

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1999

The Speaker, John Pollak, Animal Science, called the meeting to order. He then called on Dean Cooke for his opening remarks.

1. REMARKS FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "There are two items that I would like to describe for you. The first is a presentation that is going to occur later on in the agenda by Professor Harris on the campus climate and I hope that the Senate will be actively involved in that because I think it has the possibility of being one of the more significant things that we've undertaken in recent years. I think that it could play a significant role in making this a better place to live and work. I have one other thing to describe for you and you will hear more about this later in the agenda as well. It has to do with the Financial Policies Committee. My predecessor will give a description of that in a few minutes. I wanted to share a few quick items that I think are worthy of being brought to your attention.

"Here's a curve ([Appendix A](#), attached) that has worried me for quite some time. This is tuition not adjusted for inflation. It has, in my view, a very alarming trend. From 1981 to the present is almost a straight-line increase. Of course, each year the percent increase is less, but the absolute increase in nominal dollars is almost a straight line. This is endowed, non-resident statutory, resident statutory, and room and board, which is also going up. Here are some of the same curves ([Appendix B](#), attached) in inflation-adjusted terms, corrected for constant dollars. Constant dollars means that if it were flat, there would be no growth. With a positive slope like this, it means that it's growing at a very substantial pace. The thing that is most concerning, in my view, is that we have no contingency plan for when we do reach the end point of the process of raising tuition every year. As best as I can judge, we have no contingency plans to revert to if, in fact, we hit the wall. Here is another reflection of the same data that I have shown you before ([Appendix C](#), attached). The top curve is revenue from tuition. You can see that in 1981, the revenue from sponsored research was roughly comparable to revenue from our students. You can see that now the students are carrying a much bigger load of financing the University. In my view, that fact will change the nature of this University if it is allowed to continue for a substantial period of time. This really can have an impact.

"Here's another graph that I think this group needs to see ([Appendix D](#), attached). The Financial Policies Committee has had some difficulty in deciding whether there is a more severe salary crisis in the statutory or the endowed colleges. The endowed has in place a program of five percent a year for five years, and we are in the second year of that program. This is constant dollars, so a flat line would mean that it is constant. You can see that the statutory colleges were zigging and zagging with a slightly downward trend and are now in a slightly upward trend, and the endowed is climbing steadily. Much to my dismay, I have been unable to convince the Financial Policies Committee where the crisis is, and we have not addressed in any meaningful way, the statutory colleges' salaries. Let me stop at that."

Speaker Pollak: "Is there a question or two on that?"

Assistant Professor Penny Becker, Sociology: "In looking at the raising revenue streams and the increasing gap between revenue from tuition versus other sources, is this a similar pattern seen in comparable institutions?"

Dean Cooke: "I don't know. Do we have someone who does know?"

Professor Becker: "It wouldn't make it alright, but it would give us a better idea."

Dean Cooke: "I would not be surprised if this is characteristic of many other private universities. Maybe the state universities with different funding mechanisms have not gotten as much out of alignment, but my hunch is that the state schools around the country probably increase more. I don't know whether the Provost has any knowledge of what is going on in other places. The real problem is our basic cost in people and we have not found a way to increase our productivity in an economic sense. We work hard, but in the sense of more students educated per faculty. So, there's a two percent rule that says universities are going to be out of balance by two percent."

Don M. Randel, University Provost: "It's clear that the budgets for sponsored research have not gone up over time at anywhere near the rate that tuition has gone up. You can look at the NSF budget over time to see that. What's important to bear in mind is that they are separate streams of revenue and you can't spend money from one of them on the other and you cannot take money from sponsored programs and spend it on the kinds of things that you would spend tuition on. Sponsored research volume has never paid the bulk of faculty salaries, so in that sense, it's not quite right to think of this as creating a gap that is putting more of a burden on undergraduate tuition. What is putting more of a burden on undergraduate tuition in terms of sponsored research is that the federal government is now asking for increasing matching funds for practically everything you apply for, and what that means in order to keep the volume of sponsored research at the rate at which we would like it to grow for scientific reasons, is that one does have to pitch in more unrestricted money to get the federal funds. That is the pressure on tuition. In the main, you wouldn't be able to take sponsored research money and use it to raise faculty salaries even if you wanted to.'

Speaker Pollak: "Any questions?"

Peter Stein, Professor of Physics: "You might even argue that, God-forbid, the sponsored research projects kept in pace with the tuition increase, we'd be broke."

Provost Randel: "Yes, it's a proposition in which you lose money on each transaction."

Speaker Pollak: "Well, we sort of migrated into the next item on the agenda, so while you're standing, are there are any questions for the Provost?"

2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Randel: "Yesterday we made our annual pilgrimage *en force* to Albany. The President and I and the statutory deans and a good many faculty members, some of them present today, went to this occasion which is an opportunity to meet and greet everybody on the state scene and it ended with a big reception. This reception, in fact, turns out to be the biggest thing of its kind that takes place in Albany. We do have lots of friends there and I think that the resonance is good and one can be reasonably optimistic that the legislature will restore everything that the governor took out, in a manner of speaking, of his budget. So we will not confront the problem of no resources on a continuing basis with which to fund the salary programs that were agreed to a year or so ago. What's not clear yet is what will be negotiated with the UUP, the Union that represents the SUNY faculty for the academic year of 1999-2000 and beyond. I think that there is considerable sentiment in the state legislature and elsewhere that negotiation ought to be settled and some contract ought to be reached. One of the messages we stressed yesterday was that Cornell competes for faculty in a quite different market from the bulk of the state universities, and that whatever may be reached as a settlement with the SUNY union may not be taken as sufficient to meet the needs of an institution such as Cornell. We are steadily pressing for something that would give us more flexibility in whatever SUNY manages to negotiate. The other thing is that the CSEA, the Civil Service Employees' Association, has made a contract now which calls for a series of increases to their salaries that steps up from two percent to three and a half percent. History has been that there has been pressure on a UUP settlement to follow in the wake of the CSEA contract and we pushed soundly that that is something that won't do for us. Are there any questions?"

Professor David Wilson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology: "I thought that, in fact, the other university centers had an average salary that was higher than Cornell for their full professor staff."

Provost Randel: "That is a matter that has been steadily addressed as well, and part of the talking points yesterday included just that. The situation there is that if you take statutory salaries and normalize them to a nine-month basis, lopping off the two elevenths, on that basis the salaries for full professors are, on average, something like ten thousand dollars shy of the university center. That is an argument that we have made steadily and consistently. That is a slightly complicated calculation as you know because one has to think of what the prospects are for summer salaries in certain fields. Clearly, in biochemistry, if we take the 11/9 and compress it into 9/9, then that would liberate you to compete for a summer salary with a research grant and you'd be better off. In many fields, you could compress it to nine months, and there wouldn't be an opportunity to do anything, but you'd look better in this comparison. At the SUNY centers, the salaries are overwhelmingly nine-month.

"Let me say one other thing before answering questions. The President's Council heard a discussion this morning on

information sciences on the campus, which is but the beginning of a conversation we must have campus-wide and across all disciplines. We will put in place this week a task force and I have met with Kathleen Rasmussen to receive the nominees from the Senate. It will be a Task Force on Information Sciences. The history and antecedents of this are the task force of three years ago led by John Hopcroft and Mark Scott that identified advanced materials, genomics, and information sciences as three strategic enabling areas that the University would need to pursue if it was going to maintain its edge in the decades to come. The advanced materials effort has moved along smartly. We have permitted ourselves two major new facilities in this area and there has been considerable strengthening of the CHES enterprise, and so forth. You will have heard a great deal about genomics and you can see the shape that it is beginning to take and the really quite interesting collaborative arrangement structure. It involves a collaboration with the Medical School, which is quite unprecedented and that I think will be for the good of us all. So we wish, now, to undertake a somewhat more focused and systematic approach to the information science question. This is not just about computer science. It is about how information and our ability to retrieve it and understand it will affect every discipline that is conducted on the campus and will have the profoundest effects on how we conduct our instructional role as well as our research and extension roles. This task force is going to be asked to proceed relatively quickly to give some kind of account of the landscape by the end of this semester and following up with a report in the Fall, thinking about what the implications of the information revolution are for the University and its activities and in what ways we need to be organized to respond most effectively to those challenges. Part of what's at issue here is not just to see change in the way we all come to know what we know and look for places to find out more, it's also a major emphasis being placed by the federal government on research in these areas and substantial commercial interests in the matter, as well. We need to know how to respond to these and whether we wish to be on the leading edge of what the federal government will wish to sponsor in the way of research. Questions?"

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "I'm interested in contacting all of the faculty in CALS in order to put together a concise and fair questionnaire that accurately reflects the views of the CALS faculty concerning the reappointment of the dean. This would be a survey initiated at the grass roots level using the expertise of the CALS faculty in conducting surveys and analyzing data. I would like to use the Cornell computing system, including lists of the CALS faculty and their e-mail addresses to come up with a fair survey that quantitatively reflects an estimate of the faculty's position on this important issue. My question to you is, do you have any reason why I should not conduct a survey of the CALS faculty on this issue?"

Provost Randel: "I have had discussions, as has Vice Provost Garza, with the CALS senate, which has been interested in undertaking a similar kind of canvass, and we have worked with them to undertake a canvassing of the faculty. I guess I would prefer that you work with the senate before you launch a wholly independent effort. We're not going to decline to read things people send us; simultaneously, it is unprecedented in any college to have a systematic poll of this kind. Nevertheless, the faculty senate in CALS has an interest in this matter and we have agreed to work with them, and I guess I would prefer you talk with them before you launch an independent effort."

Professor Wayne: "I don't believe they're interested in coming up with one, single, quantitative number that will reflect the faculty's views."

Provost Randel: "Perhaps not."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 1999 MEETING

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, that's the time allotted, so we're going to have to move on. We have a quite a schedule put before us by the committee for this meeting. You had an opportunity to read the minutes on the Web. Are there any questions or comments regarding those? Okay, seeing none, we will accept the minutes posted on the Web. Now Kathleen Rasmussen will give us a report of the Nominations and Elections Committee."

4. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "It might not look from this list that the Nominations and Elections Committee has been very busy, but I assure you that it has because it is our time to develop the slate of candidates for elections for the Nominations and Elections Committee, the University Faculty Committee, and the At-Large seats in the Senate. We hope to bring you those suggestions at the next meeting."

Affirmative Action Committee

Maria Cristina Garcia, A&S

Faculty Advisory Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid

Antonie Blackler, A&S

E. Wood Kelley, A&S

Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments

Barry Adams, A&S

Financial Policies Committee

Cornelia Farnum, Vet

Minority Education Committee

Henry Ricciuti, CHE

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any questions or comments on the nominations as presented?"

Associate Professor Steven Vavasis, Computer Science: "The Provost just mentioned that you gave him nominees for the Task Force on Information Sciences. Is that another transparency?"

Professor Rasmussen: "That's not another transparency. It will come to you at the next meeting. What I've brought you today is what was available as of one week ago, which we had to send out. We will know at the next meeting which of our nominees have been selected and what the rest of the committee looks like."

Speaker Pollak: "Other questions? Comments? The next item on our agenda is for Dean Cooke to give us some clarification on parliamentary procedures, relating specifically to the resolution of the last meeting."

5. CLARIFICATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES

Dean Cooke: "We are not aware of any member proposing an amendment before the body, but I felt obliged out of fairness to the group to point out procedures, which I did not have with me at the last meeting.

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate, in September 1996, adopted rules of procedure to facilitate consultation between members of the Senate and those whom they represent, and

WHEREAS, the UFC was charged with evaluating those procedures in the summer of 1997 and the UFC has completed this task,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the UFC recommends that the Senate amend the procedures as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED, that Senate meetings be governed by the following rules of procedure.

1. For a motion to be placed on the agenda of a Senate meeting, it must be endorsed by either a Faculty Committee, the UFC (on its own initiatives or in response to a request by a Senate member), any four members of the Senate or any twenty-five University Faculty members. Motions will be distributed to the Senate membership by the UFC at least a week in advance of the meeting.

2. Members are strongly encouraged to send all proposed amendments to such motions to the UFC, who will distribute them to all members at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Non-substantive (i.e., stylistic, grammatical, or clarifying) amendments may be freely introduced at a meeting without prior

circulation. The speaker will rule substantive amendments out of order, but the speaker's ruling can be reversed by majority vote of the body. Members may also move to postpone action to the next meeting if they believe a new approach deserves full consideration.

3. Distribution of motions and amendments will be by e-mail. Any member may elect to receive the material by campus mail. Copies of all motions and amendments will be available at the meeting.

4. The order of business of every meeting will include a brief "General Good and Welfare" section, where remarks (but not motions) on any subject of interest to the faculty will be in order. Faculty members must inform the Speaker of their intention to address the Senate prior to the start of the meeting. In the absence of prospective speakers, the Speaker will re-allocate the reserved time to other agenda items.

"Item number two deals with the procedure of when the faculty can judge whether something is substantive or not and it provides that the chair can rule whether it is substantive and the body can vote on whether it is or is not substantive. If the body said it is not substantive, then it could be considered by a simple majority. Since that was confusing last time, and it was clear that some had concerns about it, I felt obliged to bring it back. We've allocated some time, which we may not need, but we did it out of respect."

Speaker Pollak: "I wasn't here then. Okay, we've immediately gotten ahead of schedule and I would ask if the Provost will address one more question."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "Point of clarification. I believe that he just said that the body could decide if it was substantive, but I thought that the issue was not whether or not they could decide if it was substantive; they couldn't, by their charge, accept whether it was substantive or not."

Dean Cooke: "Professor Stein is here, and since he was part of the architecture of this, he might care to speak to it. Ordinarily, if you want to change your standard operating procedures, it would require a 2/3 vote. Otherwise, if you have a rule that certain things have to have prior notices on, normally you would require a 2/3 vote. In this case, it was deliberately said that if the chair ruled that an amendment was substantive, the body could then appeal the decision of the chair, and by a simple majority declare that it is not substantive and proceed with the vote. Is that correct, Peter?"

Professor Stein: "Those aren't the words that the people who drafted that had in mind. It's supposed to be directly out of Robert's that there is no supreme court for a parliamentary body and Dean Cooke is right that it takes a 2/3 vote to suspend the rules and it is sometimes unclear and the speaker has to decide whether something is inside the rules or outside the rules. In that situation, if the body believes that the Speaker has ruled in error, someone has a perfect right to challenge the ruling of the Speaker, and by a majority vote, the body can decide whether the Speaker was correct or not. A responsible body does not use this majority vote to suspend the rules, but I suppose an irresponsible body might. The idea of putting that in is because people imagined situations where it wasn't clear if something was substantive or not and the idea was that the body had the right to decide for itself whether the Speaker's ruling was correct. It's not meant to be a deviation from Robert's. "

Dean Cooke: "If you care to address it, that in and of itself is not the agenda item, send a letter to me and I'll see that it's considered by the UFC. Yes?"

Associate Professor Jeremy Rabkin, Government: "As soon as Professor Stein mentioned irresponsible bodies, I thought I should stand up. The way this thing is worded now 'The speaker will rule substantive amendments out of order, but the speaker's ruling can be reversed by a majority vote of the body' - it doesn't say the grounds on which the body has to act. I'm very happy with that because they ought to be able to consider what they want, substantive or not. I think it's a real curiosity that the rule that was set up earlier didn't make a lot of sense. It seems to me that there is sense in saying that we shouldn't take up motions on whole new subjects without warning people of what's going to come up, but when people have been told in advance that we're going to be discussing this issue the main reason you have the discussion is so that people can sort out how they want to frame this. That means that you have to be able to make amendments, even substantive amendments. I'm happy the way this is, because it allows those of us who are

irresponsible to put through amendments."

Dean Cooke: "The agenda item was to discuss whether free expression was part of the issue, and since that's not the case, I propose we deal with parliamentary procedure after this meeting."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, I cut off a question that was up earlier for the Provost, and since we've caught up rather rapidly why don't you go ahead and take the question."

Associate Professor David Stipanuk, Hotel Administration: "Later today we're going to be discussing the Strategic Plan for Athletics and Physical Education. On January 22, your office sent out a memorandum that dealt with the issue of athletics admissions, in which a number of what were called 'changes around the early credentials review process' were set forward along with a provision which included, and I'll quote from the last paragraph, 'the dean will discuss with each college athletics point person any decision where his assessment differs from that of the college. In the event of irreconcilable differences, the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid is authorized to make the decision in not more than 20 cases University-wide.' This, of course, assumes continuing cooperation among all parties and the quote says that this is a somewhat temporary move and that you will review experience at the end of the semester. Is this to be viewed as a somewhat implemented tactic in relation to the Strategic Plan? Or how are we to view these actions in light of the item we're going to be discussing later?"

Provost Randel: "There are three quite separate things at issue. One is that memorandum that I sent to the deans in the wake of the discussion of matters referred to in the Deans' Council; the second is the Strategic Plan produced by the Athletics department; the third is the report that has been produced by a subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. These are really proceeding quite independent of one another. The Strategic Plan produced by the Department of Athletics and Physical Education was produced on its own recognizance and is not the product of the administration. It has been conveyed to the administration in just the way that any number of other units might well construct a strategic plan and hope to get more resources in consequence thereof. It is not an action item as something the Trustees are voting on or not voting on. Similarly, the report that the Board of Trustees is producing is not something that is being voted on or acted on, into legislation. It is simply the views of this subcommittee for the Trustees, conveyed to the administration, at which the administration will need to respond in due course, just as the administration will need to respond to the request of athletics and lots of other things. So the memorandum that I sent has nothing to do with the Strategic Plan for the Department of Athletics and Physical Education. My belief about that is that the situation that we have between the undergraduate colleges and the department of athletics has functioned extraordinarily well in the last couple of years. I myself don't believe that what is implied there about procedures represents a fundamental change.

"Now, what has alarmed some number of people is the matter of 20 cases in which the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid would be able to make a decision. I myself do not believe that there will ever be a need to exercise those slots. But this is not a new idea, it has been around forever as one of the ways of simplifying the procedures. Rather than have an elaborate machinery, let someone centrally have some many 'wild cards', as they have been described, and simplify the whole matter in those terms. Nobody in the central administration, least of all me, has any interest in admitting Cornell students who cannot prosper here. My own belief is that if the mechanisms that we already have in place continue to function as they have within the last 18 months, there will be no need to have this question about any number of 'wild cards'. Simultaneously, there is a considerable interest on the part of many people on how we are doing in intercollegiate athletics and what I propose is to demonstrate that we can deal with this and that we'll deal with it in ways that reflect the academic standards of all the colleges. I can't believe that anyone centrally is simply going to stuff something down the throat of one of the colleges. It would clearly entail a substantial discussion before any such thing were to happen. This was not intended to be a big deal, and it certainly has nothing to do with the Strategic Plan. "

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, now I'll call on Robert Harris to come down and make a presentation on campus dialogue."

6. PRESENTATION ON CAMPUS DIALOG BY ROBERT HARRIS

Associate Professor Robert Harris, Africana Studies and Research Center: "We've become a more diverse campus within an increasingly diverse society and a more interdependent global community, but we have not become a more inclusive campus. There are many individuals and groups who, because of their race, gender, ethnicity, national

origins, sexual orientation, age, religion, or disability, do not feel a part of the campus community and who, in some instances, have become the objects of harassment. Because of some incidents of harassment this past fall, several resolutions have been passed by the University Faculty Senate, the Employee Assembly, and the Student Assembly. I'd like to read from the resolution that the Student Assembly passed, where they resolved that, 'the Student Assembly recommends to the University administration, its department of Campus Life, the Office of the Dean of Students, and all undergraduate colleges, that steps be taken to provide Cornell community members with adequate educational opportunities about the importance of tolerance and the appreciation of diversity.' This is part of a set of resolutions passed by the Student Assembly.

"Given these resolutions, we have a planning committee in place to look at how we might open a campus dialog on difference at the University and not just the issue of diversity, but how do we include a diverse student body, staff body, and faculty body, into the campus community. We have about 20 members on this planning committee representing students, faculty, and staff. We've been meeting to try to see what kind of programs we could put in place for the campus. The purpose of the discussion we're proposing would be more descriptive than analytical, more of a dialog not a debate, to provide an opportunity to place issues on the table. Those issues will probably differ across units, but we hope that this dialog will shape the path of development and the issues unpacked will take us to further stages.

"We're looking right now at a scenario that we're working with the PEWS program, the Programs for Employment and Workplace Systems, in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. We've included copies of their proposal for you to take a look at. Basically, the proposal calls for a pilot program in the spring, hopefully during the second week of April, taking place in at least one department of the various colleges. We're basically drawing on a model that has been used by the Johnson Graduate School of Management. This would call for a panel of about three students, three faculty members, and three staff members, engaged in a discussion for about two and a half hours, looking at the question of how they have experienced difference at Cornell University. That is the central question that we are posing. This discussion, in a fishbowl-type setting, will be initiated by the panel and then joined in by those attending the session. The discussion will be facilitated by professional staff, someone from the PEWS organization. We're hoping to get volunteers as we call upon individuals from within the different colleges. Hopefully, members of the Faculty Senate would serve as a host, together with the dean of the college for this particular discussion. What we learn from the pilot discussions that will take place this spring, we hope to discuss further in our planning committee and work toward implementing a University-wide discussion in the fall of 1999. Bob Johnson, the Director of Cornell United Religious Works, is co-chair of the committee with me. Are there any questions?"

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research Center: "I do not think I heard you right. Did you say something about the discussion being descriptive rather than analytical?"

Professor Harris: "Yes, I did say that. We would like for people to put issues on the table rather than spend a lot of time, initially, analyzing the issue. This is a first step, as we see it."

Professor Edmondson: "I'm confused."

Professor Harris: "With the answer?"

Professor Edmondson: "No, with the methodology if I may use that word. I thought that in a dialog that analysis was one of the basic principles. How can one draw such a distinction? Clearly, I know your thoughts and the objectives you hope to obtain by focusing on the issues rather than analyze them, but it's absurd."

Professor Harris: "Well, we would like to give individuals the opportunity to describe their particular experiences as a beginning, but if we spend a great deal of time analyzing those experiences, initially, we will not have an opportunity to get the issues on the table."

Professor Edmondson: "Initially? Will there be an opportunity for analysis later?"

Professor Harris: "Certainly."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we have three questions."

Professor Wilson: "I recall that there were some serious incidents of harassment earlier and I wanted to know if they had ceased. I'm referring to specific harassment situations."

Professor Harris: "I think that some of those issues to personal safety have improved, but there's still graffiti, there is still some individual harassment -- not as much as we heard in the fall. We've also put in place, through the Assistant Vice President for Student and Academic Services, a response team so that we're looking immediately at issues of harassment as they arise and talking to those individuals who have been the target of the harassment with Psychological Services. So a response has been put in place that students felt was absent in the fall. Also, you may have noticed that lighting on campus has improved."

Speaker Pollak: "There's another question over there."

Associate Professor Michael Shapiro, Communication: "In discussing this with the faculty in my department, many of them expressed a desire to bring this down to students, but those who had attempted it expressed considerable pessimism in the ability to engage students in discussions without disrupting class. What I'm suggesting, and I have no problem with what you're suggesting, that in the long term, what a lot of faculty need, particularly those of us who teach classes in which there is an opportunity to discuss this, is help with developing the skills to do this. And if you would bring us resources and help us develop those skills, we would really appreciate it."

Professor Harris: "That's very good to hear."

Professor Don Barr, Policy Analysis and Management: "I just wanted to follow up on that. I've participated in these sorts of discussions before where one person brings up an issue and we talk about it forever and analyze it. I think that this plan is valuable because once the issues are all out, if you prefer to do the analysis, you've already completed the problem recognition stage."

Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "I'm interested in if at any point you're planning on introducing community relations. It was raised in the meeting we had earlier in the semester, and it's a good suggestion, but I don't hear it in this plan. Town-gown relations, basically."

Professor Harris: "Right now we're basically looking at the campus climate. We do exist within a broader community, and as you recall, we did have a program that was brought to us by PBS looking at dialog on race relations. This is something that we're going to have to take back to the community because right now we're focusing on the campus."

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I'm sorry what did Dean Cooke ask?"

Speaker Pollak: "Dean Cooke just asked if he knew what was going on in the Johnson School and Professor Harris said he did not."

Professor McAdams: "I do."

Speaker Pollak: "Maybe the Dean would like to elaborate on that?"

Dean Cooke: "The Johnson School has had, by all accounts, a strong effort that is quite similar to this program and I just wanted to call attention that we've already been through it in one college, so we do have a sense of where this is going to take us."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, now we'll move on to the Resolution on the Strategic Plan for Athletics and Physical Education. Peter?"

7. RESOLUTION ON STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ATHLETICS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Professor Peter Schwarz, Textiles and Apparel: "I'm here to present a proposal from the University Faculty Committee. The proposal itself is based on three main documents/events: the NCAA Self-Study Report that is still in draft form, which will be sent to the NCAA; the Strategic Plan for Athletics and Physical Education; and the Forum that was sponsored by the Faculty Senate during which the plan was presented and only limited discussion was

allowed to take place due to time constraints.

"Since this resolution was put on the agenda, there have been two events that have impacted us. The first is that the College of Arts & Sciences, at its faculty meeting on Wednesday, passed a resolution similar to the one I'm about to present on behalf of the University Faculty Committee. This is not surprising because I lifted this resolution from theirs, with their permission. The second event was the submission of answers to the questions that had been solicited from faculty that we didn't have time to get into at the Forum by Director Moore. Those are on the website in PDF format and I don't know how many of you took the time to look at them.

"Basically the University Faculty Committee, in proposing this resolution, has three main areas of interest. First, is the maintaining of current high-quality physical education and intramural programs while strengthening intercollegiate athletics and, in particular, how that can be done. One question that was submitted was why there was so much emphasis on intercollegiate athletics and slightly less emphasis on intramural programs, wellness programs, and physical education programs, and the answer Director Moore gave in response, I'm paraphrasing, was that these programs are already excellent and we have no worries about these programs. It is intercollegiate athletics that is in difficulty. There is some concern how one might, with the budget that is given to the department, maintain some areas while strengthening the other. In the report, the Department of Athletics and Physical Education claims to currently receive 1% of the total University budget and that accounts for 40% of its operating expenditures. The concern is that other Ivy League institutions give more. Penn, for example, funds 82% of its athletic budget from University funds; and Harvard, 86%, and the statement is made that one could consider that Cornell's department of Athletics and Physical Education is underfunded. There's a concern that in order to maintain the quality of the programs outside of intercollegiate athletics while strengthening intercollegiate, it will lead to higher user fees for current events, reduced operating so that you maintain the strength of some programs while eliminating others. It's not clear in the Strategic Plan how this is going to be done.

"The second concern is to maintain current admission policies and procedures. I was not planning on bringing up the Provost's memo but it is certainly underlying some of this. The Strategic Plan talks about the problems of decentralized colleges and the complex admissions processes. There is total agreement with the Provost's statement that the programs are working well. There has been some streamlining programs that have been done. The figures seem to be encouraging in that although admitted athletes tend to score lower on the Academic Index, which is a way of normalizing the scores of all the applicants by taking the average of the SAT scores and scaling them to between 20 and 80, adding the student's high school ranking that has also been converted onto a scale of 20 and 80 and adding the higher of the student's SAT average or the average of the level 2 exams also on a scale of 20 to 80, so that a perfect Academic Index would be 240, the 6-year graduation rates are the same. According to Ivy League rules, if we admit student athletes whose Academic Indices are lower than 169 Cornell must indicate why this is a special case and confirm that the student would have been admitted if he or she was not an athlete. But our student athletes are graduating and they are successful with the current admission policies and procedures.

"Finally, there has been a concern to address the cost of this Strategic Plan and the projected sources of revenue both internal and external. It is very high on marketing and very low on analytical measures.

"With that, the University Faculty Committee proposes to the University Faculty Senate the following resolution. It is in your packet, but I will go ahead and read it.

WHEREAS, the University Faculty has a strong interest in the overall educational experience and well-being of its students, and endorses the value of a broad-based program in athletics and physical education in undergraduate life, and

WHEREAS, the University Faculty does not endorse diverting significant existing or potential resources from these priorities or compromising processes for admitting students to the several colleges so as to achieve higher rankings in intercollegiate athletics,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate urges the Provost and the President to ask the authors of the Strategic Plan for the Department of Athletics and Physical Education that is dated October 12, 1998 to modify the plan so that it will:

Enhance Cornell's broad-based programs in athletics and physical education;

Commit the Department of Athletics and Physical Education to honor the standards and processes for admission to the various individual colleges; and

Provide a detailed financial plan that is consistent with these goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty to communicate this resolution to the Board of Trustees.

"The latter is in there because as the Provost described, the Board of Trustees also has a subcommittee that is going to examine this and we felt that they should have a sense of the faculty feeling."

Speaker Pollak: "There is an amendment to this resolution that needs to be discussed and voted on prior to coming back to the resolution. I'll call on Peter Stein to present the amendment."

Professor Stein: "Maybe I can do it from here. You all have the amendment on the blue sheet. The concern of the people who propose the amendment is that one part of the Strategic Plan was to significantly raise the fundraising for intercollegiate athletics. The amendment was inspired by Bruce Ganem in the Chemistry and Chemical Biology Department in the Arts College, who pointed out that there are constrained resources. There are constrained fundraising resources and a limited donor base. If, in fact, fundraising efforts are increased in one area, they will most likely be decreased in others. Professor Ganem expressed sadness that he didn't have the time to make up an amendment and to speak today, but this amendment speaks to that. I'll read it to you.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that given other unmet needs of greater importance to the future well-being of Cornell, the Faculty Senate strongly urges the administration to assign low priority to the diversion of university resources or fund-raising activities to intercollegiate athletics.

"I would just like to point out that it does not say 'no priority,' it says, 'low priority.' The answer that is often given is that there are donors who will only contribute to intercollegiate athletics. Should we refuse those? Of course not, we all value intercollegiate athletics and wish that Cornell's teams would win more, but when the development office assigns priorities in what they approach donors for, the people that support this amendment believe that intercollegiate athletics should be low on that list."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?"

Professor Wilson: "I oppose the amendment. It seems to me that the 'Whereas' in the resolution basically says that same thing in a more tactful way. I don't see the point of slapping the Department of Athletics and Physical Education in the face. It already says that we don't endorse 'diverting significant existing or potential resources from these priorities.' I think it's already there and I don't see why we have to add this explicit slam."

Professor Stein: "Well, the answer to that is that if you look carefully at what it says, it says that 'the University Faculty does not endorse diverting significant existing or potential resources from these priorities. It doesn't say from other activities. It says we should not divert resources from intramural athletics to intercollegiate athletics, and that's not really what the Strategic Plan endorsed anyway. The Strategic Plan says it wants to start a new fundraising activity for intercollegiate athletics, which would then compete with the other priorities. I agree with you that this is somewhat more boldly stated, but it speaks plainly. I think that the 'Whereas,' which is not part of the resolution in any case, and often the 'Whereas' is lost in transmission, does not say the same thing that the amendment does."

Dean Cooke: "Point of order. The 'Whereas' is, in fact, part of the resolution. This entire object is part of the transmission, so the rationale may not be that they will not."

Professor Doug Haith, Agricultural and Biological Engineering: "I'd like to speak against the amendment. I do think that it goes too far. I might be comfortable with it if I could see all of the other priorities that we're talking about here. But I think that all of us here could concede that the intercollegiate athletics is an important part of the athletic program. I don't know if it should have the lowest priority or a low priority in the allocation of University resources. I don't know which programs should be higher than it and I don't know which programs should be lower than it, but I

am not willing to *a priori*

without looking at all of those priorities to say that the Department of Athletics and Physical Education should be at the bottom or pretty low. I think that's a premature judgement. If that sort of decision wants to be made by the faculty, then I think that we should evaluate those different priorities."

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I have a question. Do we have any idea how the success of our intercollegiate athletics affects fundraising as a whole? I'm not a utilitarian, but this is kind of a utilitarian question. If successful teams make a significant impact on fundraising as a whole, we may be hurting ourselves substantially by approving this amendment or resolution. I wonder if we have any good data on that. Is this something that the Development Office has ever studied? Or do any other universities have experience with this? If passing the amendment and/or the resolution hurts us overall financially, then it's a rather poor business and we should give careful thought to that. I could imagine that a successful intercollegiate program might help our fundraising as a whole. I don't go to most of the events and I think that at the last football game I went to there was a good play and I shouted 'Bravo!' and my sister-in-law told me you don't say that at football games. I think it might hurt us if we were to approve."

Professor Schwartz: "There were no hard data, to my recollection, presented at the Forum that showed a general trend. However, there were anecdotal data about Duke University having won the National Championship in basketball and how that increased alumni donations and applicants. Northwestern, after they won in Big Ten football, experienced an increase in revenue, and please correct me if someone knows more, from sales of Northwestern sweatshirts and things like that. The third was the College of Charleston, which no one had ever heard about (but which is a pretty good school) until they started winning football games. So those are three anecdotal examples that it does affect the University. These were presented at the Forum as evidence that good athletics will stimulate alumni donations."

Speaker Pollak: "Back on the amendment. Is this on the amendment?"

Professor Reppy: "It's in response to the two points just made. I come from Chicago and I follow the Northwestern scene, and if you follow it, you know what happened subsequently. That is, they had a terrible scandal and athletes lives are ruined; the team is on probation. I think that speaks to even if you could make money off of athletics, it would be a mistake for a university, as I understand Cornell to be, to take that route. The reason for this is that it essentially commercializes and commodifies an activity that is supposed to be part of a whole, educated, complete life, not this distorted win-for-any-reason rationale. In particular, I thought that was what the Ivy League was about. To go in the direction that we've got these teams to make money goes against that spirit. With respect to priorities, at the Arts College meeting, we were told that the Athletics Department was hoping for 10-12 Endowed positions, so I think that's the kind of priority we can think about when we think of other departments or programs that we would rather see new endowed chairs in."

Speaker Pollak: "Are you ready to vote on the amendment? We can always discuss the resolution after that vote."

Professor Barr: "I'd just like to speak against the amendment because I think that the whole resolution is somewhat negative towards Athletics and Physical Education and it seems to me that the extra amendment is like a slap in the face. We're telling them that they can't go out and raise money. I feel that the amendment goes too far."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, is there anymore on the amendment?"

Professor Kenneth Strike, Education: "I guess my basic reaction was too tepid. It seems to me that the reach of athletics has nothing to do with physical education except to compete with it for time and space. Many of us are spectators when we would rather be participants. I guess I'm also hoping for someone to smuggle in another amendment that says that the Physical Education Department should install shower heads that really work so we don't freeze to death. Intercollegiate athletics in the United States is irrational and the fact that it has a strong connection with fundraising is itself irrational. If it's true, we should regret it and try to educate the community about the difference between physical education and intercollegiate athletics."

Speaker Pollak: "I'm going to call for a vote on the amendment unless there's more."

Professor P.C.T. deBoer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "I think that the amendment is premature in the sense that we really don't have the information that this is financially as bad as we think it is. I would like to have more information. I'm a member of FACAPE, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education, and we had this presented to us but we haven't been able to discuss it and therefore I think that we are prejudging the situation if we pass this amendment."

Professor Keith Dennis, Mathematics: "I must be really out of place here because it seems to me that the faculty should take a stand on what is important to them in this university, which is the academic programs. Maybe I'm prejudiced or whatever, but that's the most important thing. I'd like to see an amendment that says that."

Associate Professor Jennifer Whiting, Philosophy: "Members of admissions are quite horrified by this and by the idea that we might go into the commercial world even more than we do with athletics. I think that they very much hope that the faculty will speak up and say that they don't want the university to go the route that so many other universities have gone with greater commercialization of their athletics to the detriment of the reason for universities, which is academic. I think that we should really look very carefully at this and I support an even stronger resolution than what was proposed."

Speaker Pollak: "Shall we vote on the amendment? All of those in favor of the amendment to the resolution? All of those opposed? I want a count. Raise your hands again in favor of the amendment. All of those opposed? The amendment carries at 46 to 25. Peter?"

Professor Stein: "Move the question."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay there's been a request to move the question on the resolution. All of those in favor of calling the question signify by raising your hands. All of those opposed? Okay, we will vote on the resolution. All of those in favor of the resolution as amended signify by raising your hand. All opposed? The resolution carries 63 to 15.

WHEREAS, the University Faculty has a strong interest in the overall educational experience and well-being of its students, and endorses the value of a broad-based program in athletics and physical education in undergraduate life, and

WHEREAS, the University Faculty does not endorse diverting significant existing or potential resources from these priorities or compromising processes for admitting students to the several colleges so as to achieve higher rankings in intercollegiate athletics,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate urges the Provost and the President to ask the authors of the Strategic Plan for the Department of Athletics and Physical Education that is dated October 12, 1998 to modify the plan so that it will:

Enhance Cornell's broad-based programs in athletics and physical education;

Commit the Department of Athletics and Physical Education to honor the standards and processes for admission to the various individual colleges; and

Provide a detailed financial plan that is consistent with these goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that given other unmet needs of greater importance to the future well-being of Cornell, the Faculty Senate strongly urges the administration to assign low priority to the diversion of university resources of fund-raising activities to intercollegiate athletics.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty to communicate this resolution to the Board of Trustees.

Okay, for the next item on the agenda I will call on Peter Stein of the Financial Policies Committee."

8. REPORT OF FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Professor Stein: "I am reporting to you from the Financial Policies committee. The reason I'm here instead of Paul Sherman, the chair, is because he is chasing some sort of animal in the state of Washington and he asked me to report. At a meeting in December, this body passed unanimously, or probably without dissent, the following resolution.

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.

This is the report from the committee, perhaps a month premature. Let me take a moment to explain why it is that the Financial Policies Committee felt that it was so important to establish goals on salaries. There are lots of salary plots, but I'm only taking one to be instructive. Here is a plot ([Appendix E](#), attached) of full professor salaries over time in the College of Arts and Sciences over a period of 25 years. We have discussed this data with the administration for three to four years and one of the hang-up points that we've had for some time is what exactly the message is. The message is clearly that they're falling and clearly that they're lowering. But that's not enough. How low are they? You can look at the way this is plotted and it says that we're 18 1/2 percent low. Or, in another way to look at it, we could say that 1972 is prehistory, so let's just look at the last decade where it looks something like that, and then the fall doesn't look so substantial because it's only eight or nine percent. Or we could say that we have the wrong comparison group where in another group the fall could be seen as only four or five percent. These discussions have gone back and forth for three years and the Financial Policies Committee has brought numerous resolutions in the past. At the December meeting, we felt that it was time to come to some kind of joint agreement with the administration on what the facts are, mainly, how far below were our salaries, and that's the reason for this particular resolution.

"I think it's best to describe what happened by reading to you a letter from Paul Sherman, which he wrote to Dean Cooke some weeks ago. And I'm quoting from this letter:

"Dear Bob,

"I am resigning from the Financial Policies Committee, effective immediately. It is time for someone else to take over as Chair.

"On 2 February I met with Provost Randel to begin implementing the Resolution that was passed by the Senate on 9 December, 1998 entitled 'Faculty-Administration Partnership: Improvement of Faculty Salaries.' While the Provost raised the possibility of obtaining faculty input in setting institutional budgetary priorities through reinvigorating the Budget Planning Group, and strongly reiterated the administration's commitment to improving faculty compensation, he was unwilling to initiate the process of 'developing faculty salary targets for all ranks in both units, as well as a schedule and financial strategy for meeting these targets,' as was called for in the Senate Resolution.

"For the past two years, the Financial Policies Committee has wrestled with the issue of faculty salaries. After careful consideration, the FPC developed a set of long-term goals based on the general principle that average faculty compensation at all ranks should be commensurate with faculty quality, gauged by

published rankings of institutional quality. In other words, to attract and retain the best faculty in the face of stiff competition from academic institutions of equal or higher quality, it is essential for Cornell to pay salaries that are competitive.

"Given that average salaries of Cornell's full and associate professors (the majority of the faculty) have fallen well below average salaries at private and public quality-peer institutions, in March 1998 the Faculty Senate passed a Resolution that recommended immediate remedial action, through resetting internal priorities (including consideration of the relative amounts spent on such items as new construction, staff, and administration) rather than by increasing tuition faster than at peer institutions. The FPC was poised to participate in priority-resetting, whenever it was invited to do so. It was never invited, and the Committee's attempts to offer such input consistently were deflected. Indeed, during my tenure as FPC Chair, the administration requested the Committee's opinion only once, when (then) Vice President Ron Ehrenberg asked for comments on a space-use model he was developing.

"Analyses the FPC conducted indicate that after three years (1995-98) the administration's faculty salary program has not improved Cornell's position for statutory and endowed full or associate professors relative to average salaries at ten public and eight private quality-peer institutions, respectively. The FPC believes that to make real gains we must set realistic goals -- i.e., fiscally responsible benchmarks against which Cornell measures its progress toward salary parity with peers. The Committee presented this recommendation, along with supporting documentation, to President Rawlings and Provost Randel at a meeting in April 1998. They raised no objections at that time. In fact, the President remarked that the approach of comparing average salaries at Cornell with those at quality peer institutions 'seemed reasonable.'

"In the past 12 months I have made the case for this 'external goal' approach as clearly, forcefully, and honestly as I could, to the Faculty Senate (twice), to the CALS Senate, to the Division of Biology, and in numerous other public and private forums. Other FPC members also have spoken out. The Provost has now rejected this approach and, I am discouraged to say, I see no evidence that the FPC's analyses received serious consideration or resulted in changes in the administration's policies or priorities.

"Clearly, it is time to begin addressing the important issues raised by the Senate Resolution of 9 December, especially because the Senate expects a progress report in April. However, for a number of reasons, some of them personal, I have decided that I will not continue to lead the FPC in this effort. I am unswerving in my belief that it is in Cornell's best interests to return average salaries to levels that are consistent with current faculty quality and the quality to which the University aspires. Indeed, until this occurs, it is inconceivable to me that Cornell can achieve President Rawlings's optimistic goal of being the 'top teaching and research institution' in the United States.

"I think that says it as well as I can. I think it says it very eloquently. Since we had that meeting, we had another meeting with the administration maybe a week ago Tuesday, where we spent an hour discussing the budget. The Financial Policies Committee passed to the administration a number of questions, which were directed towards the issue that concern us, mainly the issue of faculty salaries. The discussion we had was cordial, but no member of the FPC that I spoke to felt that we had advanced at all towards our goal as a result of that discussion, or indeed that we understood financial budgetary problems at the end of that meeting more than we did before.

"The Financial Policies Committee is at a crossroads at this point. It doesn't really know how to proceed. I should tell you that the Financial Policies Committee is divided. There are hawks on it and there are doves on it. The most hawkish person on the committee, and I won't name the members of the committee, believes that the sorts of graphs that I have shown you are disastrous and they mean that Cornell is about to fall off the end of a cliff and that we cannot continue for very much longer to maintain a quality institution at these salary rates. The most dovish committee member believes that Cornell's salaries are a tad high. So, there is a range of opinion on those issues. It is my own guess that the median on the committee is closer to the hawk than the dove. However, there is a substantial opinion on the committee that feels that we are in some sort of a crisis in faculty governance and that this is an issue which will not go away and that it is the obligation of the Financial Policies Committee to pursue it as vigorously as it can. There is another group on the committee that feels quite differently, and I am not a member of that group, so it's a little hard for me to summarize it. Nevertheless, it goes something like this: That we don't know all of the facts and

that we are represented by the Provost, whom we admire, and the President, whom we also admire, and that those people have all of the facts. I, myself, classify myself as part of those who admire the Provost and the President, but I am not a member of that group. That group believe that this must be the best decision because if there were a better decision, then those who are better informed and whose hearts are in the right place, would have made it. Therefore, this is the best that can be done with the resources we have and we should stop nagging the administration and get on in some cooperative mode and support them rather than quarrel with them.

"Those are two very different, inconsistent, points of view and I believe that somehow this Senate must speak to the Financial Policies Committee. We've already had one resignation, I'm told we're going to have other resignations. We really know that we represent you. Our beliefs are not what ought to drive the work of this committee, it's your beliefs. I ask you seriously to please instruct the committee. I don't think it's appropriate for the committee to come up with a resolution but we need to know what you think. We need to know whether you think that we should pursue this goal with the same vigor that we have tried to pursue it before or that it's better to back off. We know you're not going to say 'Forget the issue,' but the real cutting edge is in the present situation that we face; should we pursue this with full vigor or should we know step back a little bit and let things percolate? It's obvious that it can't be done at this meeting, but I ask you very seriously and very sincerely to please try to bring us some instruction at the next meeting. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "There has been no time requested for Good and Welfare so we do have a few minutes left in the meeting, so why don't we start with questions and comments."

Professor Wilson: "One thing that disturbed me, and I'd appreciate a clarification, is the fact that I thought I saw somewhere that administrative salaries were on average higher than at competitive peer universities and we're definitely rising significantly faster in faculty salaries, where the faculty are below the average. I guess I'd like to know if that's true or not."

Professor Stein: "I wish I could answer that David, but I don't know. My guess is that it's not true, but I don't know. I attempted at one point to get that data from the administration to look at what had happened to administrative salaries, to get the public information that had been available, but I couldn't get that information. So, I don't know the answer to that question."

Professor Wayne: "That information is available at that section of Cornell that's by the P&C in East Hill Plaza. "

Professor Stein: "It's true that it's available for one year, but we were trying . . ."

Professor Wayne: "I can't remember the numbers, but I've gone to get those numbers for a number of years. So you can go and they'll give it to you for a number of years but they'll charge you for xeroxing."

Professor Stein: "No, Randy, they'll only give it to you for three years."

Professor Becker: "I'd also like to find out more about the gap before I would want to tell the committee what to do. Is this disparity primarily a result of hiring in new faculty at big bucks, so the last few years of salaries aren't the problem, it's the people who have been around for a number of years? How is that gap constituted and where is it located among the faculty? Are all faculty at the same disadvantage *vis à vis* those of other institutions or not? What is the structure of that? If that's the real issue, it could inspire me to action more."

Professor Stein: "I've spent a lot of time looking at this issue, and there's always data that you would like and data that you can't have. The data that you can have is not the data that you would like. The data that you would like is limited. The data that we have would support that notion because what we have is that the percentage disparity in salaries is highest for full professors, less high for associate professors, and, as a matter of fact at the last year, we are competitive in assistant professors, and thank God for that or that would really be killing our quality. The older people get, the less we're paying competitive salaries."

Speaker Pollak: "What's going to happen now is I believe that Bob and the committee will work on an e-mail to be sent to all of the Senators and then your feedback and responses to that will be collated and some decision on how to proceed and advising the committee will be put together. It's not six o'clock exactly, so this meeting is adjourned."

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Secretary and Associate Dean of the University Faculty