

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, December 9, 1998

Professor John Pollak, Animal Science, and Speaker: "I guess we will start with some comments by the President. I would ask that when you have a question that you raise your hand. We do have a hand-held mike so that we can hear the question clearly. This room (Statler Auditorium) is a little long and many of you have chosen to sit near the door. So, please make sure you raise your hand so we can bring the mike to you. With that, I'll call on the President to come up and answer questions."

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESIDENT ON BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

President Hunter R. Rawlings, III: "Thank you. I thought I would make a few brief remarks and then I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have concerning the decision on the organization of biological sciences at Cornell. Let me begin by saying that I think the life sciences in general, the biological sciences, are exceptionally significant today for two obvious reasons. First, this is one of the most eminent areas of research in the world. The changes that are occurring in biological sciences are astounding and I expect to see that continue for the next twenty or thirty years at least. So, this is an area of tremendous intellectual activity, discovery, breakthrough, and it is clear that it is an important area for Cornell to be very much invested in. Second, Cornell already has a very strong investment in the biological sciences. We have about 400 faculty members here, depending on the way you define 'biology', who are engaged in activities within the sphere of biological sciences. It is an exceptionally large investment, and one in which we want to make the most possible progress.

"These two facts made a decision on the organization of biological sciences especially critical for us because by almost everyone's testimony, the organization we had was not working well. People disagree on why it wasn't working well, but just about everyone agreed that it was not working well. There are numerous reasons for that, but I won't go into all of them. I thought I would just give a couple examples of my reading of the problem based on a lot of information that we've received in the last nine months or so. First, a lack of strong leadership in the biological sciences. Second, unclear upward decision-making processes; that is, too many people required to make the decision and poor alignment between responsibility for decisions and the authority to make the decisions. That clearly was a problem. Third, inadequate interaction between Division faculty and non-Division faculty. That is, there has always been such interaction, but it has been perceived by many to have been inadequate. Fourth, very clear problems of resource allocation among sections, particularly in setting priorities within the Division of Biological Sciences. All of these were significant problems recognized by nearly everyone who talked or wrote about the issue.

"Something needed to be done, and two schools of thought coalesced. One was to enhance the Division and try to solve the problem by making the Division stronger by giving it stronger leadership. The other approach was to dismantle the Division and to create departments along more traditional lines within colleges. Clearly, there is strong sentiment on both sides and very intelligent people of good will disagree on this matter and we had many suggestions along both lines.

"We feel that it is better to disband the Division and move into a departmentalized structure which looks more like the rest of Cornell for several reasons. First, with the change to departmental structure, we give clearer reporting relationships for decision making, clearer accountability, and clearer means of prioritizing and making decisions. That is probably the principal reason for the decision to move to a departmental model. Secondly, we begin to conduct our biology programs in a way that is similar to that in which we conduct our own programs at Cornell through colleges and departments rather than through an exceptional structure. Thirdly, we also have the opportunity, thereby, to convert smaller units into larger, more powerful ones that bring together faculty members in closely related disciplines as in the case of Molecular and Cellular Biology and Genetics. We will, I believe, no longer be out of step with the way biology is organized in most other universities. Fourth, through this departmental organization, we will also be able to focus attention and some resources upon a critically important enabling core of modern biology: Molecular, Cellular, Developmental, and Structural. This department will now have a clear mandate, a clear mission, leadership, a clear reporting line, and a core of strong senior faculty in order to develop the way it should to become nationally competitive for faculty, for graduate students, for research grants, and for private fund-raising opportunities. That, I think, is essential if Cornell is to be at the forefront of biology, in particular the enabling area of Molecular, Cellular

and Developmental Biology.

"Now, we can do this, I think, without weakening other areas of biology. It is certainly not our intent to signal, in any respect, a desire to weaken or diminish other areas of biology which are also of extreme significance for this decade and the next, and the one after that. It is essential that Cornell maintain its strong investment in the biological sciences generally, and that we continue to have very strong Organismal biology at Cornell. We do not have to weaken our commitment to the broad undergraduate biology major. In fact, we intend to see it strengthened through the addition of faculty members teaching in the program who have traditionally not taught in the program. I am happy to say that we have invitations from departments such as Entomology, which now want to engage in teaching the undergraduate biology students on campus, as well as a strong interest from the Vet School. We intend to take full advantage of those opportunities and we are grateful for those offers from those corners.

"I also want to emphasize that the Provost's office will play a major role in insuring that colleges collaborate closely in creating the new departments and in supporting the undergraduate biology major. Vice Provost Bert Garza will play the lead role in this work and will help us maintain a broad institutional view of the biological sciences and ensure that there is close coordination, cooperation, and collaboration across college lines.

"In summary, I would like to see biological sciences flourish in the different colleges at Cornell with strong faculty leadership as we have in the physical sciences, and with inter-college bonds of the kind that we have built across campus in the physical sciences. That will certainly be our work over the next few years. Thanks for the opportunity, and I would be happy to take some questions."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, do we have questions or comments? If so, raise your hands."

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "Thank you, Mr. President. I'm sure I echo the sentiments of the house when I thank you for coming here to answer our questions, and I'm glad we broached the topic of decision making because that's the substance of my question. It's well-known that you're an expert on Thucydides, and as such, you may remember this famous passage from the Funeral Oration of Pericles, where Pericles is trying to distinguish the Athenians from the surrounding oligarchies and despotism, and he says, 'well, I guess I don't know it by heart and I'd better read it.' (laughter)

President Rawlings: "Well, I can do the rest of it for you in Greek."

Professor Howland: "He says, 'If we Athenians are able to judge at all events, if we cannot originate and instead of looking upon discussion as a stumbling block in the way of decision, we regard discussion as an indispensable preliminary to any decision.' Now Pericles didn't say, 'And the decision should reflect the discussion,' but I think that's a fair interpretation of his meaning. Now, Mr. President, you've made two very important public decisions for this university. The first one, after not much public discussion, concerned putting all of the freshmen on North Campus. In taking that decision, you surprised us, because that particular course of action had not been discussed publicly at all. Indeed, I think that at the time the decision was taken, financial implications had not been totally investigated. Secondly, in the decision we're talking about today, you decided after long public discussion to abolish the Division of Biological Sciences. That was one of the alternatives that was discussed. Still Mr. President, you surprised us because as a result of that discussion, many of the faculty in the Division, and in the Senate, and indeed many of your counselors, had come to the opinion that the Division should be preserved and not abolished.

"Well, those decisions are behind us now. They're past us, and they raise questions about your future decisions. My question is, do you agree with Pericles that the discussion is an indispensable preliminary to all wise decisions, or are you following some other ancient classical tradition -- Odyssean perhaps -- since we are in Ithaca, where a tradition that requires secrecy and surprise, and above all, the helpful intervention of the Gods?"

President Rawlings: "Thank you very much. I especially appreciate not only the reference to Thucydides but also the use of Thucydides. Yes, I am certainly very much a student of Thucydides and Periclean democracy, in fact. I do agree strongly that discussion is a strong preliminary to decision making. On both of the topics that you mentioned, Cornell has had considerable discussion. On the issue of housing, we have had thirty years of discussion, in fact, and thirty years of reports -- twenty six in all on student housing -- but very little in the way of action. So it was important not only to have the discussion, but also to render the decision. The decision I eventually made was very prominently

discussed on campus before I made it. The Cornell Daily Sun published a long and supportive editorial on housing the students on North Campus. I was pleased to have, in that case, a lengthy, strong, and student-oriented recommendation along the lines of what we eventually decided. That case is a good one for preliminary discussion leading to decision and in this case, an actual recommendation from a student publication with a good deal of authority. In the particular case of biological sciences and the organization thereof, we also had very lengthy discussion over many months, not many years, but we also had report after report and I appreciate all of the letters that individual faculty members wrote, and reports that we've had. In this case, as you've noted, it came down to two essential options. One of those in favor of retaining and enhancing the Division, the other in favor of disbanding the Division. Our own task force at Cornell, which consisted of a number of faculty members as well as administrators, recommended this course of action which I eventually took. Other committees recommended different courses of action. So we had opposing committee reports, and we had many faculty members on both sides. This is a case where, again, we tried to listen very carefully over a long period of time and then to make a decision."

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "I have a large comment. The history of science shows that the vast majority of advances in science have come from individuals or small groups. Indeed, Einstein suggested that refugee scientists should seek jobs as lighthouse-keepers, so that they may find the isolation necessary for scientific work. In an article entitled: 'In praise of smallness how can we return to small science?' Chargaff wrote, 'We all know that what is cannot be otherwise. The existence of anything weighs the scales most unfairly against anything else that could have been in its place, but is not.'

"If this be true, then the way the Division of Biology was set up, weighed the scales most unfairly against everything else that could have been in its place but was not, and thus, in spite of the fact that the majority of the students and the faculty spoke in favor of maintaining the division, you sought to change it. Likewise, the structure you have set up by presidential proclamation will weigh the scales most unfairly against everything else that could have been in its place but will not be.

"I would like to comment on an aspect that I believe will be diminished in what you have called the 'post-division era'. That is, academic freedom and the spirit of the independent investigator. Again, according to Chargaff, 'Science is the application of reason, and mainly of logic, to the study of the phenomena of nature. Therefore, the most important scientific tool is the human brain. Each brain sits on its own head, and the all-important unit of research is the individual scientist.'

"If the most important unit in research is the individual scientist, what is the value of centralization? It has been argued, equally strongly by Socialists and Capitalists that: (1) science exists to serve the material wants of human beings and (2) a central authority, knowing the material wants of the community, could efficiently and quickly switch researchers to the most immediate problems of the day. In this way, overlap would be avoided, and trivial investigations would no longer take up time and money. However, the thinking of economists does not typically take into consideration support for the creative and original investigators, who, in the main, have discovered the phenomena necessary for technological progress. According to John Baker: 'The proper function of a research team is to work out the consequences after an independent worker or two or three scientific friends have opened a new line of investigation. There will be plenty of people who will want to follow the new line. Indeed, one notices a strong tendency for scientists to ask, 'What is being done?' They might as well ask frankly, 'What is the fashion?' The original investigator on the contrary asks himself, 'What is *not* being done?' The people who want to follow a new line often do excellently in teams and they can be fitted satisfactorily into planned research. They have neither the wish nor the ability to think originally, though they are often talented, well equipped technically, and possessed of a great love of knowledge. If science is to flourish, however, encouragement must be given to people of independent spirit, who want no master. The desire to know is widespread among men: the desire to know specifically that which is not known is on the contrary very rare.'

"Your decision will have a negative effect on the current and future biology students and faculty for two reasons. Firstly, you have sent a very clear and resounding message that the President of Cornell University has a better grasp of 'what is biology?' than do the majority of the one hundred faculty members in the Division. This lack of respect is extremely demoralizing to the faculty, and I'm sure you're aware that faculty morale has plummeted ever since the college and university administrations started to micro-manage biology. Given that each faculty member pursues his or her own difficult, demanding, and underpaid profession to a large extent because we enjoy what we do, a lowered morale would have an adverse effect on our ability to teach, advise, and do research. Secondly, your decision will have

a negative effect on academic freedom; and in destroying the environment where the brain can function creatively to discover new phenomena and laws.

"I believe that the transference of power from the faculty in the Division to Day Hall sends a chilling message to all faculty members in the Division of Biology. That is, the first question that must be asked when pursuing biological research will no longer be, 'How can we better understand the biological basis of life?', but 'Will the proposed research bring in a substantial amount of money to Cornell?' That is, Day Hall will support work on biological projects that have short term economic gains -- that is sell buyology . . ."

Speaker Pollak: "Senator, do you have much more there?"

Professor Wayne: "A little more."

Speaker Pollak: "You can submit that in writing to the Secretary and if you have a question at the end, you can address it now." (The complete text of Professor Wayne's comments is attached as [Appendix A.](#))

Professor Wayne: "Okay. In order to alleviate my anxiety that you are only looking at biology as a cash cow, and not as an intellectually satisfying and important enterprise, which incidentally provides the knowledge for technological advances, perhaps you can describe to me one or two areas of biological research that currently are not well funded, because they are at variance with existing knowledge, yet in your opinion have significance for increasing our basic understanding of life, and long-term potential for satisfying the material needs of human beings."

President Rawlings: "Well, let me say that I appreciate your comments and I certainly hope that this decision will not cause morale problems for the faculty member. I'm sure that there are a number of faculty members that are disappointed with this decision because they prefer that we maintain and enhance the Division. On the other hand, there are a number of faculty members who are very pleased with this decision, as one might expect, and who feel that it is an important element in their decision to stay at Cornell. We have opinions on both sides of the fence, and we expected that no matter which way we made that decision. I do also . . ."

Professor Wayne: "Do you have a proportion of the number of people who felt the two different ways?"

President Rawlings: "I do also strongly agree with your view that we should pursue science and knowledge for their own sakes. It is certainly my very strong view that we should not allow funding opportunities to weigh anywhere near as heavily as intellectual discovery. That to me is what the University is about, what it should be about, and what it should always be about. As a member of the Humanities faculty, I have more reasons to believe that than perhaps most others. So I think that is a value that I share most strongly with you. I also agree that its impossible to predict in a given year, where research is going to go in different disciplines, and that is why we support so many at Cornell because it is extraordinarily difficult to know when a particular discipline is going to start issuing the results we've seen issued by many in the biological sciences."

Professor Wayne: "Can you answer the question? Which other intellectually stimulating areas of research that don't make money are you aware of?"

President Rawlings: "Yes, my own area of research, Classics."

Professor Wayne: "I meant in biology, this is about biology."

President Rawlings: "Oh, in biology. I'm sure that there are many fields in biology."

Professor Wayne: "I just want an example."

President Rawlings: "I'll just say many."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we've run over, and you do have a plane to catch, so we appreciate your coming and we'll move to the next item on the agenda. Dean Cooke will make a few remarks."

President Rawlings: "Thank you."

2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "I will be brief. We've made substantial progress on the Colloquium on the Future of the Research University. At one point we thought it would occur at the end of next semester, but now have decided that the proper planning time will move it to September. Here are the members of the Planning Committee if you wish to communicate with them: Robert C. Richardson, Chair; Dale Bauman, J. Robert Cooke, Dale Corson, Robert Cowie, John Hopcroft, Walter LaFeber, Sally McConnell-Ginet, Frank H.T. Rhodes, Fred Rogers, and Mary Sansalone. We have made tremendous progress in finding speakers of national stature to participate in that. In the same vein, here is a reference that I would like to recommend to you if you're interested in reading something on the future of the university: 'Reinventing Undergraduate Education' by the Boyer Commission, and it's on the Web site <<http://notes.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf>>. There is a handout with the table of contents ([Appendix B](#), attached), and I think that it's one reference well worth taking seriously."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we'll move on to the next item, which is questions and answers with the Provost."

3. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, do we have questions for the Provost?"

(Unknown): "Did you have a nice Thanksgiving?"

Provost Don Randel: "Yes." (laughter)

Speaker Pollak: "Well, that put us back on schedule."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF NOVEMBER 11, 1998

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, you've all had an opportunity to review the minutes from the November 11 meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to those minutes? We did have some grammatical corrections and changes that were submitted. I checked those over with the Senator. There were no content changes so we'll just accept those in if there's no objection to doing that. Seeing none, we'll accept the minutes for November 11.

"We'll now hear the Report from the Nominations and Elections Committee. Kathleen?"

5. REPORT OF NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I have the report of the Nominations and Elections committee for today's Senate meeting:

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies: Donald Greenberg; AAP, Tim Mount, CALS

Faculty Advisory Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid: Peter Schwartz, H.E., Chair

Faculty Committee on Program Review: Peter Stein, A&S, Chair

Minority Education Committee: Dorothy Mermin, A&S

University Faculty Library Board: Julie Blue, Vet.; Keith Dennis, A&S

University Hearing Board: Leigh Phoenix, Engr.

West Campus Initiatives Committee: Jennifer Gerner, H.E.

Are there any questions or comments?"

Associate Professor Robert Corradino, Physiology: "Considering the discussions we've had this afternoon on distance learning, I wonder if you could remind me of what the Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies is charged with?"

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "That group is a policy making group that has worked with Information Technology on the campus; that is, the computing environment on the campus and the support and instruction on the campus."

Professor Corradino: "Do we have, or is there any indication that we should establish a Committee on Distance Learning?"

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "There has been a task force appointed, chaired by David Lipsky, former Dean of the ILR School, that produced a report, but there is not now an active committee on distance learning."

Dean Cooke: "We do intend to form such a committee shortly."

Speaker Pollak: "Other questions or comments? Okay, if there are no objections to the nominations, we'll accept them. Seeing none, we accept."

"Now we'll move on to the report of the Academic Leadership Series. There will be two: the first by Peter Schwartz on Distance Learning, and then a report by Dave Galton on Student-Faculty Interaction."

6. REPORT FROM ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP SERIES

a. Distance Learning

Professor Peter Schwartz, Textiles and Apparel: "Thank you. This information is literally off the press, and I used Microsoft Word, version 0. The Academic Leadership Committee ended its meeting approximately an hour ago, and one of the topics was distance learning. One of the questions that each of the discussion groups were asked during the breakout session was to try to identify issues that the Faculty Senate should look at, and I've broadened it to some issues that are related to the faculty that we may want to look at."

"Basically the distance learning discussion centered around two groups: one was the business of distance learning, and that was much more relegated to the administration, or within the purview of the administration although it does have implications for the faculty. The second, and far more important, is the education mission of distance learning, and whether the technology can improve by learning and whether interactivity is a benefit. There are a number of individual issues that were brought up as to courses or enrichment programs being offered through distance learning, and I will go through them in no particular order. One was the issue of credit, academic credit in particular, and whether courses should be offered for Cornell credit, whether the credit would be equivalent to the learning experience and the credit given on campus, and whether that credit would lead ultimately to credit towards a degree wholly or partly through distance learning. As part of the degree, each college and certainly the graduate school, has residency requirements. There was some discussion as to whether it is desirable to have some residency requirement in the distance learning atmosphere or should the degree be wholly off campus and individual. There was a question on reward or the value of the work done in distance learning. The effort that the faculty member would have to put into a quality, distinctive Cornell distance learning environment, and how that credit would be valued in a typical academic reward structure. How would a distance learning course equate with refereed publications, how would it equate with a course taught on campus? Also the issue of time was tied up with the issue of rewards. The course will take substantial faculty time -- how will that be allocated and accounted for? There was an issue on content that centered on two items: Who owns the content of the distance learning course? If it's on disk, does the faculty member own that content? More importantly, who controls the content? Who has the authority to add or delete items from the course?"

"One of the positive features of distance learning is that this will allow us to increase our audience and increase our revenue without increasing the physical structure or the number of individuals physically taught by a faculty member. In terms of that, if there are revenues, how will they be distributed? There are issues of quality and quality control. What is the ultimate quality control mechanism for distance learning courses? There were questions of the intellectual property rights, again, as to who owns the course. And the other question was if you have a popular course, who markets that course? Is it marketed by Cornell or are the faculty individual entrepreneurs? An example that was used was textbooks. A faculty member writes the textbook and derives royalties from it. There was a need that in any of these courses that there be some clear commitment from the University to help develop and maintain the courses."

"Obviously, the Faculty Senate cannot address all of these issues. It's up to the Senate to determine which to address."

Speaker Pollak: "We'll save questions until both of them have gone."

b. Student-Faculty Interaction

Professor David Galton, Animal Science: "In the beginning of this semester, a committee was appointed on the Cornell Undergraduate Experience. Through this committee, which I am a member of, and what I've heard as summary points from the ALS on student-faculty interaction, I would like to suggest that there may be three areas that we need to address and look at from the perspective of faculty providing input for the environment of the undergraduate experience here at Cornell. First, and the main one, is to have a sense of community for both students and faculty. This is a major topic of concern and also of discussion by faculty, students, and the administration. What we need is to be really proactive in this area to make sure that we are delivering what is needed to improve the sense of community on behalf of our students and faculty involved in undergraduate teaching. Students want interaction with faculty and it is just a matter of providing an environment that will enhance the student-faculty interaction. There is much discussion as to how that may be done. There were many ideas presented this afternoon at the summary of the ALS meeting that the Undergraduate Experience Committee will take into consideration and will try to work with the administration and student organizations to deliver. Another aspect is that, at times, we bring the students to our world rather than looking at the students' world and looking at what they really need and what they'd expect. I think it's a matter of providing training and leadership to the faculty on what are the expectations of the faculty as advisors, teachers, and participants of activities outside the classroom. Also on the student side, how they could better interact with faculty that may be intimidating at times. For example, Faculty Fellows serve a tremendous purpose in interacting with the students but, as was indicated by a former dean in our group today, the poor student who sits next to the Faculty Fellow has to do the discussion while other students have their own discussions. It is a matter of how we can join with the students to improve the interaction.

"The second item is an item of importance to our committee, one that we worked on this fall and we hope to bring to the Senate for consideration next semester, and that is for the University Faculty to identify, recognize, and reward teaching quality and advising. There is much concern on how to improve advising, what are the rules and the expectations of the students and faculty in advising, and what are the reward structures for the faculty that are committed to undergraduate teaching as compared to graduate teaching and research. Advising is an area that comes to the top of importance."

"The last area is faculty input to address the issues and needs of the undergraduate experience at Cornell. We have a tremendous amount of data, but we are lacking on the faculty side. We need more ideas to have a better program of undergraduate teaching. These are the three areas: first, to enhance the sense of community for students and faculty in the undergraduate experience; second, to identify and to reward and recognize teaching and advising quality; third, to seek further faculty input for better decisions. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Does anyone have a question or comment for them? None? Okay. We'll move on to the resolution that is before us on Faculty-Administration Partnership: Improvement of Faculty Salaries. Kathleen Rasmussen."

7. RESOLUTION ON FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION PARTNERSHIP: IMPROVEMENT OF FACULTY SALARIES

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "Today's resolution deals with a specific issue that this body has discussed previously, namely faculty salaries. On this occasion, this issue is considered within the context of the faculty-administration partnership that has been fundamental to the development and operation of the Senate. My remarks, which are made on behalf of the UFC, the Senate's executive committee, will focus on the broader context. Paul Sherman, who chairs the Financial Policies Committee, will follow to discuss the specifics of the salary issue. I will trace the history of this partnership, point out some of its successes and failures, and introduce the relevant portions of the resolution that is before you today.

"The primary reason for replacing the Faculty Council of Representatives with the Senate was to establish a partnership with the administration. The timing seemed right as a new administration was being inaugurated. The concept of a faculty-administration partnership was enthusiastically embraced by both the President and the Provost. To this end, the document that established the Senate, the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, recognizes the context in which this partnership must operate:

University leadership functions best when it is . . . able to strike the delicate balance between the twin needs for broad consultation and timely decision making.

"It also recognizes the faculty's stake in this partnership:

By long tradition the faculty believe that their views should profoundly influence the course Cornell will follow. . .

"Finally, it describes the role of governance in this partnership:

The appropriate role of faculty governance is to facilitate communication between the faculty and the administration,. . .thereby building a faculty administration partnership that will serve as a firm foundation for effective leadership.

"In the three years of the Senate's existence, we can point with some pride to examples of successful partnerships. The Faculty Committee on Program Review is now functioning successfully, the Faculty Committee to Advise the Provost on All Tenure Decisions has nearly completed a year's worth of reviews, and the Provost and the Nominations and Elections Committee have worked together well, for example, to provide faculty for search committees for new deans.

"Today's resolution is about an area in which we have not been so successful in creating a true partnership with the administration, namely faculty salaries. Unfortunately, there are additional examples of areas in which this faculty-administration partnership has either not materialized or has actively failed. As a result, the UFC is increasingly concerned that this partnership is not occurring on issues that are critical to faculty. Some of these may be coming forward for Senate action in the future.

"It is important to define exactly what we mean by the term 'partnership'. For this purpose, we distinguish between *notification*, *consultation*, and *partnership*. Notification means finding out after the fact that something has already occurred. This is the situation that occurred when the proposal to build a new dormitory on North Campus was announced. Consultation means seeking advice. An example of this is the recent decision-making process about the future of the Division of Biological Sciences. In contrast, partnership means sharing fully. Today's resolution seeks partnership in the development of policies on faculty salaries. In particular, the resolution states that the Senate believes that:

. . .It is both appropriate and in Cornell's best interest for the Faculty to be fully involved in a partnership with the administration on all major fronts. . .

and

. . .It must not only be consulted, but also substantively involved in the formulation of major policy and selection of major priorities involving Cornell's faculty, academic programs, curricula, and students.

"In summary, this resolution asks that the administration extend to the issue of faculty salaries that behavior that is fundamental to the university's future success and that has been exhibited in other areas recently.

"Paul Sherman will now present the latest data on faculty salaries, which is the basis for the remainder of the resolution."

Professor Paul Sherman, Neurobiology and Behavior: "The resolution that Kathy was just speaking of goes on to say the following: 'One critical area that could benefit immediately from a unique partnership is faculty salaries. The Senate believes that progress is not proceeding rapidly enough toward average salaries in both the statutory and endowed units that are competitive with those at peer institutions in whose faculty are ranked similarly in quality.' I'd like to give you some understanding of why the Financial Policies Committee and the UFC has made this statement.

"We started two years ago with a general principle. It's a principle that is broadly applicable to our administrators, to our staff, and to our faculty. This general principle is that faculty compensation should be commensurate with faculty quality based on published rankings of institutional quality. The latest published rankings on institutional quality were from the Research Council in 1993. These data have been evaluated in various ways and we have taken the most

conservative evaluation which is the evaluation that ranks Cornell the lowest, and yet even in spite of that, Cornell is ranked 9th in its quality of faculty in [Change Magazine](#) rankings, up from 11th in 1982. Now one approach given the idea of parity in faculty salaries commensurate with quality in order to maintain the quality of the University Faculty is to simply look at our salary ranks relative to that set of five institutions ranked above us and the five institutions ranked below us ([Figure 1](#)). To do so, we would simply take the average salaries published every year from the AAUP publication, [Academe](#). We would simply combine the data for statutory and endowed Cornell for an average and compare them to those institutions. When we do that, according to the 1998 data published last April, the top in this list is Stanford with \$112,000 a year on average. The average for Cornell is about \$83,000 a year. Obviously, we're at the bottom. Now there are various problems with this sort of way of doing it. One, the endowed and statutory sides of Cornell are very different schools. Two, private schools and public institutions across the country pay salaries according to very different scales. And so it seems appropriate to divide these up and compare quality of peers in the public institutions with Cornell's public institutions and quality of peers in the private institutions with Cornell's endowed institutions. Let's start with the data for the endowed colleges. We will separate them by ranks and look at the four schools ranked above and the four schools ranked immediately below Cornell in the latest NRC rankings ([Figure 2](#)). The data are shown for assistant professor at the top, associate professor in the middle, and full professor on the bottom. You could see the schools, Penn, Chicago, Stanford, Northwestern, Duke, Columbia, Princeton and Yale. These were ranked immediately above and immediately below us in the NRC rankings. In the assistant professor category, Cornell ranks right in the middle, right where it ought to be in essence. In associate professors, Cornell goes much further down, and in full professors we rank at the bottom. The disparity is almost \$30,000 in salary at the full professor level and these are average salary figures.

"Now in order to look at the data for statutory Cornell, it's a little bit more difficult trying to arrive at a peer comparison group. Peter Stein, however, when he was Dean of the Faculty, contacted the deans of CALS, Human Ecology, and Vet Medicine and asked them for a list of schools that they regarded as peer schools. He was very quickly able to zero onto a group of nine schools that were seen to be peers by all of these deans. (Although it was generally acknowledged that Cornell is at the top of the list.) Now Cornell statutory, as you know, is a very unusual organization. It isn't really comparable to any other school, but these are the schools that the deans regarded as the most appropriate comparison schools. We looked at the salaries in those groups, and again, this is the 1998 data ([Figure 3](#)), and we were expecting, given what the deans thought of the quality of their schools relative to these schools, that Cornell would be ranked at the top. In terms of assistant and associate professors, again, Cornell ranks at the bottom of assistant professors although the gap is not very great and ranks near the bottom for associate professors, and again the gap is not very great. It ranks at the bottom in full professors, and the gap is quite significant -- about \$10,000 per average professor. One other comparison that seems appropriate here is Cornell salaries compared to the other SUNY centers in 1998 ([Figure 4](#)). The data are a little unusual because the data for Stony Brook and Buffalo include the Health Sciences faculty (these are the published data -- we had nothing to do with that) and Cornell's does include the Vet Medicine faculty so there might be some equivalence there. Among assistant professors, Cornell is ranked second among the SUNY schools, but the disparity among the centers is insignificantly small. Among associate professors, Cornell ranks lower and the disparity is not much. Among full professors, Cornell does rank the lowest and the disparity is about \$5,000 on average.

"These are the 1998 data and these are the data which led us to continued concern about this issue about which I spoke to you last spring. The situation has not gotten to where it is overnight. There has been a long and gradual decline in faculty salaries and that is seen in this graph prepared by Peter Stein. It started in 1972, and the way to read this graph is that the zero line is if Cornell's salaries would be equivalent to those at the eight private peer institutions -- so this is for Cornell's endowed side ([Figure 5](#)). The zero point would mean that we were at the average salaries of all of those peer institutions together. Starting in 1972, we were about 3% low; there was a slight increase and then considerable decline. There was a slight upturn in 1988-89; and there has been a slight upturn in the last year. We're delighted to see that, but the general trend is as you see it. At present time, Cornell's average salaries in the endowed side lay about 17% below the average of the peer comparison group. Now if we look at statutory Cornell, the data are a little bit harder to interpret ([Figure 6](#)). Here's what happened. The zero line is once again the line where Cornell's salaries are equivalent to the peer institutions identified by Cornell statutory deans (this graph has a mistake, it should read Cornell statutory not Cornell endowed.) The point is that the graph is above the zero line in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and then it plummets, so that at the present time in the statutory schools, Cornell is about 7% below the average and, as I told you before, the deans of those schools thought that we ranked at the top of that statutory comparison group, which would mean that salaries should be at the top.

"Now we presented many of these data, except for the 1998 data which weren't available last spring, to the Provost and the President last spring. If you will remember, last spring there was a motion passed by this body having to do with faculty salaries and the last line in the motion was 'be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate would urge the President and the Provost to meet with the Financial Policies Committee at an early and mutually convenient date to discuss how these changes can be achieved.' We had that meeting last May. It was a very cordial meeting and I left the meeting with a sense of enthusiasm -- a positive feeling about the whole thing. We got across many important points. We presented the material that I just presented to you and I thought that there was general agreement. My committee members felt the same way. The approach of comparing quality of peers was a reasonable one, that breaking down salaries by ranks was a reasonable one, that cost of living differences were not on the table because quality is not associated with cost of living salary adjustments but rather with straight pay, dollars on the barrel. There was a reiteration that not only was this a reasonable approach, but that salaries were a high priority with this administration and so we left the meeting with a real sense of great enthusiasm and a sense that this fall we would be starting to discuss the issues of priorities with faculty salaries and try to make some progress. We felt that when we came back this fall, we would be dealing with the following issue that was part of our previous resolution, 'That these changes should be brought about by setting priorities of current teaching resources, including consideration of the relative amounts spent on construction, support staff, and administration, to reflect the need for salary parity among peers across the professorial ranks, rather than by increasing tuition faster than at peer institutions'.

"We met with the administration early in this semester and frankly I have to tell you that I thought we were back to square one all over again. We were presented with a list of all institutions, not just peer institutions. They were not broken down by ranks and cost of living was back in the equation. There was no discussion of a target or a goal of attempting to achieve a parity of faculty salaries. It was just, 'Here it is.' Now, I don't think that our administration is oblivious to this problem by any means. I think that they understand it and they have said again and again that it is a priority with them. Their approach has been that there would be a program -- which is in its third year now -- that there would be a 5% increase per year for five years and they've let us know that that's what they can afford. The Financial Policies Committee and the UFC have a different target in mind and that is parity with quality peers as I showed you before. There is a gap between the two approaches and we feel that the gap needs to be set down and discussed. We were expecting substantive discussions this fall; we did not achieve these substantive discussions. And that is the basis for the resolution before you today to get involved in this partnership again.

"In particular, we're very concerned that if the current program of the administration continues, and this upward trend at the end of the graph continues, it would take approximately 25 years to achieve the goal of parity with quality peers if nothing else changes and no other schools raise their salaries faster than we do. We're worried about the future of Cornell University under those circumstances. How can we maintain the quality of faculty when we're not paying our faculty what they're worth? People have said, 'Well, it hasn't happened yet'. To me, that's like the captain of the Titanic saying, 'We haven't seen an iceberg yet.' When departments start to decay due to the loss of certain individuals, they can start to fall apart very rapidly. So we feel that the entire future of the University is at stake here.

"The same thing could be said for statutory salaries. It would take us 20 years to achieve salary parity with peer institutions, but it would take about 10 years if we had the 5% increase in salary pool, which we do not. It has been sometimes said that the statutory school salaries have to do with what is going on in Albany, but it seems to me that our administration ought to be finding ways to shield the faculty from what's going on in Albany. In other words, we should be solving this problem and moving forward and getting out of the cruel line shown in this graph. I don't think it's good enough to say that we can't do anything about it. The main point is that this resolution is offered not only to raise faculty salaries -- although we regard this in the UFC as a significant problem -- but to try to bring back the partnership in the discussion which has been singularly lacking. We thought we had it going last spring, but it fell apart this fall. So the rest of the resolution says the following, 'To attack this problem in a spirit of cooperation and partnership, the Senate asks the Administration to develop, together with the Financial Policies Committee, faculty salary targets for all ranks in both units, as well as a schedule and financial strategy for meeting these targets. The Senate instructs the Financial Policies Committee to report on the status of this joint effort no later than the April 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate.' Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Yes?"

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research Center: "The single most important statement in this resolution is the last one. 'The Senate is increasingly concerned that the partnership is withering rather than

flourishing.' And I think that it should be emphasized and underlined, especially for the President and the Provost (and I'm sorry that the President wasn't here to hear this part of the discussion). We have some significant dissatisfaction about the process regarding the biological sciences. The process to be more open, perhaps. There are some statements about how the residential community issue was arbitrarily conceived a year ago after a previous attempt a year before to impose another arbitrary rule. Today we had some discussions in the Academic Leadership Series and it is significant to note that a survey of 1998 seniors states that 'The administration's responsiveness to student concerns has one of the lowest scores of the questions.' This is a summary from the Dean of the Faculty. Another report to the ALS today from Bob Johnson points out, 'Many students are cynical about administration sensitivity to student needs.' He goes on to mention, for example, that students cherish and want to keep Balch and Risley dining. I think you understand exactly where I'm leading. There is a cumulative concern from different levels -- students and faculty -- about an administration perceived, with good reason, as very activist, very proactive, extremely decisive, but sometimes with very flawed procedures regarding the process often seeming to be just too autocratic and too unilateral. Therefore, it's worrying on the one hand, but pleasing on the other hand, to see that something dealing with the technical issue of faculty salaries has been broached in a much larger way which concerns the sense of community. We cannot have a sense of community if there are lingering reservations about the autocratic and unilateral decisions of the present administration."

Professor Sherman: "I'd like to thank you for that comment because that's exactly the spirit in which this resolution is offered. It is meant to be a partnership and to try to reestablish in one specific area something that we think would benefit the entire University because I think there's a shared sense on all of the committees of a shared loyalty and love for the place and I worry that if we don't do something, we will end up like the Titanic."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we have several back there."

Associate Professor David Stipanuk, Hotel Administration: "I wondered about the deadline that the committee chose being in April and any considerations the committee had on possibly moving the date up. My concern is that if progress is not reached in this regard, and the April date is used, I question if we're not going to lose the opportunity to respond as a group and possibly take further action that would be less quiet in tone than what's there. Are there any thoughts or observations that the Committee had?"

Professor Sherman: "We thought that would give us plenty of time. We hadn't thought of it this way. Some members of our committee and the UFC are here. Would any of them like to speak to this?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I think that the reason that the April deadline was chosen is because there is a May Senate meeting, and the feeling is that this is not a simple question and it's not the sort of thing where you snap your fingers and come to a solution. I think that, in fairness, we have to allow as much time as possible to allow the process to work. On the other hand, it can't go on forever, and that's why the compromise of April was chosen."

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "I wanted to follow up on Locksley Edmondson's comments in terms of the broader meaning of this resolution, specifically for faculty salaries, that needs to be addressed. The resolution is not only to tell the administration that we're not only seeking to be consulted and to be negotiated with in a meaningful way about this issue or other issues that we request this partnership to be initiated, but also that we as a Faculty Senate expect that the administration should take the initiative to seek our input and to negotiate with us as faculty rather than having us read in the paper that the administration intends to do X, Y, or Z on a certain issue, and then we have to run to the administration and say, 'But wait, wait, we really do want to negotiate about this.' Rather than have this on a case-by-case basis, this resolution seeks to have the administration build into its processes an automatic response of when the faculty should come into it and who should be consulted, how can the student groups be brought in, and how do we have that as an institutionalized and automatic response."

Professor Douglas Haith, Agricultural and Biological Engineering: "I sympathize with my colleagues about the broader implications of this regarding administration and faculty cooperation, but let's not lose sight of the salary issue. I have not seen any evidence at all that the administration has gotten the point that you cannot maintain a first-rate faculty with second-rate salaries. Until that point gets really made and they really believe it, I am not sure that we will make real progress on this, and for me, that's absolutely the bottom line of this discussion."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments on this discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of supporting

the resolution signify by raising your hand. All opposed?"

The motion carried as follows:

The Senate believes that it is both appropriate and in Cornell's best interests for the Faculty to be fully involved in a partnership with the administration on all major fronts as priorities are chosen and a vision of the future is crafted.

One critical area that could benefit immediately from a renewed partnership is faculty salaries. The Senate believes that progress is not proceeding rapidly enough toward average salaries in both the statutory and endowed units that are competitive with those at peer institutions whose faculty are ranked similarly in quality.

To attack this problem in a spirit of cooperation and partnership, the Senate asks the Administration to develop, together with the Financial Policies Committee, faculty salary targets for all ranks in both units, as well as a schedule and financial strategy for meeting these targets. The Senate instructs the Financial Policies Committee to report on the status of this joint effort no later than the April 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The Senate believes that it must be not only consulted, but also substantively involved in the formulation of major policy and selection of major priorities involving Cornell's faculty, academic programs, curricula, and students. The Senate is increasingly concerned that the partnership is withering rather than flourishing.

Speaker Pollak: "We do have Good and Welfare. There has been a request for the time by Kerry Cook. I'll ask her to come up to the podium since she has an issue she would like to discuss."

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

Associate Professor Kerry Cook, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "I'm representing the UFC here in the Good and Welfare section. As you all know, there is considerable concern and reason for that concern that Cornell could do better at being a place where people with different backgrounds, cultural identities, academic interests, and political ideas can interact constructively and freely express themselves. I would suggest that how a university handles these issues, collectively being referred now as the 'Campus Climate Issue', is central to its character and this is especially true for Cornell, perhaps, which was founded as a place where anyone could find instruction. Given the importance of this issue, it seems appropriate that the faculty be a central force in determining this aspect of Cornell's character. Of course, a number of faculty are already involved in this issue as individuals. However, through the Faculty Senate, we have a means of collectively weighing in on the issue, and the UFC would like to invite the Senate to provide input for developing some possibilities.

"One example would be a statement or a resolution from the Senate about the need to have a safe, nurturing environment that maximizes the intellectual and social growth of everyone on campus and encourages the free and open exchange of opinions and ideas. Another possibility is that we could suggest that we, the UFC, could perhaps suggest ways that the faculty in general could play a more active role in this issue. To get a sense of the Senate's reaction to these ideas, I invite you to make any comment during this section especially telling us whether we should proceed in thinking along the lines of a statement or some kind of action on behalf of the faculty. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Before we open it up to input, Brian Chabot wants to comment."

Associate Dean Brian Chabot, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences: "I would say to Kerry, 'Si!', because I know that as a community we seriously need to address these issues, particularly issues of respect, tolerance, and openness to people of different ideas and handling that in a respectful and tolerant way. The community has heard in response to a series of events that have occurred in the past weeks from several organized groups representing students, representing employees, representing the Greek system, and representing the University administration. In some important sense, I think that the Senate has missed an opportunity to provide leadership on these issues by being silent. I have been concerned about this and have expressed those concerns to Bob Cooke. I learned in the last session, the ALS series, that the students are very much concerned about the silence of the faculty. This is an issue that is being discussed in

the dorms currently. So in some sense, the opportunity has not been lost. I also learned from Andy Bass, who is a Faculty-in-Residence individual, that there is a great deal harassment, what he characterizes as hate crimes, that go on routinely -- a lot unreported -- so that the faculty are generally unaware of the extent of this problem and the impact on individual students. We do have an opportunity to forestall future incidents and to address them in a more timely way. I would certainly encourage this group to develop a resolution or some statement on these issues. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Peter?"

Professor Stein: "I am really unaware, I must say, of what Brian is talking about. And I'm willing to bet that a lot of people in this room are unaware of it. So I'm suggesting to the UFC that we have a report that outlines openly and frankly at the first meeting of next semester what it is we're talking about. I think that these are serious matters and I don't think that we will do ourselves any favor by speaking about them in a way where you really can't understand what's going on. Rather than a resolution, I'd be interested in an exposition."

Professor S. Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel: "I think we can study and have reports, but I'm like Brian, and I think that we should quit being silent and before our students go home for the break, we should make a statement to the campus and possibly to the Board of Trustees in January."

Associate Professor Jeremy Rabkin, Government: "I want to agree with Peter Stein. I could not follow what the proposed resolution or statement were about. It's very confusing to me. I think that Peter is right and that many people are in that situation. I think to make a resolution which is so abstract and general, which is just saying that we're all in favor of tolerance, is useless. On the other hand, I did not interpret Peter's suggestion as 'Let's delay and study it.' I think it would be a real contribution to have some semi-authoritative findings on what we are talking about. Just to add one other thing -- I think it's obvious that some of the characterizations and claims that are made about harassment are politically motivated. People are saying, 'We are victims of harassment, therefore we need Latino Studies' or 'therefore we need this, that, or the other thing.' I'm not saying that all things are false, but given that there is some skepticism on the part of many people, I think it would be a real contribution if we had a committee to look into this and present findings."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments? Yes, down in front."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I think that sometimes saying something more than once can be helpful, so I'm going to jump in here. I do think that with the discussions about the incidents of racial harassment and homophobia on this campus that have been going on, and other problems of this sort that have been going on for a long time and, more recently, that it is time for the faculty to step in and say, 'Okay, let's examine this. Let's examine the experience of the students of different races and different sexual preferences. What are the experiences of different groups on this campus And report about that.' I think it's very useful to be followed with figuring out what we as a faculty can do to help create an environment where we respect all individual's rights to be here, to learn, to be free from harassment, and to have this university where we respect each other and openly discuss issues as opposed to having an environment where we have people who are afraid of incidents of racial harassment and homophobia that they have been faced with. I think that this can be the start of something really constructive where we go beyond resolutions where we make statements, but don't follow up, and an important role the faculty should take."

Speaker Pollak: "In the back?"

Professor Edmondson: "I planned to leave ten minutes ago, but I'm glad I stayed. Let me say one thing. I think that it's entirely appropriate for this body to express concern. But after all of the special reports that we have seen in recent times about incidents of racial harassment, for one Senator to imply that minorities are going around making things up, is insulting. You are being very insulting, let me tell you that right now, Jeremy. Now let me proceed. It would be quite appropriate for the Senate to express itself. We don't have to be more specific at the moment. We could also try to get more specific information so that later we could follow up with more action that we might want to take as Senators or as faculty members to try to alleviate these incidents and make a better climate of racial harmony on this campus. Don't you ever believe that this country has yet solved this awful history of bigotry which rises ever so often."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments? I think it would be beneficial if we had a straw vote of directing the Dean of the Faculty to move forward in this area in whatever appropriate manner it is he would take. All of those in favor of that

please raise your hand."

Professor Rabkin: "Wait, what are we voting for?"

Speaker Pollak: "We are voting to move forward with some kind of report, some kind of a movement if there is interest from this group. Again, a show of hands to indicate to the Dean that we should move forward with some kind of action. Are there any other Good and Welfare?"

Professor Rabkin: "Locksley, I was not saying this about any Senator. I was just responding to what I see in the newspapers, such as the Cornell Sun. I'm not at all saying this about Senators or about professors or administrators."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we are before 6 o'clock, I need a motion to adjourn. Thank you."

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty