<p style="text-align:center">**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE**
October 13, 1999</p>

Speaker Pro Tem Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "Counting everyone who is filing in, we will have a quorum, so I now call this meeting to order. The Speaker, Howie Howland, is out of town today so you are stuck with me, the Speaker Pro Tem, for the afternoon. I remind all of you that no photos or tape recordings are allowed during this meeting and I will now call on the Dean of the Faculty for a Proposed Strategy on Distance Learning. One more point is that we have a very full agenda this afternoon, as all of you have noticed, so I'm going to really keep to the time limits."

1. A PROPOSED CORNELL STRATEGY FOR DISTANCE LEARNING

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "We do have a very full agenda. I'd like to outline the Proposal on Distance Learning for you (Appendix A, attached). It's not a new topic but it is certainly something that is going to have a profound effect on the University and it will certainly have a lot of business around the country. There have been a number of task forces and committees dealing with this and I decided that I should try to put together a proposal to see the world through the eyes of the faculty and try to structure whatever we do in a manner that is most supportive of faculty. I will post a more detailed statement on the University Faculty website for you to look at. I'm going to move rather quickly now. We've had the Office of Distance Learning Task Force Report, the Academic Leadership Series discussion in December of last year, a group of ad hoc individuals met through last semester once a week, and the trustees also have a Task Force on Distance Learning, so there's been a lot of activity, discussion, and individual action. Some faculty at this University have been deeply involved in this for years.

"Here's my sense of what you would expect of a distance learning program. We should establish the highest standards of excellence as our hallmark in order to protect and enhance our reputation. In other words, the distance learning program should not be permitted to diminish, drain or deplete the reputation that we have. The residential program is core to the University and we need to be careful that our reputation is not sold in a way that would diminish what we do.

"Second is that all faculty participation must be voluntary. No one should be required to participate in this activity who does not wish to do so. That means that there will be some incentives that I will talk about later. It is very important that those who wish to do it are given help and those who do not wish to engage in this (as most of us who came to the University without the expectation that we would be teaching students at X, Y, Z University) do not have to. This is a significant departure and it should be done in a way that will make faculty want to participate.

"My third point is one that you have heard me talk about often, that given the tuition growth and the demand for faculty salaries (which come primarily, in Endowed at least, from tuition) that there is a collision path that we're on and if we wish to protect and sustain what we already have, we need to find additional sources of income. I propose that one of the legitimate purposes of a distance learning program would be to generate income to make it possible to continue to have the residential program that we have long had and that we should preserve.

"The last point is that we should utilize our existing strengths. There is a temptation around the country in distance learning to become fascinated with the technology and to spend most of the time on that piece of it. It is the enabling technology, but the faculty here have been hired because of their interest in content -- not because of their interest in technology. So rather than become a deliverer for the end-user, I'm proposing that the faculty would be served best by having them focus on content and let us become the supplier of the distinguished textbooks for the next generation -- the digital, interactive, multimedia textbook. That is the place we ought to make our contribution because it has a great many benefits that flow from restricting ourselves.

"There would still be cases where we would do delivery and actually try to set up some infrastructure, but it's important to have a human at the other end of the distance learning operation if you really expect it to succeed. If we concentrate on the wholesale instead of the retail part of it, we will be able to keep the faculty dealing with the parts of it that are important to us. We should deal with wholesale, not retail.

"The second major point that I would make is that we ought, in my opinion, make a commitment to our alumni that we will provide life-long support for them. Kenneth King, who was a former Vice Provost, suggested at a committee meeting about a decade ago that this is the direction that he thought we ought to follow. Of all of the audiences that we might serve beyond the laws of the University, this is the easiest audience to address. We already know them and the standard of material that we can present to them and it presents an interesting new opportunity. That would come over time, but we ought to set ourselves to the task of figuring out how we might serve that group and how to generate revenue.

"In this emerging phase, the technology is changing very rapidly such as the quality of video, and so on, as Professor Greenberg suggested at the distance learning conference. We should spend the effort on high-end because high-end today will be middle-range very soon.

"We ought to remain focused on the faculty interactions on campus and not interactions with students on X, Y, Z campus because we don't want to create a demand that will take faculty away from Cornell. The wholesale approach will prevent this. Another problem of distance learning that we can overcome with this approach is that we

remain free of a responsibility for assuring accreditation of the courses that are taught in distance learning. If we produce the textbooks wholesale to other universities, the credit, at least in the short term, will be given by the host institution, not Cornell, and we would not be insulting our standards by trying to certify an instructional program over which we would have very little control.

"In summary, a wholesale focus will free us from the responsibility of creating an elaborate technology infrastructure, interactions with the end user will be reduced, and the certification of degrees would be minimized. I fully expect that there will be some degree programs. For example, the Johnson School, as I understand it, has been actively negotiating it. Degree programs will require a massive commitment and also a long-term commitment. By taking this approach, we give ourselves some breathing room before we commit ourselves to something that is going to require a long-term commitment. If you start a degree program, you have to stick with it long enough to see it through.

"There are other issues to consider. I propose that we create a Cornell Digital Press or something like it, something free-standing and for profit. It has an advantage in that the issue of intellectual property ownership would be put in a typical pattern. If we were to do it and invest large amounts of money in this, the University will be tempted to assert control over the copyright, legitimately. On the other hand, if we create a free-standing publishing house, then the faculty are accustomed to negotiating with a publishing house and then you can negotiate over royalties and financial issues as well as control over content. That would remove one of the most serious obstacles we would have if the discussion were to go down the path that the University has to control copyright. This would leave our current copyright policy in place.

"Financial support to produce a serious multimedia interactive course requires on the order of $500,000 to a million dollars. We have one example of that in the Engineering College, a fluid mechanics course. We're talking about large amounts of money. If $10 to $20 million were available for competition, the faculty could treat the teaching materials on the same basis it treats research. Our courses now, even large courses, may have a few thousand for support and if you have large amounts of money, such as is required here, then it becomes a legitimate exercise for the faculty to spend serious academic time involved in it. It also provides an opportunity for employment for our Emeritus faculty so that they can continue their professional experience and also for faculty spouses, which is another problem this University faces because of its geographical location. Digital learning and the digital press could cover the entire gamut of intellectual interest in the University not just a fairly narrow path such as we have now."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The chair would like to tell the Dean that his ten minutes are up." (Laughter.)

