

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
September 8, 1999

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "First, I would like to let any new members of the Senate know to sign in because that is the basis of the quorum. There are also handout materials up here; some are duplicates of what you have received already in case you did not receive them in the mailing. Next, I would like to introduce the new Speaker of the Faculty Senate, Professor Howard Howland." (Applause)

Speaker Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "Thank you for that kind applause. First, I should remind you that no photos or tape recordings are allowed of the meeting; and when you speak, please state your name before you start. Now it is my great pleasure to call on President Hunter Rawlings."

1. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT RAWLINGS

President Hunter R. Rawlings III: "Thank you. It is a pleasure to welcome all of you to the new semester at Cornell and to say how delighted I am about a number of developments from this past spring and summer. I thought I would mention just a couple that, to me, deserve emphasis in the beginning of this new academic year.

"First, we have an enormously strong freshman class, and I wanted to underline how much I appreciate the efforts of faculty members in bringing us this new class. This was a banner year for admissions at Cornell, owing to a number of different factors—and it's always hard to sort out what they are—but this is certainly one of our strongest classes ever. It is also a larger class than we had anticipated because the yield went way up, in admissions parlance. It went up two plus percent, which is very unusual. As a result, we have a lot of students living in lounges still this fall but that is probably not a bad problem because these students have decided to come to Cornell and, as a result, we are delighted to have them. In terms of their test scores and class rank, this is an outstanding class and it is a pleasure to see the yield go up in just about all of our undergraduate colleges. We also have a stronger than usual group of transfer students and the result overall for the campus is very positive. I've heard from a number of departments that while it is difficult to meet the demands in every case, we really do have a terrific crop of new students. We don't know much yet on a campus life basis about our graduate students; the early returns are certainly good and by the end of this month, we should have data that will help us know just what went on in terms of graduate recruiting.

"We also had, this past spring and summer, an outstanding year in faculty recruiting. I would like to underline a couple of facts. First, we made more appointments than we have in recent years and that is a plus. As you know, we saw a steady decline in the number of new appointments that we made through the late 1980s and early 1990s. It's

now good to see the numbers turn to a positive direction. In addition, we made a number of superb appointments at the senior level as well as a large number at the junior level. I would particularly single out new appointments in Sociology, where we made several new appointments at the senior level to build that department further. We also made a number of strong minority appointments and I am very pleased about that. I would single out senior appointments in Engineering. I would also like to point to a number of appointments in the English Department and a number of other departments in Arts & Sciences.

"I am especially pleased to note this because this is the year when we want to make significant progress in the number of minority appointments that we make throughout the campus as a whole. Bob Cooke has made diversity an important agenda item for this body, and with the help of Bob Harris, he has embarked on a new program to have diversity as a major item of discussion in a number of departments. I know you'll be hearing more of that through the course of this year, but it's important to all of us at Cornell to increase diversity on campus in the student body, the faculty, the staff, and in the administration. I wanted to say at the beginning of the semester how pleased I am at the number of very strong faculty appointments who are minorities. Bob Cooke and Bob Harris have embarked on an ambitious agenda that I went over with them a couple of weeks ago. Bob Johnson is also co-chair of the group that is working on diversity initiatives. They are honing their agenda, making it more precise, and I wanted to say how fondly I support that agenda as one that the entire University should be embarking upon. It's good to see some momentum building and we'd like to be able to build the momentum further through the course of the year.

"I should also tell you that we're beginning to take major steps in terms of our State relationship in order to improve the lot of our statutory colleges. All of you are familiar with some of the issues we have confronted in the recent years in terms of downsizing and meeting faculty salaries. It is very important that this be high on our agenda list and it is. I wanted to signal to you that this summer we made some very substantial progress in our discussions with the Governor's office and the Legislators' office in order to give our statutory colleges greater flexibility in the way they are able to manage salaries. I think that we have made some substantial steps forward that we intend to build on in the following year on this very high priority item. I can't go into more detail at this point because the discussions are ongoing, but I wanted you to know that we are beginning to see signs of progress in terms of developing more flexibility for Cornell in the way it is able to manage the statutory colleges and in how to manage faculty salaries in those colleges. We have a good deal of ground to make up and it is important that we make up that ground as rapidly as possible, and I think that we are now beginning to see means to do that.

"I would be happy to take any questions that you might have for me."

Speaker Howland: "Yes."

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "Can you tell us what thoughts you've given to having the faculty review the President's Office?"

President Rawlings: "The President's Office gets reviewed frequently, as do faculty departments and faculty members, by the Board of Trustees. In addition, there has been a proposal in past years that various administrative offices at Cornell be reviewed as a part of the Program Review process and I know that there is ongoing discussion on this."

Speaker Howland: "The President is on a tight schedule. If there are no further questions, thank you, President Rawlings."

President Rawlings: "Thank you."

Speaker Howland: "I'll now call on Dean Cooke for his remarks."

2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Dean Cooke: "Any new members who came in and didn't know to sign in, we still need you to do that to ensure that we have a quorum. I have a number of items that I want to go through rather quickly. I will put the transparency materials on the website so that you can look at them and think about them further, if you wish to do so. One of the long-standing traditions is that we announce the deaths of former faculty members, which I have on two transparencies. ([Appendix A](#), attached) Please take a moment to scan these. Please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. You may note that the Office of the Dean of Faculty does produce a booklet of the Memorial Statements and copies of that are in the office.

"Another one of the mandates that I have is to report on the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments for the period covering September 1998 through May 1999. ([Appendix B](#), attached) The report follows promotion of faculty to tenured: 45 were positive and 1 negative were forwarded to the Provost. The Provost agreed with all 46 cases. Yes?"

Associate Professor Steven Vavasis, Computer Science: "Does negative mean that you disagreed with what was said at the Dean's level?"

Dean Cooke: "It means that the Dean of the College had said 'yes' and the committee said 'no.' I'll give you a report at the next meeting probably; the legislation requires that we report on how well the committee is operating and it's been in operation for a year. That's for next time. We welcome any questions or comments on it in the meantime.

"We have a new website, which you may have noticed in the mailing. It has been a long time in coming, and here are some of the people who have worked on it ([Appendix C](#), attached). I wanted to put it up so that you can appreciate the people who were involved. I'll show you some pictures and talk about it a bit. There is also a Calendar of Events. We started an initiative a while back of posting the academic seminars around the University so that everyone can have access to it. It is up in the test mode and there are thirty departments participating. Eventually, every department will have a password and will be able to post things directly onto the server. Anybody can now use and generate a list of seminars for today, this week, and other extended periods of time. Part of the plan that will be implemented later in the semester is that you will be able to have a profile of the topics or key words that interest you and have the computer generate, say on Sunday, a list of the seminars for the week, regardless of where on campus they are coming from that would match your interest. This is not yet in place. We will broaden from the thirty departments as quickly as we feel we can do so to ensure that it works. There's a menu down the left side with items of interest to us. The current Senate Meeting is always the first item and then there are announcements here, both current and archive. There will also be Faculty Forums and discussions taking place and the links for those are here. The Academic Policies will be a compilation of all of the policies that have evolved over the years; everything from Academic Integrity or retirement procedures. This will be things that are open to the public. There is also a link for the Emeritus group and they have provided information for their page. Under 'Forums and Discussions' you will find the previous discussions we have had such as those on Cornell Athletics, Biological Sciences, or Cornell '69. There are also links that are for use by the faculty governance, which is you. The key means that it will require your password to gain access. The Kerberos part is not yet implemented, so the minutes are temporarily not there. We wanted to have the minutes that are not yet approved to be accessible only to you and not the entire faculty. This is to ensure that the minutes made available to the faculty are correct. Once they are approved, they will be available to the faculty, but not to the whole world. There are some things that will be added likewise to the 'Committees' page for them that will be passworded. If you are a member of the Senate, there will be a list maintained so that you can enter your regular password; you won't have to learn a new one. Here we also have an 'Op-ed' page, which will give us a place for more extended dialogue in a virtual mode to carry on conversations on issues that are facing the campus without having to convene in a meeting. 'Links for Faculty' will include things of interest to you and things that you would be interested in finding out such as addresses for other universities, a weather report, or finding things on campus. It is intended to give you a quick access to resources. 'Seminars and Events' is a link to the calendar that I just mentioned.

"I will also hastily put in a plug for the Faculty Forum to be held next Wednesday, September 15. The announcement went out earlier this semester but some of the documents that were supplied to you and others that weren't can be found here. The

'Op-ed' essay that I wrote is here plus one has just been added by Bob Constable and Charlie Van Loan.

"Let me shorten this, I'm taking more time than I ought to. Here's a transparency that will grab your attention ([Appendix E](#), attached). (Laughter.) I thought so. I picked the one that didn't have the year, but it goes up to last year. It is a graph of the salaries adjusted by the professorial rank of CU endowed. Other universities have a very old population or a very young population so we've taken the average of those ranks and mixed the proportions according to Cornell proportions. The legend is organized in descending order; the two at the top are Harvard and Stanford and they keep coming down and down and eventually you find Cornell and if you go further, past Virginia, Rutgers, North Carolina, Illinois, Davis, etc., you get to Cornell statutory. I haven't shown this before but I think it shows rather dramatically that the trend is not in the right direction at this point. There were two plateaus for the Statutory colleges and the line should be adjusted slightly because there was a mid-year correction that is not reflected. So it's slightly better than shown.

"Here are a few pieces on enrollment ([Appendix F](#), attached). This is total student enrollment, undergraduate, graduate, and professional, broken down into ethnic groupings. At the top of the circle are foreign citizens, the largest group; next is Asian and Pacific, which has plateaued a bit; next is unreported; next is Hispanic; then black or African-American, which peaked and then dropped to a new plateau; and finally American-Indian, which has a very small enrollment. I'll shorten this even more. This shows graduate students. I'm saying this not to chastise you, but to let you know that the enrollment of black students in the graduate population is not going up as in the undergraduate enrollment it is not going up. So, if we thought we were filling the pipeline, we are not moving as quickly as we thought we were. This is the minority faculty. Asian is going up; Black reached a peak, again this is 1992 and now has dropped; Native-American went from near zero up to a very small number and stayed flat. I think I will stop at that."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much Dean Cooke. I would like to call on Provost Don Randel for a discussion of the salary issue."

3. DISCUSSION OF SALARY ISSUES WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Don Randel: "I would like to pick up where both the President and Dean Cooke left off, beginning with the Statutory colleges. There were, in fact, some fruitful discussions in Albany this summer, including discussions between President Rawlings, our current Chairman of the Board, and the preceding Chairman of the Board with the Governor and his close associates, and salary was the number one issue to be discussed in that forum and others that have ensued. We're hopeful that new and more flexible arrangements may be put in place.

"In the meantime, rather independently of all that, the faculty union that represents the faculty of SUNY did negotiate a new contract, which provides for four percent per annum for the next four years. That contract needs to be ratified by the membership on the 28th of this month. If it is ratified, there will be a one-time \$500 signing bonus for everybody made available as quickly as possible. Three percent each of the Januaries going forward and a separate one percent in July. Which is to say that it makes it complicated for us to administer, but it will be four percent in the aggregate. Simultaneously, we have been discussing with the deans ways in which we can supplement that further. This is a matter that is under discussion with SUNY and the State, to be sure, but we believe that we will be able to augment that four percent pool for specially targeted situations where we know that we have problems with salary compression and so forth. That will be done off-cycle, as they say. We will not be able to advertise, publicly, that there is a program different from SUNY's, but in the aggregate by using the same techniques that we use on the Endowed side, it will be the case that something equivalent to five percent or more becomes available for distribution to faculty members over the next four years. If that is added to the last up tick that Dean Cooke mentioned, at least we have the grass growing in the same direction and some hope of making other gains as well, even if nothing changes about the State relationship. For the next four years, we will be in a better position than we have been in recent years.

"On the Endowed side, we will continue with the effort we have undertaken. We are now in the third year of a program that has been described as 5%. What I can say on that front is that the colleges have been able to further augment that pool. So, if one looks at what actually was distributed, in terms of increased salaries for continuing members of the faculty, the amount is distinctly above 5%. And if you look at it by rank, the number is above 5% for all ranks and strikingly so for Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. One of the features of most of the colleges' salary programs is to provide some kind of added burst at the time of promotion, so if you look at Associate Professors becoming Full Professors or Assistant Professors become Associate Professors, there the percent increases tend to be above average. In any case, the program on the Endowed side did in fact in the last year result in increases for continuing faculty on average across the board rather higher than 5%, and in junior faculty, strikingly higher.

"You will have read in the 'Chronicle of Higher Education' a story about faculty salaries corrected for cost of living. This was done based on data supplied by the U.S. National Chamber of Commerce. We have looked at such numbers ourselves and have typically used a different index that is widely used in corporate America for the purposes of relocating executives. Either of those methods does show the Cornell faculty strongly benefiting from cost of living features, though we like the one that we use better. If you look at the Runzheimer Index, it turns out we're ranked first for Assistant Professors and second for Associate Professors in the nation and sixth or ninth for Full Professor.

In any case, the aim will continue to be to provide pools of the size that we talked about and to encourage colleges to find ways to augment the pools that are provided. I'll take your questions on that in just a moment.

"Let me just say something first. I'm truly sorry that the matter of Computing and Information Sciences has generated some of the consternation that it has generated. My aim there, and I think that aim is shared by the President, has been to facilitate the discussion that began with a Task Force, the members of which were appointed in conjunction with the Faculty Senate last January. There is considerable enthusiasm, I think, for moving in some forceful new direction in computing and information science. I believe that we can't not do something. If you look at other institutions and the kinds of things that are in the works, if you look at the government and the sorts of resources brought to bear, if you look at virtually any discipline that you can think of, the impact of computing and information sciences is very profound. We need to be able to bring to bear on all of those disciplines the kinds of tools and thinking that are emerging from Computer Science and closely related fields. What to do about that is still to be decided. We set up the Task Force as producing two reports; one at the end of last semester and one at the end of this semester. This was to create a space in which there could be campus discussion so that the final report would reflect something of that discussion. Here it seemed that, perhaps, we had learned something from the Biological Sciences situation. Rather than let a Task Force produce a report and then have another extended period in which everyone complains and objects that they weren't consulted, we would have a preliminary report, have a period for discussion, and hope that the Task Force final report would reflect that discussion so that we could get on with it.

"To give you a comparison of the rate in which this is happening in this field at other universities, Penn State had a similar task force started in the fall of 1997. In the fall of 1998, it had been through their Senate and their Board of Trustees and now they are building a 100,000 square foot building for their new school of Computing and Information Sciences, or whatever they're going to call it. I don't think that this is a field that is going to wait for us. The aim was to create a task force with two stages so that discussion could take place. In the meantime, what I did was to appoint Bob Constable, the then chairman of Computer Science, as a member of the Task Force and gave him the title of Dean for Computing and Information Sciences. This is something that the President and I discussed with the Dean of the Engineering College and with the chairs for the Engineering departments last spring. There was some discussion as to what the title would be. The point was to have in place someone from the faculty who could exercise some leadership in carrying on the discussions so as to be in a position then to move on to implement whatever it was decided that we should implement. I think, and it cannot be said in any way, that there is a foregone conclusion about what's to be implemented or how it will be implemented.

"In the meantime, we have recognized that we are likely going to have to put new resources into the matter; we will certainly have to put additional resources into Computer Science itself, even if nothing changes. For that reason, I have felt that I should assume responsibility for providing finances there. Some of you all know that there has been some tension within Engineering about the flow of other resources away from other departments and into Computer Science. So I said that I would assume responsibility for making sure that the money got where it needed to go. As we began to seek new resources it worked to have Constable in place to work through the discussion and then be able to move briskly into an implementation phase when we begin to return to what we ought to do. I continue to believe, and I believe many people on campus continue to believe, that something ought to be done to this set of disciplines and its effect on the rest of the University.

"Let me add one thing more. At this moment, the Department of Computer Science remains a department in both Arts & Sciences and Engineering. They have no ability to change degree requirements, to admit students, to offer new courses, without working through the Educational Policies Committees of those two colleges. So the whole question of how that academic program works or will work has remained completely unchanged. Now for your questions."

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "I've been watching this faculty salary issue with key interest, principally because my own department, Chemical Engineering, has lost 3 established or rising stars to 'greener pastures' in the last two years. I'm glad to hear some good news on the statutory side, it seems like there's been progress. The Faculty Senate has requested rather specific actions be taken and I'm curious about the status of those. For example, in December of 1998 there was a Faculty Senate resolution urging you to work with the Financial Policies Committee to develop targets for faculty salaries and a means to achieve them. As I recall, Paul Sherman, the chair of that committee, felt that progress was not being made and resigned in frustration. Then in April of 1999, another Faculty Senate resolution implored the Dean of the Faculty and the University Faculty to achieve the goals of the first resolution by working with you on this. Then in May of 1999, new data showed that we had slipped a little bit, which punctuates the urgency of the situation. It appears as though no significant progress, relative to our peers, has been made in the last four years. So the question I have is, have you been able to meet with the Financial Policies Committee, the Dean of the Faculty, and the University Faculty Committee to discuss specifically this issue that targets faculty salaries? If not, why not? If so, what progress can you report in your interactions with them?"

Provost Randel: "We have met with the Financial Policies Committee last spring on a number of occasions and have assured that committee of the central administration to continue to do that as regularly as they want to. The sticking point has been over the question of would we say that we guarantee to make Cornell rank nth in some

particular poll? I do not see, as I've said many times before, how anybody in his right mind could do that. I'm certainly committed to seeing faculty salaries improved as steadily as we can improve them. This is the first time in the history of the University that for three years running we are raising faculty compensation at a higher rate than we are raising tuition. Those two numbers are the two biggest numbers on the revenue and expense side, respectively. The pressure to hold down tuition mounts daily, if you read the newspapers. We are, nevertheless, finding ways of driving faculty salaries up in spite of that environment. In the last four years we have made more progress on this than in the preceding twenty years, one would have to say. We'll aim to continue to do that. I think that the rate of increase, as I have described it for you based on last year's data, is better than ever. Do I believe that that we'll get Cornell to sixth when I have no control over what any of our competitors is going to do? I do not think that I can honestly say that and I think that anyone who promised it to you would be a fool."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Howland: "I'm sorry, but I think that we're going to have to cut off this discussion and move on. I'd like to call for approval of the minutes of the May 12 Faculty Senate meeting as posted on the web. If I hear no objections I'll assume that there is unanimous approval. Hearing none, they're approved."

"I'd now like to call on Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty, Kathleen Rasmussen, for a Nominations and Elections Committee report."

5. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Associate Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty: "Unfortunately, I am low of voice, as it is the beginning of the year and the students are back and I usually catch a cold. I have a long report, ([Appendix G](#), attached) so I will try to hit the highlights. I do want to bring to your attention the results from the election that we held last April. We have also just completed an election for Speaker Pro Tem and the winner is Mary Beth Norton. You have received in writing in the call to the meeting these actions, which are replacements to committee members who have rotated off. I do want to bring your attention to the new chairs of committees: Melissa Hines for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty; Richard Galik for the Educational Policies Committee; Jon Macey for the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education; Charles McCulloch for the Financial Policies Committee; Sandra Siegel for the Lectures Committee; Keith Dennis for the Library Board; and Olan Forker for University-ROTC Relations Committee. We also have appointed two members to the University Faculty Committee as a result of resignations. These are short-term appointments, not for the full three years. They are Keith Dennis and Terry Fine. We

have also made most of the appointments to the Assemblies committees, but there are a few more to go. Are there any questions? Thank you."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I'd like to call now on Professor Terrence Fine to give a report on Computing and Information Sciences."

6. REPORT ON COMPUTING AND INFORMATIONAL SCIENCES

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "Well, part of my report was already given by Dean Cooke and Provost Randel — as you will see I agree more with one representation than another. To set the stage, I have two quotes that come from the June Task Force Report. 'Nearly every discipline is changing, not just because of new tools but because of computational ideas and new paradigms.' 'We can be the first University to broadly integrate Computing and Information Science into education for all students and into research and scholarship across the campus.' That is the broad-scale picture. I want to address four issues and follow the process to date, which has been addressed by the Provost as well: The Vision, The Vision Statement, Organizing how we are going to meet that Vision, and then how we are going to do what is left to do. So those are the four things I want to address in the time that I have here. I've been told that this overhead ([Appendix H](#), attached) has far too much print for this room — I was told correctly, but we are all in love with our own words. I wanted to put up a kind of document history. I hope it's complete, but there are things that I don't know about the committee.

"Very quickly, the chronology starts in October 1997 with a report from the Research Futures Task Force about three strategically enabling areas, biology, advanced materials, and computation. There is a fourth one too, informational sciences. In March of this year, a charter was provided, I believe by the Provost, but my copy wasn't signed, to create a membership to a Task Force and charged to act. The first report of it that I know of was in the 'Cornell Chronicle,' in an article by Bill Steele about that matter. There was a response at the end of May before the June report appeared that I do want to mention because it was really in disagreement with the report that came out. It recommended against the creation of an autonomous academic unit. It went on to say, 'we are particularly concerned that engineering faculty, other than those of Computer Science, have not consulted with the committee deliberations.' None of those caveats found their way into the June report. This was, I believe, a unanimous report from the chair with the exception of Computer Science. When they were consulted at the end of the month, before the report, the complications had no effect on the outcome. We heard from the Provost, correctly, that in the course of the summer there was some consternation on the subject. There was quite a bit of consternation. There were rumors down the halls, people were saying, 'I walked down by somebody's door and his title was changed.' We were getting information from that kind of channel. Not a satisfactory state of affairs. The Provost was then urged to respond to that, and he did.

He responded by a memorandum of August 19 but, by that time, things had already happened. We have just been told that nothing has been set in concrete, and I can accept that. But, the first changes were a little more substantial than was indicated. The Computer Science Department now controls its own tenure process and controls hiring; it has more than just budgetary control. A lot of the control exercised by the college has been transferred to that entity as well. It has been detached in more respects, not all respects. Dean Constable used that in a talk he gave a few days ago, 'Repositioning the CS Department as a University-level Administrative Unit.' It seems they want to go further with this process than there has been any consultation warranted at that point. Understanding, however that there is a feeling of urgency in this matter.

"There has been a repositioning in the Computer Science Department, not just a matter of a change in budgetary control. So from the point of view of the members of the Engineering College, there is a substantial undertaking in this process all in a rather urgent basis. This is not to invent a pretext to do nothing; we are getting a sense of the urgency of this issue and things have been happening without broad consultation.

"There is a document trail, some of which will be on the Faculty website; others will be added to it. Some of the extended versions of the overheads will be available as well. There has been a process in place that has been going on throughout the summer. There is a feeling that there has been a *fait accompli*; we have been assured that it is not a *fait accompli* but the word 'consternation' is a fair word to use to describe what is being felt of this process.

"Let me go on then to substance. The division has been an attractive one to those who have seen it. It engenders enthusiasm. Professor Huttenlocher assured us that the November report will not address organizational issues but principles. It will be a clear convincing statement of principles and leave organizational decisions to Dean Constable. CAPP has, in the meantime, asked the Task Force to embed their statement of principles in a larger context. The principles seem very personal. They are very convincing, but there are other people who are talking about this. It would be nice to relate to something that is going to be an engine, driving as big an enterprise as this one, which is already starting to leave the station. It would be nice to know that those principles are well-founded in a community of people who will create with it. We do not have that evidence in the Task Force Report. We are seeing persuasive but still individual statements.

"There are some things out there about the centrality of Computer Science, what they call Information Science, which is not about merit and I have some information on that. This is why I think that this needs faculty involvement. Some things are debatable; they are not obvious truths. I think it may be the truth, I may not agree with it; I think it needs your attention and not something that can be overpassed. The Web, as I recall, was invented by the bloody physicists and lives on what us electrical engineers build.

You can make an argument that a lot is being left out here. It's kind of a hegemonic plane -- I learned that word recently from my colleagues. (Laughter.) This is not a foregone conclusion what they are saying. Engage with them. You may agree, but engage with them.

"With respect to substance and organization, CAPP met twice. We were going to start to discuss the organizational issues; we didn't want to postpone them and were able to meet with Dean Constable. There are three kind of entities in play here; there is the CS Department, which in some way seems interchangeable with the Task Force even though it is a minority member of the Task Force with only 3 members, but it seems to be the leadership element. There is the CIS, which contains CS and Dean Constable and would be the driving force of the FCI which will contain maybe 200 faculty. One of the issues I raise here is that inflation may be from where problems in Engineering and Computer Science come and implementing the vision. Both the birds are being killed with the same stone, maybe not successfully. They are kind of intermixed. I liked Dean Cooke's comment, so I put it up here, 'Being the Dean of Faculty is like herding cats, put out food and they will come.'

"One of the good things to come out of this was that on August 25, Dean Cooke put out a second version of a memorandum with this thought on how to organize this. It disagrees some with what was put out from the Task Force. As of yesterday afternoon, there was a memorandum circulated from Constable and VanLoan. There may be some convergence between those two things on organization. There are some prospects here that perhaps something productive will come out. However, I am not ready to present them. CAPP has not met, I just received this memo early yesterday evening.

"So, what is the role of faculty in this? We are already engaged in moving targets. CAPP expects to see a fixed proposal. If someone wants a degree in Atmospheric Sciences, then they give us something specific and we look at it. This is moving at a great rate, which is not a bad rate — it just doesn't fit it with the way we're used to operating. However, there will be some kind of Faculty Forum on the 15th. We should be targeting a response from the Senate at our meeting on October 1. The final Task Force Report is expected on November 1st. The Provost has mentioned this himself that there will be some opportunity following the November 1st final report to engage in the issue. I think that's very important and everyone deserves that. I am very concerned about the sense of urgency here, which could engender some recklessness. We see urgency in different things and look at it in different ways. Finally, you're going to like this Howard, before you try to shut me up. This came from a discussion last December. I think it's an interesting analysis of how things can be done around here, a Periclean and Odyssean mode. President Rawlings, when asked about this, agreed that the Periclean mode was more desirable, but I have to say that the events of the summer indicate more of an Odyssean mode in operations. I hope that with some of the remarks today, we can re-establish the Periclean mode. Thank you." (Laughter.)

Speaker Howland: "Next, I'm going to call on Professor Christine Olson and Professor Stein who have a resolution amending the Faculty Committee on Program Review."

7. RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW

Professor Christine Olson, Nutritional Sciences: "Other than Peter Stein, I am the longest standing member of the Faculty Committee on Program Review. This is a fair committee and we seek to amend the legislation that speaks to the size and composition of the Committee. Specifically, we would suggest, or hope that you pass a resolution, that will allow us to change the size of the committee from nine to 'no fewer than nine and no more than eleven.' In addition, a second change that we would suggest, which is more in line with the administrative structure of the University, there is an ex officio member of this committee, who in the legislation is stated as being the Vice-President for Academic Programs, Planning, and Budgeting. That is no longer an existing position, so we would suggest that this be changed to 'a senior member of the administration, appointed by the Provost.' And, as I said before, this is an ex officio position. Our rationale for the change in the size is that this is a committee with a heck of a lot of work and each review that happens at this University has two members from the committee that sort of follow it through. Often, this is a nine-month to one-year process. Academic leaves and sabbatics are a feature of life at this University and when a faculty member goes on leave, it doesn't work very well for someone to be appointed to the committee for six months or one year to take that person's place. So, if we have a slightly larger committee i.e., no more than eleven but no fewer than nine, there would be a little more flexibility in covering this."

Speaker Howland: "I'll call on Professor Stein to move the motion and then we'll open for questions."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I'll move."

Speaker Howland: "Second? (Someone calls 'second'). Thank you very much. The motion is open for discussion. Are you ready to vote? All in favor say 'aye.' Opposed? Resolution passes unanimously."

The Faculty Committee on Program Review (FCPR), a new university-wide professorial faculty committee, will oversee the program review process. The Committee will consist of no fewer than nine and no more than eleven faculty members representing the broad disciplinary areas and academic functions of Cornell and a senior member of the administration appointed by the Provost ex-officio.

I will now call on Professor Barry Carpenter. This is a resolution amending the Natural Sciences Research Advisory Council."

8. RESOLUTION AMENDING THE NATURAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCILS

Professor Barry Carpenter, Chemistry: "Let me begin by reminding you what the Natural Sciences Advisory Council was designed to be. About a year ago, this body brought this council into being largely, I would say, as a result of our displeasure with the action of the Research Futures Task Force Report. A number of people thought that this was putting in place a kind of top-down way of running research at Cornell and we wanted something else. So the Senate put together the Research Advisory Councils as an alternative structure for providing input to the central administration on research. That had two components as originally envisioned; a local component that has been meeting over the last year and what I have on the overhead is a list of the membership as it currently stands ([Appendix I](#), attached) and just a little bit about what we have been doing since inception. We began by educating ourselves about what the University-supported research looks like. That involved hearing in impressive detail from Vice Provost Richardson and also from the people involved in research support from some of the colleges of the University. As a result of educating ourselves about that, the Local Advisory Council put together what one might call a 'best practices' memo, which was circulated to deans, department chairs, and center directors that I actually brought before this body before the end of last semester. In addition, we have been acting as a central source for looking at proposals that go out of the University to the various funding agencies, many of them private foundations. Those foundations often are looking for only one or two proposals to come from the University and, often there are more proposals than that that are eligible, so one has to choose amongst them. Vice Provost Richardson has called on the Advisory Council for the particular foundations and fellowships listed on the overhead to make those selections. So, we've been doing that too.

"So, that's kind of what we do, but there was a second part to the original proposition and that had to do with the External Advisory Council. The idea here was, originally, that this would be a group of five luminaries, people who would be major figures in research, science policy, or perhaps in funding at the federal level, who would come to Cornell on an annual basis and would have two principal functions. One was to tell the central administration what was important and to give the central administration some idea of where Cornell stood in the larger scheme of things. The other was to provide some objective assessment of proposed initiatives that would be involving expenditure of major resources of the University, just to make sure that those decisions were really being made on the merits of the case and not because of any particular influence of individuals at the University. Well, when the Local Advisory Council came to try to put together an External Advisory Council, we came to recognize that there were some difficulties with the original plan and those difficulties seemed to us to be significantly profound that we wanted to amend the original plan and that is what is now before you.

"Let me tell you briefly what we thought the difficulties were. In summary, one could say that in the original conception—and I must say that I was a part of this, so it is partly my fault—this group of five external advisors probably could do something that with reflection we wouldn't want them to do and couldn't do what we did want them to. What they could do was make prognostications about what would be happening in science and pass these on to the central administration. The problem is, what would happen next? Suppose that central administration believed them, how would that lead to the new research at Cornell? It seems upon reflection that this might actually be encouraging the kind of top-down administration research that the whole thing had been set up to get around. So that's what they could do that we wouldn't want them to do. And, as far as what they couldn't do, they probably couldn't give us any useful advice on any new initiatives that had been generated by the faculty at Cornell. What five people are going to be able to give us useful advice on all of the possible research enterprises at Cornell? So, it didn't seem like there really was the expertise nor would an annual visit schedule work well with the realities of federal funding, where often major research initiatives are brought about as a result of some requested proposal that comes out of a few months at best, or a few weeks notice.

"Finally, when the original proposal had been put together, we didn't really take account of the fact that there are already a whole bunch of external advisors that come to Cornell and much of what we had in mind would simply be duplicating what those people were doing.

"So for those reasons, we want to suggest a change and that change would be that now the External Advisory Councils would not be just one group of five people but would be different Ad hoc groups that we would put together as a result of some major initiative being started by faculty members and that the deciding principal would be whether that initiative would involve expenditure of significant quantities of University resources. The purpose of that group would still be to provide us with external validation of the scientific merit of this initiative and to tell us that this is really the right direction.

"So that's what we'd like to propose. As far as the Local Advisory Council is concerned, the only major new task for the Local Advisory Council is that we would like to propose that the group communicate with several of the External Advisory Councils that are already coming to campus and to act as a sort of central clearinghouse of information. At the moment, those groups tend to work rather independently of each other and it seems that it would be valuable to have a group that knows about all of them and can correlate the information we have on them. So, that is our proposal and I will attempt to answer any questions you may have on it."

Speaker Howland: "I believe we have the proposal here on the overhead ([Appendix J](#), attached). Is there any discussion on the motion?"

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "One thing that your proposal doesn't seem to address is new directions that have not been proposed for new initiatives on campus. I can imagine a scenario in which the five luminaries that we had envisioned said that the next important thing for universities in this country to be doing is x and Cornell is not doing x. Whereas, the people that you're bringing in are going to be reviewing initiatives that the administration has already thought about. How does your plan address that?"

Professor Carpenter: "It doesn't, and it doesn't do so deliberately for the reasons that I tried to allude to. Let's take a hypothetical case. This group of luminaries came to Cornell and said exactly that, 'Here is something that you should be looking at.' What would happen next? How would that get translated into faculty members getting involved in that research? The feeling of the Local Advisory Council is that we want research at Cornell to be driven by faculty initiatives. That was the whole point of this thing, that we don't want it driven by the central administration. I think that it doesn't address it and nor do we want to address it."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Stein?"

Professor Stein: "Before we approve this unanimously, I would just like to add a little note of sadness that, in fact, this initiative wasn't tried. I know that Rich Galik and you were on the drafting committee. I don't know if Linda Nicholson is here, but it was her basic idea. There was a seed of a thought there that when we talked about that we recognized the problems that you're alluding to, but the feeling was that there are people in science administration who have a very broad view, for example, the head of the National Science Foundation, has got the whole perspective of Natural Sciences under his or her purview, as well as the director of the NIH and so forth. The feeling was that, if you recall, one problem that Cornell has because of our location is that we tend to be more insular than other places and the idea of having a very broad-based group that can understand the scope of the funding situation of science in the United States to react to a proposal might teach us something or other. If I recall, the interaction between the Local Advisory Committee, who would have a detailed knowledge of what we have in terms of resources and what we're good at, and the External Advisory Council, which would have a broad understanding and appreciation for the direction of science in the country, could really tell us something about how we could link what we have to where the world is going. Maybe it's no good, but it seemed to me at the time that it was worth trying since no one had tried it before, and I'm a little disappointed that we didn't try one round of it by selecting a committee and then bringing back results that it doesn't work."

Professor Carpenter: "Let me just respond to that. I think it's not that we just didn't want to give it a try. I think that it's that when we thought about putting this thing together, the sorts of problems that I alluded to arose. It seemed to us that risks that perhaps you

understood at the time&endash;I must confess that I did not understand at the time&endash;became clearer to me as I thought about it. It seemed to those of us on the committee that the risks outweighed the rather ill-defined, if I might say so, benefits."

Speaker Howland: "One more question here and then I think we'd better decide on what we're going to do."

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering: "In the proposal that you have assembled, External Advisory Committees will be formed in response to new initiatives. . ."

Professor Carpenter: "Not all new initiatives. . ."

Professor Ballantyne: "To some new initiatives, but major ones. It's my impression that such a procedure might be quite unwieldy and not very productive because most major new initiatives that involve external funding as part of their own process have to get a very credible external body in place, so they've already done that. Why does your committee want to make another one? It will slow up the process by have two such committees. I think that the vision for this setting up additional committees is redundant."

Professor Carpenter: "Well, actually, if you look in detail to what the resolution says, it addresses precisely that point and says that for those initiatives with major external funding we would not institute our own external advisory group precisely because those kinds of initiatives already have their own external advisory groups. So, there wouldn't be a second one, that's pretty clear in our legislation."

Speaker Howland: "We're at the end of our time for discussion. What is the feeling of the body? Do you want to vote now or do you wish to postpone this? Someone make the appropriate motion."

Someone unidentified called to close discussion and to vote. The question was moved.

Speaker Howland: "All in favor of voting now please raise your hand. All of those opposed to voting now please raise your hand. It clearly carries so we'll take a vote. You are voting on the motion and the text is in front of you. All of those in favor of the motion say 'Aye.' All of those opposed say 'Nay.' The motion clearly carries. Thank you very much. I'll call now on Professors Bob Harris and Bob Johnson to give a report on the Campus Climate Initiative."

9. REPORT ON CAMPUS CLIMATE INITIATIVE

Professor Robert Harris, Africana Studies and Research Center: "Let me just begin with a quotation from a pamphlet called 'Reasons for Hope.' This is a publication that is put

out by the American Association of Colleges and Universities from the pamphlet 'Diversity Initiatives' that was sponsored by the Ford Foundation. I believe that we still have some copies of this publication available in the Dean of Faculty's Office. This is the quotation: 'Even though we live in a nation where issues of race are continually in the news, few of us have learned how to talk across racial lines. Our silence, aggravated by persistent social segregation, means that college is often the first opportunity many Americans have to live and work in a multiracial setting, and to engage in multiracial dialogue. . . .I've learned that dialogue about racism can be a powerful catalyst for change.' This is from the Dean of Mount Holyoke College. I think that the quotation summarizes part of the problem that we're facing in that we have students who are entering Cornell University who really have very little experience engaging with others who are different from themselves. Some of the incidents that occurred on the campus during the fall of last year and a few of the incidents that have taken place this year suggest that we really need to have a discussion within departments, across the University as a whole, about difference and diversity and how we can create a wholesome learning and living environment for our students.

"We've made available a Mission Statement that the Campus Climate Committee has developed. There are still copies that are available on the handout table ([Appendix K](#), attached). We've also indicated the role, as we envisioned it, for the committee and then our plans for the 1999-2000 academic year. Also, as a part of the handout is a statement of why diversity is important and how it enhances Cornell's mission. It looks at the environment for learning, curriculum and faculty development, intergroup relations in campus life, recruitment, admission, retention, and community relations. One thing that we would like to do this academic year that was started in the Spring of the last academic year was when we had some pilot conversations in a couple of departments. Of course, we learned from those because we were ambitious and wanted to bring together faculty, staff, undergraduates, graduate students, and post-doctorate fellows in a conversation of difference and what could be done to improve the climate at Cornell. We learned that it maybe better to start with faculty and then also to have separate conversations among students and staff. That's the direction in which we're heading this year. We're encouraging each academic unit and each department to devote a department meeting this term to a discussion about what the faculty can do to improve the climate at Cornell. We have discussed this with President Rawlings and we have his support, but we're trying to do this from the bottom up as opposed to from the top down. We're not proposing a one-size-fits-all solution to some of the problems that we face. We would like for each department to discuss among its faculty, initially, what faculty can do to improve climate at Cornell and then we would encourage departments to have conversations with students and staff associated with those particular departments. I want to make this very brief so that we can have an opportunity to answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Howland: "Questions? Thank you for that presentation. Fortunately, we're a bit ahead of time and we can pass to the Good and Welfare time. We have about 15 minutes and 4 people to speak. I'm going to list the people I'm going to recognize first Opperman and Sass for an announcement on the United Way, Professor Brad Anton, Professor Charles Walcott, and Professor Stein. So, if you take about 3.75 minutes each, we'll be fine. I call on Vice President Mary Opperman and Professor Steve Sass for an announcement on the United Way."

10. GOOD AND WELFARE

Mary George Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources: "Like any good administrator, I came in through the back door. (Laughter.) I want to be very quick. This is just a reminder that the Annual Tompkins County United Way Campaign will kick-off on the 15th of September with a 'Day of Caring.' We're looking for about 75 to 85 volunteers to spend the day down on the campus. We know that this is a bad time of the year for you but we don't set the day, the county does. So if you get a request from a staff member to spend the day downtown cleaning shrubs or painting, we hope that you will do that. Now I'll turn it over to Steve and then follow up with some logistics."

Professor Steven Sass, Materials Science and Engineering: "Thanks Mary. First of all, I've spoken to some of my friends out there who might ask me why I'm standing here. When Mary asked me to help her out with the United Way campaign I thought that I would do what I always do at Cornell when I'm faced with being on a committee, which is 'Just say no.' (Laughter.) After you've been here a while, you learn that. But Mary is smart and she told me a few facts and one or two of them got my attention. She told me that only 22% of the faculty and staff give to the United Way and that in the faculty that number is probably less than 22%. I was both surprised and disappointed and I thought to myself, 'boy what tightwads these people are.' So I was hooked in and I told Mary I would help out. What I thought I would do is tell you very briefly why I give to the United Way to kind of appeal to you. When I looked at all of the organizations under the United Way, I saw the Boy Scouts and thought that my two sons, who are both away from Ithaca, benefitted from that, so that's nice. I saw other ones like Challenge Industries and I thought that my family is very fortunate because we haven't had to benefit from that but some people do. So when I give to the United Way I'm saying 'Thanks — thanks for all of the services that helped my kids but also thanks for the fact that I don't need certain things but other people do.' So I want to thank the folks that do give to the United Way and I admonish you to give more and for the folks that don't give I would like you to open up your hearts and your wallets and pocketbooks as well and make any kind of contribution that you can. Ithaca is a very special place and United Way helps Ithaca to be nicer. I really appreciate your listening to me."

Vice President Opperman: "Just quickly, did you know that you can designate your gift? You can designate for or against any of the member agencies. Less than 1% of our dollars go to the National. All of the rest of the money stays here and supports only 4 people at the local United Way and the rest goes to our agencies here in the area. There is \$175,000 challenge grant from a donor for all new gifts that are increased this year. Thank you very much."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. The speaker recognizes Professor Brad Anton."

Professor Anton: "I'm an associate professor and I've been here for thirteen years and want to quickly demonstrate how the financial issues we've been dealing with, such as faculty salaries and rising tuition costs, can cloud the future for some of us. Young faculty who are thinking of starting a family should pay attention to this. I'm 43 and I just got married this summer, finally. My wife Susan, who is 33, and I would like to have children. Now, she's a very shrewd planner, she's much better with money than I am and she said, 'We need to figure out what we have to do to make sure that when our children grow up we can send them to college and we'll have retirement benefits left over' because my kids will be going to college at about the same time that I'm getting close to retiring because I'm a slow mover. So I went through the exercise and used data that I've collected over the last 13 years at Cornell and projected into the future ([Appendix L](#), attached). First of all, I started working in the beginning of 1987 and the numbers I have here I got from some colleagues whose averages are very close to my own and I'm not afraid to reveal them. My month's salary expanded to 10 1/2 months. In the College of Engineering roughly about half of the months of summer salary are paid. I started at about \$45,500 and that's expanded now on average for people of my rank to about \$79,900 and this shows that the salary has grown in this period at an average of 4.4% per year. Tuition during the same time period went from \$11,500 to \$23,700 and you can see that from a fraction of salary it went from 25% to 30%, one year of tuition versus one year of faculty salary. We take from that the rise in tuition as 5.7% per year. Let me project twenty years into the future when my kids will be going to school. My salary will be \$188,000 for ten months&endash;if this sounds ridiculous, go back to 1969 and try to guess what would be happening now&endash;and the tuition will be \$71,600.

"So, here's the planning exercise. Let's say that we want to have 2 children attend Cornell for four-year degrees beginning in the academic year of 2019-2020. Two years/four years tuition each, 50% Cornell tuition benefit from the Cornell Tuition Scholarship; that means I need four tuitions in 2019, that's \$286,000. If I'm going to save to achieve that in a savings account, I need to save \$650 a month for 20 years at 6% per year interest rate or, alternatively, if I wanted to invest in a house and then use that to borrow against I would have to accumulate about \$1,200 a month in principal over that time period. So, one final point. An interesting comparison is if you look at tuition growing at a rate of 5.7% per year as it has from my starting date and then look at it as

if, instead, tuition had grown at 3.5% per year which is the Consumer Price Index, the general rate of inflation, during the same time period and project that into the future, the tuition comes up half as large, which means that increase of the growth of tuition over inflation has consumed the 50% childrens' tuition scholarships. Thank you very much."

Speaker Howland: "The speaker recognizes Professor Charles Walcott."

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: "Thank you, I'll be brief. The Federal Office of the Management of the Budget, a wonderful organization in Washington, has instituted a new requirement that Universities report the faculty effort devoted to various sponsored projects. This effort reporting system needs to be put in place at the University. We have been asked by the various financial powers that be to look at these proposal and the proposal is very simple. We need to report the percent of effort devoted to research. In making a proposal for the Office of Sponsored Programs, one has to fill out a Form 10, which says how much effort we propose to devote to this activity. Clearly, here's a good beginning and we propose that once a year faculty look at that number and say 'Yes, that's about right' or 'No that's violently wrong' in which case they get to change it. The administration has asked us to look at these procedures and we think it can be as simple as that. In the event that it turns out not to be that simple that might be something the Faculty Senate wishes to consider further."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much, Professor Walcott. The speaker recognizes Professor Peter Stein."

Professor Stein: "I would just like to say a word about my favorite topic, or my unfavorite topic, meaning faculty salaries and respond to what the Provost said about salaries. When I taught Physics for the first time in Physics 112 I learned — and I think every professor who teaches 112 learns to say to students when they say 'this is big' or 'this is small' or 'this is going up' or 'this is going down' or something like that I know in my sleep what to say — to say 'compared to what?' It's always 'compared to what?' If faculty salaries are getting better, then compared to what? What do we compare faculty salaries to? When the Provost says that we have a steady program of improvement and that faculty salaries are a high priority, then the question comes up, 'compared to what?' Faculty salaries are getting better—compared to the Consumer Price Index, the median family income, the average industrial wage, Ithaca College salaries? I don't think so. I think that when we talk about faculty salaries, it's always 'compared to what?' And what it is compared to is what other institutions that are like us pay. In fact, if one looks at those numbers, it is clear that over the past four years, in the endowed part of the University, our salaries have not gone up; they have gone down. Now, compared to other institutions, full professors are paid less than what they were paid four years ago. It's very difficult for me to see how one can from those data say that salaries are going up. It's as simple as that. When the Provost says

that we can't promise, of course we can't promise, but we can plan. We're in a real world where everybody else is acting and doing something and like in all our other endeavors, when we talk about Information Technology, when we talk about Biotechnology, when we talk about the Genomics Issue, we don't work in a vacuum. We think about how we're going to be able to compete in the world we compete in and faculty salaries are no different. When the Provost says that we want him to promise to make Cornell salaries 6th and he can't promise that, I understand full well that he cannot promise that, but we ain't anywhere near 6th. Do you want to know where we are for full professor salaries? 6,7,8, 9, 10, 20, 30 — 37 for full professor salaries. That 's where Cornell is and I find that a disgrace. As the Provost knows, I sent him a memo whereby I demonstrated, and I have not heard it refuted, that the current plan that we are on, namely the five percent plan, if one looks to see what the rest of the world is doing, this plan will take us down and not up. I believe that this is a matter of great importance to this institution and cannot be answered by saying that it's one of our high priorities or that we are getting better. I'm sorry to make that statement so strongly, but I believe that if a person who does not have a stake in it looks at the numbers with a dispassionate eye, the way that my colleagues have learned to look at the numbers, they cannot conclude from that data that our relative situation is getting better or that the present course that we're on will succeed."

Speaker Howland: "Okay, we have about two minutes left." (Laughter as Provost stands up.)

Provost Randel: "I should have left sooner (Laughter) or, Peter should have spoken longer. (Laughter.) Compared to what? Well, compared to the Consumer Price Index, for one thing. Real income, real faculty income, is growing. The problem has to do with the comparisons that Peter invoked. He always wants to speak about full professors and they're not the only people who work here. When we say 'Get us to six because we are the sixth ranked University' well, not every department is ranked sixth and they're not all operating in the same competitive environment. Compared to what, well, compared to other things that we're trying to do. We're pouring more money into compensation than we are into growing any department's budget for an other purpose. So, I'm sorry it's so unsatisfying. It is a high priority and we will try to do still better, but I'm afraid that we're going to have to continue to disagree on what the limits of our possibilities are and what the consequences will be. As I said in the beginning, as is demonstratively the case, that as the year just ended, Cornell faculty salaries went up on average across full professors by something like 5.6%. They went up 9% for Associate Professor and in some cases it was up in double digits. One would have to take a much more fine-grained approach, I think, if you wanted to look at numbers dispassionately than to say talk only of averages or of rank alone."

Professor Stein: "But you do agree Don, do you not, that the full professor salary compared to peer institutions, has over the past year gone down 8/10 of a percent?"

Speaker Howland: "Gentlemen, I'm sorry we're out of time."

Provost Randel: "Saved by the bell!" (Laughter.)

Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty