

# MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, December 10, 1997

The Speaker, Professor John Pollak, Animal Science: "In case any of you are wondering, the quorum is fifty-five. We are up around forty, I'm sure there are some who are delayed in the snow. We will give them time to get here. This doesn't affect anything other than voting, so we will progress through the agenda as best we can and take it from there. We will start off with a few opening comments from Dean Stein.

## 1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Peter C. Stein, Dean of the Faculty: "I feel a little bit like Cal Ripken. We are in danger of breaking that long string of quorums that we've had so far. I want to talk about two things today. One is to give you an update on what is happening with the University-wide Committee to Advise the Provost on Tenure Appointments. It turns out that putting that into operation is a task of some magnitude, more complex than I realized. We are progressing. The elections that must first take place in all the colleges are going on right now. I have been in contact with all of the college deans. We hoped to have had those elections done by this time, but that was not possible; the deans all promised me that we would have the results of those elections by early January. Once we have completed that process, the Nominations and Elections Committee can appoint the other five members of that committee. The way that tenure appointments work is that they are defined by meetings of the Board of Trustees. There will be a meeting of the Board of Trustees in March, and the length of this process means that this committee cannot participate in those particular appointments because they are already midstream. Probably half the tenure appointments that are made during an academic year are made at the May meeting and it is my hope, and I have no reason to believe that my hope will not be realized, that this committee will be up and running and participating.

"I realize that this was a very contentious issue. After the last meeting, I sent out invitations to almost everyone who voted 'no' to meet with them. After looking at the vote, I realize that most of the 'no' votes were confined to essentially three places. One was the College of Engineering, a second was the small colleges and professional units, and the third were the two statutory colleges, CALS and Human Ecology. We had three separate meetings with the faculty who voted 'no'. We talked to them and tried to understand their concerns. I think that their major concerns could be addressed by careful management of this committee.

"In addition, I took a trip out to Wisconsin to talk to the faculty members who are in charge of a similar committee in Wisconsin. I chose Wisconsin because Wisconsin seems to be the closest match to us in terms of the range of programs offered on that campus. Almost everything you can point to on our campus there is a parallel at Wisconsin. I talked to those people who have twenty years of experience in making this work, and I think I learned a great deal from them. I feel confident that we will be able to make this work and I will put every effort into making this work for the remainder of my term when I will be chairman of that committee.

"The second thing I think I should address is the Sexual Harassment Procedures. It sort of reminds me of a joke. There was a weather forecaster and he had a simple way of forecasting. If it was a nice day, he would look out the window and say, 'It's a nice day.' If he looked out the window and it was a little foggy, he'd say, 'It's a little foggy, but it's going to clear and it's going to be a nice day.' If it was raining hard or snowing, he'd say, 'It's just a front that is coming through, it will clear and it's going to be a nice day.' His prediction was pretty much, 'It's going to be a nice day.' After about a month of living like this in Ithaca, someone asked him how he was at predicting the weather. He said, 'It's kind of 50/50, I'm not very good at predicting bad weather, but there hasn't been a single nice day that I didn't predict.' I feel as though I am in a similar situation because at every meeting, I stand up here and confidently predict that by the next meeting we will have a new set of Sexual Harassment Procedures. I have not been good at predicting not having Sexual Harassment Procedures. I can say that the effort has been going along in spurts, it has not stopped, as far as I know. On several occasions I felt that we were close to the end of the trail. I am not sure why we are not at the end of the trail, I sort of think we are at the end of the trail, but I am reluctant to make any predictions at this time."

Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "Could you give us some idea about the things you learned in Wisconsin?"

Dean Stein: "I asked the question about extension, because extension has been mentioned as something that is very difficult

to manage. They told me that extension is much more extensive in Wisconsin than it is here. They do extension work in the humanities, engineering as well as the extension work in agriculture and human ecology that we do here. They told me that they did not find that to be too big an issue. Extension could be judged similarly to the way that they judge teaching. They told me that the real pitfall is the performing arts. They have great difficulty with that because the circumstances in the performing arts were different than they were in other parts of the University. Somebody summed it up in the following way, 'We expect our researchers to be world class. But if we had a pianist who was world class, we frankly wouldn't expect him to be on the faculty of Madison-Wisconsin, we'd expect him to be out performing.' I said to myself, well Malcolm Bilson is a world class pianist, but I understand the point they're making and it has a certain amount of validity.

"The other thing I noted in Madison that we don't have here is they have a very specified way in which tenure files are put together. They don't differ from department to department in overall structure. In talking to the woman who has been looking at all these files and also in talking to members of the IGOT, the 'Infamous Gang of Three,' I realized that this uniformity in the structure of the tenure files, not the substance, but the structure of these tenure files at Cornell is not nearly as great as it is at Wisconsin. I started thinking then that if we are going to have a group of fifteen faculty members half of whom are going to change over every year, we are going to have to have a greater degree of uniformity in the way that tenure files are put together in order to make this work."

Speaker Pollak: "We will now move on the section of Questions and Answers with the Provost."

## **2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST**

Don M. Randel, University Provost: "The matter of the structure of the tenure files is a matter that I think the committee could take up. We have talked often about that already. At a University as diverse as Cornell, I don't think we can create a uniform recipe for the whole University."

"With the snow coming down, I don't think I should make a speech, so I'll get right to your questions."

Professor Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "What is the story with the Sexual Harassment Procedures?"

Provost Randel: "I do think that we are near the end. There is an established mechanism for bringing policies into effect. It involves a group called the Policy Advisory Group, which is broadly constituted across the whole University, and then it goes to the Executive Policy Review Group, and all of the policy that goes into the notebook goes through those two groups first. Peter and I have met with the Policy Advisory Group many times, we have not had what I would call the final meeting with them, and we have not met with the Executive Policy Review Group. There simply was no time to schedule both of those meetings between the last time I was here and today. I have been in touch with the University Controller who oversees those groups. She told me that we can schedule a meeting in January, so I am hoping that in January before the term begins, we can see progress with those procedures."

"It is important that I not appear to try to short-circuit that procedure; that is the procedure that gave us our AIDS policy among other things. There is a lot at stake for members of the staff and students and we must be sure that we convey to staff and students the seriousness with which we take these matters. I'd be lying to you if I said that everyone in these quarters is going to be happy, but it is my aim to have these meetings in January make some progress by the beginning of the term."

Professor Ann T. Lemley, Textiles and Apparel: "This may come up with the Research Futures discussion, we have the first report, which in my mind covers some of the basic sciences. There has been some discussion about Biology because there has been some discussion about the division. I know there is a committee being formed about the social sciences, and I've heard about the humanities and arts. If this is all that is to be, then there is a very significant aspect of the sciences that has not been examined and discussed in terms of where the key areas are. I would not like that to happen. I am wondering if we have done everything that we think we are going to do on the sciences."

Provost Randel: "The answer to that is surely 'no.' On the other hand, one of the attempts here is to not set in motion too many things simultaneously. There have been various discussions with the deans about what are the next set of areas that need to be discussed and at what rate we need to take them up. We are in the process of trying to create that list based on discussions with the deans, and the President will assimilate that advice to try to lay out a schedule for the next group. I

suspect that even there we won't try to make it exhaustive. I don't think it is useful for us to suggest that there are four and there will only be four. New areas emerge and situations change. I welcome your concrete suggestions. It is helpful to have a precise formulation of this, bearing in mind, with over 100 departments, and as you know if you are in Ag, over 150 programs, we can't have a task force on all of these things."

Professor Lemley: "I will do that, I wasn't even thinking in terms of my own department, but in terms of the general applied sciences which I don't think have been covered yet."

Professor Seymour Smidt, Nicholas H. Noyes Professor of Economics and Finance, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "This may not be appropriate here, but the Provost normally does not participate in the discussions. We'll be talking later about the Transitions Report and it refers to two options. As a factual matter, I wonder to what extent are the proposals new or just talking about things that already exist."

Provost Randel: "I think I can safely say that there are examples of practically anything you can imagine happening. Part of the aim here is to have a more coherent set of alternatives so that people will know what the possibilities are. One of the things we have been afflicted with is the sense on the part of faculty members that, 'Jones worked out this, Brown worked out that, so what should I try to work out?' We are trying to take some of that guesswork out of it."

"In Arts and Sciences, in my period as Dean, we did make agreements for half-time appointments only for a fixed duration. There had been earlier appointments that were indefinite, so both of those things are around."

Speaker Pollak: "Thank you Provost Randel. We have the minutes from the November meeting, but we can't approve them without a quorum. We are still two people short of a quorum. So we will move on to the report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

### **3. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "We have completed the elections for the University Faculty Committee and are pleased to announce the following additions to the UFC:

Sidney Leibovich, Engr.

Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Vet

"We also make the following suggestion for an appointment by the Nominations and Elections Committee. We hope that that will meet with the approval of the faculty when a vote can be taken:

### **CODES AND JUDICIAL COMMITTEE**

Martin Hatch, A&S

"I would also like to let you know about our progress for a search for a slate of candidates for Dean of Faculty. It had been my devout wish that I could present a slate to you today for an open forum to be held early in January. We have two candidates; we must have three. There is another one who is thinking. But I don't have a complete slate of candidates that I can present to you. I assure you that we have considered more than once all of the suggestions that we have received. It is a big job; you have to be at the right stage of your career, and you have to have the interest. If you know of anyone who you think fits this description, please let me or any other member of the Nominations and Elections Committee know. If not, please pray that we have one more candidate who might say 'yes'."

Speaker Pollak: "We have two areas that we need to bring to a resolution. We can't do that today, but we will go through some of the discussion for them. Peter do you want to lay out the background on that?"

### **4. DISCUSSION ON A MOTION RE: THE 11/11/97 REPORT OF THE PROVOST'S COMMITTEE ON THE TRANSITION OF FACULTY TO EMERITUS STATUS**

Dean Stein: "I'm a little bit at a loss as to how to proceed. We do not have a quorum and I think it is doubtful that two or

three more people will arrive. We have quite a few people here and we have important issues to settle and we cannot settle them formally. We can either disband now, which I think would be a waste of time for the people who came here; we could discuss them and take a straw vote. Perhaps the UFC will decide whether or not, having done that, we ought to try to formalize whatever straw decisions we make with a meeting next week. I have no idea whether we could achieve a quorum with a meeting next week. Or perhaps the sense of the body, with these two matters, could guide the UFC who acts for this body in emergencies in carrying forth how people feel. If straw votes are very close, then they don't have any validity; but if they are overwhelming, I think they probably do. I would suggest that we proceed in that matter with the full realization that this is not a legally constituted meeting and cannot bind the body to any decisions that it makes."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any feelings on that that anyone would like to express?"

Professor Smidt: "It seems to me that because these are important issues, the discussion will have to be repeated for the people who aren't here. I think we are wasting our time having a discussion that will have to be repeated."

Dean Stein: "It will be on the web. That is, whatever discussion we have here will be transcribed and placed on the web."

Colonel Larry Wheeler, ROTC: "Is there any provision for carrying on and then passing this information on to the people who aren't here and then getting a vote from them? Or do they have to be here for the entire meeting to have a valid vote?"

Dean Stein: "We have a tradition that you have to be present in order to vote. The emergency power that we have is that the UFC can act for the body if it has to and I think that it could be guided by the discussion that takes place here."

"Part of the problem with faculty governance is that we have to recognize that we have these big gaps of time that the institution must make decisions and it must move. The Transitions Report has been through some vetting back and forth and I feel myself somewhat awkward asking the administration, having gone through this process, if indeed we have come to something that expresses the overwhelming will of this body, to wait for two months before we do anything."

Speaker Pollak: "Hearing no motion to adjourn, I guess we will just move down the agenda."

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "I think with 10-15 minutes of discussion on each point, we can lay out the groundwork for these two issues, have at least some idea of what the major points are, and in doing that, I think we will not have wasted our time here today."

Speaker Pollak: "Peter, would you set the context for us then?"

Dean Stein: "A committee called the Transitions Committee put together a report called the Transitions Report. It was brought to this body a few meetings ago. It did not find a lot of favor in that meeting. The body sent it to the Academic Freedom Committee. That committee then brought back to this body proposed extensive revisions to that report and then sent those revisions to the Provost and Vice-President Ehrenberg. The Provost and Vice-President Ehrenberg called together the Transitions Committee and they adopted nearly all of the proposals that the Senate recommended and changed the report to make it conform rather closely to what the Senate had passed. That report was then brought back to the Academic Freedom Committee. The Academic Freedom Committee then discussed it, debated it, and then came up with a response. Professor Strike, the chairman of that committee will discuss what I guess is the one outstanding issue."

Professor Kenneth Strike, Education: "We have three parts to our resolution (below). One is essentially to say 'thank you for your cooperative spirit.' The second was simply to note that some of the things we have said about emeritus professors and telecommunications were not mentioned and in our judgment, this is not so much of a disagreement as it was just not mentioned. The real issue, I think, is the status of Option 1 and Option 2. The real difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that Option 1 allows the arrangement to be indefinite and Option 2 places a time frame on it. It is my feeling that we think the right choice between Option 1 and Option 2 is both. We think that Option 1 provides more flexibility for both faculty and the institution. That is a good thing and a bad thing. It is a good thing because it allows the faculty to go into this without specifying a fixed time for retirement. It allows the institution to keep people in a part-time status who are doing work that they value beyond a fixed limit. So it provides flexibility on both sides. The downside is that it seems to invite large numbers of part-time faculty members hanging on forever and ever. It also may be the case that faculty will feel more comfortable choosing Option 1 over Option 2. That is a good thing if they choose to retire after a reasonable amount of time. It is a bad thing if they hang on forever and ever. We have suggested that the right choice for this is both, partly because we don't

have the experience to make a decision of this sort in light of that experience and perhaps some additional research in understanding faculty decision-making patterns.

Professor Katherine Stone, Law School: "If you have both options, what would ever induce anyone to choose the second?"

Professor Strike: "One might be that they know. The other might be that that is all that their college or department might give them."

Professor Stone: "So they might be forced, in other words, they really won't have both options."

Dean Stein: "Well, the additional advantage to Option 2 is that the amount that is put into retirement is greater and that might be an inducement."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there other comments on this?"

Professor Galik: "I assume you mean that there is going to be a study done over a short period of time in the near future that would involve all faculty who are within striking distance of making this decision."

Professor Strike: "I think that could involve two things. One could be a short term ethnography, if you like, about how the faculty tend to think about these things. Another, a longer term monitoring of the process by looking at records to see the kinds of choices and decisions being made in order to determine if they reach a desirable compromise."

Professor Galik: "Studies always have interesting data. I think Provost Randel said during his time as dean, he was usually unsure of overall faculty sentiment about aspects of phased retirement. So I'm not sure that the results of this study will remain static."

Professor Strike: "True, you can only step through the same river once."

Professor Farley, Electrical Engineering: "How do you respond to what Peter said about the difference in the University's contribution to the retirement fund? I thought they would be the same."

Professor Strike: "I think Peter should handle that one."

Dean Stein: "I think it is spelled out in there if you read carefully. With the so-called phased retirement option we have now, a faculty member who chooses to do that goes to 50% pay for 50% work, but the retirement contribution to TIAA-CREF, remains at 10% of the full salary. So it is the full benefit. But the notion in the other option is that the benefits go down proportionally to the salary, except for the health benefit which has to stay at 100% or it doesn't make any sense. It is complicated. But it is assumed in that package, that the retirement benefit will scale down proportionally to the salary, but that the health benefit will, through a combination of Medicare and University payments, remain at 100%."

Professor Farley: "I don't remember that being spelled out anywhere, but I may have missed it."

Professor Lemley: "Is that the same in statutory? Can you do that with the state retirement? Or are we once again subject to what the State of New York decides?"

Dean Stein: "I had a lengthy discussion about this with the people in benefits about how actually we would structure this option. They did not have a real answer to that. They asked if they should study this. It would take a full-scale study, and they went to their consultant, Collis Perin, and they didn't get a full answer to that either."

Professor Lemley: "Did they ask you what tier you wanted to study?" (laughter)

Dean Stein: "It seemed rather premature for me to tell them to do anything, because it was necessary to first see how this body would respond, and then necessary to see how the administration will respond to this arrangement. The benefits obviously have to remain an important part of the arrangement."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any other comments on this issue? Is there any interest in a straw vote on this issue? The sentiment of the body is in favor of a straw vote. All those in favor raise your hand. All those opposed. If it were an official

vote, it would have been somewhat overwhelming in favor of the issue."

## 5. DISCUSSION ON A MOTION RE: RESEARCH FUTURES TASK FORCE REPORT

Dean Stein: "We talked about this a little bit last time. Professor Drell called me just before the meeting and said she had a child-care problem and couldn't be here and asked the body's forgiveness. This is the report of a committee, the Research Futures Task Force, who worked last summer. The UFC could not think of a very good way to bring this report to you for discussion. That is one of the problems we have when we receive a report for discussion from a half-faculty, half-administration committee, to be discussed by such a large body. So what we decided to do was draft a resolution (below) that supported the report, and the way the resolution is structured allows you to either support the whole resolution, not support the whole resolution or only support parts of it. The UFC wanted me to emphasize that just because the resolution is drafted in support of the report does not mean that the UFC supports the report. We did not discuss it in any way or make any decisions about it. The resolution is simply set up in a way that allows you to discuss it and come to some sort of a decision.

"Five minutes before the deadline, we received an amendment from the Senators from Mathematics, Cliff Earle and John Smillie, asking to amend essentially bullet number four. They unfortunately framed it in such a way that it made the serial consideration of the five or six points impossible. So what they did, which is not quite legal, but on the other hand, we don't have a meeting, is with unanimous consent of the body, they will change their amendment to eliminate the first paragraph which really wasn't the operative one, to allow you to do seriatim consideration of the five points. O.K., so with that, I will turn this over to Professors Smillie and Earle."

Professor John Smillie, Mathematics: "Before describing our amendment, I would like to describe our view of the report. The Research Futures Task Force Report can be read many different ways. The report expresses many different viewpoints, some of which are contradictory. We do not feel that this means the report should not be taken seriously or that the report has no force. The fact that there are different viewpoints in the report means that we may endorse something that looks like Mom and apple pie, and end up with something that can be used as a justification for a significant reallocation of resources. So, there are two underlying ideas of the report. The first is that in order to be a top University, there are certain fields in which we need to be outstanding, while in other fields we only need to be adequate. This is an interesting idea that we neither support nor oppose, but we feel it needs further discussion. It is not really discussed in the report. It is taken as a given. The second underlying idea is that there are three very hot areas around that every University wants to get into, and there seems to be a consensus about what these three very hot areas are. The logical leap that follows, which we do not support, is that these three hot areas are the ones in which the University must excel. Our problem here is that just because the areas are trendy does not mean that a University must excel in them in order to be a top University. What follows in the rest of the report is not a discussion of how to allocate scarce University resources, but, rather an impassioned multi-page advertisement for these three trendy fields. I read this advertisement as a call to shift University resources into these three fields.

"If we look at the original motion which is taken directly from the report, item four can be read in two ways. It can be read as an attempt to organize research in these three areas, or it can be read as a call to shift University resources into these three areas. Our amendment resolves this situation in favor of the first interpretation. So, our amendment changes item four to read:

4. Develop a process to focus research efforts. The faculty will determine the actual implementation of the process and the particular foci that will orient research.

So we have removed the discussion of these three particular areas in item four, but we have not removed discussion of these three particular areas from the final resolution of the report. The final resolution of the report is not ambiguous. It suggests that we form joint ad hoc committees to further formulate options and plans in these three areas."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any comments on the amendment? Seeing none, can we get a sense of how the body feels on this amendment? If you are wondering, fifty-four Senators have come, some have left."

Dean Stein: "I move to consider the remaining items ad seriatim."

Unknown: "Is that one at a time?"

Dean Stein: "Yes, that is one at a time."

Speaker Pollak: "Is there a second to that motion? OK, now we'll take a straw vote to see if that is something that you would be interested in doing. We will discuss the motion ad seriatim."

Dean Stein: "For those of you who do not have a copy, number one reads:

1. Increase emphasis on the recruitment and retention of the very best faculty. All faculty searches should include broad representation from the discipline, including members from outside the academic unit.

Professor Smidt: "I have a question about the second one. The scope of the report covers certain disciplines. But that statement could be read all over the University, and that could have dramatic affect that may or may not be desirable. For example, one time I chaired an inter-disciplinary committee on economics at the University. Broadly interpreted, around a quarter of the faculty could be said to be using applications of economics. Almost every unit of the University had economists in it. So you could imagine that we would need a committee the size of the tenure committee to look at every appointment. I'm just not sure what it means."

Professor Clifford Earle, Mathematics: "I'm senator at-large, by the way, not representing the Mathematics Department. Our other senator is back there. I think one of the ambiguities in this report as a whole is that much of the report, and most of these recommendations, read as though their scope is very broad and covers the whole University. With respect to the faculty searches including people from all over the University, even those outside the academic unit, economics is one example, statistics is another one that I'm familiar with. These things can have implications other than what was intended. The subtitle of the report narrowed the scope to the sciences in a way that was reasonably clearer. But, as you point out, the recommendations seem to be very sweeping."

Dean Stein: "It occurs to me that we have one of the two authors of the report sitting in the rear of the room if you would like to question some of the wording in the report."

Norm Scott, Vice-President for Research and Advanced Studies: "I'm not sure that I want to address every one of the questions. On the other hand, what we attempted to do was set a framework for broad discussion. In the first part of our example, we recognize that whether we are talking about the physical or biological sciences, the advantages we gain from a broad perspective or input on faculty hiring outside the commonly perceived groupings was important, and that was what that was all about.

"On the issue of graduate students, I think that under the present circumstances, the report has been inclined towards the physical sciences and engineering sciences and their relationship with the biological sciences, and should be interpreted within that context. On the other hand, certainly, the perspective of attracting the very best graduate students is something we believe ought to be present throughout the University."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there additional comments on the first part of the resolution?"

"All those in favor of the first point, signify by raising your hand. All those opposed. About eight are opposed, and the remainder are in favor.

"Peter would you like to present the next point?"

Dean Stein: "Here is another controversial one:"

2. Enhance our competitiveness to attract the best graduate students. There is an urgent need to address this lack of competitiveness immediately. We recommend the appointment of a Task Force to develop actions to restore our strong graduate student environment.

Professor Galik: "Just a quick question for Vice-President Scott. Is this task force supposed to investigate graduate programs throughout the University or just in the specific areas mentioned?"

Vice-President Scott: "I think the need exists across the University. On the other hand, the focus of this report is in the present and, just as at Stanford, where a major factor in raising the number of graduate fellowships overall has focused

efforts in engineering and the physical sciences. So again, I would say that the response would be in the context of the title of the report in the areas of the physical and biological sciences. On the other hand, I believe, and I think the other members of the group believe, that it ought to be looked at broadly."

Speaker Pollak: "Does anyone else have a comment on the second point? Seeing none, all those in favor, please raise your hand. All those opposed. The sentiment of the body is in favor of the point."

3. Maintain a commitment to basic research in the sciences and continue the current investment strategy of hiring superb faculty and letting them make the strategic choices of what research directions to pursue.

Professor Farley: "I have the feeling that we are voting right down the line for Mom and apple pie here. On the other hand, if we vote for or against any of these things, does it make any difference? Of course that is what we are going to do. I hope that we've been doing this all along. I guess it is nice to put it down, but I'm getting the feeling these votes are a little meaningless. How could we possibly vote 'no' on this? I mean what are we going to do, go out and look for mediocre faculty?"

Professor Douglas Haith, Agricultural and Biological Engineering: "Just an example of when our vote might not be meaningless. In CALS right now, there is a list of fifteen priority faculty positions for hiring. The research directions in those areas are defined incredibly narrowly. To me, that does not seem consistent with this provision which is essentially saying, 'hire good faculty and let them decide research direction'. So I think right there is a key issue of policy. That also brings up another key issue which is that most of the decisions about research direction is made by deans. So, my question is, how binding is some of this stuff going to be on the individual colleges? If it is taken seriously, I think this could have a significant impact on the way we conduct research here at Cornell."

Dean Stein: "I think in answer, again to Don Farley, this report singles out three areas in the physical sciences. What is left out of those areas are three areas of our traditional strengths, namely, Physics, Astronomy, and Mathematics. So, if you don't have number three in it, someone could say well, we can deplete our strengths in those areas in the physical sciences that don't fall into this classification, in order to increase our strength in the areas that do fall into this classification. Number three should be read as an answer to that particular interpretation of the document. Is that correct, Norm?"

Vice-President Scott: "That is very well stated."

Professor Farley: "I had no clue of the importance that that point held."

Associate Professor Joseph Laquatra, Design and Environmental Analysis: "Another area where this point may be contentious is in the current direction of research funds in the statutory colleges. Traditionally, faculty have had a lot of latitude in deciding what research those funds were going to be applied to based on proposals. This year's statewide program committee has been given the charge to decide what research priorities for those funds should be. That arrangement, by the way, is in response to a federal mandate on how those funds are used by universities. So this portion may end up only being enforceable selectively depending on what funds we are talking about."

Professor Strike: "This is starting to become worrisome. We seem to be voting for something that is apple pie, unless someone wants it to mean something else, and they are able to do that based on whatever phrase or sentence they decide to latch onto, and what context you import. I'm becoming reluctant to vote for things that are desirable only when they're vacuous."

Speaker Pollak: "Just remember we're not really voting." (laughter)

Professor Strike: "Well then, I'm becoming reluctant to pretend to vote in favor of this." (laughter)

Professor Smillie: "To emphasize that, if we are actually to vote up each of these individual points, each of which sounds great, it might be interpreted as support for the report which contains a lot of things that are not really present in these individual recommendations. So there is a danger to considering these fine looking resolutions."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any other comments?"

Professor Gordon Teskey, English: "I'd just like Professor Smillie to say a little more about what is coming in the report in the



context of basic and fundamental research, and strategic enabling procedures."

Professor Smillie: "Well, there is a question to what extent the report addresses the balance between what it calls basic research, which I prefer to call 'fundamental research' and what it calls strategic research initiatives, which I prefer to call 'three hot or trendy areas'. I think if you read the report, taken as a whole, it clearly comes out in favor of the three hot areas. Just in terms of the number of pages devoted to those areas versus the number of paragraphs or lines devoted to fundamental research. Does that address your question?"

Professor Teskey: "It does a little, but if I may address them from the slightly frivolous perspective of an English professor, the two phrases. 'Basic Research' sounds boring. It doesn't sound like something anyone would want to do. But 'Strategic. . . Enabling. . . Initiatives', that sounds exciting really much more energy involved. There are times when you need to let your attention slide sideways from what the phrases actually seem to denote, to what they actually sound like. That can really tell something about what to look for."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any more comments on number three? Seeing none, I'll ask how many of you are in favor of the third point? Those opposed, please raise your hand. I see you are starting to rebel against the straw votes. So maybe we will just devote the remainder of the time to quickly considering numbers four, five, and six. Four we considered in the amendment portion, so now, we will move onto number five. Peter?"

5. Improve Cornell's research infrastructure. Increasing expense of new faculty start-ups and senior faculty appointments, rising costs of state-of-the art instrumentation, and increased demands for matching funds for research equipment proposals require a more comprehensive and unified approach.

Speaker Pollak: "Are there comments or questions on that issue?"

Unknown: "Yes, what does it mean? Does it mean that Norm Scott is going to kick in more start-up money?"

Speaker Pollak: "Well, let's take advantage of Norm being here. Norm, would you like to field this one?"

Vice-President Scott: "One of the problems that exists now is that it is all ad hoc, and that usually the sources of funds are in various places, in the Provost's office, my office, in the colleges, the deans, and the department chairs. What really is meant here is that we need to try to develop a more unified approach and identify some funds in a pool, so that these needs can be better addressed and avoid some of the ad hoc relationships that have been going on recently.

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I wonder about this. On the one hand, one wants to be fair, and I understand how administrators must feel when they are approached by really excited department members and chairs who insist that they have a really hot prospect and that we need to jump on this opportunity right away. I think that is the sort of thing that happens in this ad hoc arrangement. On the other hand, what are we substituting for that? Maybe that is the way this should be done, that we should be responding to enthusiastic, well- made arguments and that what we are substituting for that is some sort of formula that is going to spread the money around. We are substituting basically an administrative predetermined solution to the problem."

Dean Stein: "I think you have identified a fundamental decision here. There is a theme that runs through these motherhood statements. The theme is that we need to be more focused. We need to make these decisions in a more focused manner. It reminds me when Ernest Lawrence built his first cyclotron in Berkeley, California and he did it by going around to these little companies and getting a thousand dollars here and a thousand dollars there, and managed to put together enough money to build a cyclotron. Anyone could do that, there were a lot of sources. Twenty years later, there were two: the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. I think that is what this report is trying to do is to move internally to a more unified and focused outlook. Now, you can say that is a bad idea but, frankly, if you were trying to build a modern accelerator by going around to companies one by one, you would fail, because the scale of the project has just gotten so large."

Associate Professor Kerry Cook, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "I think there is more being talked about here than whether we should focus our research areas. I think that those three research areas have already been chosen for us. I wonder if I am the only one who feels that we are being led through a series of fairly innocuous statements and that in the end we are going to come out in support of a top-down approach to science in this University. I haven't talked to any faculty

members who are in favor of the Research Futures Report. On the other hand, I feel that a very different thing is going on here in this meeting. And most of the faculty members that I have spoken with feel that we can't and we shouldn't define the University's research future, especially with only a few weeks over the summer."

Professor Barry Carpenter, Chemistry: "I do support that view and it seems to me that there is a fundamental contradiction between saying that the faculty ought to determine the focus of research, and writing a proposal that tells them what their research ought to be. While I'm generally loath to turn to the private sector as an example of anything that I care about, in this particular case, I think there is something worth looking at there, and that is the flexibility that one finds in the smaller start-up companies as opposed to the less flexible IBM-type of company. I'm afraid that this report is moving us more toward an IBM model rather than a small startup model."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any other comments? Peter would you like to read number six?"

6. Encourage interdisciplinary research. Barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration at Cornell are minimal. Cornell has a strategic advantage of strength in broad areas, but we need to develop new approaches in order to enhance and improve the process to capitalize on Cornell's inherent advantage in interdisciplinary research in comparison to other institutions.

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any comments."

Professor Richard Quaas, Animal Science: "To me, that epitomizes the report, in that I can't tell the difference whether we pass it or don't pass it. We all agree with that statement and hope it is being done, and so I don't know why we have this report. If we have no barriers, what's the problem?"

Vice-President Scott: "Not just to that, but to the general feeling here. Let me give you a very specific example to illustrate that. The National Science Foundation is ever pressing in the way in which institutions have to contribute to the support of the research that they fund. I think most of you know that there is a major research program, and in that process, they expect 30% of the funding for that effort to come from the institution. It varies from time to time on the percentages, but increasingly, our research institutions are expected to bear a significant part of the cost of research. One of the problems is that we are not able to address all of the particular demands and interests that occur. So, we continue to hear words like, 'if we don't do this, we won't be competitive'. So, what this report has attempted to do is to provide a basic taxonomy for three areas: basic research, interdisciplinary research, and areas that we saw as strategic enabling areas, that we thought would provide a basis and a rationale for the investment that would have to take place by the University. So, in that sense, one of the things that the report tried to accomplish was laying out of three fundamental areas. We suggested three strategic enabling areas, but we opened it and asked for others that would support the basic concept and would have a lasting impact, so that we could more readily enter into a process that would address these pressing problems and make these strategic decisions, because we are not in a position to meet every request."

Speaker Pollak: " For those who don't have it, would you like to read the final paragraph Peter?"

Dean Stein:

Be it further resolved that the Senate together with the administration should further form joint ad hoc committees to further formulate options and plans in biology, information sciences and advanced materials.

"What this is saying is that this centralization of decision-making pervades this whole report. I think this has been correctly identified by several people on the floor; it accepts that notion and says that the Faculty Senate wants an equal partnership in running that particular decision-making process. Namely, that if we accept the view that we need a greater focus as an institution in these broad areas, then at least the faculty should have a full role with the administration in driving this train, and that is essentially what is being said in that last line of the report."

Professor Richard Root, Ecology and Systematics: "I'm a bit concerned that Biology is discussed in this report, yet Ecology and Systematics is the best prepared of the sciences to deal with the new genomic, and it wasn't even mentioned. Even though this was a report on Biology, it left out many of the fields that are actually the fields in which Cornell is strongest. If you look at the rankings, Ecology and Systematics is ranked very high, and I feel that this is very symptomatic of this top-down process that there can be these oversights and, for that reason, I am opposed to this final point."

Dean Stein: "But then you see if you are opposed to this resolution that it will go on without us. That word 'Biology' was carefully chosen to address what you say. In fact, you are quite right. There were a very small number of Biologists on this committee that developed this report, something like three or four. Biology is a very broad word, and the use of the word 'Biology' in this final paragraph was meant to be inclusive of Ecology and Systematics and Biochemistry and Genetics and Plant Biology, and all of the various forms of Biology on this campus. The use of that word does not necessarily endorse the particular view of Biology taken in that report."

Professor Howland: "With all respect, I don't want the faculty to believe for one minute that the administration would carry out a top-down policy, in the face of what I see as real faculty opposition to it. We have heard these arguments before, 'the bus leaving and either we get on it or it goes on without us.' In this case, that is ridiculous. We are the faculty. We determine the direction of research at this University and it is not going to be put on us by the administration from the top."

Provost Randel: "I should perhaps begin by pointing out that the study of Medieval Liturgical Chant is nowhere pointed out in this report, and I expect Cornell to continue to be the leading University in the English-speaking world of Spanish Liturgical Chant, barring none. Now, should we have an ad hoc committee? This committee was an ad hoc committee, half appointed by the Senate. So what we are pleading for here is in fact what we got. Now the question here is what we are talking about here more or less centralized than what we already have? Part of what we are talking about here is that our current process is ruthlessly and radically centralized. That is, I sit in my office by myself and somebody comes to me and says, 'I need a million bucks for this' or 'I need half a million bucks for that, so I can compete in the next round of something', or 'we'd like to hire this really terrific Assistant Professor, but we've got to have an NMR machine, and she can raise \$700,000 of the \$1 million we need, but we have to come up with the rest'. Those decisions are being made on a regular basis by me, sitting in my office and acting on whoever comes into my office with a good idea. I was not an author of the report, but what I think the report is groping for is an invitation to make this process somewhat more open to a broader number of people, and to make this process open to more viewpoints rather than only available to those who hustle the best with the Provost. Now I am optimistic that the Senate as a body can debate and resolve all of the many issues that deal with science policy. What we're looking for is some uneasy compromise that opens up the discussion somewhat more, but allows us to have a sense that, as decisions are made, they are made in the context of a discussion by a reasonable number of people, some of whom are faculty, some are chosen because they have some standing in these cases. I hate to see this thing forced into the mold of being centralization, and different from what we have always done, when in point of fact, there is a great deal of centralization in what we have always done. Unfortunately, it reminds me a little bit of our discussion on tenure. Me, trying to invite the faculty to take part in the process on a broader basis, but in the end, when the chips are down, we're not so certain we wouldn't rather take our chances with the rascal in the Provost's office than have a slightly broader discussion of the matter. We can continue the current system, but it seems to me that once in a while it may be good to get a group of smart people together to talk about this sort of thing. Many of the sciences or other fields of research, including Medieval Chant, don't take anybody's resources and there is no reason to have a big discussion on them. There are some things that require cross-disciplinary work. There are only so many NMR machines we can buy, and there has to be some way to have these conversations."

Professor Carpenter: "As you were talking I made the same analogy you did, but the difference that I would draw is that this report is telling us what the answer is going to be before we even start talking, and I think that is what makes it seem so centralized. So the analogy, I think, would be that you would have a committee to advise you on tenure, but they would tell you who was going to get tenure before any of the files were reviewed."

Unknown: "I also would not like to paint this report as planning in favor of hustling. In this report, I see a great deal of hustling. A couple of people want to get in there really fast and institutionalize a certain direction. I think many more of us are in favor of some sort of planning rather than this particular report."

Dean Stein: "I'd like to tell you what I've taken away from this non-meeting, from a series of non-votes. I've come away from this in complete confidence that it doesn't matter whether or not we had a quorum with respect to the first issue we had in place. The sentiment of the body was nearly unanimous in its treatment of the Academic Freedom Committee's response to the Transitions Report and I don't think that the lack of a quorum by four should inhibit us from expressing that opinion. With regard to the second issue, I've heard no consensus on the floor. I've heard a lot of people arguing in different ways that have changed with time. I have come to no conclusion about how the body feels or how it would have felt with a quorum. My inclination, as with the tenure discussion, is to try to appoint a committee of representative people of about a half dozen or a dozen, to come to develop a resolution to bring to the floor of the Senate. I think it would be a mistake to let

it drop for two months."

Unknown: "Peter would you want to talk about this in the broad sense, or just in terms of the Physical Sciences?"

Dean Stein: "I don't know."

Unknown: "I think that is something we need to think about."

Colonel Wheeler: "One of the observations that I was making was that it seems when we have a rider that explains what it is we are trying to say, very often that does not match up with what we have written down. As Don Randel was saying, what we are trying to do is this. . . but what we have written down does not match up with what we are trying to do."

Speaker Pollak: "Since we are not an actual meeting, we will just stop, and I guess that we'll all see each other outside the Provost's office tomorrow morning trying to hustle him."

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

### **MOTION FROM AFPS CONCERNING THE TRANSITION REPORT OF 11/11/97**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate supports the following recommendations of the 11/11/97 report of the Provost's Committee on the Transition of Faculty to Emeritus Status:

- 1. Overall Reactions.** The Faculty Senate is pleased with both the process and substance of the interaction between the AFPS Committee and the Transition Committee. It commends the Transition Committee and its chair, Vice President Ehrenberg, for a job well done and for the respect shown for Senate input and faculty governance, and looks forward to a similarly cooperative relationship as other issues raised by the original transition report receive further attention.
- 2. Telecommunications.** The intent of the report (see D.3) concerning office resources for emeritus faculty seems to be to provide equitable office resources (comparable to non-retired faculty) based on an assessment of actual levels of professional activity as well as departmental capacity. However, no explicit mention is made of access to communications resources (e-mail, WWW access, fax access, etc.). The Faculty Senate recommends that an appropriate reference be made to these resources in D.3.
- 3. Phased Retirement.** The report describes two options for phased retirement. Option 1 is for indefinite half time retirement with tenure retained. Option 2 is for fixed term phased retirement. Options 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, arguments for either option tend to make highly conjectural assumptions about how they would effect the transition to full retirement. The Faculty Senate recommends that for the short term the University make both options available, that it engage in a study to determine how faculty are likely to respond to different mixes of options, and that it carefully monitor the consequences of these options.

Rationale for recommendation #3:

1. The argument for Option 1 assumes (a) that it will be more attractive to faculty because it does not specify a point at which one must retire, and (b) that those faculty who choose it will not continue half-time for an undue amount of time. In contrast, Option 2 ensures that those who take it will retire in a timely way, but, because it is less flexible, it may also reduce the number of takers. If both (a) and (b) are true, it is reasonable to believe that Option 1 will be more successful in moving faculty into retirement than Option 2.
2. The basic argument for Option 2 denies (b). Thus it envisions Option 1 proliferating a significant number of long term part time faculty and slowing the transition to emeritus status.

3. The Option 1 plus Option 2 plus a study has the following rationale:

- a. We do not know whether assumption (b) is true. Thus, we do not know whether Option 1 or Option 2 is more likely to facilitate transition to emeritus status. We are unlikely to know this if we do not study the matter and if we get no experience on the matter.
- b. Option 2 is not only less flexible for the faculty, it is less flexible for departments and colleges. It may be that there will be numerous cases where departments and colleges will benefit by permitting a faculty member to continue in a part time role for an indefinite period.
- c. Adverse consequences of including Option 1 in the mix of options can be controlled. None of the proposals under consideration grant faculty any right which they can unilaterally exercise. The effect of any mix of options will be to create a bargaining situation between faculty, departments and colleges. Departments and colleges are not compelled to agree to either Option 1 or Option 2. Thus departments or colleges might choose to limit the number of people who can be on part time status (in either form). Or they might limit the number of people who can be on Option 1.
- d. If the Option 1 plus Option 2 plus a study approach proves to generate an unacceptable number of indefinite part time faculty, it is possible for Cornell to eliminate Option 1 leaving only Option 2. Whereas, if we have only Option 1, there is no fall back position, and if we have only Option 2 we will never know whether Option 1 would have been more successful in facilitating the transition to emeritus status. In short, the Option 1 plus Option 2 plus a study allows Cornell to choose between Option 1 and Option 2 (if that should prove necessary) on the basis of evidence and experience rather than on a prior speculation, and it avoids the out of hand rejection of the option (Option 1) that may be better both for Cornell and for the faculty.

**MOTION FROM UFC CONCERNING THE  
RESEARCH FUTURES TASK FORCE REPORT**

RESOLVED, that the Senate supports the recommendations of the Research Futures Task Force:

1. Increase emphasis on the recruitment and retention of the very best faculty. All faculty searches should include broad representation from the discipline, including members from outside the academic unit.
2. Enhance our competitiveness to attract the best graduate students. There is an urgent need to address this lack of competitiveness immediately. We recommend the appointment of a Task Force to develop actions to restore our strong graduate student environment.
3. Maintain a commitment to basic research in the sciences and continue the current investment strategy of hiring superb faculty and letting them make the strategic choices of what research directions to pursue.
4. Develop a process to focus research efforts in the key strategic enabling areas of biology, information sciences, and advanced materials, in order to take advantage of Cornell's unique strengths. We have proposed an organizational mechanism to foster this process. The faculty will determine the actual implementation of the process and the particular foci that will orient research initiatives.
5. Improve Cornell's research infrastructure. Increasing expense of new faculty start-ups and senior faculty appointments, rising costs of state-of-the-art instrumentation, and increased demands for matching funds for research equipment proposals require a more comprehensive and unified approach.
6. Encourage interdisciplinary research. Barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration at Cornell are minimal. Cornell has a strategic advantage of strength in broad areas, but we need to develop new approaches in order to enhance and improve the process to capitalize on Cornell's inherent advantage in interdisciplinary research in comparison to other institutions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate together with the Administration should form joint ad hoc committees to further formulate options and plans in biology, information sciences, and advanced materials.