Dean Cooke: "Okay. Well, on the issue of alumni, we can ask the Emeritus faculty to produce materials that we could share with prospective students. If we could share at least the first chapter with students, it would be an ideal recruiting strategy to give them a glimpse of the content and the quality of the faculty. For enrolled students, whatever we produce will be available to residential students and it also means that we would have the option, if we chose to do it, of allowing students to do a Cornell flavored advanced placement to allow them to graduate in seven semesters instead of eight thereby reducing the total amount of tuition that they pay for a Cornell degree.

"There are some obvious omissions, of course. We have not talked about degree programs or bringing resources from outside the University to the campus and I know of at least two cases in which the courses at Cornell are made much richer and better because of that, and the potential is there to serve the international audience. Thank you."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Thank you, Dean Cooke. I now call on the Provost for a very rapid five minutes of questions. Speak in shorthand, okay?"

2. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH PROVOST RANDEL

Don Randel, Provost: "Yes, there are only five minutes allowed for the ritual flogging. Why don't we get right into that?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Are there any questions for the Provost? Yes, please identify yourself for the minutes."

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "You certainly know that I don't like the top down way that you treat the faculty and I asked you during the Biological Sciences debate which biology books you had read lately, and now that you're dealing with computing, I'd like to know which computing books you've read lately?"

Provost Randel: "I take it that the question is rhetorical. Thanks."

Professor Wayne: "No it isn't. I'd like to be just as educated as you are."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Provost has given an answer. Does anyone else have a question for the Provost? Yes sir, please identify yourself for the minutes."

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "The major thing we're going to talk about today for almost an hour is Computing and Information Sciences for which you now have a dean and a department which is under that dean's purview. I thought that perhaps in upcoming years, there would be new departments spurned, excuse me, spawned by the entity. Do you actually see this evolving into a new college?"

Provost Randel: "I have no view of that. I think that there's a general consensus that no one looks forward to a new college by anything like the definition of college that we now entertain. I wouldn't rule it out, but I don't have a belief that it is what we ought to do. In fact, suppose as a strategy, you thought we needed more nimble organizational structures that can evolve and adapt to the change in the science and the scholarship that we want to do, and if every time something new comes along we have to create a whole new unit, department or college, the rate at which we are able to adapt to changing scholarship and science will be slow. I think that one of the ways in which we have done a lot of things here is by virtue of having these structures that can thrive across departments and colleges. We don't need to reinvent that basic organization that we've had for a long time."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "There is just enough time for one more question, if there is any. Seeing none, we'll move on, unless the Provost wishes to speak. (Laughter.) Thank you, Mr. Provost.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

"The question now before the body is the approval of the minutes of the September 8 Faculty Senate Meeting, which you have had a chance to read on the web. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes of the September 8th meeting? Seeing none, I will assume you are ready to approve them. All in favor say 'aye.' All opposed? The minutes are approved. I now recognize the Secretary of the Faculty for one minute."

4. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I'll make in it a minute too. I bring you the report of the Nominations and Elections Committee (Appendix B, attached). The first two overheads were in the Call to the Meeting, and these are general actions. We appointed two new chairs, Clare Fewtrell has agreed to chair the Affirmative Action Committee again and Anthony Ingraffea will chair the Minority Education Committee. It seems as though the list of Assemblies Committees never ends. We have been at this for months and I don't think we're done yet, but this is the latest issue of people who have agreed to serve on committees.

"Of higher interest are two search committees for deans. Both of the search committees will be chaired by the Provost. On your behalf, the Nominations and Elections Committee, as is our custom, has named at least half and, in the case for the search committee for the Dean of the School of Hotel Administration, more than half of the committee. There is an out-of-the-college faculty member who, unfortunately, is not on my list and I apologize to that person. The dean who will be appointed to this committee is Dean Swieringa. We have also named the search committee for the Dean

of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the Dean on that committee will be Dean Patsy Brannon. Are there any questions? Yes?"

Assistant Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "I'm curious about the search committee for the Hotel School dean. Neither of the Senate representatives from the Hotel School were consulted about any of that and I'm just curious as to the information that went into making those selections."

Professor Rasmussen: "Vice Provost Garza consulted extensively with faculty in the Hotel School and particularly with the Executive Committee in the Hotel School in giving us guidance as to the lay of the land. In particular, he was sensitive to the request of the Hotel School that untenured faculty be included and that is the specific reason for including Professor Sherwyn. Are there any other questions?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Thank you very much. Now we'll move on. I recognize Fred Rogers and Yoke San Reynolds to give a five minute report on indirect costs."

5. REPORT ON INDIRECT COSTS

Fred Rogers, Senior Vice President: "Thank you very much. We're going to briefly report on the status of the indirect cost negotiations which were completed this past summer. Yoke San is handing out copies of the handout that will help understand this (Appendices C1-C5, attached). There was a miscommunication and we didn't know that we would have a projector. I would ask Yoke San first to go through the numbers and talk about the results of the negotiations. If we have a minute at the end, I'd like to talk about some of the new regulations that we operate under and answer any questions."

Yoke San Reynolds, Vice President for Financial Affairs and University Controller: "We thought it would be important for you to know what the differences are from the change in policy. Every research university in the country is assigned to one federal agency for negotiations of indirect cost rates and that is a cognizant agency. For many years, Cornell's cognizant agency was the Office of Naval Research. In May of 1998, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) changed the regulations so that now there are only two federal agencies that are responsible for negotiating with every university in the country. The two agencies are DHHS and ONR and at the same time, the OMB changed the regulation to assign Cornell from ONR to DHHS. There are differences in philosophy between the two federal agencies and also differences in perspectives and the way they negotiate. The most important difference for faculty is that ONR negotiates 'fixed-rates' that carry forward whereas DHHS negotiates 'pre-determined rates.' With ONR we would make an estimate of what our indirect costs were projected to be and also we would project the research base. We would have an estimated indirect cost rate that we would apply to the year in question. After the year ended, we would do a 'true-up' so we can compare the true costs and actual research base with the

estimated costs and research base that we used to set the rate. If we had over-recovered in the year, then we would have to repay that to the government in the form of reduced rates going forward. In the handout (C-1), what you see on the first page is the history of our billing rates and the rates going forward to the year 2000 when negotiations may adjust. You can see that prior to that time, the rates were up and down and this is due to the phenomenon of 'truing-up.' We can talk about that if you want, but we don't have much time. There is a lot of variability with ONR and what you see going forward then with DHHS is a predetermined rate situation of a rate that we expect to be pretty constant and there will be no adjustments. On the endowed rate, you will notice that for the years 2000-01, 2002-03, we're at 57% percent and for 2003-04 we are at a provisional rate of 59%. The reason for the two point reduction for the first three years is that we are paying back some over-recoveries with ONR. So, in one fell swoop we have closed out all of our prior 'carry-forwards.'

"We're often asked what the indirect cost rate covers and what are its individual components? So turning to the second page (C-2), this is for endowed for FY04, which is the most recent year we have data for. You'll notice at the bottom on line 12 that our billing rate is 59%, which is prior to our adjustment for 'carry-forward.' No, I'm sorry, in FY04 we do not have an adjustment. There are two components, two major sections: administrative costs add up on line 5 to 26.4% but there is a cap on administration costs and we are limited to 26% of modified total direct costs so we lose that 0.4% on the endowed rate. For facilities, as you can see, the bulk of our 59% applies here. You'll notice that the depreciation for building is only 2.7% and the reason is that we use a convention of historical costs. So what you're paying for in your indirect cost rates is use of the facility based on historical costs. If this were based on placement costs or the real costs of capital, it would be much higher. Down at the bottom, I wanted to put down a formula that I have here. The indirect cost rate is facilities and administrative costs that are allowed to be allocated, divided by modified total indirect cost for research. We have federal rates that constrain what we can put into our indirect cost rates. At the same time, the DHHS will not allow us a certain rate for components just because of general practice. For example, DHHS does not believe that it should be reimbursing any university more than 2% for library and at Cornell if we allocate the library to research, the points that we can justify on calculation is about 7.2% but we don't get that. The other point is that the denominator is not the total research funding dollar. It is modified total direct costs for research so that there are certain categories of expense that we have to take off of direct costs before we can apply the formula. That's always very complicated for people to understand. On the next page we have a pie-chart (C-3) which puts it in simpler terms. It is for 1998 because that is the last year that we have data for our direct costs. This says that for every dollar of research, every dollar that is awarded by the federal government for research, 70.4 cents goes to direct costs, 3.2 cents is library, and 12.0 cents is administration. The percentages for statutory are comparable except that, for some reason, the percentage to OAM is greater, about 12.4%.

"The next table (C-4) shows the three schools that DHHS picked up were first negotiations and as you can see, Princeton submitted the highest rate. They felt that they could justify 68% of the MTEC and they ended up with 58%, the biggest cut. The best result from our standpoint was Cornell statutory. We submitted 59.89% and we were able to justify to 59%. The last page (C-5) shows the amounts that we submitted and the adjustments made by the DHHS after their review and what we finally ended up negotiating."

Senior Vice President Rogers: "Are there any questions about any of the negotiation rates? One other provision of the regulations that I wanted to comment on that a number of people have raised is that because our rate has been reduced there is a provision that was introduced in the OMB regulation A21 in 1996 which stipulated a market in which federal rates were rising. If you received an award and the subsequent change was made to the indirect cost rate, the award would always pay the rate that was in effect at the time the award was made. That was put into the regulation under the belief that the rates were rising out of control and this would be a way to gain budget stability. Of course, once you put that regulation into effect, it applies in all circumstances. So in circumstances where rates are falling, it also applies. So you have a rate stipulated at the time of an award which that award would pay for the life of the award even if the rate of the institution subsequently declines. Why does that make sense? Because in the long run it also moves in the other direction. On average, it's supposed to work out but we have circumstances at Cornell now where several people have awards that were made in the past three years at rates that were higher than our current award and those rates will continue until the award life ends. So are there any other questions? Thank you."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "All right, moving on, I'll now call on Robert Richardson for a brief update on the Dale R. Corson Symposium on the Future of the Research University."

6. UPDATE ON DALE R. CORSON SYMPOSIUM ON THE FUTURE OF THE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

Professor Robert Richardson, F.R. Newman Professor of Physics, and Vice Provost for Research: "This is more of an announcement. I want to bring to your attention a plan that evolved at the instigation of Bob Cooke when he took office. An important idea to have a major symposium on research. The dates for it will be December 6 and 7 and the sessions will be held in Call Auditorium and Schwartz Auditorium. The name of the symposium is 'Strategy for a Great Research University' in honor of Dale Corson. There will be a number of moving mentions of things in Dale Corson's career that relate to this. This is a list of the speakers who have been invited and I have high hopes that we're going to get all of them. Neil Lane, Presidential Science Advisor; Harold Barnabas, the outgoing director of NIH; Joseph Wyatt, the Chancellor of Vanderbilt

University and the Chair of GUIR, Government University Industry Roundtable, the National Academy of Science organization that Dale Corson was the first chair of; Charlotte Pim, the director of OSEP, Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel of the NRC that also happens to be the organization that does the ranking of university departments, but she's not going to talk about that; Bernie Adams, Congressman from Michigan who has written the strategy for Congress on Science Policy for the next twenty-five years; Katsa Lokaili, the director of FRD of South Africa, the South African equivalent for the National Science Foundation and, if we succeed in getting him, he'll talk about the strategy for the development of research universities in South Africa as well as all of Africa. We have indications that he might be able to come. We will keep you updated and we will be sending out invitations to the entire faculty in about a week and a half to attend this."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Thank you very much. We'll move on to the next item on the agenda which is a resolution that you received with the Call to the Meeting on establishing a Graduate Degree Program in Atmospheric Science. I call on Terry Fine, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies and Stephen Colucci, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences, to present the motion."

7. RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM IN ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I'm sorry I don't have this in plastic, but it's a short motion that asks:

WHEREAS, a graduate degree program in Atmospheric Science has been approved by the Graduate School, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves establishing a graduate degree program in Atmospheric Science and urges the Administration to place this on the agenda of the Board of Trustee s for consideration.

"Professor Colucci from Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences is here and he might be able to comment on this or take any questions that you might have. Do you want to make a brief statement?"

Associate Professor Stephen Colucci, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "The Atmospheric Science Program is maintained in Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences but there are atmospheric scientists in other departments and other colleges around the University, so the proposed new program would be a means of formally linking these faculty in the education of graduate students."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Are there questions? Yes, sir. Identify yourself for the minutes."

Associate Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "Is this a Master's, Ph.D. or both?"

Professor Colucci: "Both."

Professor Fine: "It's really been an ongoing program under the graduate program of SCAS, right?"

Professor Colucci: "Right."

Professor Fine: "So, it's just separating it out from under Soil and Crops."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, I'll assume that you're ready to vote. All in favor of adopting this resolution say 'Aye.' All opposed say 'Nay.' Thank you.

"Okay, we can now move on to the major item on the agenda today, or the major items on the agenda today, which is a series of six separate motions being presented by Professor Fine in his role as chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies. Let me just make a comment before we start as to how we'll manage this. I'm going to try to enforce a general rule on debate or discussion on these motions so that we can get through all of them by the end of this meeting. We have people who wish to speak at Good and Welfare, so we have approximately 45 minutes. I would ask people to be concise when they speak on the resolutions and I'm going to enforce a rule that with respect to any given resolution, Senators and visitors from the Faculty may speak once on any resolution and I will not recognize anyone again to speak on the same resolution unless there is no one else seeking the floor. Also, I see many unfamiliar faces in the room, and I would point out that all members of the faculty may speak at Senate meetings but only Senators will be able to vote. Other visitors do not have speaking privileges. I will turn the floor over to Professor Fine, but first how are you going to do this? Are you going to present them one at a time?"

8. MOTIONS CONCERNING COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

Professor Fine: "Yes. Let me just make some brief initial remarks and then start with the motions. This is the membership of the committee: Jerome Cherney, CALS; Jonathan Gerber, Student; Jennifer Gerner, HE; Douglas Gurak, CALS; Paul Hyams, A&S; Richard Rawson, Lect/Sr. Lect, Vet; Danuta Shanzer, A&S; and Jery Stedinger, Engr. It is a large committee and has met about six times on this issue, starting in late August about every week. Members are drawn from a variety of colleges, so we have quite a bit of breadth.

"As I reported about a month ago to you, the main event that initiated a public demand was the Task Force Report of June. The Senate and other groups were asked to contribute to this ongoing discussion on the initiative in computing and information science. CAPP decided to adopt a strategy that I'm going to present that lists the motions, and there was an accompanying rationale but the rationale is kind of the Whereas's, and we separated the Whereas's from the Be it Resolved's (Appendices D and E, attached). We're not going to ask you to vote on the Whereas's, just on the Be it Resolved part. The Be It Resolved part has been cast in the form of six motions. The Whereas's took three pages of small print and I hope you appreciate that it would have been difficult to sight read as you walked into the meeting.

"There have been a large number of contributions to this discussion to this point. Following the Task Force Report, there was a memo from the Provost on August 19. There was also a memo from Dean Cooke on organizational issues and intellectual coherence issues. There have been a number of participants who organized a forum on September 15 and documents were placed on the University Faculty website, so this discussion is going in that direction. CAPP, in particular, had a long discussion with Dean Constable that occupied most of one meeting and another long discussion with Dean Hopcroft of Engineering that took most of another meeting. We tried to talk to many individual members. I would like to invite any members of the committee, in particular those who are not Senators, to come up.

"With that, I would like to put up the list of the motions. This, of course, is not readable. (Laughter.) These are the six motions. I'm going to put them up one at a time. I did do a brief excerpt of the rationale for each but I should probably blank that out. Here is what the committee is offering as the first motion. If you don't like this motion, then I suppose that the rest of them aren't much to the point either." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Professor Fine, do you wish to say anything more about this or just open it up for discussion? Does anyone else on the committee wish to speak? We're going to do this one motion at a time, so you don't need to worry about the other motions now. The Chair would recognize anyone who wishes to speak on this. [An unidentified Senator called out "Call the Question"] The question has been called, which makes it easier. Are there any comments or questions? I don't want to stop debate if there are any. Seeing none, the Chair will assume that you're ready to vote. The Dean of the Faculty has proposed a show of hands on this matter and I think this is a good idea. Should we do it on this motion too?"

Dean Cooke: "Either way."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Okay, let's just do it by voice vote. All in favor say 'Aye.' All opposed say 'Nay.' Okay, the Chair rules that this has been adopted unanimously."

Professor Fine: "We can only go downhill from here." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Onto resolution number two. Oh, hold on for a second. The Chair would also advise the body that there were no amendments received 24 hours in advance and I will rule any substantive amendments out of order. This does not mean that minor stylistic changes cannot be offered, just that all substantive amendments are out of order because none were received before the 24-hour deadline by the Dean of the Faculty's Office. In other words, it's 'yes' or 'no' on these motions. Go ahead Professor Fine."

Professor Fine: "In the events of this year, a new office was created, a Dean for Information and Computing Sciences. It was brought up in the Task Force Report and has been in place. There are issues of the processes by which it was created, but that is not what we are addressing here. CAPP decided that it was, in fact, a useful office and would like to urge that on you and that the office be supplemented by an Executive Board. The main part of this motion is that the Executive Board, in particular, be chosen in a manner not determined by this motion. We thought that there wasn't time for the Senate to get into that kind of organizational detail, but following two principles that were important. These are that the board be selected independently of the Dean; and that it have representation from the right variety of stakeholders or interest in people from all areas of the University, but not something so big that it could not meet as a Board and conduct business. It would provide policy for actions taken in fulfillment of the roles assigned to the Office of the Dean of Information and Computing Sciences."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The floor is open for comment or debate on this motion. Yes, Professor Stein."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I have a question. I voted for the first one because it sounded like a 'Whereas' and who could disagree with it? I have the same feeling about the second one. I feel funny about it. Is this thing we're talking about a College or isn't it? It's hard to say. If it walks like a college and it quacks like a college, I sort of think of it as a college even though it isn't called that. But then, we don't go telling other colleges how to run themselves. Some colleges run themselves with a policy committee, some colleges have an elected Senate, some colleges have committees that are appointed by the Dean, so it's not clear to me that if this is an independent unit that we should be legislating how it runs itself. That's number one. Number two is if you tell me we should, then I don't see how this has any meat to it at all. In your remarks, you said 'independent of the Dean' but it doesn't say that in the resolution. It says '. . . selected by a process to be determined that ensures that Board membership appropriately balances the interests of the University, discipline, and department', and I think that a good way to do that is to ask the person who knows the most about it, namely the Dean, to select a committee that has that function. I'm sure he would want to do it. I'm not sure if there's any point to this or, if there is, that we have any business doing it. It's a question really."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Do you wish to respond to this?"

Professor Fine: "Yes. There is a strong presumption here. You are saying that something walks and talks like a duck and I am not willing, nor is CAPP willing, to assume that at this moment we have another college here."

Professor Stein: "What about the second point?"

Professor Fine: "About the independence? The words from the rationale should have been in the motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "It does say that. The Chair points out that 'B' says 'independent CIS Executive Board.' Yes, sir."

Professor Galik: "You can tell that Peter Stein and I talked about this a little bit last night about the notion of 'college.' I would assume that if a college were to be formed, would it not take some sort of faculty approval to actually form a new college at this University? That's why I asked the Provost my question before. It's more of a rhetorical question. The more substantive issue that needs clarification is that you say, 'department' in here. Do you mean the Department of Computer Science?"

Professor Fine: "No, no. In that motion that means all departments. Departments in total."

Professor Galik: "Well, then can I make an amendment to change that to plural."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair assumes that it is a typographical error."

Dean Cooke: "Discipline is singular also."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair rules that these are purely typographical. Are there any more questions or comments? Please identify yourself."

Professor Jery Stedinger, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I'm a member of CAPP and our understanding is that we're in the middle of a process. The Deanship has already been created and filled and we're trying to understand how this whole process is going to work. One of the goals in trying to respond to the 'computer revolution' is to think about how resources may need to move around the University and how various colleges will respond. One of the ideas of the Task Force was that we needed to be responding cross-University, perhaps moving resources in different ways and there was a concern that because the 'computer revolution' was so broad, a single dean no matter who that person was, would have trouble with the breadth of understanding to by themselves be the person making all of the decision. So what this motion was crafted to address was that to make sure the University as a whole, both department and

discipline and the interests of the University as well, would be reflected in a governing board that would help and support the Dean in making decisions about how we should go. We hope that this motion would help the University to establish a process by which we could move into the revolution and make sure that all interests were appropriately represented."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Other comments or questions? Yes, sir?"

Professor Donald Farley, Electrical Engineering: "Yes, I just had a question about what the committee feels the function of the Board really is. It says, 'Advise and support' and then later, 'Provide policy.' Supposing the Board and the Dean don't agree on what the policy should be, who has the final say? How does that committee interpret that?"

Professor Fine: "The responsibility is that the Executive Board provide policy."

Professor Farley: "So it's like a Board of Directors?"

Professor Fine: "Not to, itself, select all of the actions, but provide the policy by which actions will be taken."

Professor Farley: "Right. That's fine."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Other comments? I see none so I assume you're ready to vote. This time I will take a vote by show of hands. Any other comments? Very well. We'll take the vote. All those in favor of Resolution 2 proposed by CAPP raise you hands. I ask Professor Rasmussen to be a teller on one side and would Professor Holloway, my colleague, be a teller on the other side? How far did you come over Kathy? Okay. All opposed? I see only three hands. Professor Holloway, what was your count? Okay, the vote was 51-3. Were there any abstentions? 5 okay. Let's move on to the third resolution please."

Professor Fine: "The third motion continues to amplify the second one regarding the roles. The rationale is that this would be a somewhat centralized structure, that is the Dean and the Executive Board, but that they would support a decentralized use of resources which we felt was characteristic of the success of many of Cornell's intellectual enterprises. It really is important to have centralized support for decentralized resources. It's a bit more specific on what the role would be for the Dean and the Executive Board."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Comments or debate? Questions on resolution 3 presented by CAPP? Professor Stein?"

Professor Stein: "Yes, I'm sorry. (Laughter.) This is a question I should have asked in the very beginning that I don't understand. There's a phrase missing in these which is, 'Be it

resolved that the Senate determines' or 'Be it resolved that the Senate recommends.' Is any of this legislative on the part of the Senate or is it 'Be it resolved that the Senate recommends to the Provost that'? Except for the first one. That is something that the Senate can decide, that we're in the 'Information Revolution.' (Laughter.) For the rest of them, how to set up the governance of this body, we're getting into more detail on the roles of the governance and I was wondering what the status of what we're doing is. I guess I direct that question to Terry and the Provost and anyone else who has wisdom on the subject."

Professor Fine: "I understand that it's part of an ongoing process. The Task Force will issue another report in November and that the door for discussion is open, at least until the end of classes, as we announced at the last meeting. At this point, it is a recommendation also to the Task Force but primarily to the Provost and President as what we see as a successful way to arrange this."

Provost Randel: "I would agree."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Provost said that he agreed."

Professor Fine: "Very softly." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would also say that it is, indeed, implicit since the Senate does not have legislative control over this matter obviously anything that the Senate passes is recommendatory to the Provost. Yes?"

Professor Galik: "Again, another question on the central role of the department of Computer Science in this endeavor. Where it says that the CIS board and Dean would 'enrich programs in their home departments,' does that mean that they would not enrich programs in Computer Science? Part B, last phrase."

Professor Fine: "It seemed that you were bringing up something in the next motion."

Professor Galik: "Well, it's also in the next motion, but let's stay here for now."

Professor Fine: "Okay, could you repeat the question."

Professor Galik: "Yes. In the last phrase, 'in their home departments' there is the implication that it would be for departments that are not under the purview of the Dean of CIS."

Professor Fine: "No, no."

Professor Galik: "So Computer Science is included in those 'home departments'?"

Professor Fine: "Yes. The deal was to provide support, not to bring people out of their home departments into some central organization, but to provide support in their home departments. There was a way to read some of the things in the initial Task Force Report that suggested that people who were involved in computing and computing thinking might be pulled out of their home departments and brought into some common area and we're emphasizing the importance for them to remain in their home departments where they could enrich their home areas rather than be pulled out."

Professor Galik: "I totally agree with that sentiment. I just wanted to make sure that this was being extended to the Computer Science Department."

Vice Provost Richardson: "Then I have a question of clarification. That is feeding against the notion of having joint appointments of faculty with their home department and as faculty of Information Science."

Professor Fine: "That would probably be a corollary to that."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Other comments? If not, oh yes."

Professor S. Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel: "Having watched some of the fundraising efforts of the Board of Trustees, I question whether the Executive Board that is advising on curricular matters is the best group to assist the Dean with fundraising."

Professor Fine: "Well, why are you assuming that the Executive Board would (unintelligible). That would be a function of the Board."

Professor Obendorf: "But if you select the Executive Board to help you with curricular matters, I have a hard time thinking that are the best body to assist in raising funds."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "There is various muttering up front and I would like people to make specific comments. Yes sir."

Michael J. Todd, Leon C. Welsh Professor of Engineering,: "The beginning of the paragraph says, 'The Dean along with the Executive Board' so I assume that the Board would point out areas in which funds could be solicited but the Dean would be the one with the responsibility."

Speaker Pro Tem: "The Chair senses that the body is coming to closure on this issue. Is that correct? No. Identify yourself for the minutes."

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "I guess my question is, perhaps, embedded in some of the questions other people have asked. This is a resolution that talks about what the Executive Board should do along with the Dean, but it's embedded in an assumption that gets voted on later in terms of what the

structure, which has not yet been decided upon, should be. Underlying this, there seems to be a presumption that gets voted on later in terms of whether there should be a new college or a new faculty as recommended by the Task Force. I was wondering if you could address what was underlying this."

Professor Fine: "I think that our view of the FCI, the Faculty for Computing and Information, which we'll talk about next, was that it could be a much larger body than the things we were reading. It was not one suited to act as an executive group. So, this does not preclude constructing what we saw of the proposals for an FCI. I do not see that group as being able to function in this way. The FCI would not be a decision-making group, they would be a group of perhaps 200 faculty members."

Professor Lieberwitz: "So your thought was that this could exist regardless of what happens to the structure."

Professor Fine: "Yes. We didn't feel that this precluded anything or forced an answer on the existence or non-existence of the FCI."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair will recognize one more speaker on this. Yes, go ahead."

Professor Stedinger: "I was also a member of the committee and I thought that this was a give away that encouraged them to do lots of good things and didn't say that other people shouldn't do good things as well. There's nothing in here that seems to be binding such that they have to do all of it or someone else shouldn't as well."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "All right, we will move to a vote on Resolution 3. I would like the same tellers again. All of those in favor, please raise your hands. All opposed? Are there any abstentions? Thank you. The vote is 57 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions. We'll move on to Resolution 4."

Professor Fine: "This addresses a more controversial issue, the creation of the abbreviated FCI, Faculty of Computing and Information. There is not one unique entity of that name. There was discussion of it in the June Task Force Report. There were responses to it. Dean Constable and Professor Van Loan, the Chair of the Computer Science Department, responded to it on September 7. There have been various discussions along the way about the role of this organization. We have a fairly long discussion of this in the rationale that we provided about what we had identified to be the roles and functions of that organization. In brief, we really see the need for smaller, intellectually coherent, working groups&endash;at least 6 or 7 perhaps&endash;rather than a large group, previously estimated to be between 80 and 200 faculty members that might provoke feelings of warm fuzzies, but be unlikely to provide much good and might impede the smaller groups. So we don't see this as a home for Computer Science

which is what it was initially proposed to be, although after subsequent discussion, that was withdrawn and the discussions weren't overlapped between Computer Science and the FCI. The function and need of this was not clear. It could be created later on, but we did not see the need for it at this point since it might be inimical to the small trees."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "I'm sure that there are questions and debate about this. Yes, sir."

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I'm hearing several things, but on this specific point it strikes me that it might still be very useful to have an FCI as a population from which the smaller coherent faculty groups would then self-select. By being members of the larger population you would feel empowered to create and participate in these smaller coherent groups. I don't see these two as being in conflict, but essentially complementary. While I have the floor a moment, I might say that while I listen to the query on the other points, it strikes me that we have to come to grips with whether, under the conditions of the Information Age, the organization of our faculty within colleges may be obsolete and perhaps this mechanism, at least in part, might be a way of providing for a larger group to involve people from all colleges and people who find coherence to act as the smaller groups you're talking about."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would encourage Professor Fine not to respond individually to these and would ask other Senators to comment. Yes?"

Professor Vavasis: "I was just wondering about something. You said something about the home of Computer Science and the FCI and the resolution doesn't say anything about that, so could you repeat what you said."

Professor Fine: "That was in the original Task Force Report. The FCI was identified as a possible home for Computer Science."

Professor Vavasis: "This motion doesn't say anything about that."

Professor Fine: "No, because that had changed throughout discussions."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes sir."

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I have a question about the way that this is organized. It would seem to me that one of the main functions of the faculty would be a service function to other faculty and other parts of the University. How do you see that in terms of faculty here getting tenure and promotions and so on? If they're devoting a lot of energy to serving other faculty, isn't that somewhat working against what might be their own self-interest in publishing and tenure on the basis of their publishing?"

Professor Fine: "No, I guess we didn't see this organization involving much outreach on the part of the members of the FCI. Our concern was that the FCI might give people a false sense of participating in something when participation was minimal. Some mention was made of tenure decisions and joint appointments and our feeling was that we shouldn't upset traditional structures without a very good reason for doing so and this is not a very good reason for doing so."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Any other comments?"

Charles Van Loan, Joseph C. Ford Professor of Engineering and Chair, Computer Science Department: "Let me address your remark. You can be in a department and also be a member of a graduate field that doesn't coincide with your department and you can participate in that other field to your well-being and it's not a conflict with your other engagements."

Professor Galik: "Certainly the role of the broader organizational structure can be accomplished without having an FCI that has things like tenure appointments and all the trappings associated with colleges and departments. I can imagine that they could put together seminars and workshops just like any other program on campus might and serve people that are in these sub-groups that would form the body and show up for those kinds of meetings. I applaud the committee's decision that things involving tenure appointments was beyond what we need to have at this point in this new structure."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Are there any other comments? Professor Stein."

Professor Stein: "I don't know whether I'm for this or against this because I really don't understand it. For instance, I don't understand why you couldn't replace the words 'large faculty of computer science and information' with 'College of Engineering' to read, 'The Senate finds that the College of Engineering is unlikely to accomplish. . .' and so on and so on. What Alan McAdams said is that maybe we need a new organization and, if we need a new organization to deal with the Information Age, maybe this is the right organization. I have no idea but I don't really see the argument or understand how I'm to know if the organization that we traditionally have in the College of Engineering, which has worked pretty well to solve its problems, isn't right for this particular college or the College of Arts and Sciences. There must be something special about computing and information technology that makes this new organization not appropriate to deal with that and I haven't quite seen it. The arguments seem to be quite general. I don't know if I'm for them or against them but I guess I don't really understand succinctly. Why not? What's the matter with this new organization to deal with the Information Age and all of it's couplings? Can you say that in a couple of sentences?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would allow Professor Fine to respond if he wishes to do so." (Laughter.)

Professor Fine: "You keep using the word 'college' and you keep hardening the balance of this thing. You keep putting this in a mold that I do not share with you. That's not going to read well in the minutes. (Laughter.) You keep making this much bigger than it is and much more permanent. The time is not now for a full structure with bylaws and 'Whereas's.' We say that in here. We are participating in what is still an ongoing discussion and trying to have the Senate's opinion heard. It is not yet the time to draw the detailed structures. We're concerned that creating something like this really will supplant a more rational structure. This may be the answer in the end, but it ought not be something you lead with at this point. It is too amorphous and untied to its function."

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "I think the crux of this matter is mechanisms and patent groups in the Information Age. I have spent my career in particularly disciplined mechanisms. Typically, the problems one runs into are the practical problems, where to raise the money, where to get administrative services like computing, if you want to hire someone with a non-traditional background, who do you put on a search committee? When you have a program or an activity that fits within a structure, such as the College of Engineering, then it's critical. What Cornell lacks, as far as I can understand, is a mechanism to support and nurture those initiatives when they don't fall in the existing structures. That is what this organization is trying to do."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: 'The Chair had already announced that people would not be able to speak more than once on a particular issue"

Professor McAdams: "Unless?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Unless no one else was seeking the floor so the Chair is asking if anyone is seeking the floor or if we should let Professor McAdams have the floor? Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize Professor McAdams, but the Chair also wishes to make this the last comment on this so we can finish by 6:00. Professor McAdams."

Professor McAdams: "I request that Terry Fine respond to me since I was the only one who was excluded from the comments. There are problems with language when speaking of the FCI. It strikes me that a PCI might be more appropriate. It would be a Program for Computing and Information, an umbrella group, not to replace colleges or departments, but to provide empowerment to the structures we just mentioned in which people would feel it appropriate to create the smaller, coherent, faculty groups. In other words, it is expected that within the Program of Computing and Information

that such groups could and would be formed and there would be minimal barriers and blockages that often occur as we try to do things across departments and colleges."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would ask if there are any further comments. If not, then we'll go onto the vote on Resolution 4. All right, will my tellers ready themselves. All in favor of Resolution 4 please raise your hands. All opposed. Any abstentions please. Okay, the motion carries with a vote of 27&emdash;8&emdash;17 (Actual vote was 37-8-17). Okay, Resolution 5. The Chair apologizes."

Professor Fine: "The Task Force Report stressed that what was happening in the Information Age should be happening in the graduate programs. CAPP doesn't support this principle insofar as the comments to try uniform requirements across the University as we have with the freshman writing requirement. CAPP decided that it would be more consistent with the Cornell tradition to have those requirements determined individually by each college, but that the colleges were urged to adopt such requirements for their own good. To do so may require use of resources available. It was really decentralizing the decision."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would like to see if we can finish these last two resolutions in a total of seven or eight minutes. So, the Chair would ask the members of the body to direct their comments to the point of decentralization versus centralization with respect to this requirement. Yes, sir."

Professor Baer: "I'm not sure I favor this or oppose it, but I would simply call to your attention that it is my judgement that at least 20 or 30 percent of our graduating seniors in CALS cannot write coherently and cannot read texts coherently. I would think that before we get too excited about this we ought to attend to issues that are even more fundamental."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, sir."

Professor Bernd Lambert, Anthropology: "Since departments like mine are unlikely to introduce a computer course, would this mean that each department would have computer courses and would require one or two of these for all of its major. How would this apply to the social sciences or humanities?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair reads this as talking about colleges, not departments, so for you it would be the College of Arts and Sciences. That's my interpretation."

Associate Professor Michael Shapiro, Communication: "I'm sitting here trying to figure out why I don't like this and I think I know. It strikes me that this is different from writing or requiring a social science because of the ways that we would implement this,

at least at this point, are so diffuse. For example, teaching students how to use the library database is pertinent. This is something that I don't want to try in a way in which colleges have to have a course on the books, or a set of courses on the books, because I think it decreases it's flexibility, not increases it."

Professor Fine: "There really was no indication of that. It really should be left to the colleges. Your college will have every right to determine its requirements."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, sir."

Professor Farley: "I just want to say that I have a problem with 'ensure.' Is that too strong a word? If we could change it I would be happier. It sort of implies that everyone at Cornell must have had a computing course, at least that's one way to read it. Is that really what we mean?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair regards that as a point of debate not to be responded to by Professor Fine."

Professor Farley: "I'd just like to know because the word is strong and it affects how I would vote."

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I'm always reluctant to urge colleagues to propose courses on people or things that in five years will become obsolete and, in this rapidly changing area of computer programming, where we seem to be inflicted with a new language every five years, I wonder about the value of the scarce resources that are available to Cornell students to urge them to deal in a computer science kind of course when the tools are like learning how to type and you know we got that backwards with the Qwerty convention a century ago."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, in the back."

Professor Arms: "I've got a message here from Dan Huttenlocher, the Chair of the Task Force. He says:

"I would strongly urge you to read what is actually discussed in the CIS Task Force Committee Report on Computing. I do not believe that this CAPP resolution reflects either the content or the spirit of the Task Force recommendations on undergraduate education.

"'The Task Force Report recommends a program modeled on the highly successful Knight Writing Program. Moreover, the report states that while such a program would 'have the goal of educating all students, we do not envision a computing requirement for all students until there is campus mandate to do so.'

"This is in sharp contrast with the claim in the (draft) CAPP recommendation that the Task Force Report recommends a 'uniform University-wide requirement.' The Knight Program model is far from a uniform requirement, rather it is aimed precisely at educating students in their own areas of study. However, the central coordinating role of the Knight Program is crucial to both in supporting this teaching and in guiding it.

"As well as finding the CAPP recommendations to misconstrue the Task Force recommendations, I believe that the CAPP recommendation is seriously flawed. Encouraging colleges and departments to develop their own courses, without central support or coordination, simply will not work. That is essentially the status quo, and many Cornell students are currently woefully underserved in this important area."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Are there any more comments? The Chair would ask you to be brief."

Professor Van Loan: "I just read that as the colleges who pay attention to computing and make sure that it squares with their ideas of liberal education. Also, about Professor Schuler's remarks, it's not just about narrow skills. The algorithmic way of knowing is just one of several ways of knowing. I think that it's a part of liberal education. You want students to be intelligent consumers, which transcends individual languages and so on. I guess this is what we should be aiming for."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Professor Stein do you still seek recognition?"

Professor Stein: "No. I will call the question"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair will assume, if no one objects, that the question has been called. Are there any objections? Does anyone else wish to speak on Resolution 5? Very well, we will vote on Resolution 5. All of those in favor of Resolution 5 please raise your hands. All opposed. Abstentions, please? People with abstentions please hold your hands up again. Okay, the Resolution fails 23-29-9. Moving onto Resolution 6."

Professor Stein: "Point of order."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes?"

Professor Stein: "Orders of the Day."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Orders of the Day have been called. Orders of the Day are for Good and Welfare. If we do that we will push Resolution 6 onto another meeting. The Chair would ask the will of the body in this regard. Professor Stein?"

Professor Stein: "I would speak to that. I think that this is the guts of the resolution and I'm really concerned about not having adequate debate to discuss it. I think that we should not be debating this important issue with one eye on the clock."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Okay, the Chair notes that under the current order we will move to Good and Welfare and this will be pushed to next week unless somebody makes a motion otherwise. Seeing no motion, we will move to Good And Welfare. I have Professors Galik and Farley signed up for 'Good and Welfare' time. We will consider Resolution 6 at a special meeting next week. Professor Galik, you're up first."

9. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Galik: "Professor Cooke and I did not want you to think that we were asleep at the wheel. There is an Educational Policies Committee, as you're probably aware. This is its membership and a list of topics that are under discussion this semester. We are the University timekeepers, we watch the calendar and there are some scheduling issues such as exam frequency, an issue brought to us by the University Assembly, final exam issues on exemptions and exceptions, universal free-time between 4:30 and 7:30. There are also some conduct issues. Most noticeably are issues of note-taking for profit, there are many note-taking agencies that hire students who sell their notes to web-based browsers for distribution. To what degree is that immoral, illegal or unethical? What can we do about it? What modes are there to address these issues? We're actively working on that. Issues that have also come up are slipping academic integrity on the campus, particularly with respect to plagiarism. We're trying to put that under an umbrella of respect for educational study. We're trying to decide if we should put together a bill of rights and responsibilities that each student must acknowledge having read. So those are the issues that are in front of us. We wanted to let you know that they were being discussed in a Senate committee. If you have anything you'd like to share, make sure it gets to us before our next meeting."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Thank you Professor Galik. Professor Jenny Farley?"

Professor Jennie Farley, Industrial and Labor Relations: "My message is brief. I recognize that every person in this room has many priorities. One that I hope we share is a concern for the needs of people who live in our town and the surrounding area. I want to talk about the Cornell contribution to the United Way. In the last two weeks, our faculty and staff have given about $80,000 which will do a great deal of good in Ithaca. What I ask you to do is look over the list of agencies on the card that you got this week and at least think about making a gift to help the Cornell Contribution to the United Way."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Since no one else has asked for Good and Welfare time, Dean Cooke has one final comment."

Dean Cooke: "I will consult with the UFC on whether we will have a meeting a week from today, which is provided for in our procedures, or if we will delay it for a month. My hunch is that we will do it in a week because of the time scale for the Task Force Report. I will send an e-mail when we decide."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Okay, so the members of this body should hold themselves available for a special meeting of the Faculty Senate a week from today. Thank you, this meeting is adjourned."

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty