

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 12, 2000

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior, Speaker: "I'd like to remind everyone that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting. I'd like to call on the Dean of the Faculty, Bob Cooke, for remarks."

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "My remarks will be brief because I'm going to have another shot at discussing distance learning later. This is a presentation of the web address, to be presented by the Faculty Subcommittee the Campus Climate Committee. It is intended for use as a resource for department discussions on campus climate. If you'd like to see it, it is at this address:

<http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/OnlineForum.html>.

"One other thing that I would like to address is that I would like to extend my appreciation to the Campus Climate Committee. You will notice ([Appendix A](#), attached) that the group was awarded the James A. Perkins Prize, and I wanted to show you the names of those people. They are an enormously energetic committee and they have gone ahead of what we expected them to do. I offer my heartfelt thanks to them for having worked on the committee so intensely and with very good results." (Applause).

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much Dean Cooke. Now I'd like to call on Provost Randel for questions and answers."

2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Don Randel: "I've just come from the Financial Policies Committee, held in the President's office, and I think that there is some progress being made in that group in terms of agreeing on what a peer group for comparison will be. The latest data from Academe arrived yesterday and it shows that the rate of growth of faculty salaries has grown slightly faster than the average rate of growth of faculty salaries at other institutions. There has been a modest gain of ground, although not as much as we would have liked. I hope and believe that the work will lead to some techniques to raise the rate of growth. If you haven't seen the figures in Academe, they're reprinted in the Chronicle of Higher Education. You should know that the figures for Cornell Statutory do not include the most recently authorized salary program at all. So our numbers would be better than the Chronicle story suggests, although the trend is still the same. That is to say, that the statutory colleges are losing ground against even other public institutions to say nothing of the leading private institutions. But you'll hear more about that later. Your questions?"

Associate Professor A. Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "At the last meeting, I asked you about Project 2000 and you mentioned a meeting of the most interested parties was scheduled for a week after the Faculty Senate meeting. I was wondering if you could report on what transpired."

Provost Randel: "Project 2000 has been declared to have reached its end. We are declaring victory and marching home. By the midpoint of the current year, we will have spent what was authorized in the budget of Project 2000 originally, which is to say that we have not thrown more cash at it than was promised. We have achieved a good deal less than half of what we expected, however. So the strategy of going forward will be to imagine our rock-bottom needs for data systems, and what we can reasonably assign to the maintenance and approval of the systems on an annual basis. No big institution has been able to get all the systems under one, so it will be a question of sizing our appetites into some reasonable estimate of what

needs to be accomplished. There is much to be done on HR, so it has been printing checks more or less correctly, but there is still a terrible problem in getting data to the departments and colleges that need data to manage their affairs. So there will need to be further improvement there. We will also have to decide what we're going to be able to do with the Student Information System, which includes their online registration and the generation of transcripts and advisor information. It will not be the huge onetime solution -- we will have to bite it off piece by piece."

Professor Anton: "To continue with that, will we attempt to recover losses for services promised that were not provided by PeopleSoft?"

Provost Randel: "The short answer to that almost certainly is no, simply because most of the money that went into it was not paid to PeopleSoft. I think it unlikely that one would be able to sue them for anything substantial. It's true that the product was not as good as we and they and some other people around the country thought it should be. But the investment that we would be able to recover is small unless something very different happened with other institutions."

Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "How much that was supposed to be accomplished got accomplished?"

Provost Randel: "Well, it was originally imagined that we would have HR payroll, Student Information Systems, Management Systems, Development and Alumni Affairs, and Sponsored Programs. Five suites that would be fully integrated and all talked to one another so that from the moment a student applied to Cornell, they would enter the system and migrate through the status from applicant to student to alumnus to a development prospect. What was done was to install the HR payroll system, though with not all of the functionality that we wanted it to have. A good deal of planning went into the Student Information Systems and the others, so we now understand what is desired, but we are far from implementing any of those ideas. What we got in the end, up and functioning, was a certain part of the HR payroll, which was clearly a large system. The other systems, like Alumni Affairs and Sponsored Programs, are smaller. We got a big chunk of HR payroll."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Howland: "I'd like to call for approval of the minutes from the March 8 Faculty Senate meeting. Are there any corrections or additions? Hearing none, I will accept them as unanimously approved. I would now like to call on the Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty, Kathleen Rasmussen, for a Report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

4. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "As is our usual practice at this time of year, I bring you the slate for the elections that will be held in about a week. That is how long it takes for us to get you the ballot. What I will do is present the slate and then you need to vote on it to accept it. The slate consists of candidates for Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty, Faculty Trustee, Nominations and Elections Committee members, University Faculty Committee members, and At-large Faculty Senate positions. The At-large Faculty Senate positions, I feel, need some explanation. The committee and I called 18 people. Five people said yes and then we suddenly only had 3 candidates. One other person has since backed out from when we first sent you the slate. I regret that situation. The University Faculty Committee is the executive board of the Senate and it is restricted to members of the Senate. Are there any questions? Yes?"

Unidentified: "A name was missing from the bottom of the slate, a Vicki somebody?"

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "Meyers-Wallen. She is from the Veterinary College and is currently serving on that committee as a replacement for someone who didn't complete their term."

Speaker Howland: "I'd like to call for a vote on the approval of the report. All in favor of the approval of the report say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' The report and slate are approved."

SLATE OF CANDIDATES

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty- 3-year term

Peter Schwartz, Professor, Textiles and Apparel

Charles Walcott, Professor and Chair, Neurobiology & Behavior

Faculty Trustee - 1 vacancy - 4-year term

David Collum, Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Ronald Ehrenberg, I. M. Ives Professor of ILR and Economics and Director, Cornell Higher Education Research Institute

Sally McConnell-Ginet, Professor, Linguistics

Peter Stein, Professor, Physics

At-Large member, Faculty Senate (tenured) - 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Eloy Rodriguez, James A. Perkins Professor of Environmental Studies, Plant Biology

Elaine Wethington, Associate Professor, Human Development

At-Large member, Faculty Senate (non-tenured) - 1 vacancy, 3-year term

Antje Baeumner, Assistant Professor, Agricultural and Biological Engineering

John Marohn, Assistant Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Michael Owren, Assistant Professor, Psychology

Nominations and Elections Committee - 4 vacancies, 3-year terms

David Delchamps, Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering

Thomas Hirschl, Professor, Rural Sociology

Ann Lemley, Professor and Chair, Textiles and Apparel

Rosemary Loria, Professor and Chair, Plant Pathology

Timothy Mount, Professor, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics

Max Pfeffer, Associate Professor, Rural Sociology

Gary Simson, Professor, Law

University Faculty Committee - 3 vacancies, 3-year terms

A. Brad Anton, Associate Professor, Chemical Engineering

Peter Bruns, Professor, Molecular Biology and Genetics

Herbert Deinert, Professor, German Studies

Terrence L. Fine, Professor, Electrical Engineering and Director, Center for Applied Math

William H. Lesser, Professor, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics

Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Associate Professor, Biomedical Sciences

Speaker Howland: "I'd now like to call on Professor Rich Galik, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee for an update."

5. REPORT FROM EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "Dean Cooke asked for an update on our committee. Here is a list of the current members ([Appendix B](#), attached). There are a number of issues before us. Last semester, we concentrated on the unauthorized use of course notes and, as you recall, we put together a motion that was passed by a somewhat small margin in December. As expected, this was not a panacea, but it did put the companies on notice that the faculty was not happy with their practices and, to some extent, the practices have been changed nationwide due to policies such as ours and from other institutions. There are still problems in this area.

"The committee is also concerned about University 'Free-Time' and you should all have received a copy of our memo on this issue. It was not aimed directly at faculty, because you are not egregious violators of this policy. It went to students, to the Athletic Department, and to any individual involved with using University time.

"This has very interesting effects on the scheduling of final examinations. We have discussed the fact that presently there are three study days before examinations and that we could disperse those throughout the examination period to ensure that students didn't have multiple exams three days in a row. We actually put a schedule together. We meet with the students tomorrow to get their feedback.

"Other issues include evening examinations, which are not only a burden to professors, but also to students; the coordination of assignments, which is a something that affects first-year students in the physical sciences; changing the Spring semester calendar to include one day off between when classes start and Spring Break, in which case we have a few days to play with from the standpoint of the Trustees and which is something that students would appreciate having. We are also still discussing academic integrity issues and we're still trying to put down a 'Rights and Responsibilities' list to give to students.

"We certainly welcome your comments on the proposed final exam schedules or any other issues."

Professor Frederick Ahl, Classics: "On the business of the scheduling of final examinations, one of the problems is the question of faculty schedules of final exams. This year, I've ended up with two exams that I

have to give to fairly substantial courses both on the final day of exams. This of course, raises problems for me and for the students. I have to try to grade all of these and get them in on time especially because I have a fair number of seniors. I hope that one of the things that the scheduling committee can take into account is to make some provisions for how this might affect faculty, especially regarding giving multiple exams on the final day for courses with seniors, whose grades are due so soon after."

Professor Galik: "This is certainly a problem for faculty as well as for students, as you can imagine. There are students who have to take exams on the last day also. Also, the fact that you have 72 hours to submit the grades for seniors is problematic. You have the recourse to talk to this gentleman (Dean Cooke) and ask to offer the examination at another time during the week at a time your students can make. You're right, it is certainly an issue to examine.

"I should also say that we looked at other examination schedules from around the country and especially the State of New York, where we have so many Regents rules, and almost all of them use a 'first-time the class meets' basis for assigning the periods. We are not the only school that uses that."

Speaker Howland: "Are there any other questions? Thank you very much, Professor Galik."

Speaker Howland: "I'd like to call on Dean Cooke for an update on Distance Learning."

6. DISTANCE LEARNING

A. Update

Dean Cooke: "I will be brief. I wanted to call your attention to what is the final scheduled faculty forum this semester. It is on Distance Learning, the second iteration, and we have an expert from EDUCAUSE, Polly McClure will moderate, and Bill Arms and Barry Carpenter are the panelists who will ask questions of the speaker. Notice that it's not on Wednesday, it's on Tuesday, April 25, at 4:30 p.m., because we wanted to be free to attend the talk by the CEO of Intel on Wednesday. It's also in Schwartz Auditorium, not Call.

"I wanted to report that I did indeed report to the Trustees the resolution that you adopted on March 8th. I did it on March 11th. One member of the Board of Trustees wrote me a letter after that and specifically asked that I communicate it too you. It's from Trustee Milstein:

'I think it is important for you to have a complete sense of my own views, they probably reflect many others of the Board, on distance learning. Please convey to the Faculty Senate and the entire faculty the Board's commitment to receiving more input from the faculty before any distance learning program begins. The steps being taken now are simply preparatory and need to be taken to put us in a position to move forward with distance learning should the Board of Trustees decide to do so. It is of the utmost importance for dialogue between the administration and the faculty to continue apace. As I mentioned in my remarks, and speaking as one trustee only, failure to have faculty fully on board would give me great pause. All of your comments reflect serious concerns that are shared by the Board of Trustees and the Administration. I wanted to write this note to underline my own personal commitment to the values underlying those concerns.'

"Another sense that I got from the Trustee meeting is that the Provost's Advisory Committee on Distance Learning has been filled with a very distinguished membership ([Appendix C](#), attached). Professor Arms will talk in just a moment on what's happened. If the [Cornell Sun](#) had chosen to do so, they would have included this quote that I supplied which indicates my satisfaction and pleasure at the appearance of this committee

and at the committee membership.

Cooke says that '...with the appointment of this strong committee I believe that the deliberative process can now proceed both effectively and rapidly. I anticipate that the committee will seek advice broadly, think deeply about this important and historic opportunity, and propose options that are consistent with the broad service and educational missions of the university. The Faculty Senate, in my opinion, is eager to receive recommendations and to respond thoughtfully.'

"It is a very able committee. On your behalf, I was suggesting that we looked forward to receiving from them some thoughtful proposals for our discussion."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I'd like to call on Professors William Fry and Kay Obendorf, Faculty-elected Trustees."

B. Report on Trustee Consideration

Professor S. Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel, Faculty-elected Trustee: "First, I want to remind you that you have two faculty-elected Board members. I have had the pleasure of serving for the past four years and you have seen the slate of candidates of who may take my place. Bill has served for the past two years as the second Faculty-elected Trustee. It's a very educational experience for a faculty member to serve on the Board of Trustees and, periodically, it is the practice of the Faculty-elected Trustees to report to the faculty. With the concerns that have been expressed, we thought this was an appropriate time to speak to you about some of the things related to e-Cornell and to answer your questions. That's what we want to do today.

"What I want to do is to review a little bit with you some of the events that have occurred related to e-Cornell. The first discussions of e-Cornell were not using the term 'e-Cornell.' They were using 'distance learning,' which is the name of the committee that Bob just put up on the overhead. The Office of Distance Learning was formed in the Spring of 1997, so these concepts have been discussed on campus for a long time. This started discussions of strategies of distance learning and what Cornell should do.

"In March of 1998, at the Trustee meeting in Ithaca, distance learning was presented by David Lipsky to the Board of Trustees. To my knowledge, that was the first time the topic was discussed. In 1999, there were a series of requests by various schools and colleges to actually work with outside entities. The discussion of distance learning and these requests led to the creation of an Ad hoc group of the Board of Trustees meeting in July of 1999. These included people like Allan Tessler and Jeff Parker as well as people from the administration and from the Office of Distance Learning.

"It was really in December of 1999, in the Executive Committee, that I first heard some of the more concrete strategies and it was still under the discussion of distance learning. If I remember correctly, what was discussed was forming a Dean of Distance Learning, looking at the continuums, and figuring out what we were doing with distance learning. This really began the more public and open discussion of distance learning and what Cornell should do. The meeting of the Board of Trustees in New York City in January had the first real discussion of e-Cornell and dealing with it in a for-profit mode. So that was the first discussion that I heard using the term 'e-Cornell.' You are familiar with the meeting of March of 2000 because this was the vote. So it is the January and March meetings that Bill and I want to talk to you about.

"I also want to remind you that after the January meeting, when we first heard about e-Cornell, Bill and I met with Bob Cooke and Mary Sansalone and arranged for the presentation that Mary made to the Senate,

opening some of those discussions. Now Bill wants to talk about the January and March meetings of the Board of Trustees and then we would like to take questions from you if our time permits."

Professor William Fry, Plant Pathology, Faculty-elected Trustee: "I had organized my comments into three categories and I want to start with 'Observations' first. I think it has been the experience of all the faculty members who have served as Trustees that it is a real growth curve. I'm still remarkably ignorant about the Board and about many activities at Cornell and it's been an interesting year and a half for me.

"One of the observations shared by the faculty that have served as Trustees is that the Trustees are a remarkable group of people. They have a remarkable devotion to this University that I think goes beyond reason sometimes. (Laughter). They are remarkably devoted to this University and I think part of that comes from the fact that many of them were undergraduates here and they have a real nostalgia for the place. As a result, they are remarkably generous with their time, with their effort, and with their money -- as you are aware of with the recent scholarship drive. They are remarkably dedicated to the undergraduate experience. The sense that I have gotten, more than anything else, is that they want nothing to interfere with that experience. They want the undergraduate experience at Cornell to be absolutely spectacular. That's important for what I'm going to say a little later on.

"As Kay mentioned, I first heard about e-Cornell on January 29. We did meet about getting the information to the faculty as quickly as possible. Since that time, I've been on a speedy learning curve again. I have had many conversations both with faculty who want some vehicle so that they can put their distance learning efforts on time and other faculty members and administrators who are absolutely livid. I want also to convey that there are many Trustees who are concerned about conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment. They want that not to happen in terms of e-Cornell. They are particular about the residential undergraduate experience; it's what they experienced and it's something that they hold very dearly.

"I've also been to the Faculty Fora and I learned much to my intrigue that Peter was sort of right with you in my skepticism about how effective e-Cornell would be. My feeling about the resolution from the March 8 Faculty Senate meeting is that the Trustees heard it loud and clear. The resolution that was passed by the Trustees identified the issues that were raised in the Faculty Senate resolution very appropriately. Bob, the letter you just read from Trustee Milstein I think reflects that. What I felt about what was passed by the Board, and what he felt was passed by the Board, was that it was a way to create a box to look at and to see what could be put into that box. There were no irrefutable actions, but it would allow them to proceed forward. I'll stop now and both Kay and I would be happy to answer questions if we can."

Associate Professor Jeremy Rabkin, Government: "The premise of this report is that the Trustees are an important, independent decision making body in all of this, and I don't mean to sound scoffing or disrespectful because I'm sure they have given a lot to Cornell, but could you give us some impressions of the extent to which the Trustees are in a position to come to a view separate from the administration? Just to help you a little bit, I know hardly anything about the Cornell Board of Trustees, but I know something about other boards and generally, they are very well managed by the administrators of these organizations. The administrators put forth an agenda, apply all of the information that they have, and more or less say, 'You've got to support us because you picked us to manage this place.' So it doesn't really make a difference what the Trustees think."

Professor Obendorf: "I'm not sure I can give all of the answers, but I think that I'm going to share one simple person's observation on a very complex system. Yes, indeed, you're right, the presentations that I described to you and other presentations that I see that are given by the administration to the Board are to inform them but there is a selection of what they are being informed about. I also see that there is a give and take in discussion between the Board of Trustees amongst themselves and with the administration. There's quite

a bit of discussion of these issues, and it's very hard for me to say what the contribution of the Board or a particular member of the Board is in some of these because it comes through discussion. There is quite a bit of active discussion so it's not that the Trustees are telling the administration what to do or the administration are simply presenting the issues the way they want to present it. There is some give and take with this. There is a fair amount of discussion and sometimes it is in discussions that occur within the Board of Trustees and in discussions that occur on campus. E-Cornell exhibits some things of those discussions.

"I also have to say that there were fairly active Board of Trustee members who were saying that with the technology and communication level, Cornell needed to make a move. The administration was presenting to the Board, but I also heard Board members stating very specific views that we needed to move ahead because we have to be active in this information age. My view is that this is not all one way or another. It's a give and take."

Professor Fry: "I think that's correct. I have a lot less experience than Kay or others who have been on the Board. I think that the Board wants to make some sort of decision. Next question?"

Professor Ahl: "Sorry to have a second point to raise today, but it's very nice to have our Faculty Trustees with us today. I think many of us would agree. I was really sad to see that we only have ten minutes with them. It would be very nice, I think, since they are delegates untainted with the blight of administration, to hear from them more regularly and to be kept up to date. I hope that the Senate would make a point of inviting them more often to keep us posted so we can keep up with the issues and what they're about. Thank you."

Professor Obendorf: "I've been here very faithfully and I've seen Bill here, so we do attend regularly to keep in touch. We could ask the University Faculty Committee to put us on. Even though my term will be ending, if you want to hear more from us, at the beginning of Fall, I'll even come back."

Speaker Howland: "I'd like to call on Professor Arms to talk about the new Distance Learning Committee."

C. Provost's Advisory Committee on Distance Learning

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "We have had just one meeting and the subject of the meeting is relevant to what we're discussing today. We talked almost entirely about the process by which decisions are made in these areas and how we can help that process. I've got three slides that summarize how we are thinking about how we can help the University.

"What I've got here is what I consider the dilemma. Here's a quotation ([Appendix D](#), attached) from the President's letter that he sent to all of us in which he rightly points out that there are decisions that have to be made quickly. I wouldn't say that the Internet has changed things, I think that there have always been decisions in which the deliberative process that we would like to have is challenged by the need to make decisions quickly. Although it is my own statement, I hope everyone will accept it -- that is, that major academic initiatives need to have more understanding and support to succeed. That doesn't mean that everyone has got to be in favor of it, but we need what we in the networking community call a 'rough consensus.' The challenge to our community, and to the University in general, is how can the University make good decisions, rapidly, with broad University-wide understanding and support?"

"I've got a little diagram here ([Appendix D](#), attached) that shows my hopes and my fears. It's got a very simple scale. The first thing is that we want the University to make good decisions. The second thing is that we want good processes to make these decisions. The definition of 'good processes' is somewhat complex, but it certainly involves flow of information, consensus building, and those sorts of things. I am saying that

we are in that right-hand side, where that big red blob is. Whether the decisions have been good or bad, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not like the process. I think it's safe to say that in the last month, there's been a sign both from the senior members of the administration and the members of the University Faculty Committee of people trying very hard to improve the processes. My hope is that we'll follow the green arrow into good processes and good decisions. My fear is that we will work so hard on the processes that we'll forget to make good decisions and we'll follow the black arrow. (Laughter).

"So what can we, as a committee, do to play our part in this? Here are a few thoughts. The first is that from this committee you will see frequent short papers and outputs. You will not see a big report that we take nine months to put together and a further nine months to discuss before anything happens. We'll see little things happening. Our high priority is to work on a general statement of principles around which all decisions can be made. We heard, in the last presentation, the principle of the real importance of not doing anything that might harm traditional on-campus education. We will use incremental decision-making. We will try to help the University identify the incremental decisions as they come up for faculty and administrative consideration. We've put a lot of emphasis on information flow. We have put up an embryo website and the address is on the agenda today. We're going to try to put on that website interim things that people should know about. I feel that the role of our committee is to be in the middle of the road between the administration and the Faculty Senate. The old joke is that if you walk in the middle of the road, you get hit by the vehicles going in both directions. I expect to find that from time to time, the faculty will think we look too much like administration and the administration will think we look too much like faculty. We have several former deans on the committee and they are people who know both sides of the road so I think that will help.

"One last thing is that I put my electronic mail address there so please send your thoughts and suggestions to us. Try to keep them under one page and remember that we'll be putting them on the website for everybody to read. (Laughter). Thank you."

7. RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

Speaker Howland: "So, we move now to the resolution on Academic Decision-Making Processes. We have received three amendments, so in the interest of efficiency here's what I would like to do: After Professor Walcott introduces his motion, we will move to Professor McAdams' amendment. It's my understanding that Professor Norton will withdraw her amendment if the motion passes. We will then consider Professor Stein's amendment and then the motion itself. Then we have a second amendment from Professor McAdams that reads as follows: Approximately four minutes before the end of the time allotted for this discussion the chair will recognize Professor McAdams to make the following two motions. He will move that when the meeting adjourns it will resume at 4:30 p.m. on April 19 at the same place. That is a debatable motion and can be passed by a simple majority. He will then move that the question be postponed until the next meeting. This also requires a simple majority and it is debatable.

"With that, I would like to call on Professor Walcott, a member of the UFC, for a resolution on academic decision-making processes."

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: "Professor Arms really gave the introduction to what I wanted to talk about. You will remember that at our most recent meeting we had a vote about a resolution to the administration about e-Cornell. It was passed by some 65 to 1, which is a rather strong sentiment for this body. I rather suspect that if I brought a resolution for motherhood and apple pie that I could scarcely get such an affirmation.

"When the UFC heard the report of what the Board of Trustees has done, we met and we proposed

resolutions and we debated among ourselves. We were very concerned about the action on e-Cornell. We proposed a number of motions and resolutions to bring before this body and we shared them with the President. Essentially, the administration, the President and the Provost agreed with all of the conclusions that we had in the resolutions. Bill's committee was formed and was given a broad mandate to look at distance learning without any holds barred. His report would come before this body as would the report from the President before they go to the Board of Trustees. This is what we were concerned about and we were pleased with those actions.

"On the other hand, the decision about distance learning follows on the heels of a number of other events, which are detailed in the handout that you have, that have caused us some concern about the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the President and the Administration. In order to try to clarify that relationship, we suggested to the President that it might be useful to sit down as a group and see if we could work out a set of ground rules, understandings, common operations, to try to forestall further occurrences of the kind that we have experienced in the past. The President agreed to do that and so what we are bringing to you today is the resolution that the University Faculty Committee and the Dean of the Faculty will work with the President and presumably the Provost-to-be to develop a series of understandings of how we might work together more effectively in the future to prevent misunderstandings of the kind that have occurred in the past and to try to pull everyone together in a more collegial and effective way.

"The motion that I have to present is up on the overhead ([Appendix E](#), attached), so I don't think I need to take the time to read it. So I would like to move for the motion."

Speaker Howland: "The chair would like to recognize Professor McAdams for an amendment."

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I propose the amendment that is on the blue sheet. It has three parts to it and they are shown in the transparency ([Appendix F](#), attached). The first 'Whereas' remains unchanged, but I propose changing the second 'Whereas,' as well as both of the 'Be it Resolveds.' If there is a second, I would be happy to speak to this."

Professor Walcott: "I would be happy to second this."

Professor McAdams: "We had a special faculty meeting of the Johnson School faculty yesterday. We found it to be a very useful event and when I speak later to the second set of motions that I propose. I am suggesting that others do likewise. I find myself very much informed by having had the opportunity to discuss with my colleagues at some length their perceptions and reactions to the motion that was originally proposed. The objective of the changes that I have listed here are to soften this motion especially in light of the fact that the President has already agreed to proceed as we are suggesting. This merely permits the Senate to go forward. Therefore, the listing of all kinds of events is no longer necessary. Those have been widely discussed, but I have found that my colleagues have not been close enough to these events to feel comfortable in voting essentially in favor of the 'Whereas' -- they just don't have enough information on it. To spend the time to bring them up to date, chapter and verse, is still very ambiguous. And we don't need it. All we need to do is to say that there are different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate faculty input and that seems to be the case and that these have occurred on recent issues. The first 'Whereas' stands as it had previously been written. So we know the issues that we are focusing on.

"I'll say just a couple of things more. If this motion as originally proposed was presented to our faculty, I doubt if I would see a majority of people in favor of it. The motion as modified, I think I could get a large majority of support. This should deal with issues in principle rather than in particular."

Speaker Howland: "The motion is before the Senate. Is there any discussion? Yes?"

Associate Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "I personally don't agree that the language needs to be softened. Personally, I'm angry and I don't think there have been misunderstandings. The Senate has spoken loud and clear several times and the central administration has chosen to ignore it. So I believe that an expression of that situation is appropriate. I don't think that the action laid forth or the action proposed by the motion is extreme. We're simply saying, 'Ouch' and 'talk to us' and we're setting up a way that we can do that. I don't think that it needs to be softened. I think that for it to be an expression of pain and anger is fully appropriate for the way that I, as a Senator, feel."

Speaker Howland: "Further discussion on the motion? Yes?"

Associate Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I'll speak in favor of the amendment. I can't speak about Biological Sciences, but in the Department of Computer Science and the e-Cornell discussions, my impression is that Senate members were upset that they weren't consulted at the beginning of the process, but in the end of both those cases, the administration did consult the Senate. You will recall that in the discussion of Computer Science, Vice Provost Garza presented the Senate with an updated report after our motions were passed, that took into account many of the Senate's motions. The same occurred with e-Cornell. The administration created a committee. So the administration has been responsive, just not as fast as some Senators would like. I agree that the softer language is more appropriate."

Professor Michael Latham, Nutritional Sciences: "I would like to oppose this resolution at least in terms of that the situation is that there has been a pattern of behavior. The preamble here lists two or three things. My writing a letter to the [Ithaca Journal](#) and the [Cornell Daily Sun](#) on this issue a couple of weeks ago was not mainly because of e-Cornell or because I was opposed to what happened with Biological Sciences or because the Provost was appointed without consultation of the faculty, but because of all of these things put together. There has been a pattern of behavior and it has been escalating in the last year or two. I've been on the faculty for the past 32 years and I think that this is unprecedented, the lack of consultation of the faculty with regard to these kinds of issues. At least, I think, it expresses a pattern of behavior that this faculty would like to change. I expect that passing the resolution does change things, but maybe it's a good idea to list why there is a reason for change. "

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor McAdams: "Maybe it takes unanimous consent, but if there's a way for me to add the word 'pattern,' if the word 'pattern' would help, 'There has been a pattern of different perceptions,' I would be happy to do that. I share a lot of the anger but I would like to suggest that this might be a very good time to look forward and not backward. We in the Senate probably have that level of anger because we are close to it and we have seen it. My colleagues haven't. It would be difficult for them to support the original motion."

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor Rabkin: "I would like to speak to the point that our colleagues who aren't in the Senate don't share our sense of this. We are elected to represent them and one of the things we are elected to do is to pay attention. If we cannot protest when we are disregarded because the people who aren't paying attention aren't as concerned as we are, then we'll never be able to do anything. The Faculty Senate was the obvious most appropriate forum in which consultation should take place. The administration just sprang things on us. If we're not going to protest, who is going to protest?"

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research Center: "I'm very happy indeed to see the day arrive when Jeremy and I actually agree. I am speaking in favor of the resolution. I am also speaking as a member of the UFC. It seems clear to us that the overwhelming views of the Senate on these two issues were ignored. In great haste. This happened, similarly, with the last reports. We asked for more time to reflect further and the administration decided not to pause. There is no way anyone can tell me that the Board of Trustees didn't pass a resolution establishing a for-profit thing called e-Cornell. This was reiterated in the letter that the President sent out to all faculty. It was extremely clear. Since then, some pressure has begun to develop from deliberations of the UFC and there has been some modification from the points of view of all involved. Let me be very clear. They set up this committee after they became aware of our discontent with their deliberative style.

"I also want to say that beyond Senate issues, this started actually with residential situations where committees that were set up were totally ignored and then in the second place, they were totally bypassed.

"I also want to mention that I regard it with some fear to be told by our President that the deliberative culture of our community is at odds with the Internet Age. That came in the context of the e-Cornell decision. So I think it's quite appropriate as elected representatives to make our position clear and uncompromising. Hopefully, I think that this will be a useful thing in pushing for a turning point. We don't want conflict with the administration, nor do I perceive that they want conflict with us.

"So I speak in favor of the original resolution and I will pause for a moment because I wanted to say something about another resolution, but I'll hold back for the time being."

Professor Norton: "I, as the chair indicated, will withdraw my amendment and I want to speak in favor of Professor McAdams' amendment. I think it solves some of the problems I had in mind in proposing my own amendment earlier. Members of my department indicated to me that under no circumstances did they want me to vote for the resolution as originally written because they felt that there had been consultation of the faculty on some of the other issues. It just was historically inaccurate that there was no consultation. The administration did something other than what the faculty wanted. In the case of Biological Sciences, the faculty did not give the administration a clear indication of what it wanted since the faculty itself was sharply divided on Biological Sciences. Therefore, members of my department, historians all, said that they did not want the history misrepresented and that was why I proposed the amendment. My own personal belief is that had the President not agreed to set up the Advisory Committee on Distance Learning, I would have been much more willing to vote for something resembling the original wording. Now that the process is moving forward and that we have the administration's attention and we have worked out a procedure or there is the possibility of negotiating an agreement to solve this procedural issue, there is literally no point in beating, what I regard as, a dead horse. We need to look to the future as another speaker said. Therefore, I support Professor McAdams' amendment."

Speaker Howland: "Okay, let's see, Professor Fine?"

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "First of all, I highly endorse the remarks of Professors Edmondson and Latham and I'd like to take this opportunity to challenge the History Department on their grounds of history. None of them are historians of the Faculty Senate. I think I'm correct in that."

Professor Norton: "But they do follow what's going on."

Professor Fine: "Let's get into that briefly. I believe that on October 24, 1998 the Faculty Senate passed a motion concerning the future of Biological Sciences in which it asked for more time for further deliberation. I don't know the exact day of Rawlings' response, I believe it was about three weeks later in mid-November,

in which he announced his decision therefore cutting off any further discussion. Was the house on fire? Was there a need for him to act so quickly? From what I understand from my colleagues in Biological Sciences, something like a year and half later, the decision has yet to be implemented. So there wasn't an emergency. Nobody was at risk and needed a quick decision. He very clearly acted in an affront to a simple motion by the Senate, very much like the 65-to-1 motion that was just asking for more time for discussion.

"We could get into the more tangled issue of Computer Science and the CIS initiative. The Provost may wish to disagree with me, he often will, about how we had to drag the administration through this process gaining the time to discuss it. Yes, there was discussion, but perhaps you and your department are not aware of how much effort went into gaining the space for that discussion. That was not freely granted. It was granted in the end. At the very last minute, where you referred to Vice Provost Garza, the UFC had to convince the Provost to allow him to come to speak to the Senate. That was not on the boards. It happened. I give him credit for doing the right thing. But this was not an automatic process. The past is not as simple as you account it.

"I also have to get to the 'deliberative culture' thing. You stole that line from me and I cannot let it go (to Professor Edmondson). (Laughter). I can't believe he contrasted the deliberative culture of the University with the realities of the Internet room. Many years ago, I eavesdropped on a conversation in the Statler Club, and I don't know who said it, maybe it was someone from this room. The person said, 'One should not make too much of reality.' (Laughter). I thought, 'what an idea!' because we engineers are used to making a lot out of reality. This is the first good example of making too much of reality. But, the deliberative culture of the University, if I had to pick two words to describe what we were about I would say that those are two pretty good words to put that in balance with the Internet. The President of University saying that? That, to me, goes beyond the pale. Nonetheless, the bottom line is the 'Therefore, Be it Resolved.' We need to come out of the meeting today saying 'yes, we're going forward to negotiate an agreement on this matter,' not postpone it to next week. I know that's speaking to another motion. The rest of it, I prefer it the way it was, but I can live with your changes. However, I think we need to be sure to end up with that 'Be it Resolved' today before we leave."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Stein?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Howland: "The question has been moved. All in favor of moving to a vote say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' Okay, we'll move to a vote. All in favor of Professor McAdams' amendment, say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' I think the 'nays' have it, do you want a count? Okay we'll take a count. The amendment fails by a vote of 19 yes, 47 no, and 2 abstentions. Okay now we'll consider Professor Stein's amendment."

Professor Stein: "Why do you think I called the question? (Laughter). I have an amendment ([Appendix G](#), attached) that qualifies the words 'academic matters' in the Therefore Be it Resolved clause. It says that the written agreement that we want the UFC to draft with the administration covers decisions of the central administration on academic matters. It struck me on thinking about this that the words 'academic matters' were very vague -- on the one hand too narrow and on the other hand too broad. Doesn't that sound like a faculty member? It's too broad because there are a lot of academic matters that don't concern this body. There are a number of negotiations that the central administration makes with individual departments and lines that have nothing to do with the academic staff. The charge of the Senate is academic matters that concern more than one college, so I would like to qualify academic matters in that way to ensure our colleagues that this asks for a big power grab by the Senate over the affairs that have traditionally gone on within the individual colleges. In that sense, it's too broad and I want to narrow it. On another sense, it's too narrow and I want to broaden it. There are a large number of matters on which this body has offered advice

that are not academic. In fact, a number of the resolutions that we have passed are not academic. In the rationale, I listed some of them. They include the sexual harassment procedures, faculty salaries, and athletic plans. These are clearly not academic matters. We have passed resolutions on all of these subjects, two on faculty salaries, several on sexual harassment, and a resolution on athletics. There are others, but I've forgotten what they are. To my knowledge, we have not been answered on any of them. We passed some of these resolutions by margins exceeding 65 to 1 and we have not gotten a response. I think that if this body chooses to pass a resolution and send it to the administration I believe that there should be enough respect for the Faculty Senate by the administration so that we get an answer. It doesn't ask for the answer to be positive but at least something from the administration. The words that I'm proposing would accomplish this."

Speaker Howland: "Is there a second for Professor Stein's amendment? Okay, it's open for discussion."

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I want to speak in favor of the amendment. It's not just the Senate that the administration doesn't respond to; I've been appalled these past few years at the times that I've written memos to the President, the Provost, and some of the Deans, never to even have an acknowledgement that they received them. These were carefully written memos in some cases. (Laughter). But not even to acknowledge that you have received something from a faculty member goes beyond the pale for an academic institution and it represents a change from the previous administration, in my opinion. So I want to speak strongly in favor of this and I think it's up to us to give the UFC examples of where we would like to see improvement and to remind the administration that they are administration and not management. (Laughter)."

Speaker Howland: "We're pretty short on time here so can we move to a vote on this? Do I have a second? All in favor of the vote, say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' Okay we're voting on Professor Stein's amendment as before you. All in favor of it, say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' Okay it passes unanimously. We'll now move to Professor McAdams' second amendment. We'll give him a chance to make his motion."

Professor McAdams: "Again folks, I respect your reaction to the last one. I believe that this motion in its current form requires consultation by us, as Senators, with our faculty constituent. I move that when this meeting adjourns that it be adjourned to Wednesday, April 19 at 4:30 p.m., our regularly scheduled alternate meeting time."

Speaker Howland: "Is there a second to the motion? Okay the motion is seconded. It is non-discussible. All in favor of moving to an adjourned meeting, please say 'aye.' All opposed, please say 'nay.' The motion fails. We're now ready to vote on the main motion. Is there discussion on the main motion?"

Professor Edmondson: "First of all, I think that the most serious message is communicated with this that across an ideological divide, people are united. I think this says it all. Second, as a member of the UFC, it has been quite interesting how frequently we have deliberated this issue in the last two weeks. E-mails were sent at 10:00 at night and at 6:00 in the morning. There was no discrepancy between the Internet culture and the deliberative culture. (Laughter). In fact, I've never actually seen such consultation. We communicated and discussed with each other more than you could ever think. We modified and amended this so much. So you can see that this was a product of serious discussion and deliberation with the most modern technological advances available. (Laughter). I don't understand what President Rawlings is talking about. The third thing I want to drag in through the back door is that I do feel personally insulted by the rationale presented by the History Department. To suggest that I was part of a group that was rewriting history, not committed to truthful representation. The language is, frankly, insulting and inflammatory and unnecessary. This is not the way that academic colleagues or fellow Senators should address each other. I want to make that very clear."

Speaker Howland: "I think I have the sense of the House. (Laughter). Would someone call the question? Okay, can we then move to a vote on the main motion?"

Professor Stein: "Point of order."

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor Stein: "We're going to vote on the amended motion, not on the motion as originally written?"

Speaker Howland: "Yes we're voting on the amended motion. First, all in favor of calling the question, say 'aye.' All opposed say 'nay.' Fine. All in favor of the main motion as amended, please raise your hand. All opposed to the motion as amended, please raise your hand. Those who abstain, please raise your hand. The vote is 64 for, 4 against, and 3 abstentions. Thank you very much.

WHEREAS, deliberation on academic issues constitutes the core of a university faculty's function, and

WHEREAS, following a pattern set with the reorganizations of the Division of Biological Sciences and the Department of Computer Science, the Cornell administration once again ignored the very clear wishes of the faculty for consultation on an academic matter by moving ahead with the creation of e-Cornell as a for-profit enterprise for distance learning, without permitting time for due deliberation by the faculty through their governance structure,*

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty and the University Faculty Committee (UFC) to draft a written agreement between the Faculty Senate and the President, covering the process by which decisions of the central administration on academic matters that concern more than one college or on other matters that the Senate has addressed or that the UFC wishes to bring to the Senate will be handled, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate instructs the UFC to present the agreement at the May 10, 2000 meeting for formal Senate ratification.

"We must get to the Good and Welfare so let's do the proposal from Asian Studies quickly. Professor Fine, are you ready?"

8. RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A GRADUATE FIELD IN ASIAN RELIGIONS

Professor Fine: "Yes. We have a proposal from four faculty members in Asian Religions for a new graduate field in Asian Religions. This was discussed in Asian Studies. It was brought to the committee in the Graduate School and they approved it. It then came to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies. We discussed it and asked some questions and got answers from Professor Law and Dean Cohen that were satisfactory. We recommend to the Senate that they approve the establishment of a new Graduate Field in Asian Religions. Professors Law and Boucher are here to answer any specific questions."

Speaker Howland: "The motion is before you. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay the question was called. All in favor of calling the question, say 'aye.' All opposed to calling the question, say 'nay.' Okay, all in favor of the motion, say 'aye'. All opposed, please say 'nay.' It passes unanimously. Very good.

WHEREAS, a graduate field in Asian Religions has been approved by the Graduate School, and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has also approved the new

graduate field,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves establishing a graduate field in Asian Religions and urges the Administration to place this on the agenda of the Board of Trustees for consideration.

"It's now my pleasure to proceed to Good and Welfare. I call on Professor Jennifer Gerner and Professor Isaac Kramnick to present a report by the West Campus Program Planning Group called 'A Vision for Residential Life.'"

9. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Jennifer Gerner, Policy Analysis and Management: "Well this is a committee that's been in existence for about three years and is pursuant to the North Campus Initiative. Therefore, what are we going to do with West Campus and how will we get upperclassmen interested in living there? This is a committee that has had faculty and students and staff. We are now in the position to begin an evolutionary development of programs on West Campus. I think what Isaac, the chairman of the committee, will do is give you the specifics but I think it's going to be involving faculty and we need to make it exciting. We need help to do that. Isaac?"

Isaac Kramnick, R.J. Schwartz Professor of Government: "Very quickly, since the 1960s, various faculty committees at Cornell have met and recommended closer integration between residential life and the academic mission of the University. Now that all freshmen are moving to North Campus as of 2001, the opening up of West Campus offers us that opportunity. Since early 1998, two faculty-led committees, with student and staff members, have met and they have proposed a fundamental transformation, over the next 15 years, of West Campus for the approximately 1,800 post-freshmen of the 9,000 post-freshmen who choose to live on campus. These two committees presume that the same number of students will want to go into the Greek system and live off-campus. But then also, as we have been seeing in other campuses, the culture of students has changed in the 1990s. More students are wanting to stay on campus. For those 1,800 who can be housed on West Campus, in University-owned dormitories, this committee has proposed that over time a closer integration between academic aims and residential life take place.

"It has been proposed that, gradually, in the course of 10 or 15 years, four to five residential colleges of living-learning units be established on West Campus. These would be under faculty leadership, with a live-in faculty dean, and would have faculty affiliates connected to the housing. Undergraduate RAs would be replaced by Graduate or Professional tutors and each of these houses would have their own dining hall.

"You have all received a copy of the proposal and this will be an incredible challenge for the faculty. Many faculty have been suggesting something like this for over thirty years. It will ensure that faculty have a closer mentoring relationship with the students. It will also put Cornell in sync with our peer institutions who are also responding to changes in the student culture that emerged in the 1990s and are making innovations along these lines and will allow us as faculty to attract the best students to Cornell.

"I could say a lot more, but I assume you have some questions. Yes?"

Professor Ann Lemley, Textiles and Apparel: "Having been through the college search last year, I visited many universities with my daughter, who is now at Cornell. (Laughter). It's a good choice, but she didn't get into her number one choice which did have residential colleges. Do you see this as sophomore, junior, senior housing? If this is the case, then is it the case that fewer students from freshmen to sophomore year are going to find housing on campus because West Campus will be more largely populated by juniors and

seniors?"

Professor Kramnick: "Well, we assume that certain features of the Cornell culture will continue, such as the desire to live along the lake or downtown or in dilapidated housing in Collegetown. (Laughter). That will continue. So we don't know that. One other thing that I forgot to mention is that as this housing is phased in, they will not have themes, they will not be program houses and they will not be associated with any particular undergraduate college. The students in them will be from all of the colleges. In realistic terms, we think that they will be primarily sophomores but we do hope that some juniors and seniors will stay on. We also are suggesting as a plan for the future that there be student affiliates, so that those who move away in their junior or senior year could come back to the house and have dinner at the house dining hall and still be a non-resident member of the house."

Professor Walcott: "You mentioned an e-mail describing this. Has this been distributed?"

Professor Kramnick: "I'm actually on leave."

Dean Cooke: "We didn't physically produce copies, but it is on the Web."

Professor Kramnick: "I believe there will be a story in the Chronicle about the committee's recommendations. Yes, Peter?"

Professor Stein: "It sounds nice and it sounds expensive. Can anyone put a price tag on it?"

Professor Kramnick: "The two committees have not. There is a report on the website. It is the case that a \$100 million gift was given by an anonymous donor to this already. You're right, there will be a price tag, but our committee was not concerned with price. It was concerned with the program and relating the faculty to this and the effect on the students and staff. There will be changes in the student culture in which certain aspects of residential life will be directed by the faculty as opposed to the autonomy that exists now in dining and campus life."

Professor Lemley: "I have another question. As a member of the Cornell Council for the Arts Executive Committee and Chair of the Department that has a huge role in the performing arts, we have discussed many times the need for more performance places and practice rooms and I hope the committee is taking that into account."

Professor Kramnick: "We address this in the report. Should this become a reality, we want to instruct architects that each dining hall should be converted into performance space and that sort."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering: "I had heard an anecdotal number of the cost from a Vice President in Day Hall and it was \$160 million."

Professor Kramnick: "Well then somebody else has got to give another \$60 million! (Laughter). We were just interested in the programs."

Professor Simons: "While on the one hand this sounds like it may make a nice contribution to student life, a factor that's coming into my own deliberation on it is that I'm being asked to take a greater role in a University whose administration clearly doesn't care what I think. It's an unfortunate coincidence of timing, but this is a factor that I think will affect the faculty."

Professor Kramnick: "Our committee assumes, as you will see in the report, that faculty participation isn't going to be simply out of the goodness of their hearts. They will be appropriately remunerated as is done is

other institutions. When you give time to this kind of the venture, there's got to be something for you as well in addition to free dinners and conversation with bright students."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. Do I hear a motion to adjourn? Okay, the meeting is adjourned."

Adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty