

## MINUTES OF A FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, April 21, 1999

### 1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Dean Cooke: "Let me just make a couple of brief comments. We recessed the meeting last time and the Resolution on the Professional Master's Degree in Architecture was pending. We will return to that as soon as we begin and we have two persons who can respond to your questions. We have also supplied additional background material by e-mail so that we could get the purely procedural issues out of the way today. The second thing is the Resolution on Dissection. In case you haven't seen this, I wanted to call your attention to an agreement between a group of students and a group of faculty over the introductory courses in Biological Sciences and the dissection alternatives and options available. The faculty members agreed to do certain things to follow through and the students agreed to follow through with certain items. That conversation had to do with specific courses because it was with students who had specific complaints. So that was done and put in place prior to the resolution that is going to come before us today. As alluded to last time, there were two resolutions that were intended to come before the group, but a miracle happened and the parties supporting each resolution managed to come together in the single resolution that will come before you shortly. Do we have a quorum? Has somebody come in?"

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "Is there any Senator here who has not signed in?"

Dean Cooke: "I'm ex officio with vote, but I don't vote, so I guess I can vote. I'm a member and have voting rights even if I don't exercise them. Let me ask for unanimous consent to approve Melissa Hines as Speaker Pro Tem for today. Are there any objections? Okay."

Assistant Professor Melissa Hines, Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Speaker Pro Tem: "I've been asked to remind you that today's meeting is closed to outside visitors. . ."

Dean Cooke: "Open."

Speaker Hines: "It says 'Closed'."

Dean Cooke: "We changed our minds." (Laughter)

Speaker Hines: "Okay, I've also been asked to read the last sentence to you that reminds you that all participants, except the secretary, including visitors, are prohibited from photographing, sound recording, video-taping, or using any other electronic means to record these proceedings. So Dean Cooke, would you like to continue with your remarks?"

Dean Cooke: "No, I'm finished."

### 2. RESOLUTION ON PROFESSIONAL MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM IN ARCHITECTURE

Speaker Hines: "Dean Cooke is finished with his remarks, so we will move onto the resolution that was presented to you last time about the Professional Master's Degree Program in Architecture. Professors Jonathan Ochshorn and Ken Hover are here to answer any questions on the resolution. Are there any questions or discussion on the resolution?"

Associate Professor Michael Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering: "I just wanted to say thank you for providing us with the information that we need. It would have been very useful at the last meeting."

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "Move to call the question."

Speaker Hines: "Okay there has been a motion to call the question and it has been seconded. Is there any opposition to that? Okay, let's now vote on the resolution. All in favor of the resolution please raise your hands. All opposed. The resolution carries."

*WHEREAS, the First Professional Master's Degree Program (M. Arch. I) in Architecture has been approved by the Department of Architecture and the Graduate School, and*

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

*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves establishing the First Professional Master's Degree Program (M. Arch. I) in Architecture and urges the Administration to place this on the May meeting of the Board of Trustees for consideration.*

"Now we're going to move on to the second item on the agenda which is the resolution on dissection policy. This will be presented by Professor Martin Hatch."

### **3. RESOLUTION ON DISSECTION POLICY: REVISED RESOLUTION REGARDING STUDENT CHOICE IN DISSECTION**

Associate Professor Martin Hatch, Music: "As you can hear, I've sort of lost my voice, so for your benefit and for mine I'll make my remarks brief. As most of you are probably aware, the institutional life of the resolution began a couple of weeks ago. Two resolutions were sent for consideration. One was sponsored by some of the signers of this resolution and the other was sponsored by other signers of this resolution. The week before this, we worked to merge the two resolutions into one that has the strengths of both. Although the issues presented in this resolution have been in the official Senate record or processes only for the past couple of weeks, the resolution that we asked you back for today is the product of months of constructive and productive discussion of students, faculty members, and administrators from various departments and colleges in the University. The results of those discussion were called to your attention by Dean Cooke just a few moments ago. So we recommend this resolution for your consideration and action. I expect that several of the other sponsors will wish to make statements to support and there may be points in the resolution that require a significant amount of discussion and so I'll end my remarks with that."

WHEREAS, all of the introductory biology courses at Cornell provide students with alternatives to performing dissection, and there exist students who choose these options based on ethical conviction, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate deems it desirable that no student ever be coerced to perform, as part of a curricular exercise, an action which that student finds morally or ethically repugnant or inadmissible,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate applauds the practice of offering alternatives to dissection in the introductory biology courses, recommends that this practice continue in future, and commends the efforts of biology instructors to investigate the relevant innovations in educational technology as these come on the market.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate affirms the right and responsibility of instructors to determine the content and conduct of their courses, and affirms that a Cornell education should convey and instill, among other values, a respect for the environment, for fellow human beings, and for other living beings and recommends educational practices that reflect those values.

Speaker Hines: "Are there any remarks or questions about the resolution?"

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior, and Director, Biological Sciences: "The faculty that are involved in teaching the introductory courses in biology have met with the students and talked about some of these problems. We had reached some reasonable agreements and I think this resolution, the essence of it, affirms the right and responsibility of the instructors to determine the content and conduct of their courses. That to us in biology is the essential point of the resolution."

Professor Peter Schwartz, Textiles and Apparel: "I was delighted when I saw the first two resolutions. To me, there was nothing more stark than to have a resolution that struck at the very foundations of academic freedom countered by a very principled resolution that defended those. And then we get this polenta to vote on. I've seen this happen a lot. We refuse to confront issues that are controversial. In fact, I've seen it so often that I went to my abridged English dictionary and looked up the word 'cornell' and I found this: *Cornell: verb transitive. To refuse to take a firm principled stand on any issue, thereby allowing it to fester indefinitely.* I plan to vote against this and I urge my

colleagues to also."

Speaker Hines: "Any other questions or comments?"

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "Great sense of humor."

Professor Schwartz: "Coming from a master."

Speaker Hines: "Any other questions or comments?"

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I had had an amendment to this. I have at times had students express moral scruples to all sorts of things: taking written exams, taking exams at all. I thought that we might save ourselves some trouble in that second whereas:

Whereas the Faculty Senate deems it desirable with respect to animal dissection that no student ever be coerced to perform, as part of a curricular exercise, an action which that student finds morally or ethically repugnant or inadmissible, ...

"I simply suggested that we add the words 'with respect to animal dissection' and so on. I just think it might save us some trouble down the line. I've had students who found grades very repugnant, they have found exams repugnant, getting papers in on time morally repugnant and I just wouldn't like to have to deal with that."

Speaker Hines: "Is there a second for this amendment? Okay, there is a second. So the motion is to add the clause to this resolution. Is there any further discussion?"

Professor Walcott: "I would be very much opposed to such an addition because it seems to me that what we're talking about crosses the entire spectrum of activities at the University. We ought to adopt this philosophy as a whole rather than in part and simply not limit it to one action that a small group finds undesirable."

Associate Professor Carol Rosen, Modern Languages: "I agree with Professor Walcott. I think that the amendment, the addition of 'with respect to animal dissection', would scarcely have any effect on the intent of the resolution but, nonetheless, I am opposed to the amendment because it spoils the prose and it might tend to bespeak a certain faintheartedness. I believe that on this topic, which is a serious one, we can't afford to make a statement that is writ large and does not sound mincing. Keep in mind that any statement on this issue will always be open to some form of *a productio ad absurdum*

from any of various angles, be it the 'what about worms?' angle or 'what about microbes?' angle, or this other suggestion that a student could claim ethical objection to being graded. The answer is that anytime the Senate passes any resolution, it places a certain faith in the exercise of normal common sense with respect to the body of limitation. This should not stop the Senate from registering a viewpoint in general terms. What we are dealing with is not a 'polenta', but rather a joint statement that respects, on the one hand, the principles of academic freedom while, on the other hand, registering a respect for students and their sincerely held convictions. Lastly, I would say that the example proposed in reference to the amendment is not relevant because note the words 'perform an action' and being graded is not performing an action."

Professor Richard Galick, Physics: "I am certainly in favor of academic freedom but I don't think that the proposal addressed one other obligation of the faculty which was, as Carol Rosen just said, to respond to the concerns of the student body. I'm happy that that this type of resolution came about that molds together the concerns of the student body with those of the faculty. However, this proposal, despite what Carol said, is specific to dissection in both the first 'whereas' and the second 'whereas' and in the 'be it resolved.' I'm not sure that the amendment would change that it is actually somewhat specific. I wish, actually -- I will vote in favor of this whether or not the amendment carries -- that it were worded in a more careful fashion and not be so specific to dissection."

Professor Keith Dennis, Mathematics: "I find the wording of this distasteful, particularly the last paragraph. . ."

Speaker Hines: "We're just talking about the amendment for the moment."

Professor Dennis: "Oh, excuse me."

Speaker Hines: "Are there any other questions or comments about the amendment?"

Professor Baer: "Just one other word of explanation. I made it in part because I have at least five or six times taught semester long seminars in animal rights and animal welfare. One of the things that I have learned from doing that is that there are few issues that raise more deeply felt concerns. They do have a kind of ultimate meta-physical, sort of religious intensity and I think that it's an area that calls for that kind of commitment. That's why I wanted to limit it to that. I want to respect people's consciences. I'm generally in favor of the resolution, but I wanted to see if we could avoid having to deal with it in other areas."

Speaker Hines: "Any other discussion about the amendment? Are you ready to vote on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hands. All of those opposed. The amendment fails. We are now going to discuss the whole resolution unamended. Yes?"

Professor Dennis: "This bothers me a lot because the whole idea of an affirmation of the right and responsibility of the instructor to determine the content of their courses seems to be stuck in a paragraph with a lot of stuff that doesn't belong there. I mean, somehow, that should be a completely separate statement. I agree with the statement made earlier that at least before there were two honest statements. Now they're all mixed together and it looks like someone is trying to hide the fact that the faculty should determine the content of their courses in this last paragraph. It doesn't seem to be a reasonable wording."

Professor Emeritus Milton Zaitlin, Plant Pathology: "I find some statements here to be mutually exclusive. If you look at the second 'whereas' and the last paragraph, these seem to be contradictory to one another. It says that no student should ever be coerced to perform something that is repugnant but then that the faculty reserves the right to determine the content of courses. A few months ago we heard Howard Howland say that there were no alternatives to dissection in some of the advanced courses so what is an instructor in one of those advanced courses to do if a student refuses to perform a dissection. It seems to me that this resolution is rather confusing the way it is designed."

Professor Terence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I very much agree with Peter Schwartz. Who are we? We are the Faculty Senate. We're not a civic action group, we are the Faculty Senate. As such, we have proper concerns. There are other concerns that are fully proper; concerns for the environment, for example, but they are not concerns for the Faculty Senate. You may personally feel very strongly about them. I look at this thing and ask 'Why is it here?' We had a dispute and the dispute was resolved by the disputants. I don't have a problem with their resolution. I have a problem with their rhetoric, but they've resolved it. Why are we here? Is this a publicity action? Are we supposed to applaud something? Is that my function as a Senator here, to applaud somebody's ethical convictions? Personally, I may do so, but not in the Faculty Senate. That's not my job to be here. Let me come back to a point that you made.

We affirm *en passant*

the right of instructors to control the content of their courses? This is not something that you affirm with the back of your hand and you state it in a bunch of text about concern for the environment. I have concerns for the environment, but that's not why I'm in this room right now. I'm in this room because I'm in the Faculty Senate. Bedrock for me is that the faculty control the content of their courses. That is academic bedrock. It is not bedrock in City Hall but it is bedrock here. This is what we are about. It does not get mixed in *inter alia* with a shopping list of people's concerns. I'm glad you have them, I even share some of them. I don't share them with regard to that motion. It's utterly inappropriate. A resolution on ethical convictions? Why don't we just stick to our business, our proper concerns. Faculty matters that do not include all of these other things. We have no need for this motion. This issue was resolved. Let it pass. Defeat the motion. People will go on and do what they should be doing, which is faculty controlling the content of their courses in a responsible manner. I'm sure you've been doing and will continue to do it; you do not need us to applaud you."

Speaker Hines: "Any other questions or comments?"

Professor Baer: "I, on the contrary, want to speak very strongly in favor of the resolution. I don't see a contradiction. We ought to remind ourselves that it's a mark of civility and something entirely appropriate to a highly pluralistic society that we do pay attention to people's conscientious objections. Some of these students find that it violates their persons at a very deep level. I don't happen to agree with their particular concern, but I respect their concerns and convictions. I think that insofar as we can respect those conscientious scruples without compromising academic integrity we ought to do it. I think that this resolution means that this issue won't have to be revisited again and again

and the student won't have to be simply at the mercy of the faculty member. We will be expressing some joint sentiment that as far as we can do it within the limits of the course and the academic requirements, we go on record as wanting to respect diversity of opinion and the conscientious scruples that some students have to dissecting animals. I hope that we will vote in favor of the resolution."

Professor Rosen: "I also would like to say an additional word in favor of the resolution. There are, perhaps, elements of rhetoric that could be objected to in what Professor Fine has said, and we must note carefully that this resolution does not call upon the Faculty Senate to applaud the convictions of any particular minority. It does not go on record against dissection. It does not, in any way, support or negate the convictions of any person. Rather, it calls upon us to go on record as respecting the forms of intellectual and ethical diversity that we might find among our student body. What the previous consultations between students and intro biology professors have shown is that such a resolution would not counter any of the current policies and practices of the intro biology professors. It would express the sense of the Senate in favor of those practices, which is a constructive outcome that comes from this resolution. I, therefore, intend to vote for it."

Speaker Hines: "Let me remind you to state your name and affiliation before making any comments."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I came prepared to vote for this compromise resolution but now some questions have been raised in my mind by a lot of things that people have said. I think that there are good things to say and there are bad things to say. As to Professor Baer's objection, I've sat through a lot of committee meetings where faculty members have looked very carefully at how language might be interpreted in matters that are considerably farther from the core of what we do than this. It does seem to me that that rather broad statement of 'respecting any ethical concerns of any student' is very broad. We may be licensing a certain amount of new ways of complaining about things that they don't want to do. People have ethical concerns about not wanting to read or discuss certain material and I think that we do not want to carelessly create a channel for further discord. I don't think that there's anything pressing about this resolution. I don't think that there's any real reason why this has to be dealt with today. I wonder if some of the concerns that have been addressed by Professor Fine, Professor Baer, Professor Dennis, and other people that have spoken, could just be looked at by the UFC and have them think about it and see if there's some kind of redrafting of the proposal that could answer the concerns that have been raised and still speak to the students and to the academic freedom that we all cherish. With that, I'd like to move that this be sent back to the UFC to be brought back at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate, thinking about it in light of the discussion today."

Professor Schwartz: "Point of order. The motion did not come from the UFC."

Professor Stein: "I understand, but it can be referred to the UFC."

Professor Schwartz: "That should be said then. The words 'sent back. . .'"

Professor Stein: "Referred to the UFC, then."

Speaker Hines: "There's a motion that this should be sent back to the UFC. . ."

Many members call out "Referred to the UFC."

Speaker Hines: "Referred to the UFC. Okay, we have a motion and it has been seconded. Can we vote on this? All in favor of the motion to send this to the UFC, please raise your hand. All of those opposed? Okay, it is sent to the UFC."

"Now we have three items of Good and Welfare on the agenda. I will call first on Professor Clare Fewtrell from the Affirmative Action Committee."

## **4. GOOD AND WELFARE**

### **A. REPORT FROM THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE**

Associate Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine: "In February I reported to you that the Senate's Affirmative Action Committee was working on a proposal to replace the Associate Provost formerly held by Professor Winnie Taylor. Our ideas evolved considerably as a result of our discussions with other faculty and with other groups on

campus. We presented the final version of our proposal to the Provost at the end of March. To demonstrate the importance that the University places on this new position and the achievement of its goals, the Provost will be chairing the search committee to fill this position. What we propose -- and our full proposal can be found on the Faculty Senate webpage -- is the appointment of a Vice Provost of Diversity and Faculty Development, which we will hope to fill from amongst the tenured faculty at Cornell. The position will require 80% effort, which will allow the person appointed to maintain a 20% effort in his or her departmental home. We propose that the position will have three distinct but complimentary responsibilities. The first, as University Affirmative Action Officer, a 20% effort. The Vice Provost will be a leader, spokesperson, and catalyst for the University on all issues related to Affirmative Action. He or she will work closely with the Office of Equal Opportunity and will have overall responsibility for updating and monitoring the University Affirmative Action plan. However, at least initially, the new director of the Office of Equal Opportunity will report to the Vice President of Human Resources. As many of you know, we're also interviewing candidates for the directorship of the Office of Equal Opportunity. The coordinator of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Resource Center will continue to report to the new Vice Provost but only on issues related to faculty and staff. We're hoping that these reporting arrangements will minimize the administrative responsibilities associated with the new Vice Provost position while allowing this person to have significant influence in aspects related to affirmative action. The second responsibility of the Vice Provost position, 40% effort, will be to increase faculty diversity by developing and improving programs and approaches designed to increase the hiring of both women and underrepresented minorities faculty at all levels. I think that we feel that this is a really important aspect of the position that over the years we have continued not to do well at. The third aspect of the position, 20%, will be to develop strategies for enhancing the retention of all faculty, with particular emphasis on junior faculty, particularly untenured faculty. This will include those from underrepresented groups.

"So those are the three parts to the position. We realize that they are major responsibilities for the individual who is appointed and clearly for this position to be successful it needs strong support from the University administration but also from us as faculty. In our discussion with the Provost, he clearly acknowledged the need for this position and stressed the importance of involving the new Vice Provost in major University decision-making processes, and also providing the individual appointed with the necessary resources, both financial and personnel to be effective at this position. I hope that his words will translate into actions.

"The first meeting of the search committee will be next Wednesday and I've listed their names here.

Associate Professor Ronald Booker, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior, W253 Mudd Hall (rb28)

Executive Director Raymond Dalton, Office of Minority Educational Affairs, 100 Barnes Hall (rad3)

Associate Professor Clare Fewtrell, Department of Molecular Medicine, C3 125 College of Veterinary Medicine (cmf3)

Interim Dean Porus Olpadwala, College of Architecture, Art, and Planning, 129 Sibley Dome (pdo1)

Vice President for Human Resources Mary Opperman, 130 Day Hall (mgo5)

Associate Dean Terry Plater, Graduate School, 384 Caldwell Hall (tdp3)

Provost Don Randel, Chair, 300 Day Hall (dmr4)

Associate Professor Vilma Santiago-Irizarry, Department of Anthropology, 212 McGraw Hall (vs23)

"As I've already mentioned, the Provost will be chairing the committee and, as I think you heard last week, half of the committee was appointed by the Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections Committee. The other committee members were appointed by the Provost. Clearly, the most important task will be to identify the best candidate for the position and then persuade him or her to accept this not-insignificant challenge. As I said, we're hoping to fill this position amongst the tenured ranks of the faculty at Cornell, but if we're not successful in doing this, I hope that a national search would be conducted. The committee as a whole thought, however, that the best way of filling this position as effectively and quickly as possible would be to recruit someone from the tenured faculty. I urge you and your colleagues to contact the Provost or the other members of the search committee with names of possible candidates and suggestions for how they can be encouraged to apply for this position. The names of the search

committee, their e-mail addresses, and campus addresses are also available on the Web."

Speaker Hines: "Okay, I'd now like to call on Robert Johnson for an update on Diversity and Inclusion: A Dialog on the Campus Climate."

## **B. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION: A DIALOG ON THE CAMPUS CLIMATE**

Robert L. Johnson, Director of University Ministries and CURW: "Pursuant to the work of the Campus Climate Committee, we are pleased to announce that, in the next two weeks, we have lined up five units to do the fishbowl exploration with 3 faculty, 3 staff, and 3 students, meeting for roughly 2 1/2 hours to explore the simple question, 'How do you experience difference at Cornell University?' The five that will meet in the next two weeks will be: Rural Sociology, Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Neurobiology and Behavior, Anthropology, and the Campus Store. The committee will then receive the findings from these five explorations and, with the help of the Hughes group in ILR, plans to develop means to do this on a wider scale in the fall term. We also hope to do this with the Assemblies retreat in September, which will expose a fairly wide representation of academic and other units to this process. I'd like to say in response to several questions that have been raised along the way that this is chiefly a means of getting on the table issues from discreet departments that we have to face to create a better living and learning environment at Cornell. It's not a PC truth squad. It's not sensitivity training for faculty, students, or staff. It's to get these issues on the table and it's for an improvement."

Speaker Hines: "The last item on 'Good and Welfare' is from Peter Stein."

## **C. FACULTY SENATE LIST SERVE**

Professor Stein: "A thought for the day. Last Monday when I picked up the Cornell Sun at the breakfast table I could hardly put it down. I read the whole addition of what happened in 1969 and I suspect that most you or all of you that were here at that time, as I was, probably read it with similar interest. It was interesting to read but there was also one part of it that made me sad and that was the part on faculty governance. The section on faculty governance had comments from various faculty members about how the faculty no longer seems as concerned about making issues as they were in the years surrounding 1969. Indeed, there was one comment from Dean Lewis, which was the saddest of all the things I read, which said that faculty interest is now mostly confined to the Faculty Senate, which has reduced its scope to such an extent &mdash; I'm paraphrasing since I don't have it in front of me &mdash; so that you can address issues. On the other hand, it hardly addresses issues that are core to the University and to the various activities or decisions that are made on the campus. It also talked about the fact of how faculty members, at that time, seemed to talk to each other more about these big issues. And my memory, dim as it is of that time, is that this was the case. In fact, I used to talk to a lot of people about a lot of interesting things and those conversations seem not to take place anymore. It also occurred to me that the only member of this body that I ever talk to about these matters is Rich Galik because he's in my department. If the Physics Department were only represented by one Senator then I probably wouldn't discuss it with anybody. Why that is, I'm not sure. Part of it may be due to the demise of the Statler Club and the social relationships that were different thirty years ago. It is a fact of nature, I think, that we don't talk about these things and it's hard to have a deep and meaningful discourse about matters that people don't talk to each other about. I don't really have a sense about how you people feel about these issues."

"So, starting with that concern, I starting thinking about this a little bit and I came up with a small idea that I would like to float between you, Dean Cooke, and the University Faculty Committee; a way of making it easy for us, the people who represent the University Faculty, to have access to each other and the ability to talk about things. This great idea that I have is a listserve. I propose to Dean Cooke and the University Faculty Committee that they establish a listserve. An unmoderated listserve that is available only to the members of the Senate. What that would mean is that if I had a thought that I wanted to share with all of you, I would just type FacSenate in there and it would zip out to all of the members of the Senate. If people wanted to answer just me, that's great. If they wanted to answer the whole group, that's fine too. Nobody else would be able to read these e-mails or get onto the listserve unless they were a member of the Senate. Likewise, nobody would be able to send mail unless they were a member of the Senate. On the other hand, unmoderated means that there is no prior censorship. You and I don't have to ask anyone's permission. You just sit down at your keyboard and send it out. I don't know if this would promote more discourse, but it's worth trying. On numerous occasions, I have thoughts that I wanted to share with people and I don't know how to do it. I would like the UFC to consider this possibility."

Dean Cooke: "May I respond? Okay, we have, in fact, thought of how to get the University Faculty to deal with big issues and I have a couple of things to call your attention to. One is that on May 3, we have a forum in which President Rawlings, former President Corson, Kenneth McClane, Bob Harris, and Walter LeFeber are going to deal with the big issues that came out of the discussions 30 years ago. That's May 3, at 4:30 p.m. in Call Auditorium. You do need tickets and we are handling that by way of departments to avoid you having to walk to the Willard Straight Hall Ticket Office. They are also available to the public. Tickets are free but we have 600 seats so we want to ration the attendance.

"In response to Professor Stein's suggestion, we have been thinking about that and apparently the Arts College does have a listserve and, I've heard second-hand, they've had some unfortunate insults that have been hurled back and forth. What we have done in the Senate office, and had we had more time on last week's agenda I would have described this to you, is that we are creating a University Faculty website to serve all of the faculty, not just the Senate. It will have things in it such as a self-serve posting of seminars so that each department could use a password to post seminars and the entire campus could find out about the intellectual activity on campus. It will also have an item called 'Issues' and I've talked to the faculty in Communication about setting that up. It would be moderated so that you wouldn't post it yourself, but the only censoring would be to avoid libel. Otherwise, any member of the faculty can post and the example for it is what we did on the Biological Science and Physical Education discussions, so that you can have more than a two paragraph rebuttal in the newspaper. You can now have several pages to whatever extent you think the reader will be tolerant of reading it to provide a forum to try to get back to some raw issues. I will report on that in the next meeting if the agenda allows."

Professor Stein: "Those all sound fine to me, but I still think it would be a good idea for the members of this body to be able to communicate with each other easily."

Professor Don Farley, Electrical Engineering: "I'd like to support that. I think that listserves are a great idea. I open up my e-mail every morning and see what's there. If you read through something and it's something you're interested in, you can reply. I don't open up the Senate website nearly as often, I must confess, rarely compared to my e-mail. The list serve is always there. You always look at your e-mail and it takes two seconds to respond. It's very convenient, and you get to know peoples' personalities from reading what they write. Eloquent people are eloquent and uneloquent people are uneloquent. It's a very good way to communicate. It's very informal and easy to do. It's a great idea."

Dean Cooke: "Thanks much. In fact, I had already offered that to Professor Stein so that we could get moving on this. Over the summer, CIT has agreed to set up listserves for individual courses to anyone who wants it. There are already about 300 courses that use it. We're going to set it up so that anyone who wants to use it can. We'll take it into account."

Speaker Hines: "Motion to adjourn? Second? Okay, we are adjourned."

Adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty