's rights organization, nor has the government permitted one to exist. So Cornell is holding itself as establishing Cornell in another country, but it cannot meet the expectations of the university experience that will provide the same rights to students and faculty that they would find in the U.S. They can expect much less in relation to religious freedom, peaceful assembly and political demonstrations, women's rights, and given the legal prohibition on women's rights, faculty, students and administrators in Qatar will be placed in a dangerous situation with regard to their rights and safety.

"Quickly, on the second issue. Cornell Medical College in Qatar is fully funded by the Qatar Foundation, that is tantamount to being the government of Qatar, given that the Qatar Foundation is funded completely by the Emir's wealth. The Qatar Foundation will have a role in governance, including participating in appointing members of the Joint Advisory Board, along with the Board of Trustees and the Board of Overseers appointing the members of the Joint Advisory Board. You have a conflict of interest created. It's simply there. If you have total economic power in the Qatar Foundation in relation to the funding of this program, when conflicts come up between academic issues and economic issues that is a very real issue with regard to compromising and really giving up independence of the college. So I would like to hear some responses to those problems."

James Mingle, University Counsel: "Well, I'll start. On the conflict of interest issue, the last one, the Joint Advisory Board which will be jointly comprised of four members selected by the Qatar Foundation and four by the Trustees and Overseers, and they in turn will select the additional ones, is just, as you had in your background notes, strictly advisory. There is absolutely no governance surrendered or transferred to that group. It's quite clear in the agreement, and this was from the start when we met last May, it was a fundamental principle among many, that the university would have full operational autonomy.

"The second point, and it relates to another question, is full financial coverage. We also addressed up front issues of assurances of academic freedom and non-discrimination. That from the start, even before we looked at due diligence, was committed to by them, and it's embodied quite explicitly in the agreement. The Joint Advisory Board just provides guidance. The budget is not only formulated by Cornell, but the ultimate judgement of how much will be in the budget is by the Trustees and the Overseers. We have extraordinary legal protections to assure that there are five-year rolling budgets. We would love to have something like this in another comparable contractual relationship, and that is the contract with the State of New York, where we have built in a five-year rolling budget that they have committed to, that we formulated (the Medical College formulates), secured by a letter of credit on a London bank that we select and approve. The protections financially . . . and they are good questions. The questions you raised were questions that we raised up front. We built in to protect—you can say its operational autonomy, but you have to back it up. It's backed up and protected. That's a fundamental precept that we have control. Academic freedom is a fundamental precept. They have assured, up front and in the agreement, that the

same type of academic freedom that faculty and students and staff enjoy, particularly in dealing with instruction and research, is also going to be respected at this branch of the Medical College."

Professor Lieberwitz: "What about demonstrations?"

James Mingle: "Now, the issue you are raising is not academic freedom, as a legal matter. It's first amendment protections. It's unique, and this is to say when you are a faculty member or a student, you can go to a program abroad in Nepal, or in Singapore, or a visiting professorship in England, and these countries do not have first amendment protections of the range of liberties that we have anchored in our constitution. If there is an objection to particular policies that are promulgated on that branch campus over there, the same way it's done here, there can be voicing of criticisms of that by students, faculty and staff and that will be protected. However, to the extent that there are local laws that govern here in Ithaca, in Nepal, in Singapore and in England, which says no first amendment, we have to comply with the local laws and restrictions. So academic freedom, if you think it means you can go downtown and demonstrate on the Commons, that's first amendment protection, but there may be rules of the city of Ithaca, permits, that we have to comply with that will be different than demonstrating on Ho Plaza. The academic freedom principles were critical; non-discrimination principles were critical, and they fully agreed to them."

Professor Michael Todd, Operations Research and Industrial Engineering: "I'd like to comment on the sort of indecent haste I see in this proposal. The comment was made that one of the advantages of this was globalization and spreading our knowledge around. One of the great advantages of globalization was meant to be that it would spread democracy around. I noticed again in this same report that I think in 1998 a commission was set up to work towards some sort of constitution, and I'm sort of suspicious a little bit of the timing. This was a nice move to try to get some nice agreements set up with the West and so on. I don't see that there would be any great problem in holding back this agreement until such a constitution or some progress towards it had been in place. In particular, there was another note in there about how much academic freedom for foreign residents exist. Visas need to be obtained. You know you can have all the academic freedom but if you are held there against your will, it's not a whole bunch of good. I would have really hoped that democracy would have been the first thing before this agreement had Cornell's name put on it."

James Mingle: "The State Department report that the professor mentioned. I do commit it to your attention. We certainly read it. We consulted with the State Department about this. The State Department and other government officials, because of the globalization issue, were very supportive of this; they think it is educational diplomacy. That was one out of many factors to consider. As far as the many restrictions that they may have on liberties. It's true there are various restrictions. There are also, what wasn't pointed out is, that if you look at the index of the degree of liberties, we are unique in the United States. You look at a place like Qatar vis-à-vis other places in the Middle East, their range of more relaxed restrictions, and this report, by the way, chronicles how they have relaxed over the past several years since 1995, including rights for women to run for office and to vote. The other thing that is important is that they have a cable television over there and that has the full range, almost mimics the range, of press freedom that we have here and is extraordinary in the Middle East region.

"So there are elements, there is obviously a mixed report there, it notes that they are moving more towards democratization, but it is a conservative regime. It is, if you look at the spectrum, over here versus the United States, but a lot of folks are over here from the United States. There is a movement there, and what's important is that we have pinned down in the agreement the critical principles that are near and dear to us, and academic freedom is one of them. Non-discrimination is one of them. Autonomy is one of them, and that coupled with the risk protections we have in there of safety and security for faculty and staff, we have covered and addressed that. So the questions that you raised, they are very cogent

questions, a lot of these questions we had, Trustees had, and Overseers had. In the process of examining this and the due diligence and in getting to the agreement stage, we addressed as much as possible, retaining our control and having financial coverage."

Speaker Howland: "Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry but our time for this discussion is over. We pass to the next agenda item. The Chair would now like to call on Francille Firebaugh, Director of Special Projects, for the Faculty Gender Equity Salary Study."

7. FACULTY GENDER EQUITY SALARY STUDY

Professor Emeritus Francille Firebaugh, Policy Analysis and Management and Director of Special Projects: "Good afternoon. I have been asked to give a bit of background and then describe where I think we are today in the review of Gender Equity Salary Analysis. Some of you know that there was an MIT review on the status of women faculty in science and they issued an interim report as early as 1995, and they addressed individual issues of space, resources, equipment, previous underpayment of pensions, and responses to outside offers. Then by 1999, Lotte Bailyn, who is faculty chair of their Senate, wrote the key conclusion and I quote from her, 'Gender discrimination in the 1990's is subtle but pervasive, and stems largely from unconscious ways of thinking that have been socialized into all of us, men and women alike.' Things continued at MIT; their report came out, and the faculty and administrators suggested that this was a model that could be used in other than the science department; this was not all women faculty at MIT.

"I came on board, I should say I couldn't decide which of those titles, the debilitating Emeritus title that I hold or what, but I came to this position in January of 2000. The MIT report was under great discussion. It was concerning to the President's Council of Cornell Women, to the members of the Affirmative Action Committee of this body and it was a concern to the deans. After various meetings, as we are wont to do at Cornell, it was agreed that we would conduct a university-wide set of analyses of salaries for gender equity. I should point out that over time colleges have used regression analyses and other tools for assisting them in looking at the salary equity. This happened to be a decision to be a bit more proactive with the university-wide analysis. Along the way, Ms. Bailyn came to Cornell, saw some of us here, made a speech, and I had known her before, lots of us have known her. I'll come back to that. More recently there was a conference that was comprised of presidents, chancellors, provosts, twenty-five women professors from 'nine top research universities,' and we were not among them. We were not invited, and it wasn't that we didn't read the mail. So they met to discuss equitable treatment of women in science and engineering. In the call I asked why were we not invited, so Lotte said, 'Well, our hope is that this initial effort will go well beyond these few universities and will encourage all universities to take this problem seriously and try to combat these continuing barriers just as Cornell is doing.' Some of you read this weekend in the April 8 *New York Times*, an article titled 'The Reluctant Feminist,' which describes this MIT study in considerable detail.

"So what is going on here at Cornell. A Methodology Committee for examining this gender equity and salaries was appointed by Provost Martin with Francine Blau, Frances Perkins Professor of Labor Economics, as consultant to this Methodology Committee. The Provost had visited with the Associate Dean of the Faculty, and Professor Blau was mutually agreed on as someone who could be key in this planning for the methodology and the analysis. Under her leadership, a regression model was developed, and from the start it was clear that the analyses would have to be at the college level, college based, because each of us here knows that salaries are determined at the departmental and college level and not by any university level. Colleges and departments, of course, have additional information that would be critical factors that were not included in the regression analyses.

"Each college reviewed the data for accuracy. Now the regression analyses have been run; the colleges are now examining them. The colleges will give particular attention to the salaries for women, where the actual salary is 5% or more below the predicted salary from the regression analysis. After this review process, they will make recommendations for any appropriate changes as part of the annual salary improvement process. A small faculty panel, to be appointed by Provost Martin, will review the recommendations with the deans for fairness and general consistency in the attention given by the deans across the campus. A panel member, for whatever college that person is from, that panel member would not be involved in their own college. Efforts will be made to absolutely ensure the privacy of individual salary information, to respect that is part of Cornell's continuing policy. We are trying like crazy to schedule those reviews in May, and when the salary program for 2001 — 02, the one we are coming into, when that is completed and the data are available, we will run the regression analyses again. Differences in the results may or may not occur—this is not an effort to bring all salaries to the predicted level, but to assure fairness in the review. But it is the purpose of this review to assure that there is fairness and consistent consideration. In the future, I must say, we may want to give more attention to the subtle factors that Lotte Bailyn suggested. Mr. Chairman, I am open for questions."

Speaker Howland: "Yes, we have seven seconds."

Professor Firebaugh: "Oh, no. I can't be that slow."

Professor J. S. Butler, Policy Analysis and Management: "Different from all the other times I've spoken here, I actually know something about the subject I'm talking about here. So I have an econometric question. If you estimate the model as it was specified and for men and women and include a 'gender dummy', do you get a significant coefficient on it, controlling for all the other factors included?"

Professor Ehrenberg: "This is not the first time that this type of study has been done for the university. In fact, at the behest of a group of female faculty I did such a study in 1996-97, however, I was never allowed to tell the results to the university faculty, and I'm still sworn to secrecy. What I can say is that results were very, very favorable towards Cornell. In any case where significant differentials showed up, either in terms of salary differences or differences in promotion probabilities and time of promotion, we went and spoke with the deans, and they looked very carefully and either came up with an explanation that satisfied Don Randel, or they fixed the problem."

Speaker Howland: "We have time for a couple more questions."

Professor Danuta Shanzer: "I was wondering whether the results are going to be made public."

Professor Firebaugh: "Indeed. Remember the part that I said 'Cornell's continuing commitment for privacy', so anything that's done will do that, will protect the privacy. We hear different suggestions for how we might do it that would protect privacy. I don't see Michael Kelley here, but Michael is on the Methodology Committee and has suggested ways that they have been doing it in Engineering that he thinks are fair, so I hear the concern."

Professor Harry Kaiser, Applied Economics and Management: "I guess my question is for Ron. How do you control for quality, other than I can see a regression of salary and on gender and rank, but how do you control for quality differences such as in research and teaching?"

Professor Firebaugh: "You can ask Ron, but I want to quickly answer what we are expecting. That's the college-based nature, so when we visit with the deans and the deans report 18 years since this person has published, that's what we . . ."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Firebaugh: "That's it. Ron, do you think there is any other way to say it? I mean, in the model we have 'named professorship,' but it will have to be at the department and college level to give this performance indication."

Professor Kaiser: "You use the model to raise red flags."

Professor Firebaugh: "Absolutely. Then we go, and then they will...."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much, Professor Firebaugh. I would like to pass now to Good and Welfare. I'd like to call on Lynette Chappell-Williams for an announcement on the Moving Wall."

GOOD AND WELFARE — MOVING WALL ANNOUNCEMENT

Lynette Chappell-Williams, Director, Workforce Diversity, Equity and Life Quality: "Good evening. I'm with the Office of Workforce Diversity, Equity and Life Quality. About a year ago we worked with a group of students from ROTC and some of the local veterans from the Ithaca area to bring the Vietnam Moving Wall to Cornell, and we found out in January that our application was accepted. The wall will be here May 1 — 5. The opening ceremonies will begin on May 1 with a closing ceremony being on May 5. We are asking your assistance in terms of letting students know about the event. We ask faculty to assist in terms of doing presentations to talk about the Vietnam War, and we will have more information later in terms of what those particular programs are. We do want to thank Dean Henry, who has agreed to allow us to use the Ag Quad for this, so that we have as many students passing through as possible to see. We are really excited about this. We have been getting calls from individuals throughout Ithaca and the State of New York who are coming in to see this. We are really delighted to see that Cornell is hosting something like this. I just wanted to share that with you."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. We've come to the end of the agenda. I will entertain a motion to adjourn."

Provost Martin: "Could I . . . ? I just wanted to make one point about the Gender Equity Salary Study. When somebody asked if the results would be made public, I think the appropriate answer is something will be made public. I mean something about how we do it needs to be made public, the question is what level of detail and how to do it in a way that does protect the privacy of individuals and the salary information. But will anything be made public? Yes. Otherwise, why do it? No, there is a reason to do it and that is to try and find inequities and correct them, but the other reason is also for the community to have a sense of how we are doing overall. So something will be made public. We have really excellent people like Fran Bau helping us determine the best way to make information public, so the answer to that is yes."

Prof. Anton: "Move to adjourn."

Unknown: "Second."

Speaker Howland: "Meeting adjourned."

Adjourned 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty