MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, September 8, 2004

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior and Dean of Faculty: “I’ll start the first Senate meeting of the year. I would like to introduce our distinguished temporary Speaker since the Speaker of the Senate is not able to be with us, Speaker pro tem has retired to a position as senator at large leaving us without anybody to moderate this important group. I have prevailed upon a senator at large who is actually on sabbatical leave and not here in Ithaca at all to act as Speaker pro tem for us today. Professor Howland.”

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology & Behavior and Speaker Pro Tem: “Thank you very much. I am going to change the order just a little bit. I’ll first call on Provost Biddy Martin for remarks and answering questions if that’s all right.”

1. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST BIDDY MARTIN

Provost Martin: “Well sure. Hi everybody. Welcome to the new semester. I know President Lehman is on his way. He is actually in traffic. It happens even in Ithaca. Let me tell you what I did over the summer. Over the last part of the summer actually I did something that renewed my faith and confidence in you. Although I have to admit it didn’t need renewing but it reinvigorated me anyway. I invited between 30 and 40 faculty members who were around this summer. I invited them, I begged them basically, to let me interview them at the TV studio downtown so that we would have tapes of faculty talking about your work and your teaching. So, I now have about 40 hours of taped interviews with some of you in this room and many who are not in this room. Those interviews, the process of developing those interviews and listening to you talk about your work was one of the best things I have done since I first became Provost and got to wander around and visit and hear about all the work that was going on in the different colleges. We did edit the 40 hours down to about 85 minutes which we are going to show the trustees when we meet with them tomorrow and Friday. The purpose of showing it to the Trustees is to get them acquainted with more faculty than they currently know and also to prepare for the campaign, which as you know we’re in the midst of beginning. But the other purpose is to have hours of video chronicling or recording what our faculty are doing for posterity, as well as for the campaign. If any of you would ever like to look at some of this video, I promise you it will be worth your while to find our more about what various ones of you are actually doing.

“There have been many other things over the summer, but let me say that the other activity of note right now, that I usually report on and will report on today, is the dean searches that are currently underway. We are searching for a new dean of the Hotel
School, and that search committee is far enough along to have begun reviewing prospects. We are also searching for a new dean of ILR, and that search committee has begun meeting and just developing the position description. We have two new deans who took office on July 1, Mohsen Mostafavi, the new dean of Architecture, Art and Planning who comes to us from London; and Lisa Staiano-Coico, the new dean of the College of Human Ecology who joins us from Weill Medical College in New York City. They are both enjoying themselves, at least they say they are, and they are fine additions to our academic administration. The deans are working beautifully together. There is a really strong sense of espirit de corps and collaboration. I couldn’t be happier about that. It’s a delight to work with the deans group.

And as I said, Jeff will catch you up on some of the other news which will include his response to what he heard from the community in response to the Call for Engagement, what we are about to offer our Trustees as priorities for the capital campaign that we have just launched. We intend to do a study this year of faculty work/life with a special emphasis on the experiences of women. We are just getting underway with formation of a committee to do that study. Of course there will be a thousand other things that we end up deciding to pursue in the course of the year. The most important of all, as always, will be the hiring of new faculty. I am pleased to say that all colleges are in a position budgetarily to have searches underway this fall, and the renewal of the faculty continues for that reason. Now before I turn the floor over to President Lehman, I would be happy to take any questions you might have.”

Professor William Lesser, Applied Economics & Management: “Can you give us any idea as to when you might be announcing your decision about the Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences.”

Provost Martin: “Oh.”

Professor William Lesser: “Your decision as to whether or not you will reappoint?”

Provost Martin: “Yes, within a week. I can tell you right now that we will reappoint the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. We will reappoint her with enthusiasm.”

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: “Biddy, a year or two ago John Hopcroft chaired a committee to look at the university copyright process. Do you know what happened to that report?”

Provost Martin: “Well I could make so many jokes in response to that, as you could. You know I am going to have to defer and ask Bob Richardson what happened to that. I can honestly say that it’s not just sitting on a shelf, but I honestly don’t know what
measures have been taken in the Office of Research or at the new incarnation of the Cornell Research Foundation. So I will have to find out.”

Speaker Howland: “Additional questions?”

Provost Martin: “No, well there’s nothing yet to question I guess. Anyway, welcome and I will be back. Thank you.”

Speaker Howland: “Thank you Provost Martin. I neglected to say that at the start of the meeting that I wanted to remind the body that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting and please turn off your cell phones and do remember to identify yourself and the department from which you come when you speak. And there are no good and welfare speakers for this meeting.

“So now it’s the chair’s pleasure to call on Professor President Jeffrey Lehman for remarks and questions.”

2. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT JEFFREY LEHMAN
President Lehman: “Welcome back everybody. I thought I would just tell you a couple of things about what I did over my summer vacation and then take any questions you might have. The summer for me began with a trip to Asia. This was something that I had been planning for quite some time. I originally thought that I might be able to take it in January, but there was too much work to do along the way, too many different projects with principals and colleges to be confident that we would be in an appropriate state and so we deferred it until the first two weeks of July. I was able to spend five days in Beijing, four in Hong Kong, one in Singapore, two in Bangalore and two in Bombay. And in each city I had a chance to meet with leaders of different academic institutions, sometimes business organizations, and always an all-alumni event.

The purpose for me was to begin to explore how collaborations might work for Cornell in Asia. As you all know, I am strongly committed to the view that Cornell is a transnational institution and that it needs to sustain a powerful presence worldwide. The Call to Engagement and other questions asked, “what exactly does that mean?’ Part of what I was hoping to learn in this was what are the prospects for us, in addition to faculty-to-faculty collaborations that exist and flourish and continue to remain and school-level partnerships that exist and also to flourish. What is the possibility that we might be able to form some kind of institutional-level commitment to a joint research, or teaching, or both, relationship with the very best academic institutions in China and India? The first priority of the project was to identify particular institutions from the very best in China and India. I spent enough time in China, consulted widely with a lot of people who understand the Chinese and Indian institutions, and I had a fair sense in my own mind of what those institutions might be. The results were extraordinarily
encouraging. The clear sense I received was that the very best institutions in China and India are eager to work with Cornell across a wide array of subjects. There is a terrific appreciation for the quality of the work that is done here and a real eagerness to work collaboratively. When I was in China I was in the process of carrying several initiatives that were already well underway: one initiative for the College of Arts and Sciences with Peking University; one initiative for the College of Engineering with Tsinghua University; an initiative for CALS with the China Agricultural University; and another initiative with the Medical College with the Chinese Academy of Sciences and Zhejiang University. And so that was the premise for a lot of the conversations I had. These projects have been in the works for a number of months to years. I will just say for now, that I was enormously excited by the possibilities that are there if we can find the right way to execute them.

The next question is what does it mean to have a relationship that is something other than a signed piece of paper that says we like you, you like us and if our faculty go to visit you, you will welcome them kindly and vice versa. I will continue to think about what that means over the next few months. My initial sense is that it means we should each be facilitating visits of the faculty to the other partner that are not grounded in a concrete, well-advanced collaborative project necessarily, but could be more exploratory; and that we should be facilitating those relationships even when someone does not have an outside grant to cover their transportation costs. That is just one idea I have and I’m proceeding in pursuing more directly.

The other thing I did over my summer vacation was to plow through the responses to the Call for Engagement. I was gratified and overwhelmed literally by the volume of response that we received. I have three very thick loose-leaf notebooks full of responses. We ended up scanning them into pdf files so I was actually able to work on them on my computer. I ended up with over 1000 pages of relatively small font text to go through and highlight. I did that and I have begun, actually more than begun, I’m in that sort of middle phase. I have a sense of what kind of document I will be producing to describe my response. It will be about 100 pages of text; much of it will consist of quotations from the responses. But much of it won’t. My plan is to roll this out around October 29th. Last year I did something that kind of worked for me. I used the inauguration as a time to speak poetically about Cornell, and then I followed it with some other mundane prose that was actually the text of the Call to Engagement document. I think that kind of two-sided combination of poetry and prose works okay for the community, so I think of this document as mundane prose, and the right time to issue it is the day after I speak poetically at the State of the University Address on October 29. I know State of the University addresses are not ordinarily thought of as occasions for poetry, and I’m not sure I’ll be able to bring that off, but at least that’s the one thing I’m trying to do this fall. At the end of the day, what I will be producing is sort of the next step in the conversation about where we ought to be heading between now and the sesquicentennial in 2015. I will distill from the responses
to the Call a set of thoughts, ideas, suggestions that I will try to articulate as clearly and persuasively as I can, but it will be up to all of you to decide whether I am successful or not. Anyway, I am glad everyone is back and it is wonderful to have the campus alive again. I’ll stop there and answer any questions you might have for me.”

Associate Professor Sheila Hemami, Electrical & Computer Engineering: “I think the idea of collaboration of and building ties with Chinese universities is wonderful. I have two outstanding students myself from Tsinghua but I think that our government is getting more and more meddling in this type of thing. We have students that we admitted this year that are not here because they were denied visas and it is unclear to the faculty as yet whether they will be able to come. What are your thoughts on that?”

President Lehman: “It is a huge issue for us and for all the top research universities. It’s a huge issue for the country. Actually we are seeing a massive diversion of top quality student talent towards Australia, and the UK. The AAU and individual schools are trying to prevail upon the government to work out better processes for handling these applications where universities are concerned. Right now I am planning to take another trip to China in early November, and I have been talking to our government relations folks and the current thought is that if we don’t hear anything in the next few weeks I will go to Washington before then and talk with folks in the Justice Department about the possibility of carrying some kind of proposal to Beijing, meeting with the Ambassador Sandy Randt while I’m there and talking about some ways to improve the treatment of visa applicants especially when the applicant has a clear relationship with Cornell, either as a student or as an invited faculty member. We’re thinking about that but it is not too well spelled out yet. My sense is that in order to make any headway we can’t just go and rail at them and say you’re destroying higher education and demand changes. We need to say we understand that national security is very important and homeland security is very important and we have an idea for how we can help to address your concerns at the same time that we ask you to recognize the impact this policy is having, and the question is what goes into the box about the idea of what we have. It will probably be something administrative. We will designate a particular person here who will be responsible for extended follow-up back at the consulate office. Students often come in with incomplete files. In the old days there was more patience with that. Nowadays this just can’t happen but we’re hoping that we can get some kind of a kinder and gentler process in place. But it’s a very serious issue, but one for which we don’t have any clear or immediate answers.”

Professor C. C. Chu, Textiles & Apparel: “I would like to add a comment about that issue. We also have a student who has had visa problems. In her case, the State Department put an alert field on her application. Student applications flagged by this alert field have it sent to Washington DC for the FBI and CIA to check background, sometimes this takes six months. So I write a very polite, but informative letter to US councilors in Beijing and told them that if he or she or their relatives in the future will
have a heart attack problem they will appreciate that the student had come to my lab to work on a technology that would save maybe his or his relatives’ lives. After that she got the visa.”

President Lehman: “Really. That is a great story. That’s the best anecdote I’ve heard.”

Professor Chu: “Could I change the subject? I would like to ask the central administration to look into the issue of making the Cornell work environment more family friendly. I bring this issue up because, and I don’t know how this started, but why do we have classes on Labor Day? Maybe the administrators that set up this policy, either they were empty nesters or they didn’t have two working parents. There are no child-care facilitates open on Labor Day. Another issue related to that family friendly working environment is that two major institutions, Cornell University and the local schools, can never seem to agree with each other. I was so glad when I saw your picture meeting with the local school districts because the calendar of Cornell and local school calendar always oppose each other. Look at the two institutions. They fool with each other, whose calendar will be more inconvenient to the other institution. As an example, the March 2005 Cornell calendar shows spring break on the 16, 20, 19th or something that week and the local school has all the days off before Cornell’s spring and after Cornell’s spring break. Do they purposely arrange it this way to make it inconvenient for those working parents who have kids in school? So maybe as a new administrator you can look into that situation and try to get Cornell to have a more family-friendly environment. I’d appreciate that.”

President Lehman: “I will do both of things. Actually, the Labor Day thing puzzles me. There must be a forty-year history behind this. Is there a three sentence version of why?”

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: “Yes, the problem is Christmas.”

President Lehman: “We can’t have classes on Labor Day because of Christmas?”

Professor Stein. “The reason is that you have got to have 14 weeks of classes and it has to be exactly 14 weeks. Because some classes are given on Mondays and Wednesdays and others on Tuesdays and Thursdays, if you have less than an integral number of weeks then there’s a problem. As scheduled now, we have one week off. That’s Monday, Tuesday and 1/2 Wednesday for fall break and the other half of Wednesday, Thursday and Friday for Thanksgiving. Now the problem is that if you take off Labor Day the whole thing is thrown into a mess because classes that are only given once a week if they happen to be on Monday then you lose that. That’s essentially the reason. And the only solution, I’m not going to give you a solution. Okay, start classes earlier. Typically it is a Thursday or something. You wouldn’t have to start on Thursday, start
on Wednesday. Only call it Monday and take off Labor Day and that would solve the problem.”

President Lehman: “So, what is the reason we don’t do that?”

Professor Stein: “Because there’s no one listening.”

President Lehman: “So who has the power to decide that? Isn’t it this body’s?”

Professor Stein: “Yes it is.”

Provost Martin: “Yes it is, the Faculty Senate’s job.”

Professor Stein: “The Faculty Senate performs the voting.”

President Lehman: “So, Professor Chu I refer your very sensible suggestion to the Dean of the Faculty.”

Dean Walcott: “Who hears you and there have been discussions along these lines and there will be more discussions.”

Professor Stein: “I have just a thought that came to me as you were talking about your Far Eastern trip. You mentioned that people have commented on the political and cultural problems that result from the fact that we as a nation have almost no serious intellectual contacts with Islam. I think it is unfortunate that Islam gets thought of as being oil, thought of as the Saudi Peninsula only. There’s a lot of Islam that’s in the Far East, there’s Indonesia, there’s Malaysia. While it may be difficult, because of the Patriot Acts, to bring people from those countries into ours, it is not difficult at all to bring people from our country into them. And, I just want you to think about if there is any opportunity to make some kind of a contact with an Islamic nation in Cornell’s and our nation’s national interest.”

President Lehman: “That’s a terrific suggestion. Do you know, does anyone know, of any existing contacts, faculty-level contacts, or school contacts?”

Unidentified: “The medical school at Qatar.”

Professor Martin Hatch, Music: “There are exchange programs affiliating Cornell with different schools in Southeast Asia, Indonesia, Malaysia. A lot of these programs are through the Southeast Asia Program.”
Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: “Johnson School has a number of relationships with schools in Turkey and has a long standing and serious relationship with them.”

Professor Alice Pell, Animal Science: “CALS has ongoing programs in Indonesia. Also, I guess that asks the larger question, what about Africa, Latin America?”

President Lehman: “We obviously do have some programs there. I don’t know right now of academic partnerships that are promising at an institutional level in Africa. In Latin America, I’ve been directed by several people to the University of San Palo as a very strong academic institution in an economically and culturally significant and influential country. So I’m thinking of actually going to San Palo over winter break, otherwise known as Labor Day. It was originally intended to be a vacation but …… do you know of institutions that are interested?”

Professor Pell: “There are several in South Africa and there are institutions like Makerere University that are developing in East Africa that we should be involved with.”

Professor Steve Pope, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering: “As we talk about different countries, the answer to my question may be obvious, but could you articulate why you honed in on China and India.”

President Lehman: “Yes, two largest countries in the world, two of the fastest growing economies in the world, two of the most powerful cultures in the world. When I started asking people, if you wanted to insure that Cornell has a strong global footprint where would you begin? Those were the first two countries almost everyone said.”

Professor Christian Otto, Architecture: “I would like to shift this conversation a little bit if you don’t mind. I very much support the idea of engagement with the globe and I very much support the idea of engagement in terms of initiatives at home. But I would appreciate it also, if perhaps you would talk about what ultimately will underpin all of these initiatives and all of these activities, which is money. And that is to talk a little bit about the very dismal and unhappy financial condition that Cornell has found itself in in the last couple of years in terms of its investment performance, both itself and in relationship to its peer institutions. Is something being done to correct that situation?”

President Lehman: “I think the word dismal is accurate, to describe our downward performance over, let’s take, the last seven years relative to our peers. This was something that was recognized by the Board of Trustees about a year and a half ago, maybe two years ago. They went through a period of analysis and concluded that part of the reason why we had underperformed which was basically in performance with
some of the big specialty areas of alternatives in the late 1990s. They concluded that a significant part of the reason was because of the way our investment management system was structured. It used to be that the investment committee of the Board directed our investment portfolio. It was very large, something like 35 or 40 people. All of them had day jobs and, so it was difficult to take a strong direction, that didn’t involve some kind of very high level of consensus. Most of our peers had moved to a different model. So the Board restructured the investment committee, downsized it substantially to seven members. The seven members are supported in their work by separate, specialized task forces in particular areas such as venture capital, real estate, and the decision was made to build within the administration something that had never been here before, which was a professionalized investment office led by a chief investment officer supported by investment analysts. That process was begun just about the time I was named, so just about a year and a half ago. Last year the office hired a couple of senior staff people, senior investment analysts, and the group on campus have been working very closely with the investment committee. Our performance this past year I would not say, would dazzle anyone, but we were back in the game. We were right in the central cluster of investment performance with peer institutions. I don’t know that this is all of the adjustments that we will be making in order to have our investment performance be comparable to the performance of our faculty, but I think it is certainly the right first step and we’ll just have to now take a couple of years to see whether this is all we can do.”

Assistant Professor Kate Whitlock, Molecular Biology & Genetics: “While we are on economics, what’s your future vision of the economic status of the university given increases in things such as the price of oil, and also investments by the National Institute of Health for next year which will not even keep up with inflation?”

President Lehman: “Sorry?”

Professor Whitlock: “How we will we get money to balance out for the future with programs like the Life Sciences Initiative?”

President Lehman: “Right now we are not looking at wonderfully plush times ahead. We, like just about every other major research university, are facing the collision of a number of forces. Our expenses continue to grow very quickly, oil is one significant cost driver, and steel turns out to be another one. I mentioned China a minute ago. The building boom in China has significantly increased the price of steel worldwide, which means that when we build buildings they are expensive, dramatically more expensive than they were five years ago. That is colliding with a significant tightening of funds from a number of different directions. There’s the federal government and there’s the end of the big NIH boom. It doesn’t seem to be leading to a new NSF boom or a new NASA boom. There are little booms - homeland security is a big boom area. We would like to do research in that area with some of the support that we have. But overall the
The federal government is not stepping up. As we all know, the state government is stepping down at the same time. We are hitting a wall on tuition. We are not the most expensive institution within our peer group, but we are not cheap either. We are concerned about the impact of tuition rates on our ability to continue to attract an economically diverse class. Right now we continue to do very well with Pell Grant eligible students. However, we are especially concerned actually about students who come from families that are a little bit better off than that and who are really hurting when it comes to college tuition. So what do we do? There are two essential sources of funds that are left when we go through that litany. One is philanthropy, like the campaign we began quietly on July 1. This campaign will last seven years and it should provide significant support for some of these initiatives like the Life Sciences Initiative. Again a lot of this depends on the stock market and other economic factors, how plush people are feeling, how generous people are feeling, how excited they are about supporting Cornell. But, we are guardedly optimistic. From initial conversations that we have had with our graduates, it appears that they will step forward and help us in the ways that we most need.

The other area that we continue to talk about is and look at has to do with a controversial area, which is technology transfer. Some of our peers have become reliant on their ability to reap commercial rewards from inventions that were developed on campus and the discoveries that are developed on campus. We have undergone, as Biddy mentioned, a renewal of CRF, which is now CCTEC (Cornell Center for Technology Enterprise & Commercialization). Candidly, I don’t foresee that that will be an area of tremendous revenues for the university in the next five years. Whether it is in the next five years after that will depend on a whole variety of factors, some internal and some external. So it’s not a great picture. A lot will depend upon our being optimistic and finding for projects that we care about, sources of grant funds in a very tough competitive environment where there’s not a lot of grant funding around.”

Professor Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management. “Two weeks ago Governor Pataki vetoed several initiatives that affect Cornell, one that is dear to my heart is the MVR North. What affect will that have on plans for those buildings and more generally how much of a problem do you see the eroding of contributions of the state to Cornell?”

President Lehman: “I went and had lunch with Bob King, the Chancellor of SUNY, a couple of weeks ago to talk about this. It’s not a pretty sight. It really isn’t. I think, the particular veto of Martha Van extra supplement, and I have no doubt is necessary to build that building, puts us in a very bad spot. We can’t just build all but the last floor and then use the building. We are working with the governor’s office and SUNY to see if there might be special supplemental legislation introduced in January that would allow us to move forward, but it is inevitable that this will set us back at least several months in getting it built. More generally, I think as long as funds remain tight in the
state, we are not going to do very well. The philosophy of SUNY is that when times are good, everyone will benefit including Cornell, and when times are good SUNY loves the special partnership that it has with Cornell. When times are tough the underlying feelings in SUNY is that Cornell has more alternative resources that it can turn to than most of the campuses do, and it will take special care of what it sees to be much more life and death issues around the margin there than it sees here. Having said that, when I talked to the Chancellor, we talked about how important it is that there be education at the very highest quality in the state. As an economic matter we continue to attract students. He agrees with everything and he, we think, as an honest broker carries that message forward to the governor. Although he’s a friend of the governor’s, I don’t think he has a lot of influence. So this is really a set of decisions that are already taking place. We are continuing to analyze all of the different options that you can imagine about altering our relationship with SUNY, trying to change the budget allocation formula so that the land grant allocation is figured separately, and figuring whether that’s helpful or harmful. I’m continuing to work with the SUNY folks on making some of those adjustments but those aren’t big enough. They are small ones on the margin. That is why the contract colleges also will be participants in the campaign.”

Speaker Howland: Are there additional questions for the President?”

Professor John Guckenheimer, Professor-At Large, Mathematics: “Can you give us a bit more of a preview of the campaign. I guess it’s no longer a preview if it started July 1st.”

President Lehman: “It’s been very quiet. In the this year we are mostly going to be working with what I refer to as our closest friends, our trustees, our friends who have been great donors in the past, to get a sense of where they would like to come into this campaign, how substantial of a contribution they would like make, and towards what areas. The vice president for Alumni Affairs & Development, Inge Reichenbach, is working with the Provost and with the Deans to develop a sense of what the school and college-level priorities are, and part of what will happen in these next couple of years is a test of how receptive different donors are, to different priorities. Institution-wide, we have our Life Sciences Initiative and we have a West Campus Residential Initiative that I will be stumping for as well. After October 29th I have something else, probably not of the same scale as either. Largely this is going to be a campaign that will be pursuing academic priorities.

Oh, yes we have a Faculty Excellence campaign already underway. While this is actually one, there are several elements that have been defined already. Faculty Excellence is one of them, we have ....

Provost Martin: “It’s really the West Campus, Life Sciences, and Faculty Excellence.”
President Lehman: “Faculty Excellence is the third one, which is again to increase the number of endowed chairs that we have and other kinds of support for the faculty research and teaching. There’s actually a pretty cool web site the alumni office has put out where students and alumni talk about faculty members who have a profound influence on their lives. They give little testimonials.”

Speaker Howland: “Any further questions? If not thank you very much President Lehman.” The Chair now calls on Dean Charles Walcott.

3. REMARKS BY DEAN CHARLES WALCOTT
Dean Walcott: “I have just a few.”

“First a matter of some business that I would like to tell you about, I am required to make a report on FACTA and here is the report. Well you can see as well as I. Forty-nine files were reviewed, 46 positive recommendations, three negative recommendations and the Provost concurred with 47 of those recommendations. That is the general numbers, and I don’t think I can tell you very much more about it other than that general report.

“Another announcement is that the draft of the strategic corporate alliance which is the output of a committee led by Cynthia Farina which has been puzzling over the issue of how to do business with corporations should any appear on the door step and want to give us very large sums of money. What the dangers are, what the potentials are, and so on, and a draft of that has been sent around to each department. We hope that there will be discussions within the departments, and that any reactions will come back to Cynthia by the middle of October so it can be incorporated in some kind of a general document. It seemed useful to have discussions occur at that kind of local level before it arrives back here on the Senate floor to be discussed.

“On another matter I can report that the conflict policy, which caused a certain amount of unhappiness to some faculty members because of its vagueness about what constituted a conflict of interest, has been substantially revised. This was done at the instigation of our distinguished Senator from Physics, former Senator from Physics, Peter Stein. It has been revised in the form of a footnote, a very long footnote. And this has the great advantage in that it does not change in any way the policy. It simply explains it. And so it is not necessary to bring it to you for endorsement, nor to the Cornell Board of Trustees. But we think when you get to read it, it’s now at least vaguely comprehensive, comprehensible as to what it actually means.

“And then on a somewhat more practical point I was asked to bring to your attention the fact that there is now a bus that shuttles between Ithaca and NYC on a somewhat regular basis. There’s a whole stack of brochures over there on the table. On this one
you make reservations and it has, in my opinion, two great advantages over Short Line. One is the seats are very much more comfortable. There’s much more space. There’s a tray table, facilities to plug in your lap top computer. There’s sound and music, I assume, available and that is one great advantage.

But the most important advantage is that it takes roughly four hours to from here to New York, as opposed to five or six through Mr. Short Line. So I urge anyone that’s interested to pick up a brochure and explore this service. I’ve actually sat in the seats and they are really very nice.

“I want to spend just a few moments on is what are the issues that are likely to come before you this year, what are the problems that the various committees are working on. The Educational Policy committee is talking about the calendar issue. It has become possible, because of the changes in registration, that we may free up that initial Wednesday which was used for grand course exchange. It may be possible to declare that a Monday, an honorary Monday, and then to fix the Labor Day situation. We’re not sure. This needs to be explored, but it is a possibility that the EPC will be considering, and this would be a big jump. The committee is also working with the University Registrar. As you probably know, the Registrar’s working on putting in the new system for student enrollment, and it was suggested to me that it would be good to have some faculty involved in that process because we do have an interest in how students get registered for our courses and how enrollment is capped and a variety of other things. And so the University Registrar has agreed to put some members of the Educational Policy Committee on his council to help him with that perspective. Certainly that’s cheerful news.

“I hope by the next meeting we will have the research scientists and principal research scientists titles ready for you to discuss. I’m sorry not to have it for this meeting but we simply were not able to get all the pieces in place to have an intelligent discussion, so that will be coming.

“The suspension policy issue is being worked on by the various deans. I hope that policy will be ready soon for this body to consider once again.

“I have just received a report from the ad hoc committee that’s been working on the status of non-tenured track faculty and I have a series of recommendations from them. Before I distribute it widely I have asked the President and the Provost to take a look at it, and see if there are any issues there which cause them alarm and palpitations so that we can operate as a group to try and see which of those changes that are suggested in the report really make sense. And so I predict that will be along before too much longer.
“We have had a group from Operations Research working on the scheduling of final examinations. It turns out that something like a thousand students have more than three exams in a 24-hour period and the folks from Operations Research think that they can fix this to reduce the number by about 90%, and again that is something that will come back to you.

“Financial Policy Committee is being vigilant at looking at faculty salaries compared to our peers as they have for a number of years. The administration has very kindly followed through on their plan to increase our salary levels. FPC is also looking at the consistency in salaries for the same kind of jobs across the various colleges. There are economists all over the place at Cornell, and are they being paid kind of roughly comparable wages; or biologists, for example, a group that happens to come to mind for some reason. And this is another matter which is going to be looked at.

“Apparently there are different costs of graduate tuition depending upon which college your major professor is located in, and that is another matter which Financial Policies is going to be examining.

“On another issue we’ve decided that it might make sense this year to have the Committee on Affirmative Action and the Committee on Minority Affairs meet in the same room, at the same time, with the same chairperson to facilitate communication between these two groups and to work with Bob Harris particularly, who is already gathering much of the information that Affirmative Action used to gather, to see if we can’t facilitate that whole operation, and see how we best interface with Bob’s activities.

“The Library Committee is going to be considering a whole variety of issues, not only that of journal pricing and our friend Mr. Elsevier and his or her activities, but the consequences of Work Force Planning for the libraries and a variety of other matters.

“There’s going to be a proposal very shortly from CAPP about a Hotel School satellite in the Far East and that will be coming very shortly.

“So that is kind of the preview of coming attractions and if you have any further suggestions of items that should be considered by faculty committees, please let me know and I’ll try and see that they find appropriate homes and get some consideration during the year. Thank you.”

Speaker Howland: “The chair would now like to call for approval of the minutes of the May 12, 2004 Senate meeting. I ask for a unanimous approval. Do I hear anything? Hearing none those minutes are approved. The speaker now calls on Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty and Chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee for a report.”
4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Cynthia Farina, Law School, Associate Dean and Secretary of Faculty and Chair of Nominations and Elections Committee: “Good afternoon. While I am going to be brief, I am not going to be quite as brief as the Walcott tradition, because since you received the list of nominees in the mail, we have had some faculty agree to requests from the committee to serve on various committees and we wanted your approval so they could start their work. These additional names are on the list. Let me just give you an additional minute to look this list over before we ask for your approval.

Let me just explain the last entry, which is somewhat unusual. This position, you probably realize, is normally elected by the faculty at large. We needed a single year’s sabbatical replacement, so our typical practice is to handle that simply by replacing by appointment. So we ask you to approve Professor Davis, who was actually the next runner up in the election that was held. So with that I ask for approval.”

Speaker Howland: “Any objections? I ask for unanimous consent. Seeing no objections, the report is approved.”

Associate Dean Farina: “I do have another slightly unusual matter for you: Speaker Pro Tem, another position elected by the faculty at large. Our former speaker Pro Tem was elected to another position so we need to fill that position. I am sorry, I guess not by the faculty at large but by you, and so we are now asking for an election to be held to fill out the term. Professor Cooke has agreed to serve,

Speaker Howland: “Professor Bob Cooke has agreed to serve?”

Associate Dean Farina: “Yes.”

Speaker Howland: “So, since he is very well known to everyone here, we are going to ask for unanimous consent and approval of this appointment.”

Dean Walcott: “It might be wise to ask for any additional nominations from the floor.”

Speaker Howland: “Yes. Thank you sir. Are there any additional nominations from the floor?” Seeing none, I ask for unanimous consent. I hear no objections. Now I call on Associate Dean Farina again for a resolution to modify the Nominations and Elections Committee selection process.”

5. RESOLUTION TO MODIFY NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE SELECTION PROCESS
Associate Dean Farina: “You have received the proposal. As you doubtless know there are two committees of the Senate that are elected at large, the Nominations and Elections Committee and the University Faculty Committee. This proposal would modify the selection process for the Nominations & Elections Committee to the extent of allowing three of the nine positions to be chosen by the committee itself. That would actually work out to one position each year, because there are three three-year staggered terms. The reason for that is spelled out in the background memo that was sent out with the proposal. We tried to include a fair amount of detail. I won’t repeat that unless there are questions in terms of the resolution.”

Speaker Howland: “So the resolution is open for discussion. Are there any questions, comments on it? Hearing none, again, I’ll ask for unanimous consent to accept this resolution. Do I see any objections? None. This resolution is passed.”

Resolution to Modify Nominations and Elections Committee Selection Process

Whereas current legislation stipulates that the entire Nominations and Elections committee is elected at large by the Faculty for staggered three-year terms;
Whereas it is important to have the membership reflect a balance among the schools/college and disciplines, as well as the diversity of the Faculty to facilitate the committee’s ability to reflect a similar balance in its work of nominating candidates for various Senate and other University positions;
Whereas such a balanced membership does not reliably occur through the at-large election process;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the legislation regarding the composition of the committee be modified as noted below:
Delete:
The Nominations and Elections committee consists of nine members of the University Faculty elected at large by the Faculty for staggered three-year terms.
Replace With:
The Nominations and Elections committee consists of nine members of the University Faculty who serve staggered three-year terms. Six members shall be elected at large by the Faculty and three members shall be nominated by the Nominations and Elections Committee and appointed by the Faculty Senate; these three members shall be selected with the goal of having the nine members of the committee reflect a balance among the schools/colleges and disciplines, as well as the diversity of the Faculty.

Associate Dean Farina: “"Thank you.”

Speaker Howland: “Well, nobody is going to speak for good and welfare. So we are ready for a vote to adjourn. Adjourned: 5:35.”

Respectfully submitted,
Cynthia R. Farina
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty