

**A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018**

1. CALL TO ORDER

[Interim Speaker Chris Schaffer](#): “I would like to begin by calling the meeting to order. And we have the usual thing; remind the body that Senators have priority in speaking. Only Senators or designated alternates may vote; but since there are no votes, I do not suppose that really matters.

“Please identify yourself and your department before you speak, and wait for the microphone so that we can transcribe what you had to say and attribute it to the right person.

“I recommend a speaking time of two minutes, and there are no Good and Welfare speakers that I know of. And the only other thing is we have to approve the minutes of the March 14th meeting, as distributed, as a consent item. And I assume everybody is willing to take an examination on the contents of those meetings.

“Okay. So we begin with [Charlie Van Loan](#), dean of the faculty.”

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS – DEAN CHARLES VAN LOAN ([SLIDES](#))

[Dean Charlie Van Loan](#): “Just a couple of announcements. So you [know](#) that we formed this committee that is going to look into non-tenure track academic titleholders. Several parts to this. The main one is whether or not there is some way of representing that group, which is about a thousand colleagues, through the Senate. So, here is the lineup. We are going to do some things before summer; and then after summer, wrap it up and show up here in October with some recommendations. So it is a really interesting lineup of colleagues there.

“Elections will be next week. We have trustee elections this year. And there is -- six people will be in the mix. And then we have elections for some of the major committees that operate and, also, the Senator-at-large. So next week. I think the window is probably two weeks or ten days.

“There is going to be an extra Senate meeting in two weeks right here devoted entirely to wrapping up the consensual relationships policy stuff. You will get the finished version of it on Monday -- everyone on the campus will get the finished version of it on Monday with some surrounding FAQs and so on. So two weeks from today.

“Here is how it's going to work. Hopefully within your department or field, there will be discussion; hopefully, that has already gone on. Then, by vote, here is what it will be. It will be sort of like the calendar last year. We want every Senator to vote. In this case, it is going to be "yes" or "no" on the whole thing. But every Senator gets a box, okay, where you can indicate -- you know, qualify your vote, explain your vote, or anything you want to do. So that will be part of the public record. It will be something like this.

“We are going to produce a final report that goes to President Pollack. All the other assemblies will be doing the same thing. The idea here is to capture how the campus thinks about all this and all these important issues.

“So, for example, we actually talked to some graduate students over the last two weeks, and I just pulled out some comments. One was very positive towards what we propose; others were more negative. So there will be a list of a hundred things like that. And, collectively, it will give a nice snapshot of how the faculty think.

“Okay. So, with that, we have a nice 45-minute slot here to talk about -- the Social Science review has several committees. One of them produced a report on Organizational Structures.

“So you guys just want to sit up here?”

“So it's unstructured Q&A, unless you have some opening statements. And I'll try to moderate this thing.”

3. SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES, JUDITH APPLETON (VICE-PROVOST), TED O'DONOGHUE (SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN, ARTS AND SCIENCES), MIKE KOTLIKOFF (PROVOST) -- [REPORT](#); [SOCIAL SCIENCE WEBSITE](#)

[Senior Associate Dean Ted O'Donoghue](#): “Hello, hello, hello. All right. So I'll just say a few things. So for those that do not know me, I'm [Ted O'Donoghue](#). I am from the Economics department, and I'm currently Senior Associate Dean for Social Science in Arts and Sciences and committee Co-Chair for the committee Organizational Structures.

“So just a couple quick comments about the report -- well, about this discussion, which we really want to be a discussion and hear from you. The first point I just want to sort of highlight -- or we want to highlight, that the report puts some ideas on the table. And I do want to say we intentionally use the word "ideas" and not the word "recommendations." And our hope is that now there's going to be a campus discussion

of these ideas. We sort of really put this on the table, and this action meeting today is the sort of first meeting that the three of us are going to be going around to to try to hear from faculty, student, staff all over campus.

“And, then, the other comment I'll just make as background -- let's see if these guys want to add anything -- is we really want to urge you and urge the campus to truly engage these ideas, to force yourself to imagine what it might look like to not kind of quickly latch on to one of the limitations and kind of dismiss it, but to think it through.

“I mean, just to put a little perspective on that, on our committee, many times an idea came up, there was sort of anxiety and sort of not wanting to dig in, but we just kind of forced ourself forward. And when we did, sometimes that sort of helped us see things that we did not see right away. And so we hope people all around the campus will force themselves to do that, as well.”

[Vice Provost Judith Appleton](#): “So I'll just introduce myself. I am Judy Appleton. I am Vice Provost, and I was Co-Chair with Ted.

“And I'll just comment that everything that Ted and I know about the process and the discussions of the committee are in this report. So you may get “I don't know” from us if you ask us questions. Everything that we know is written down. So I hope that you have all had a chance to look at the report and familiarize yourself with it. It describes the process of the committee and the issues that arose as we did our work.

“And, then, as Ted said, these are ideas. And the opportunity now is to really engage with the ideas and really think about them in all their various features.”

[Provost Mike Kotlikoff](#): “I am mainly here to listen. The one thing I would just state and restate and re-estate is this is a faculty report. They are ideas. No decisions have been made. We are engaging in a listening process and trying to get feedback. And, again, no decisions have been made. I know that's difficult sometimes to believe, but we're really trying to think about what's the best -- what are the best ideas in how we move forward in the Social Sciences.

“So with that, questions? Discussion?”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Okay. Don't forget to state your name and your location.”

[Professor Harry Katz](#): “So my name is Harry Katz. I am now a faculty member in the ILR School in the Labor Relations, Law, and History department. I served as Dean of

the ILR School from 2005 to October 2014. And from then, for nine months, I served as your interim Provost.

“So I think the merger, as proposed, between ILR and the College of Human Ecology is a really bad idea. This is a university. We value research and evidence. I want to remind you that the research is that most mergers -- organizational mergers, fail. The only ones that seem not to fail are ones that are exceedingly well conceived, exceedingly well motivated, and are prepared by extensive discussion, research, and analysis.

“Evidence. I do not see any evidence of that extensive analysis to try and understand how ILR and Human Ecology could improve through a merger. I will not take up too much time.

“ILR, as you're probably aware, is a school well known for excellence in its research, excellence in its teaching and concern for student services, and excellence in outreach. And for the life of me, I do not see how a merger -- an ill-conceived merger is going to do anything but harm ILR.

“The only other thing I'll say is that I interact a lot with our alumni and with our students and our donors. They've gotten wind of the proposal. Mike is correct, as I understand it, it is still just an idea. But nearly every single one of them agrees with my views or, at least are opposed to the merger. And so this is not a threat, it's just a warning: If the merger talk proceeds, get ready for an awfully big fight. They will fight like hell.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Any comments from the -- you guys are just going to listen? Okay. Let us try to have a little bit of structure. Let us continue with the merger option, if possible, or whatever.”

[Senator William Sonnenstuhl](#): “I am the ILR Senator, along with [Risa Lieberwitz](#). And two weeks ago, actually, we had a school-wide meeting on the committee report, and the only thing that was really discussed was the merger. And I think it is important that faculty meet like we did and discuss this report and let the Faculty Senate, the University Faculty Committee, and Dean of Faculty know our views.

“I think this is critical because the Faculty Senate strongly supports faculty governance in educational matters, including academic programs, degrees, curriculum, faculty appointments, and tenure.

“And as I said, two weeks ago, we did have a conversation here. Following that meeting, Risa and I, as the ILR Senators, conducted a Qualtrics survey of the tenured track and tenured faculty asking whether they supported or opposed the proposed merger and the reasons for their support.

“To date, we have received 52 responses from the 60 ILR tenured track and tenured faculty; 45 voted no, 6 voted yes, and one stated that he or she had no opinion. That is 88 percent of those voting opposition to the merger.

“Faculty voted no for a variety of reasons. These include the following: Lack of rationale in the -- for the merger. And I would say that, as Harry has already mentioned, most mergers do fail. And you need to have a well-reasoned vision and ideas before you actually go into these things to make them at all successful.

“A number of faculty talked about the unique mission of the ILR School and its best in class. We are known all over the world for the work that we do here. And many may think that Industrial and Labor Relations is an old-fashioned idea. But, in fact, we have been talking about our own curriculum and our mission for the last two years and, you know, we are actually thinking about the coherence of our curriculum in dealing with the issues of today.

“The ILR School is not dead, and anybody who thinks it is is acting kind of foolish. Many people talk about the ILR School as a gem, you know, that we have a unique culture here; we are very supportive of one another as faculty. We argue all the time -- you might find that true in terms of Labor and Management stuff, but we are also incredibly supportive of our students; and we do not want to lose that kind of focus.

“I have already said, mergers fail. Another thing that people talked about is that we do not need to merge with anybody. If we want collaboration, there are ways to do that. You know, you can give us money. You know, faculty responds to incentives. Give us some money, we will throw in some collaborative ways to work with colleagues over there. We can cross-list courses, if that is what we need to do. There are more constructive ways than destroying the ILR mission and distorting that, and people do not want that.

“Now, there are some reasons why people did vote yes. One of them is that some people are concerned about the long-term viability of the ILR School. Well, again, we have been talking about that issue. The opportunity to revitalize ILR, again, we have been talking about that issue. And, yes, there are overlapping interests that exist. And

we already have faculty who actually try to collaborate with folks over in Human Ecology side. So we are doing those things, we just think there is a better way to do it.

“So, again, I'd just say that the faculty vote was 45 opposed to the merger, 6 in support of the merger. And as the Faculty Senate, University Faculty and Dean of Faculty, consider the committee report, the ILR faculty call upon you to support our vote of no merger. Thank you.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Kim?”

[Professor Kim Weeden](#), Professor of Sociology, Chair of Sociology, Director of Center for the Study of Inequality and former ISS Director: “I don't want to speak directly to the ILR/Human Ecology merger. But I do think, as I was reading the report, there was sort of a general theme that I call a set of treatments for an incorrect diagnosis of the problem. And I think that there is a lot of discourse at Cornell and has been since I began here maybe 16 years ago.

“But the problem is that we don't talk to each other enough. We do not collaborate with each other enough. We do not talk across disciplines. We do not talk across units.

“I actually think that's fundamentally incorrect. And I think that we see a lot of bottom-up collaborations; we see a lot of sort of more organizational collaborations between departments that are members of the same field and have some sort of similar interests far more than my experience at Stanford where I did my PhD or University of Chicago where I spent the first two years of my career.

“And I think that part of the issue here is that a lot of these ideas -- first of all, they are made under a very significant set of constraints, which is no more money. But a lot of the ideas seem, to me, to be kind of forcing collaboration and creating new administrative structures that overlay what's already there, which is going to, of course, not increase the amount of money because that was part of the parameters for the committee, but basically suck money out of the core mission of faculty research and teaching and into more of this administrative apparatus that I think we don't have a lot of strong evidence that is actually effective in recent examples.

“And so I think that as we're thinking through these set of ideas, we really need to kind of keep the eye on the broader question, which is: What really is the problem that we're trying to solve? Is it the case of a lack of collaboration and coordination, or is there something else that is going on? And that is what we really need to be addressing. Thank you.”

[Senator Richard Miller](#), Philosophy: "I would like to strongly support what Kim Weeden just said, and I'll do it from a particular perspective. I direct the Cornell program in Ethics and Public Life where it has Philosophy, but we are intensely interdisciplinary.

"Most of our work involves Social Sciences, having visitors come from the Social Sciences to address issues of public concern. And in that process, we vitally consult with people in the Social Sciences at Cornell.

"I will first briefly address the one five star proposal that Cornell Center for the Social Sciences. It would not help this sort of interdisciplinarity; and in some ways, would hurt. EPL is not alone. Einaudi is of mention as having the same relationship to the Social Science units inside the proposed Cornell Center; the Atkinson Center is mentioned, as well, and certainly is deeply both outside and connected with the Social Sciences.

"As I think Kim was emphasizing, there's an enormous amount of collaboration at Cornell. It is based on people knowing one another, as they do not in more demographically dispersed universities. And it is all very much a matter of knowing individual people, what they can offer and what they are interested in.

"If the Cornell Center were to go through, I would remain deeply committed to working with the Center for the Study of Inequality. And I would seek to bypass the Cornell Center as just a level on top that is a source of confusion; if I could not because of needs for cosponsorship, it would simply be a headache.

"I would also like to mention a proposal that I think rightly didn't get a lot of stars, the proposal for three divisions in the College of Arts and Sciences. It seems to me that this would simply interfere with highly productive interdisciplinarity of a kind that -- another context of College of Arts and Sciences is trying to promote. And along with that interference that we are talking about as zero sum, but administrator's salaries -- well, they are real, so there would be -- there has to be a significant loss of teaching. There would be added expense from this additional level of administration, which I think would actually be counterproductive."

[Senator Risa Lieberwitz](#), ILR: "I have some things to say about the general report and the process and also some specific things to say about the proposed merger of ILR and the College of Human Ecology. First of all, you know, I know that we are using the word "ideas" here, but this is an idea that had four out of five stars, the idea of merging the two -- you know, the ILR School and Human Ecology. So it can get one's attention,

you know, in a particular way when it has four out of five stars, and so it really comes across more as a proposal.

“Specifically on that, as already has been mentioned, there is really no rationale provided in the report for this proposal to merge ILR and Human Ecology. They are just generalized statements about synergy and about interesting possibilities.

“And as other people have just stated just before, the proposed merger would cause great harm and dilute the focus and identity and the mission of the ILR School, which is why we had the kind of vote that we had.

“And I'd also mention that we asked people to give their positions on, you know, why they support or oppose this idea. And people wrote lengthy comments, you know, going into many aspects of the ILR School and the concerns and reasons why they oppose the idea of the merger. This is not just some sort of, "oh, we don't want to change." This was really based in our rationale in contrast with the lack of rationale from the report.

“The other thing, more generally, that applies to the report as a whole on Organizational Structures and specifically to this proposed merger is that it seems both illogical and counterproductive to have the Social Science Review Ideas Committee working separately and on a different time line from the Organizational Structures Committee.

“The vision and ideas for institutional organization and body should come before the structural ideas. Creating structures first, puts the cart before the horse; and, indeed, putting structures in place first is a substantive move. It is not simply structure without substance. Structure never is without substance, but it is clearly substantive here.

“And this kind of structural proposal would displace the Ideas Committee and really displace any ideas they come up with, and I think we have seen that in the College of Business situation.

“Then, also, I want to note that the report of the committee on Organizational Structure omits many of the drawbacks that exist to the proposal to merge ILR and Human Ecology. And, again, I want to make a contrast, and that's if you look at the idea of creating a College of Social Sciences, which received two stars out of the five as opposed to the four that ILR and Human Ecology received, that proposal lists many drawbacks or, as they say, limitations regarding the idea of creating a College of Social Sciences.

“And if you look at that list, all of the limitations that are listed with regard to the College of Social Sciences also apply to the proposal to merge ILR and Human Ecology and, yet, the report doesn't list them in discussing the proposed merger of ILR and Human Ecology. Instead, it ignores those drawbacks, which, you know, can make one think it is kind of an unfair weighting in favor of the merger between ILR and HumEc.

“Then, more generally, I would say that there's an inadequate role given to the Faculty Senate and the colleges affected in the list of the process -- the steps in process that's listed on the Social Sciences review website on how these issues will be considered. It reads as if the Senate is just one of many voices giving feedback. And it seems to me that given the educational policy issues and the way that it relates to more than one college overall in the report, that the Senate -- since the bylaws of the university provides for us to be consulted in a meaningful way on educational process -- educational policy, that the Senate needs to be key to this consideration; not just one of many voices. And, certainly, the colleges affected should have greater weight in terms of what is being done -- the colleges directly affected.

“And I'd also just note that here, we have no faculty up here in the front of the room who are on this committee on Organizational Structures; we only have administrators. And I think that it is kind of ironic to say this is faculty-led and, yet, have only administrators up at the front of the room.

“And then just finally, I would say that I think we really need to avoid any kind of decision-making in the way it was done with the College of Business on this kind of fast track. It was run through. And I know that you have stated that that is not the plan, but I think it -- we have an experience from the College of Business, and we still feel it.

“So first I'd say I think that it's clear that the proposed merger between ILR and Human Ecology should be simply set aside. It should be a non-starter, but we would be extremely unhappy to see something just simply run through and on fast track on that.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Anyone from Human Ecology here, by any chance, or want to speak? Eric, I guess, then.”

[Senator Eric Cheyfitz](#), English and the American Indian and Indigenous Studies Program: “I concur with what's been said both in terms of product and process. But I also had a question, that missing from the report is any mention of Anthropology, which is a Social Science last time I checked; and DevSoc, which is also a Social Science, and I wondered what the thoughts are on that. Their absence seems kind of ominous in terms of reorganization of Social Sciences when we have two key departments here that

aren't even mentioned in any of the structural changes that are going on -- or are proposed, I should say."

[Vice Provost Appleton](#): "I would say that the report does reference DevSoc in a few places, and Anthro was represented on the committee. We had a committee member from Anthropology and certainly was part of all of our discussions."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "So where does Anthro get placed in all of these changes, then?"

[Vice Provost Appleton](#): Well, you will see in the report that there are not very many departments that are discussed specifically. Anthro, I suppose, if we think about the different ideas would be included under the division idea in the College of Arts and Sciences, but not discussed separately."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "You know, my sense of this is I must have overlooked the DevSoc references. It does not seem to me they were significant as some of the others. The beginning of the report is definitely focused on grants -- the problem of grants. That is how the report begins, is that Cornell has had problems in getting -- in the Social Sciences in getting the kind of grants it, quote, unquote, "should be getting" given the visibility of the university.

"So I'm wondering about what happens, perhaps, to departments or programs that are lower on that food chain than others. And it would seem to me Anthropology might be one of those programs. So I worry about the quantitative measures here overwriting the qualitative measures with the understanding that, of course, funding is important. But at what point does funding become so dominant that certain kinds of operations are not going to get recognized, they're going to get obscured or marginalized?"

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "Let me just comment, Eric, on that. I don't think the intent of the report, which was, again, ideas from faculty about how to position us for excellence in the future necessarily was, you know, needed to specify the role of individual departments in that process. These were broad ideas about how to position us in that way.

"Let me make one other comment back to a couple of the first comments. You know, a number of people have said there is not a lot of rationale to the ideas in the report. And I agree, I do not think the charge to the faculty was to present a report that had a lot of rationale for ideas.

"Part of what is going on -- and Harry asked for analysis, evidence, a process. I see that as this process. There is -- we are going to have this conversation. There is going to be

a lot of discussion about pros and cons here, so I do think it is important not to place the burden of proof, if you will, on the faculty that developed these ideas. But I think there's setting off a process, and this is the first meeting in that process."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Yeah, sure, and then you're next."

[Senator Richard Bense](#), Government: "I want to echo what Kim and Dick have already said and try to make it a little bit more broader perspective.

"So on the one hand; we have an increasing undergraduate student body. We have in the report, an assumption of no faculty increases. And, then, the assumption is in many of the reforms, that we will have increased overhead and bureaucratic expenses. This seems like a very bad combination.

"And one of the things I would note is that most of the Social Science departments at Cornell are now far smaller than their peer departments that they compete with. Those peer departments have been able to hire over the last decades more than we have. They have incorporated new views, been able to experiment at the margin with alternative perspectives and alternative fields. And this idea that we're going to continue with the constant faculty size seems to me exactly the wrong way to go."

[Senator John Cawley](#), Policy Analysis and Management in the College of Human Ecology" "I just wanted to provide a little bit of perspective from our college. I should have done something more formal and surveyed the entire college. I did not think to do that, but I did send an e-mail to all of my colleagues in the department.

"And the responses I got, I thought were very professional. People's cumulative response seemed to be that they are open-minded; and if there is a case to be made, they are willing to listen to it. But there was a sense, too, that we had not heard what the case was, yet. As was mentioned in the report, what is the problem that this is solving?

"And it did occur to me, that, in 17 years at Cornell, I've never heard, what's really holding back Social Sciences at Cornell is the fact that ILR and Human Ecology are two separate colleges. (LAUGHTER)

"So it seems ad hoc. Nor is it particularly ambitious big thinking either. If we think that there's administrative savings to be had or that there's real synergies, then something along the lines of the College of Social Sciences or the School of Public Policy might make a lot more sense."

[Professor Thomas Björkman](#), Horticulture: "I want to address "Is the problem diagnosed correctly" issue that's come up earlier. And I see under the first one here that there is a desire to increase coordination of faculty within disciplines across academic units, kind of "holy cow, we've got economists everywhere.

"As somebody who interacts with economists in academic work I do, I say, thank goodness for that! That makes us strong. And I work with economists that would presumably be oddballs in a regular economics department, and so because they get to be in a College of Agriculture, they can do agriculture things.

"So I think that kind of thing really makes Cornell strong. I do not want to lose that by organizing all of them together so that they do not interact with the rest of us. So that is a non-problem, to me.

"And then in terms -- one thing that came up was, you know, we'd be happy to interact more if there was money to support that. And the mechanism that has worked for us is writing grant proposals together. Because when you get those grants, you get the money that takes care of that particular limitation. That has actually worked well. There is more and more demand to have interdisciplinary teams on these things. So that might be a tool that is much simpler for solving some of the problems that have been identified in coordination."

[Senator David Delchamps](#), Electrical and Computer Engineering: "As an outsider to Social Sciences, I read the whole thing; and it was interesting to me. I have questions. My questions are mainly about what I call the origin story and how the unfolding narrative grows out of that or supports it, or how the origin story supports the unfolding narrative. And maybe this is about rationale that these faculty members were not asked to think too much about.

"But, first of all, there is this phrase, this mantra that pervades the whole thing, starting with: Before the external report that -- quote, unquote -- the Social Sciences at Cornell are less than the sum of their parts. Unquote.

"Okay. Now, I do not know exactly what that means. I would love to know what it means to you guys. Okay. What exactly does it mean?

"I thought, well, maybe it means that because we've got economists here, economists there, economists there, we don't have a big powerhouse, you know, Tower of Hanoi Economics department to point to. I do not know what that means. Maybe if that is the

case, fine, I will look in the unfolding narrative to see whether any of the ideas support that.

"I didn't really see that happening. I did not see people saying, well, we will put all the economists together or we will put all the sociologists together or anything like that.

'Second of all, about the merger, again, even the committee said: We're not really sure what problem this solves, but let's think about it.

"Okay. And I thought about it, and I thought the following: The folks I know the best in ILR actually are not social scientists. They are statisticians whose primary work is not necessarily Social Science, and they are Labor historians -- a Labor historian. Okay. Now, I consider him a Humanities guy.

"So given that, there is non-Social Science work, significant non-Social Science work going on in ILR. I know Biological Science is in HumEc, so there is significant non-Social Science work going on in HumEc. And, therefore, to me, those two colleges are not, quote, unquote, primarily about Social Sciences necessarily.

"And in the Arts College, any Social Science is represented in the Arts College somewhere. So what problem exactly does it solve to merge those two particular colleges in the light of a whole Social Sciences review? I do not know the answer to that question. I would love to hear, you know, a rationale for that.

"But that's -- as I said, I'm an outsider. I am in Engineering. I look for sort of this structure, but I don't see it in the report anyway."

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "Let me just say one thing to that. It has come up a couple of times of "What problem are we solving." I think the focus of the committee was not on what problem are we solving, but on how do we position ourselves in the future for further excellence. And I think that was the charge, and my co-chairs of the committee can speak to that. But I think the idea should be viewed in that light."

[Senator Dan Brown](#), Animal Science. "I would like to start by thanking all involved of actually putting this to discussion in community and the faculty before going forward with it. I think we have a chance here to improve, but certainly not repeat the fiasco and disaster that is the formation of the Business College.

"Some of the things we've learned from that is that, you know, the shotgun marriage forcing together faculties that had no interest in that, you know, was part of the morale destruction and some of the continued problems are there.

“So I would think that if you want to merge some colleges again, you could learn from the past and make sure that both colleges, or all three colleges, or whatever is going on, there is enthusiastic support by all the elements of the merger, that this isn't being imposed from the outside. But I think we learned that, and that probably is not going to happen.

“I do have questions about Social Sciences in other places, like, you mentioned the Economics department. Certainly a large -- I mean, the Dyson School has economists -- applied economists that aren't social scientists and some of them, in particular, development economists and so on, that might be pulled back and become part of this if this -- if whatever this is were to happen.

“And it's just -- again; I don't understand what it solves. One of the things we have learned is whatever merger or reorganization is going to have to have the full support of each element. This cannot be forced on the faculty again; I mean, that was bad.

“And, in addition, we need to not repeat the experiment of creating a very expensive administrative structure over the various elements. That was an expensive result that was predictable but, you know, we cannot afford to do that again.

“So I don't know how this will turn out or what the pros and cons are. I would like to hear more from Human Ecology. I know they do Social Sciences in Human Ecology and Design has elements of the Arts, as well. But you have departments like Textiles that have some hardcore physical chemists, as well as Design, as well as Humanities, Social Science and so on.

“But it is also a very large Biomedical Science college. And how that fits into a Social Science merger college thing, I am not quite sure. I mean, we all teach sometimes as amateurs some aspects of Social Science, like, certainly courses on production systems and that. I just think it is a funny match to take what I think of as being predominantly a Biomedical college, which is probably wrong, it is just, you know, the people I run into. I just don't understand why they would make this matching.”

[Senator-at-Large Suman Seth](#), Science and Technology Studies: “I just wanted to ask again for an explanation. The mandate for the committee appears to be to ask how to position Cornell for future excellence. One suggestion for that would, of course, be continue to support Cornell's current excellence and indeed provide further and better support for that. Since the committee's come up with quite radical suggestions, it would seem to suggest that that answer is not considered adequate, that there are problems with Cornell's current excellence as we imagine moving into the future.

“So we're back to the problems issue. Could we get some kind of diagnosis from the committee about what the problems with Cornell's current excellence in the Social Sciences is such that these radical changes are necessary?”

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): “Well, I think -- I don't know if you've read -- have you read the materials on the website in terms of the previous reviews going back to 1965?”

“Okay. So, well, there is a summary of some of the statements from those reviews that initiate in '65. Many of those have identified similar challenges with the Social Sciences at Cornell. And so I think some -- and this process initiated with an internal review of the Social Sciences and then an external review, which also identified some areas for potential improvement. So I think the information is there. That was part of what was built off of the committee. But they did not -- in their report, they were not challenged to revise that or restate that. And these are just ideas that are responding to a series of reviews, many of which have identified similar issues.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Back row.”

[Senator Michael Thonney](#), Animal Science: “I have been around here for quite a few decades now -- I'm Mike Thonney from Animal Science -- and it occurs to me, then, when we ask for external reviews and even internal reviews, that there are faculty who don't understand why Cornell isn't like every other university. And that has led to some changes in the 43 years that I have been here that has not been so good. “Instead of embracing mediocrity from other universities, why don't we embrace the excellence that we already have?”

[Professor Eli Friedman](#), ILR: “I want to just follow up on that last comment. You know, I do not know if everyone knows this, but ILR is the best Labor school in the country; and it is basically universally agreed that that is the case. I think many people would say it is the best Labor school in the world. I do my research internationally and, certainly, in East Asia, that is the perspective.

“So if that's the case and what we're trying to imagine is how Cornell positions itself for excellence in the future, well, it's not to say, well, we just keep doing precisely what we're doing, right? And as I think Bill, or maybe Harry, mentioned at the outset, you know, we are reviewing our curriculum; we are thinking about how to update ourselves, you know, for the 21st century.

“But we already do a really good job. So given that that is the case, you know, I just want to voice a concern that I have and I think that some of my colleagues in ILR have,

the concern is that it is not that ILR is not good, it is that people do not value Labor. And, frankly, you know, that has been the case at many universities around the country where Labor programs have been merged or shutdown completely. And it kind of seems like Cornell is interested in moving in that direction, as well.

“So that's the concern that we have. And if we were to be merged into a new college, it seems almost certain that that kind of focus that we have would be diluted. And I think that that's something that has not -- is not addressed at all in the report.”

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): “I want to respond. I certainly understand the risk and the points that you are making. I do want to say that there -- I do not think there is anything -- and I discussed with the committee their report. I do not think there is anything in the report of the committee that would suggest that Labor is not valued, that somehow we want to shut something down or anything of that nature.

“I did not hear anything of that in the report, so please don't -- you know, we can disagree with these ideas. This is not a negative comment on any school or program. It really is thinking about how we position ourselves for excellence in the future.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “I want to go back to this issue of the rationale. Mike, I have -- I actually was flabbergasted to hear that you said that the charge to the committee was not to provide any sort of long or extensive rationale for their ideas. I have never heard anything like that. To ask Academics and Social Sciences and the social scientists not to give rationales for their ideas is just stunning to me.

“And, actually, what I've heard from other social scientists is: Where is the data? You know, we are social scientists; we want to see is there support for a proposal? What is the rationale? Where is the data supporting it? What is the case to be made for the ideas being given?

“These ideas didn't just drop out of the sky and give themselves stars. They were developed by a committee that is not here today with no rationale given in the report, other than some sort of generalized notion of excellence. And that is not going to fly with people who are used to looking for evidence and a case to be made.

“So I just have to say that I'm truly stunned by that response. And I think that some of the things you are hearing today have to do with the fact that there is a case to be made for the excellence that we have. There are cases to be made for ways that we can encourage that, but we have yet to hear rationales or evidence for the proposals that have been prioritized.”

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): “Judy, I wonder if you want to speak a little bit to the ideas underlying the nature of the report and the data behind the report and (Off mic).”

[Vice Provost Appleton](#): “All right. So there was a tremendous amount of data that was collected as part of the internal report, and that was provided to the external committee; and their comments are based on what they saw in that internal report. So this particular report does not emphasize the data that much because that was all done previously.

“We did continually drift -- I would say as a committee, we would drift towards solving problems, and we had to keep coming back to the idea of: What would success look like? How could the Social Sciences at Cornell be as outstanding as possible 10 to 15 years from now?

“That is a very different mindset from being in problem-solving mode. So the committee was really challenged to stay focused on positioning Social Sciences to be excellent 15 years from now. It is a very different way of thinking about the work.

“There were -- and the committee referred back to the data from the internal report. And the very strong sense from the external reviewers was that the Social Sciences at Cornell are very distributed, very broadly distributed across the campus. So that was a prompt for the committee to think about positioning Social Sciences to be excellent in the future.

“But it really was this focus on excellence that drove the discussion so that it was a very open way of thinking about things and not focusing on identifying problems.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “Well, there is still a case to be made for why this would position us for excellence in a certain way in the future, as opposed to just, well; we think that would be an interesting idea.

“I also would note that in the external review, the external review warned against just looking at mergers and said that mergers are not the answer to every question; and that, in fact, we should be skeptical about mergers because they can actually lead to disruption and changes in identity and real reasons for mergers to be -- to result in an inferior result.

“So, again, there needs to be a rationale for doing something. And I think you've heard a lot of evidence today, and I'm sure you'll hear more in the future, about why the

proposal to merge these two colleges is a bad idea, that, in fact, the evidence tells us not to do it.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “I will just add a couple comments. Again, I think the sense we got from a lot of the past reports is that Cornell could be better in the Social Sciences. So a little bit -- I mean, our committee really wanted to just imagine, let us cast a broad net on different things we can do to be better. That is probably why we did not dig deep on rationale, because we wanted to be broad. We did not want to sort of latch in on one thing.

“I mean, in some sense, any one of these ideas, if the campus discussion starts to suggest that there's some promise to it, sometimes the next step is to have that deep discussion, but that's going to be a lot of work for one committee. And to ask a committee to do that for eight ideas is a lot, so that is what's upcoming.

“Another thing I just want to mention -- it does get a little bit back on the sort of problem side. I think one of the things about Social Sciences being less than the sum of our parts is -- I mean, we have heard today two things, we have this great breadth in the Social Sciences, but we have also heard that our Social Science departments are too small.

“In fact, when you look at the data -- some of the data we collected as part of the internal report, there are actually a lot of social scientists on campus. So there could be an argument made that Social Sciences are not too small.

“In terms of investment in Social Sciences -- I was pulling it up here while we were going through -- the Social Science faculty, just in the narrowly-defined Social Science departments that we defined last year, grew by 15 percent over the last 10 to 15 years; and that was two-thirds of the growth of faculty across all of Cornell.

“So in some sense, it's not the case that Social Sciences are necessarily being squeezed, but it feels like we need to somehow get more out of those resources. But, I mean, I think now we do need to move into sort of engaging these ideas, are these the right ideas or not? And that discussion needs to continue.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Okay. Why don't we just have, like, maybe two more questions? We are at the end here. If that's okay with you guys?”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Yeah.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Neil.”

[Senator Neil Saccamano, English](#): “I want to respond to that a little bit. Again, I am an outsider to this in looking, as other colleagues have done here today, at the report and trying to sort of read from the advantages that you state what the problems or the disadvantages are that you are trying to solve, because they are not clearly laid out in the beginning. So it is kind of retroactively understanding how the advantages answer disadvantages.

“And so what keeps coming up to me -- we haven't talked much about the first polls, which seems to have gotten the most support, which is for the center, which doesn't involve necessarily merging schools or units, but it does involve adding another layer of organization, it seems, on top of them and coordinating.

“I am not really sure what exactly that accomplishes. But it seems to me from looking at the advantages that you list in the report on Pages 10 and 11, it is mostly about visibility and efficiency. So it is not about collaboration -- it is mostly about visibility and efficiency.

“So it's not really about collaboration because there is all this collaboration going on, as has been said before. All these centers attest to the number of faculty who are engaged collaboratively with each other, but that is also -- you see that as a problem, that there is all this collaboration. It is too dispersed, it is too distributed. So it is not collaboration, per se, that is the issue, it is the organizational structure.

“So would it be fair to say, then, that at least in terms of that proposal -- and, again, the first thing you list under advantages is consolidation of support in activities in order to achieve what you call a superior level of function. I do not really understand what that means. But I do not know what the -- you can explain it to me later, maybe, because we are out of time.

“So would it be fair to say that really it's about consolidation in order to provide external recognition to the Social Sciences in order to increase the possibility for getting grants? Is that what really this is about? And, then, to decrease the amount of money that is being given to all these individual units in terms of support and organization for them.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Let me give a try at that. I don't think there's any hidden agenda here at decreasing funding for the Social Sciences.” (Off mic)

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "I understand. I will -- for the first idea; I will give a little context. Many institutions that are prominent in Social Sciences have centers that have -- are the kind of catalyst for large proposals from faculty, that bring faculty together, obtain external resources, obtain recognition in competitive applications through that process, and bring additional resources that allow for additional impact from discovery and scholarship.

"Our centers have been relatively -- we don't -- we have not had that kind of large nationally prominent center in the Social Sciences. We have many in the physical sciences. And I think that is one idea that the committee is trying to see how we achieve that stature.

"I think it is all of the things that you mentioned in terms of extramural funding, national recognition, those sorts of things, but no one thing."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Okay. Eric, and that will be it."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "So a significant part of the report points to the fact that graduate students are not sufficiently involved in the research of the Social Sciences, that's a long part of this report. It seems to me, first of all, that consolidation does not necessarily guarantee that they will be. There is a recommendation here that money not be given towards TAs, that sort of funding, but be focused on research.

"But the question is: Have we heard from the Social Sciences that they don't involve their graduate students?"

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "Eric, are you looking at external review or internal review or the report?"

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "I am looking at the external."

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "External review?"

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "Yeah, which I assume weighs heavily here."

[Provost Kotlikoff](#): "Yeah, it does."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "Okay. So that is what I am looking at. And there is this critique that the Social Sciences do not involve their graduate students sufficiently in faculty research.

“So the first thing I'd like to know: Is that a general feeling of the faculty here in the Social Sciences? Does it have any objective verification?”

“The second recommendation is that funding be decoupled from teaching, and then focused on research. What does that do to Cornell's teaching abilities if we are going to do that in the Social Sciences?”

“And then my third point was that if we want to increase graduate student participation in the Social Sciences, if that is indeed a problem, I think we need to hear from the Social Sciences. It does not seem to me consolidation plays any part, necessarily, in that. You can do that independently of any consolidation or collaboration.

“But I'd really like to know what the objective basis of the external committee is for claiming that graduate students are not sufficiently involved in research, that they aren't trained -- and this is the implication here, and it's also explicit. They are not trained sufficiently in research skills, that they leave Cornell inadequately trained in research skills at this point. And I think what we need to hear from is the Social Sciences here and the graduate students.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming.”

4. **SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW AND THIS [PROPOSAL](#) FOR HOW THE SENATE SHOULD BE ENGAGED WITH KEY ISSUES ([SLIDES](#))**

[Associate Dean of Faculty Chris Schaffer](#): “Good afternoon, everyone. I am Chris Schaffer, the Associate Dean of the faculty.

“I just wanted to take the next few minutes and talk a little bit about a proposed idea that was developed in large part by Charlie and I in response to the critiques of lack of involvement of the Senate in decision-making at the university that was raised by Professor Lieberwitz, Cheyfitz, and others last week.

“So I think we need for the Senate to provide voted-upon kind of sense of the Senate feedback regularly, as in every single meeting. Right now, the Senate rarely weighs in on issues. We have passed two resolutions this year, which is small, but even in a year where many were passed; it is seven, eight, nine.

“And I would say this is despite what we saw here today, which is a very successful shift of what we're doing in Senate meetings from just presentations and updates, which is basically what it felt like three or four years ago when I was on the UFC,

towards something that's very much based on a vibrant discussion where I think there's a lot of good ideas.

"But I can tell you that nobody digs through the minutes of the Senate meeting, unless they're looking for a "gotcha" quote. So it basically means that those good ideas just sit here in this room."

"And I think this has real consequences. It decreases the relevance of the Senate for true-shared governance, it decreases the perceived value of coming to present to the Senate and getting feedback, and I think it decreases the engagement of Senators on issues.

"So we'd like to propose an idea to try to just have a regular process that I hope over a few cycles we get good at, and then this just becomes a standard way that the Senate operates. So the process that we are at least initially proposing would work something like this: The UFC would identify issues that the Senate is going to make formal comments on. My guess is that would be most issues of any substance; there are some things that are just obvious updates. But if there was something that a Senator felt the Senate needed to comment on and hadn't, a simple floor motion and a vote would be enough to make it something that we would comment on.

"And then we would work to -- Charlie and I, as well as members of the UFC, would work to capture kind of key threads and comments from Senators during the meeting. Just to give you an example -- and would -- and then we would have a couple of weeks where Senators could make additional comments via website. And then, finally, the UFC would try to distill all of these comments into a series of sense-of-the-Senate statements, which would be distributed ahead of the next agenda meeting.

"Just to give you a sense of the kind of things we were thinking about, I tried to pull together a couple of statements based on the things I heard here today. And this is just draft, but something along the lines of: A merger between the college of -- between ILR and Human Ecology should not move forward without enthusiastic support of the faculty and the affected colleges.

"So that could be a statement that the Senate would vote on and transmit to the administration.

"Another possible statement we could pull out is that the Structure committee should pause activity, then reassess and reissue the report -- their report after the Ideas

Committee has made recommendations. So that could be another kind of sense-of-the-Senate statement.

“So these statements would be distributed ahead of the meeting, along with the agenda. At that Senate meeting, then, they would be presented. They would be debated with opportunities for amendment, and then they would be voted on individually.

“Those statements would then be communicated back to the presenting individual or group, sometimes with a request for follow up, sometimes not.

“This would provide, I think, a regular process that would allow a one-month turnaround on voted-upon sense of the Senate feedback. There's time in this for Senators to consult with their constituent groups on issues, both before submitting comments, it would be a couple of weeks after the Senate meeting where comments would be available; and the statements that are going to be debated and voted on would be available about a week before the Senate meeting along with that agenda. So there would be time for Senators to consult with their constituents.

“I think this could mean an opportunity for increased engagement of Senators on issues both with the Senate and with their constituents.

“This would require us to spend more time on issues, now spread over two meetings. So I think it would significantly decrease the number of topics we cover, and the UFC would have to do a more careful job and a harder job of allocating time and deciding some things might just not make it to the Senate floor.

“One thing I want to emphasize is under no circumstances is this process meant to replace resolutions, committee reports, or any of the other existing mechanisms that the Senate has at its disposal to weigh in, either through the action of individual Senators, for outside faculty, or through the UFC. And under no circumstances is this meant to represent the totality of Senate feedback either generally or on any particular issue; but, rather, a mechanism for the Senate to think about and act on and make recommendations and give feedback on the thing that they just hear month-by-month.

“You know, I think that there's a potential here for this to increase the influence that the Senate has on decision-making processes around the university because of both the timing and the seriousness of feedback that carries, you know, a vote in the Senate.

“So in terms of trying to try this out, Charlie and I thought we might try to pilot this process. If the Senate approves, we would try to pilot this process for the Social Sciences review we just heard about.

“So the way that would work is this week, we'll send out -- so I have notes from today's meeting. This week, we will send out information on a website where additional comments can be submitted. We will draft the sense-of-the-Senate statements, and they will be available with the next agenda. And, then, we will have a good chunk of time at the May Senate meeting that will focus on debate and vote on those statements.

“If the Senate approves and this pilot is okay, we'd then ask for feedback on the process after this pilot. And then we would envision -- if there was broad support among Senators for doing this, we would introduce a resolution in the fall that would sort of inshrine this as a formal process that the Senate does on a monthly basis.

“So with that, I'd be interested in hearing questions or comments on this as a process, and then I'll -- after that comment, I'll make a quick motion to see if people want to proceed with the pilot. “Why don't we start in the back here, please?”

[Senator Cawley](#): “I was just curious, if a constituent has a strong opinion, can they directly log on and enter their comments; or do they have to do it only through us, only we would be able to enter these comments?”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “So my initial -- so this is early days, but my initial thought would be that we would distinguish between Senators and faculty members, but that comments could be submitted by any member of the faculty. But I want to emphasize the goal here is a sense of the Senate, not a sense of the whole faculty. So the comments from Senators would weigh more heavily in the sort of editing and crafting of statements that we put together.

“Risa I think had a question? And then next, is you.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “Yeah, well, thanks for putting all of the effort into doing this. And I think that the goal is very good. I like certain aspects of it, the idea of continual statements from the Senate, continually weighing in, putting us out there to be engaged with. I like all of that.”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “Thank you.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “Yeah. My question is: What is the difference between a sense-of-the-Senate statement and a resolution? You know, I could picture that the kind of things you just read out as examples could be resolved that the Senate, you know, blah-blah, blah-blah, blah-blah, blah, you know, whatever the thing is that the Senate calls on the Organizational Structure Committee to pause until the Ideas Committee weighs in, and that those could be resolutions by -- that are sponsored by the UFC, which has always happened in the past; that's one of the jobs of the UFC, is to sponsor resolutions or it could be sponsored by Senators.

“But I understand your concern about saying, well, how do we get this so it really happens? We are not just going to wait for Senators or faculty to put something forward, but that has always been the role of the UFC, is to keep this going. So if you could, explain the difference between what you mean when you say sense of the Senate, as opposed to Senate resolutions, that would be helpful.”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “Thank you, Risa. So I think in terms of formal mechanism, it is not much different. I think structurally in terms of the documents that are produced, it might be different. I do not think the UFC would be crafting three pages of whereas statements that proceeded what the sense of the Senate was. But probably what would come forward is a resolution, something like a resolution. Clauses would be voted on individually because they would often refer to different things. And some of those statements might go back to different people, depending on who presented.

“So I think in the end, it's sort of a big resolution, but it's sort of more what we would do with it and the fact that we'd make this just a monthly thing. So it just becomes a natural process for the Senate.

“So I think, functionally, I don't think it's much different. It is more maybe trying to reinvigorate the role of the UFC faculty and Charlie and I in driving these kinds of -- but our goal would be to try to put together consensus-type statements that could be voted on.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “Right. And I think -- you know, again, I like the goal here and I like a lot of what you are doing. My only concern about this is that the sense of the Senate, it sounds like it's -- it would carry less weight as opposed to a resolution, which is that the Senate resolves the following.

“You don't have to have pages of “whereases.” You know, that's my only concern, is that it could be perhaps dismissed or not taken seriously in a certain way, and we have enough problem getting ourselves taken seriously.”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “So I think sense of the Senate was a set of words that I put together. I don't have any particular reason that I see that as different than something that the Senate resolved, and we'd be happy just to write it as a formal resolution.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “I think this is a terrific idea, so I just have three footnotes. One is that the actual discussion live with bodies in the room in the initial meeting strikes me as extremely important. I mean, maybe there are people who sift through online comments; there are. But, then, there are people who read the minutes of the Senate; I think that is hard to do, not done much and hard to assess. So I think getting to know one another at the actual meeting is crucial.

“There was a procedure last year of votes being written down in paper ballots and then toted up afterwards, and I hope that's not our procedure. I hope with this, we go back via clickers, hands, whatever, to vote at the meeting. It is only human to want to know what the Senate vote is. It is energizing. And, also, that gives us news coverage, which is important for having a voice.”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “Just to respond to that, I would say the plan would be voice votes and then roll call, if it's too close to call, and that would happen during the meeting.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Okay. Voice, hands, whatever; the old way.

“So, look, the third footnote is sort of different. I think -- thinking that this is a great idea goes with thinking that the procedure that was announced for the Senate responding to either a report on consensual relations is, well, a bad idea, an unfortunate idea, if the goal is for the Senate to have -- be an independent voice of the faculty.

“I mean, just think of it, what does yes or no mean? I mean, views on undergraduates are very different from views of graduate students. One can have grave doubts about the proposed recusal plan and not know at all how to fit them into an overall view of this proposal.

“I think that we should start at that next meeting, and starting means having a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It would be natural if the starting point were one of support for the draft as our starting point.

“And having Robert's Rules of deliberations, including deliberations over amendments, leading to a vote that then expresses the independent voice of the faculty.

"I really think it's terrific that the UFC is taking the initiative on making this kind of thing happen, and I think we should make this kind of thing happen as soon as possible in the Senate response to the consensual relations report."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Great. Thank you very much for that comment. I will talk with Charlie and the UFC, and we will assess whether or not we think we could pull something together that would be meaningful on the consensual relationships policy. I definitely do not want to pilot this in a way where it is going to be not a success. I guarantee that we will have the sense-of-the-Senate statements ready for debate and vote for the May meeting on the Social Sciences review.

"In terms of the structure of the debate for them, what you proposed, something like a Robert's Rules based kind of amendmentry is exactly what I had envisioned. I think it will take some time.

"Could I have a show of hands, how many people know what Robert's Rules is?

"How many people remember how to -- okay, yeah, exactly. So I think we are going to need a couple of meetings to get up to speed where we are able to move through that efficiently and effectively. But that would be the goal, to move toward a formal amendmentry process along the lines of Robert's Rules."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Just one quick thing. The time -- the issue about time here, you know, we are hundreds of Senators and so on and, really, I mean, for various reasons, a very small subset actually speak up at the Senate. So just to talk about the consensual relationship thing, we need -- for that particular thing, like the calendar, we need to have every department weigh in. Okay.

"So, again, there are practical things here. I know deliberation takes time. It is not like you want to rush things through. But there is a democratic thing here, as well, that every -- you know, every department has a chance to weigh in on an issue. And we represent departments, too, so..."

[Senator Jerry Stedinger](#), Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I think it's an absolutely wonderful idea, and I don't like the idea of merging a resolution in the sense of the Senate. A resolution is something that has gone through committee and been thought of, and I think it is a very deliberate statement.

“The sense of the Senate is a way for us to stop and say, okay, here's what we thought, and it doesn't imply that the whole process has been gone through. So in some sense, you can say it more in passing.

“But I would ask the question: If we have a vote on sense of the Senate, and we get 51 versus 49, do we have a sense of the Senate?”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “So thank you for the question. My intention was we would report the statements with the vote. So in cases of voice votes, you know, it would be, you know, unanimous or nearly unanimous. We would give a sense of -- and if votes were very close, we would give the numbers; votes that failed, we would have a statement that it failed.”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “Point of information. These aren't big numbers, why not commit to accounting?”

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “I don't even -- if we still have the clicker system working, then we could do it that way and just have numbers, sure.

“Any other questions or discussion?”

“Okay. I guess I would like to make a motion that the Senate allow this pilot to go forward. I will ask for –

“Second.

“So all in favor, say "aye.”

“Opposed?”

“Motion carries.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “And no further business? I think we're adjourned.”

Meeting Adjourned.