

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, October 13, 2004

Speaker Mary Beth Norton, Professor, History: "I would like to call the meeting to order and to remind everyone that photos or tape recorders can not be used during the meeting. Please turn off any cell phones as the Chair has already done and please make sure to identify yourself and your department before you speak. I will also announce that there is one Good and Welfare speaker at the end of our agenda. I will also remark that Provost Biddy Martin is not able to be here today which means that we may actually get out before 6:00 if we operate with dispatch. I will now call on Dean Walcott for brief remarks."

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Charles Walcott, Dean of the University Faculty: "Brief remarks are what they are. There are three basic announcements, some of more interest than others. I received a call from Gannett Health Center this morning to report that, as you know, there is a shortage of flu vaccine and that the priority is going to be to give it to our undergraduates who are at risk for flu for a variety of medical reasons and to recommend that those of us of somewhat advanced years seek our friendly local physicians to get flu shots. In other words, there will be no faculty or staff flu shots this year because there simply is not enough vaccine to go around.

"Secondly, you should all have gotten an announcement from the President's office that the results of the *Call to Engagement* are on the web, all 82 pages of it. I trust everyone will read this because there will be an examination on it. But, seriously it is worth reading or skimming through it. There are some very interesting things there.

"Finally, I would like to bring to everybody's attention the Provost's Academic Diversity Post Doctoral Fellowship Program. I suspect that many of the faculty has no idea that this exists. What it is, is a program for post docs to increase the academic diversity and excellence at Cornell of promising scholars who have been historically underrepresented in higher education including but not limited to African American, American Indians, Hispanic, and Latino. This is a two-year appointment. There will be three of them and they are open to any part of the University. If you know promising people, you should really get in touch with Bob Harris who is in charge of this program. There are three pre-post docs positions available and apparently this is likely to be repeated in subsequent years. I just wanted everybody to know that that existed in case you have any interest."

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speaker Norton: "Thank you very much Mr. Dean. We will now move on to the next item on the agenda, which is approval of minutes of the September 8 meeting of the Senate at which everyone knows I was not present. Therefore I am not required to read the minutes to know whether they accurate but all of you are I assume. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes of September 8? Seeing none, do I have unanimous consent for approval of the minutes? All in favor say aye. The minutes are approved.

"Now the next item on agenda is a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee and Associate Dean Farina is not here so Dean Walcott will present that report."

3. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Dean Walcott: "Once again, this will be a brief report. I can report that the Nominations and Elections Committee has nominated the following people, subject to your approval, for the various committees. This was distributed with the call to the meeting so you should have all seen it. If not, here it is. That is what I put forth."

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee

FACTA

Sondra Lazarowitz, CALS

Faculty Committee on Program Review

Salah Hassan, A&S

Judith Reppy, A&S

Sidney Resnick, Engr.

Professor-at-Large Selection Committee

Barbara Lynch, AAP

University Assembly

Richard Depue, CHE

University Hearing Board

Brian Chabot, CALS

Speaker Norton: "Thank you very much. Are there any objections to this slate of nominations?" Hearing none. Slate unanimously approved."

Unidentified: "What is FACTA, please?"

Dean Walcott. "It is the faculty committee to advise the Provost on tenure."

Speaker Norton: "Let's move on. The next item on the agenda, to be offered by Professor Jennifer Gerner on behalf of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, is the resolution to approve a joint graduate masters degree program with the School of Hotel Administration and Nanyang Technological University's School of Business in Singapore."

4. RESOLUTION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES TO APPROVE A GRADUATE JOINT MASTERS DEGREE TO BE OFFERED BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF HOTEL ADMINISTRATION AND NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY'S SCHOOL OF BUSINESS IN SINGAPORE

Professor Jennifer Gerner, Policy Analysis & Management, Chair, CAPP: "The School of Hotel Administration has brought to the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies a proposal for a Joint Masters Degree with Nanyang Technological University Business School (Appendix 1). CAPP has considered it and brings you this resolution with the recommendation that it be approved."

*Resolution to Approve a
Graduate Joint Masters Degree to be offered by
Cornell University School of Hotel Administration and
Nanyang Technological University's School of Business in Singapore*

WHEREAS, the General committee of the Graduate School has reviewed and approved the proposal to create the Cornell-Nanyang Institute of Hospitality Management (CNI) at the Nanyang Business School in Singapore which will offer a joint (Cornell-Nanyang) Masters of Management in Hospitality (MMH) degree, the same graduate professional degree offered in Ithaca;

WHEREAS, the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has reviewed and recommends approval of the same proposal;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves the creation of the Graduate Joint Masters Degree to be offered by Cornell University School of Hotel Administration and Nanyang Technological University's School of Business in Singapore.

“We have David Butler, the Dean of the Hotel School, and others from the Hotel School here to answer your questions. I should point out to you that this program is a one year masters degree and the Hotel School is also proposing to change its masters degree to a one year long period. We have not yet considered that. That is on our agenda for Monday, actually. So this is really just the joint program with the Nanyang. We will be bringing to you a separate resolution about the change in the Hotel School’s masters degree. If you have questions we do have Hotel School representatives here to answer any questions.”

Associate Professor Susan Piliero, Education: “I had a question on page four. It says that Cornell will control the curriculum. What about admissions? How will that be determined?”

Professor Jan de Roos, School of Hotel Administration: “I guess I would be called the point person on the faculty for the program and have made a couple of visits to Singapore and am very familiar with the program. The admissions will be controlled by Singapore, by the Dean and the Vice Dean in Singapore. The admissions criteria will be determined by the Hotel School in consultation with the program in Singapore, but control over the admissions process and who will be admitted is with Singapore. Let me also state that we have great comfort in NTUs ability to admit the elites from Asia, in terms of their admission criteria. Their business school program compares very favorably to the sorts of students we are admitting in the Hotel School and at the Cornell Business School.”

Speaker Norton: “Are there other questions?”

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: “Can we move to adopt this resolution?”

Speaker Norton: “The motion is already in front of us. It is brought by the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, so there is no need to have a motion. I just want to see if there is any further discussion.”

Professor Chris Wien, Horticulture. “I just want to follow up the question about admissions. What is typical admission by this school and what would it be for this particular program? Is admissions going to be primarily Singaporeans or is it going to be taking applications and admitting students from more widely in the region?”

Professor de Roos. “The target markets, pardon the term, are India, Singapore, China, and then greater Southeast Asia. We see Singapore as being a great place to integrate, with China especially. We would like to see in the long run that we are able to offer English language instruction to Chinese nationals because that’s the fastest growing

area of the hospitality business in all of Asia, actually in the world. Initially we see, probably half Singaporeans, half foreign students. In the long run that will grow where the Singapore base will stay about the same, but we want to grow the base outside of Asia."

Professor Wien: "How restrictive is Singapore in terms of admitting students from countries like China and others?"

Professor de Roos. "They are not restrictive at all. They have very limited ability for foreign students to stay in Singapore post degree, but for study in Singapore it is very easy to obtain a student visa and study in Singapore."

Speaker Norton. "Are there other questions?."

Professor David Levitsky, Nutritional Sciences: "Can I ask about trends of these joint programs with other universities?"

Professor Gerner: "The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies brought you a joint program that the Business School is proposing with Queens University. That was actually a distance-learning program. It turns out they have not actually proceeded to implement that yet although they are still considering it. This is the only type such program ----- in the two or three years I've been on CAPP. Is that what you wanted to know? I think the Hotel School is considering trying to put together a second joint program with a European university. Is that correct?"

Professor de Roos. "Yes it is."

Professor Gerner. "We may see another one soon. But for the moment this is the only one."

Speaker Norton. "The speaker's question is rather different. Are there other programs like this with other American universities or is this a novel program? Do you know? Is this going to be a pioneer program or are there others?"

Professor de Roos. "I believe this is a pioneer. I am not aware of any joint degree programs. There are dual degrees; there are joint programs throughout the world, but I am not aware of any other joint degree programs that exist."

Professor Peter Hinkle, Molecular Biology & Genetics: "I may have missed it in the summary that you gave us, but it's not quite clear what Cornell is doing in this. Are there three professors that travel to Singapore? Are there going to be more than that?"

Professor de Roos: "The program is English language instruction. It's the only language of instruction at NTU other than their foreign language classes. The contribution from Cornell is primarily of intellectual accumulation of 75 years of operating a hotel school. We feel it is the premier hotel school in the world. There are three faculty, the Dean and two faculty to be named. The faculty will be resident in Ithaca with significant amount of their time devoted to teaching and research in Asia. We feel that with our relationship with the worldwide hospitality industry, we bring a lot to bear with the program. We have 60 faculty and 40 research active faculty on the Cornell campus that bring a knowledge base in hospitality that no other school in the world can do. We feel that is a very significant contribution to the program."

Professor Gerner: "And you'll be bringing some of the students here to study."

Professor de Roos. "I've answered the question in terms of what we will bring to Singapore. In terms of the curriculum design, it is for students to spend half of their time in Singapore and half of their time in Ithaca with a very significant amount of instruction by Cornell professors in Ithaca."

Professor Gerner. "When this was presented to CAPP there was a larger design where students in Ithaca will also at some point be able to go to Singapore or to their European partner once they get a European partner. They have in mind having masters students from each of the three places spending different times in each of three places."

Speaker Norton. "Are there other comments or questions? Seeing none I assume you are ready to come to a vote. All in favor please say AYE." Motion passes.

"The speaker will now call on Brad Anton for a resolution to recommend the establishment of the titles of research scientist and principal research scientist."

5. RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TITLES RESEARCH SCIENTIST AND PRINCIPAL RESEARCH SCIENTIST

Professor Anton: "I move to adopt this resolution (Appendix 2) and subsequent discussion will be led by Ken Birman from the College of Engineering."

Speaker Norton. "Professor Birman will you come up and talk about the resolution."

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: I would like to thank the Senate for being willing to consider this again. You may recall that the topic was tabled at the end of the spring session with some questions to the Provost's office and to Susan Steward who handles titles. The proposal that I am bringing to you originated with dialogue within the Engineering College about the adequacy or inadequacy of some existing titles for research employees here at Cornell. As you know there's been talk about versions of

research professor titles. That was discussed in Engineering. It's not what we are putting in front of you today. This isn't connected to the Clinical Professor dialogue that I know the Senate engaged in over an extended period of time. But there is a sense within Engineering, and I think it extends throughout the campus, that Cornell doesn't have sufficiently strong and prestigious looking titles to compete with our peer institutions elsewhere, and we must do something about this. Let me give you a sense of what we have now and what we are proposing to do. I hope this is legible (Appendix 3, Existing Titles). I'm used to power point on laptops being a computer science person. The existing titles that we work with in the research area in Engineering – and I would say that there are about 45 people in Engineering in these categories, and throughout the university quite a large number overall – are Research Associates, which is a soft money position. Appointments can end if the funding ends, can end if the faculty member associated with research area leaves, and it can actually end simply because of a change in research interest within an area. A Research Associate is a kind of post doc who stays on and pursues a research career here at Cornell. Such a person would almost never teach and would typically be a full time employee on a project of some sort. A good model would be Duffield Hall, that was just inaugurated, where there would be substantial groups working on new materials, new kinds of nano-techniques. These groups will employ full time researchers that will come in as Research Associates. Senior Research Associate is a promotion track for the Research Associate position. A person, in Engineering at least, to be promoted to this level goes through a tenure-like review with external letters, review by the department or by the research unit, because it's not always a department we're talking about. We might be looking at the Theory Center's Academic Research Institute or as I said Duffield would have all units. And of course that would be case in other settings on the campus as well. Such a person can potentially be the principal investigator on a proposal, and I don't know how many of you were aware of this, but can in fact join a graduate field if that graduate field nominates the individual and if the graduate program here at Cornell approves the proposal. I know of at least two cases in Engineering where people who are members of the graduate field and are able to independently supervise doctoral theses. That is the case today."

"Finally, we have a title on the books called Senior Scientist. This is very prestigious and done by a recommendation. It's suggested that the University not have more than about 10 such people campus wide. You can think of this as the caliber of a Nobel Laureate who has decided they no longer want to teach very often and we offer them a position as a full time researcher. "

"Why do we need other titles? The problems are several-fold, really. First of all, the existing titles are felt to be problematic just because of the word 'associate.' And this has to do with the fact that our graduate students are research assistants and within the general community then to be a Research Associate sounds more like a post doc than it sounds like a senior prestigious, full time research position. I think at the senior level,

in particular, that has been a problem. Our colleagues, many of whom are very respected, very, very impressive researchers who are being attracted by tenured offers elsewhere, feel that it's awkward to put a badge on at a conference with their friends who are full Professors and they are a Senior Research Associate. This has been a problem. There has been uneven application of dossier review in the past within Engineering, and probably elsewhere on campus. There are some people who have entered these positions without real research credentials, weakening the perceived value of having such a position."

" Frequently, the titles available at our peer institutions are more prestigious, and I want to emphasize there's a train that has left the station and realistically Cornell is standing on the platform. That train is the research professor track. I am going to show a table in a moment. Many of our peer institutions are creating such titles. Within Engineering, as within the Senate, there's a lot of sensitivity with the question of using professor in this way. We are not proposing that now. I won't be before you proposing it at all. But our competitors are doing this and people we're talking about are being offered Research Professor positions elsewhere. (Appendix 3, What do our peers do?) Just to give you a sense, Stanford has a Research Professor position; MIT is apparently creating one. They have a position they call Senior Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist is analogous to what we are trying to use here. Carnegie Mellon was the first to use a research faculty track and has had such a thing for about 25 years. The University of California schools have such titles available including a professorial one called Professor in Residence. Because of the institutes that they often create they have many titles available to them but I will point out that this scientist title, Research Scientist/Project Scientist is used there. Johns Hopkins has a Research Professor track that they have just instituted. They have Research Scientists at the assistant and associate level. Vanderbilt has a Research Scientist, which can be senior and a Research Professor. You can see that there is quite a range. These are just the ones I could get information on last night when one of my colleagues asked me to check who has a Research Professor title and other analogous titles to what we want to propose here today.

"I will say a few words about progression (Appendix 3, diagram). Existing titles are on the left in yellow. Right now a person comes in with a PhD or some equivalent qualification, the wording in the proposal allows a bit of flexibility so the Dean can recognize equivalent research experience. A Research Associate is probably promoted over time from an assistant; a Senior Research Associate very, very rarely might pursue a promotion to Senior Scientist. We are going to try to phase that out but we can't do that overnight because not all of these people would be qualified under a reasonably stringent dossier review. The intention here is to move to a world in which these people come in, they get a position of Research Scientist and even at that level there's dossier review, review that is scrutinized at the Dean's level to make sure that standards are upheld. Promotion of Associates to Principal Research Scientist is a

possibility of people moving over, but only on review. That means that the yellow track may well continue to exist for some period of time. I recognize the confusion that that may create but we should think of ourselves as moving towards, at least in Engineering, the green track. And again, the Senior Scientist title is not achievable for most of these people. A dossier review at all levels, owned by the department or the analogous unit and then going up to the Dean's level, provides for some degree of standard across the colleges. Engineering passed a resolution that states precisely how this would be done; just as Engineering has a policy covering how Engineering handles tenure. Other units might handle the policy aspects in their own way.

"The language in front of the Senate today is just the overall university-wide language. In fact, it was not drafted by me. It was drafted by Susan Steward, who did a wonderful job. Principal Research Scientist is similar in terms of expectations to an Associate Professor. They are non-tenured positions. I want to emphasize two things about these. They can end because you run out of money. The individual is not permitted to switch into a teaching mode in which they would have a set of duties analogous to those of a professor and yet have this title. The language precludes teaching repeatedly semester after semester as a way to bridge funding precisely because we don't want to slice and dice the professorial titles and we're sensitive to the concerns about that. However, it does leave the Dean the flexibility to approve a period of teaching in the event that funding sags but there's an expectation, or a reasonable expectation, that funding will be resumed. On the other hand, it's not a renewable position in the mere fact that it can bring in money; it is not enough to guarantee continuation of the activity. The intent here is that the university can invest in exciting, leading edge areas that might pan out and might not. And in that latter case if they don't, we want to leave the flexibility for the unit and the Dean to say 'you know we need that space in Duffield Hall.' The fact that they can bring in money isn't the entire issue here if the priorities are elsewhere. These are positions with weaker guarantees than what most of us enjoy today. And just to emphasize again the Principal Research Scientist would be eligible to be a PI, to join a graduate field if the graduate field nominates that person for membership and if it is approved by the graduate program, and to chair a special committee, and again not automatically but on request. You can imagine other combinations where for a period of time a person is allowed to join a special committee on an ad hoc basis and then after that period ends, gains full field membership with review. That's the case now for one person I can think of. For example, Computer Science in the past twice nominated rather impressive people who were later denied membership in the field because of concerns that they might not use it and that it shouldn't be a vanity.

" The longer-term question, that I suggest that we not debate, is do we need professorial titles that would be analogous to what our peers are doing. You have probably sensed where I come down on this issue, but I have to say I myself would worry about the erosion of tenure balanced against the elimination of the mandatory retirement age. I

see that as a topic that the Senate should debate, but not today. I'll just comment that I looked into demographics issues within Engineering because I know your sensitivity on that. Right now the existing research positions are dominated by men. I don't believe that there's a risk here in engineering that these titles would be used as second-class positions for women or other spouses in general. But I can understand concerns about that. The Dean in particular is very sensitive to the general diversity issues in Engineering and could speak to this. He's here somewhere. But at any rate, we don't see a problem today in Engineering, except the same problem actually that we see in the rest of our faculty and the Dean is very committed to work on those issues. So let me answer any questions of fact and then after that I suppose Charlie will want to lead the floor in a discussion. I'll step out since I'm not a senate member and will not be voting today. Did I leave any stone unturned?"

Associate Professor Michael Jones-Correa, Government: "Are all three of the categories that we want to discuss for soft money, non-tenured category?"

Professor Birman: "That's correct. All of the current categories will be, existing ones as well. There is a nice table available showing properties of the various positions. In any case, all of these are soft money, except I don't know how a Senior Scientist is handled but Charlie can answer. He did nominate someone who successfully got that position. But certainly all of the others are soft money. They can end if the funding stream dries up, they can end if the department or academic unit changes its priorities."

Professor Jones-Correa: "One more question. Maybe two more questions. How many people are we talking about in these positions that will be affected and how long do people usually stay in these positions."

Professor Birman: "Yes. At present Engineering has 24 people who have Research Associate positions, some are part time and I think the equivalent is 20 full time employees roughly, most of them are full time. It has 20 people who are in the Senior Research Associate position. Many of them have been here quite a long time. For example, in Computer Science I have four colleagues who are Senior Research Associates. It seems to me the person in that position longest has been here as long as me, which would be 22 years. I don't know when he was hired but he was here when I came in. These are long-term, permanent professional positions, at least in many cases. On the other hand, I know of many people who have taken these positions for a period of time and then they moved on. I don't think there is a single answer to your question."

Professor Guckenheimer, Mathematics: "There are couple of points in your presentation that seem to me to that differ from the material that you sent out to the Senate and I would like to ask about a couple of them. One, the materials that we were sent suggested Research Scientists would typically be a principal investigators and run

independent research programs. The second is that these appointments are specifically supposed to go to departments and not the centers or other organizations and then, thirdly there is no discussion regarding the University providing start up funds for those positions. I would like you to comment on that.”

Professor Birman: “The second one is easiest. Susan and I spoke about this earlier. Steve Vavasis raised the same question. I think that what Susan was trying to accomplish in the binding to a department had an unintended side effect and in fact that language is going to be amended slightly to be a department or a research center. She didn’t want a situation in which appointments could occur directly below a Dean without any intervening structure, and that makes sense. But she chose wording that seemed to rule out the ACRI, the Theory Center, programs in Duffield. That was not intended and that will be adjusted accordingly. She was looking for a multi-level review structure where there is the equivalent of a department chairman and faculty but the ACRI and the Theory Center would be a good example of a structure that does have that kind of decision making capability, still reports to a Dean and she’ll obviously deal with these and that’s going to be addressed. That came up today and as a result it’s not amended yet.

“ With respect to the rest, the intent is that these people should be able (the senior people, the Principal Research Scientist) should be able to have a degree of research autonomy and might well beat the odds on proposals on bringing in their own funding. For example, you can imagine bringing someone in to head an effort in Duffield. But that wouldn’t always be the case and in fact most of the existing people have a strong tie with some faculty member who brought them in and they have been here long enough to gain independence. The structure in the proposal intends that these people could have a degree of autonomy at some time counter balances that by having the department in a role that decides (or the academic/research unit) in a role of deciding whether the area is appropriate. With respect to the last question, what was the last question?”

Professor Guckenheimer: “Start-up money.”

Professor Birman. “The start-up money. That’s not necessarily the case, but the possibility of doing it exists. Again, if Kent is negotiating to bring a very senior person in who wants to have an independent authority, wants to work with graduate students, but not teach, he should have the ability to put start-up funds on the table, but not the obligation.”

Assistant Professor Phoebe Sengers, Science & Technology Studies: “I have one small comment and a question. The comment is that at Carnegie Mellon University Research Scientists can get tenure. The question is, you talked about the rights that Research Associates and Senior Research Associates enjoy, not that those are always the same as

Research Scientists, are there things that Research Scientists will be able to do that Research Associates currently can not do?"

Professor Birman: "Yes. The wording of this is intended to express greater autonomy. Senior Research Associates, at least by tradition, are still bound to a faculty member, to an existing group. The intention here is to deliberately imagine the type of person who is brought in to run an independent group, has high professorial stature but won't be teaching very frequently. It's intended to carve out a somewhat more independent role. On the other hand, there's no suggestion that these people will be eligible for tenure here even if the Carnegie Research Professor positions allow that."

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences: "The diagram you are showing here should have a branch between a research associate and senior research associate according to your previous slide. You wrote in the previous slide that to go from research associate to senior research associate requires a dossier review. You don't show it here."

Professor Birman: "Well as I mentioned it hasn't always been the case.

Professor Barazangi: "Just one thing on that inconsistency."

Professor Birman: "But there certainly should be a dossier review over here, of course. But that's in the definition. My point is that it hasn't always occurred in the past like that."

Professor Barazangi: "So we are not voting on the way it is written. We are voting on the idea that these new two titles can be done through research centers and institutions."

Professor Birman. "Yes, Susan agreed to that. She said the wording didn't quite carry out. She had something intended but the wording she chose has this other side effect. However, I think it will still be worded, just to be quite clear about that, to not include a direct appointment below the dean. It's intended to be a two-step process and she chose it partly to get at that notion of faculty or academic scrutiny, which then seems to rule out other academic structures that we have on campus and that's not the intent. But there was intent and I think it makes sense on her part to rule out a direct appointment reporting only to a dean. Her concern there was that the University has had negative experiences with direct professorial appointments reporting only to a Dean. She may be here actually."

Professor Barazangi: "But this is the salient point, if it is not going to change then the Vice Provost for Research and center directors should be consulted about this, this is really important."

Professor Birman. "I agree. I think that we should open the floor. Let me just again urge the Senate to do the right thing. Our peer institutions are way ahead of us on this. There's a broader dialog the Senate really needs to engage in, but the least we can do for our colleagues is to offer them titles that are more analogous to the titles they would enjoy at competing institutions. This is a tough world where we are competing for very, very strong people. We need to do what we can to get them to Cornell. The Dean of Engineering is in the corner, so further questions to him. Thank you very much."

Professor Lynne Abel, Classics: "In order to get the full benefit of this as I understand it, one would have to try to take current folk who are doing wonderful jobs and allow them to apply in some fashion for the new title."

Professor Birman: "That's right."

Professor Abel: "I didn't see in the material that was sent out any kind of mechanism for that. What I did see was that there would be searches for these new titles. But I would imagine or hope that a current Senior Research Associate could somehow apply for the Senior Scientist title without a search."

Professor Birman: "Of course, that's intended. Absolutely."

Professor Abel. "Do you have more ideas about how this would work? Would everybody who is a Senior Research Associate be invited to apply? How is this going to work?"

Professor Birman: "I think the department or center will control the process. So, currently if you are Research Associate and you have been here for a period of time, analogous to an Assistant Professor, after the second three-year reappointment. In the case of Computer Science, we discuss routinely whether we should consider promotion to Senior Research Associate. If we think that's merited we go out for letters. I think the same thing would happen here. With people who are in the existing titles and would like to move over, and I assume many of them would, the department would undertake that process and eventually take requests to the appropriate Dean. That's how I imagine this working. I'm sure that's what Kent would expect to see happen. As it moves forward, and as we do searches for these positions to fill new kinds of opportunities, you do a search, you bring in the most prestigious people, they interview and the hope is that we bring some great researchers to Cornell that are able to engage in the type of higher risk research activity that we might not risk if we had to bring in tenured faculty, realistically. That may be a negative in some ways but again our competitors are doing it. Let me turn the floor over and I'll sit down and you can ask me more questions if you need to."

Speaker Norton. "Unless there is another factual question the floor is open for debate."

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I think I really have a factual question and that is, is there a way to change the wording of paragraph three on the description? It says, 'Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist titles are academic and should not be used for those whose positions are primarily administrative' ... an then it says, 'Administrative responsibilities are unavoidable in creating and managing research laboratories, will occur and this should not be interpreted to preclude appointment.' It sounds to me like it shouldn't be used, but it will not preclude the use."

Professor Birman: "Well, other than the language, the intent there, which I thought was pretty clear but we can fuss with the wording, is that on the one hand you are bringing in people who are researchers and are going to be judged on the quality of their research and many think holds to a higher standard than those of us who get time off to teach. Right? We expect a pretty high standard and I think we can adhere to it. On the other hand, if a person is heading a research group that is doing proposals they have an administrative component to administering the effort and obviously that is intended to be part of the jobs. We'll work on the wording with you if you think it could be clearer."

Professor McAdams. "I don't think it should not be used for those whose positions are primarily administrative. And then you say people whose positions become primarily administrative are eligible."

Professor Birman: "No. But they have an administrative component to their activities."

Speaker Norton. "The Chair is going to make a ruling here and the Chair's ruling is that the exact language of the title descriptions is not in front of this body. We are not going to be amending this. This is not our language. The only language that is in front of us is this resolution which is to accept these two new titles."

Professor Birman: "Not even accept, but to recommend the adoption of these two titles."

Speaker Norton: "To recommend the adoption of these two new titles. Because of course it's the Board of Trustees and the Provost that have to finally approve it. The language as I get it comes largely out of the Provost's office. Is that correct? It's not for us to decide this language. I think if the Senate or Senators today have a great deal of trouble with the language, then we can always not approve this recommendation at this moment. This is not the time to, I think debate, the specifics of the language that's in front of us. I think it's the concept that's in front of us. If we don't like the concept we can vote it down. If we like the concept we can vote it up. If we don't like this

language we can say we don't want to approve it until we get something better out of the Provost's office. I think those are the options that are in front of us this afternoon. I think that covers the root of it.

"The floor is open for debate."

Professor Guckenheimer, Mathematics: "The presentation that we just heard, I think is somewhat in contrast with the earlier discussion that I have heard about these titles with regard to their relationship with the Research Associate and Senior Research Associate titles. In the presentation that we just heard, the ideal world in which all of our Research Associates are of outstanding quality and the University would simply substitute the new titles of Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist for Research Associates and Senior Research Associates involving perhaps some small modifications in the terms of those positions. I guess, I really wanted to express the point of view that that might not be such a bad idea."

Speaker Norton: "Other comments?"

Associate Professor Thomas Bjorkman, Horticultural Sciences: "It seems that one of the problems we are trying to address with this is that the title of Senior Research Associate has eroded, in part because of inconsistent dossier review. I can see our existing Senior Research Associates wanting to become Principal Research Scientists, all of them. In thinking about the department dynamic, there really seems to be no incentive for the department to be particularly rigorous in that review. It's to their advantage to have people with better titles as well. I'm concerned that the Research Scientist title could suffer the same problems that the Senior Research Associate title has suffered."

Speaker Norton: "Perhaps the Dean of Engineering wants to respond."

Professor Kent Fuchs, Dean, Engineering: "There are two levels of check. One is at the department level. I think that the department chair has an important role in processing this and one at the Dean's level before it goes on to the Provost's Office. I'm sure the department chair and the dean's office could enforce rigorous review."

Speaker Norton: "Any other comments/questions?"

Professor Nelly Farnum, Biomedical Sciences, Senator-at-Large: "For Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientists it seems that really short of changing research direction radically, we are assuming people will be long term, high level research individuals. For that reason it surprises me, unless I missed it here somewhere, that there is nothing written in here about their right to have sabbatical type leaves. It seems to me they should."

Professor Birman: "It strikes me that that's not unreasonable, but the difficulty is that their funding is coming from contracts to perform activities. Companies don't have the same rules. Our lives as professors are really very soft and comfortable, particularly with life time tenure turning out to mean until you drop dead."

Professor Farnum. "But still."

Professor Birman: "Your point is valid. But."

Professor Farnum: "In the same way though, we are acknowledging that if we want to get the best people started independently and correctly, that we would in fact have start up funds and...."

Professor Birman: "We might. But keep in mind that the money for your sabbatical leave is being paid to you by the University not by an external contractor."

Dean Walcott: "Just one comment that I would add, is that the Non-tenure Track Faculty Task Force report has now been through the administration and one of its recommendations is that there be a series of paid leaves for people in the non-tenure track ranks. That poses the problem as to where the money is coming from, but at least in theory the University seems to be willing to consider the possibility. Clearly these ranks that are being proposed would be among those and so it may be that some arrangement can eventually be made for some competition, for example, for a limited pot of funds or some such. That is a matter which will come back to this body in a few months, in terms of specific recommendations for us to discuss."

Professor Birman: "Unpaid leaves are a way for us to do that, if everyone is able to do that and if it's consistent with the funding obligations."

Professor Peter Hinkle, Molecular Biology & Genetics: "I was concerned about the use of the term 'searching' for these people. It sounds like a faculty search except you don't have a position. If the department wanted to recruit some Principal Research Scientist would they advertise?"

Professor Birman: "I believe that they would, as a matter of fact. I think that's appropriate for many reasons. Yes, the department would probably advertise in a somewhat generic way the existence of faculty and research positions in an area not necessarily with very tight language. Yes, advertising is a defense against a type of cronyism and the University should maintain its defense."

Professor Hinkle: "So then a main factor would be, do you have the space?"

Professor Birman: "That's one type of resource, yes."

Professor Hinkle: "They would have to have room to work and study."

Professor Birman: "Yes. We obviously can't bring people in without a commitment of resources. That's a part of it, and there are many other kinds of resource commitments departments or units make. But space is a dominant one, obviously."

Professor Hinkle: "Are there any other limitations? Right now departments can't just go out and recruit without permission and money. Is there going to be a formal way?"

Professor Birman: "Yes, at the level of the Dean."

Professor Hinkle: "What about the person who is already here?"

Professor Birman: "No. That would be for a person you are hiring. That would be for the initial offer. Dean Fuchs, for example, could say, this is all very nice but the department is already pressing him for space, how can he justify this use of the space."

Speaker Norton. "Other comments?"

Professor Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: "I would like to try to describe a scenario that I am familiar with that may help explain where these titles could make a great deal of sense. The economy gyrates back and forth and certain industries get whacked. Sometimes they let their research people go and they let go by paying them out to retire early. This happened at Bell Labs, maybe 15 years ago. Suddenly engineering departments all over the country hired outstanding researchers from Bell Labs. We have one in our department and I know of several others who have gone to other universities because Bell Labs/Bell Telephone chased a business model and decided to shrink the lab. That laboratory had several hundred engineers who over the years accumulated 26,000 patents and wrote who knows how many papers. They have had several Nobel Prize winners there, and so forth. It is an outstanding research lab and the people who have worked there are equal to and better than many of us in many ways. Those people became available. If they are young in mid career, if they are in their forties, you might want to give them tenure. If they are in their thirties, you might want to hire them as an assistant professor and promise them a short review because they already have a long record of accomplishments. When people become available who are maybe in their fifties and who are being bought out by an early retirement program, sometimes these are people you want to hire. For example, in our department we have an outstanding polymer science program, and what happens when a famous polymer scientist from an industrial laboratory comes available in the mid fifties? You don't want to use a tenure spot because it's the nature of the tenure track professor to be involved through the start of a long time frame in operating a research program and in developing a curriculum. This retired polymer scientist is a

person who will want to do research and is looking for a place to do it, and can fund his or her own work and bring his or her own ideas and interact with faculty that you already have who are working in that area. What do you do? Offer them a job of Research Associate? It doesn't work. They will go somewhere else where they can be Research Professors and they will fund their own research program, have their own PhD students. We'll miss out on that opportunity. That is one way I have seen these titles being important. That's a typical scenario where something excellent could work out for us, for our own graduate students, and for our own programs if a title like this were available."

Speaker Norton. "Are there any comments?"

Associate Professor Sheila Hemani, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I have a concern with this, and funding research positions. We all seem to have fallen into complacency with it. These are essentially soft money positions and we all know that funding cycles are up and down, what is the provision of how often the following situation is going to occur? If someone's grant doesn't come through - they have commitments, mortgages, kids, car payments, etc, and all of a sudden they have no position for next year, no salary. Is the department just going to cut them loose? One would imagine, based on what Brad said, they are truly eminent people and we would like to keep them here. How are we going average out and take care of the dips and the gaps? How much is that going to cost and where is the funding going to come from?"

Professor Birman: "We do have 20 such people at the senior level in Engineering today. Kent, how many such cases have you become aware of?"

Dean Fuchs: "I haven't seen any."

Professor Birman: "Maybe that's a reasonable answer. It obviously could happen, but maybe it doesn't happen frequently. And, that's out of 44 people in these research titles in Engineering. It must happen, but if it's not frequent. Hopefully, the Dean will struggle with it when it happens and he will find some way around it."

Professor Anton: "I am familiar of a case from our department. We had a Senior Research Associate in our department for a number of years back in the late eighties and he ran a research program quite well for quite awhile and then interest in that field ran out and he saw the writing on the wall and I think negotiated a deal where he taught in the department for a couple of years while he tried to find new things. There was a limited time frame where he was given support by teaching for us. By the time the bridging funding expired he was able to find a permanent position elsewhere in the University. He's actually on the staff of the Theory Center now with a permanent staff job there."

Professor Birman: "Computer Science actually had something analogous. A person taught for three semesters and then new funding came through and he's still here in a senior position. Another one comes to mind, he actually switched into my group temporarily. It was a little bit of a stretch and then Bill Arms joined us and a very large digital libraries program was built up and the individual I think became a cornerstone of it. We would have lost him had I not stepped in. I think the digital libraries program at Cornell wouldn't exist if people hadn't stepped up to try to hold on to this fellow."

Professor Rich Burkhauser, Policy Announcement & Management: "I am very impressed with the arguments being made in favor of these titles but I wondered for the record whether Senator Anton might revise his story that he gave us about using age as a criteria for whether he would choose to tenure someone or put someone into one of these positions."

Brad Anton: "Touché."

Speaker Norton: "Other comments?"

Associate Professor David Delchamps, Electrical & Computer Engineering. "I am a little worried about something related to what John Guckenheimer was speaking about earlier, which was the little dotted bridges between yellow and green. The subtext in what I heard mostly from Ken and a little from Brad, is that we not needing a dossier review and all that sort of thing has created a class of, perhaps, Senior Research Associates who wouldn't make the cut if they applied. I am just curious. In the best of all possible worlds all Research Associates would become Research Scientists, Senior becoming Principal, but maybe that's not going to happen, maybe it wouldn't be able to happen given the current personnel. I'm just wondering whether I'm misreading that? Are we going to create two classes of research citizens?"

Professor Birman: "One person comes to mind in Computer Science who for many years had a purely administrative role but held the Senior Research Associate title. Now that individual has more of a research visibility and presence. Today with a serious dossier review that might not work."

Dean Fuchs. "I think there are very few of this kind of people. Most of the Senior Research Associates are very active people and hard working researchers."

Speaker Norton. "The speaker would like to clarify. In general, is the assumption that with the creation of these titles, that at least in the sciences where people who could move into these other titles, that the Research Associate and Senior Research Associate titles will largely disappear in the context of the sciences? The answer is no. The Dean is shaking his head."

Dean Walcott: "I'm of the opinion that they aren't likely to and that they serve rather different functions. What you might have is a track where a graduate student stays on as Post Doc for a couple of years, maybe becomes a Research Associate, and then might conceivably move either to a Senior Research Associate or to a Research Scientist or stay in any title. In other words, there isn't a limitation. You can recruit people into these two scientist titles as I understand it. For the moment, all we are proposing is the addition of these two titles to the armament."

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical & Applied Mechanics: "Was it your personal opinion that Research Associate and Senior Research Associate titles would atrophy, at least in Engineering? You mentioned that."

Professor Birman: "As of now, I have heard three Deans comment on this issue and all of them favor the greater flexibility of having more titles available and a better opportunity to compete with our peers, but to also do the sensible thing. I would imagine the Research Associate titles will prove useful and won't be used for people who fit this high profile Research Scientist roll. The new ones will be used for that, but there may well be other situations that arise."

Professor Shelia Hemami, Electrical & Computer Engineering: "Kent brought something up, alluding to women or something like that, so I would like to make a statement. Cornell historically has not done very well on a lot of two-body issues and I would not like to see this used as an excuse. I'm not saying it is purported this way, but I see a danger that now instead of the University again being forced to address two body issues head on they just view this as an excuse and say well 'we just have one of these positions and if he or she doesn't want it, too bad we tried.' That's not trying. Offering somebody a soft money position is not making a good and honest effort to solve it. I would like to remind everybody that this should not be considered a viable substitute for that situation."

Professor Farnum: "I'm sure it's different in different colleges, but in my college, anyway, to my knowledge almost all Research Associates and Senior Research Associates are affiliated with one person's program. What I like about this is, it seems to give a possibility that when that one person leaves the people who are associated with that person as part of a program would have the ability to continue autonomously. We have lost individuals, who did not have their own funding and have been here for many years, simply because the head of a very large research group left. This seems to me to be much more individual oriented. Or at least has the possibility of that, which seems good to me."

Speaker Norton. "Are there any further comments? If not I'll ask you to come to a vote. In fact the exact time as stated on the agenda for a vote on this matter. The chair will soon be ready for a vote unless I hear of further objections."

In Favor	-	Motion passed.
Opposed		0
Abstained		2

The resolution (Appendix 2) passes.

“Now it’s time for Good and Welfare and I’ll turn the podium over briefly to Dean Walcott.”

6. Good and Welfare

Dean Walcott: “I’ll be very brief. For my many sins I accepted the position of chair of the Cornell United Way. You will have received pledge cards. Please fill them out and give us money. Two points really: First off, the United Way is an enormously important thing in this community. We had a talk from some of the people who have been volunteering in the various United Way agencies. Many of these are run by volunteers. There are volunteers on the board. There are volunteers that are staffing it. The money from United Way makes it possible to do their job. By and large Cornell provides a third of the entire county budget in the United Way. So it’s important that we give.

The second point is that the percent participation amongst the faculty and amongst the staff is low. It’s about 13 to 15% of the faculty and staff of Cornell. In contrast the contribution from Wegmans is 96%, even the baggers who are earning, I have no idea how many dollars per hour are putting aside \$.50 per week for United Way. They have been encouraged, of course, by their management to do so. I would just simply like to emphasize to all of you that it would really help enormously if you would be willing to give even a small contribution to United Way. If you were willing to forego a cup of coffee or coke once a week, that’s a buck a week, that’s 50 bucks a year. That’s enough to make a substantial difference in one of these meals programs. So please, don’t just take that pledge card and drop it in the circular file, please think about even a small pledge. I realize that we, none of us, are making the big bucks but even if a lot of us will give a small amount, we can increase the participation. My hope is that we will be able increase Cornell’s participation rate from 13% up to a somewhat higher level this year.

There are going to be two thermometers on the A.D. White House lawn. One for money, which I hope will surpass our goal and a second one for participation. So please, please persuade your colleagues and help us increase that participation. Thank you very much.”

Speaker Norton. "Thank you Dean Walcott. The Dean being the only Good and Welfare speaker and we have reached the end of the agenda, the Chair declares the meeting adjourned."

Adjourned at 5:38.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Appendix 1

Memorandum

To: Senators, Cornell University Faculty Senate
From: David W. Butler, Dean
School of Hotel Administration
Date: September 29, 2004
Re: Masters of Management in Hospitality Degree (MMH)

Masters of Management in Hospitality Degree (MMH)

A Proposed Graduate Joint Masters Degree to be offered by Cornell University's School of Hotel Administration and Nanyang Technological University's School of Business in Singapore

Purpose

The School of Hotel Administration requests review and endorsement of this proposal by the Faculty Senate. The Dean of the Hotel School, David W. Butler, will be available at the Senate meeting to answer questions.

Introduction

Cornell University's (CU) School of Hotel Administration (SHA) and Nanyang Technological University's School of Business (NTU) have agreed to create the Cornell-Nanyang Institute of Hospitality Management (CNI) at the Nanyang Business School in Singapore which will offer a joint (Cornell-Nanyang) Masters of Management in Hospitality (MMH) degree, the same graduate professional degree offered in Ithaca. The primary goal of this graduate degree program is to educate future hospitality leaders for Southeast Asia, primarily China, and India.

The key elements of the agreement are briefly explained below to assure appropriate CU/SHA protection of Cornell's reputation, academic quality through SHA faculty approval of curriculum and pedagogy; the requirement of students to spend half of their time at Cornell in Ithaca; Cornell faculty annually teaching several courses in Singapore and all courses in Ithaca; and, through administrative control of the program by the appointment of a tenured Cornell faculty member as Dean of the Institute, based in Singapore.

Why Singapore and NTU?

In response to unmet market need in a region of the world where the hospitality industry is becoming a major industry, this program will attract students who want to develop successful management careers in hotels, restaurants, and travel and tourism-related businesses. Developing this joint degree program in partnership with the Nanyang School of Business, which is consistently ranked in the top ten of Asian business schools, is a particularly attractive option for the Hotel School in its international outreach strategy, due to: Nanyang's geographic location, which provides the perfect platform to strengthen the reputation of Cornell and its Hotel School in Asia, including the important countries of China and India; the complementary quality of NTU Business School faculty with that of Cornell's Hotel School; the opportunity for collaborative research through the establishment of a \$1 million (USD) start-up fund; and the active financial support and expertise of the Singapore Economic Development Board (EDB), the Singapore Tourism Board (STB) and major owners of hospitality businesses in Asia for the venture. Furthermore, the proposed program will allow the Hotel School to develop expertise in Asian hospitality management through collaborative research projects and interaction with leaders in the industry.

The new program fits with the strategy of increasing the presence and reputation of Cornell and the Hotel School in Asia. It also advances Singapore's interest in establishing the country as a world-class education hub, internationally renowned for its intellectual capital and creative energy. In 1998, the Singapore Economic Development Board launched the "World Class University" program to attract a dozen world-class foreign universities to set up a significant presence in Singapore in specialized fields and strengthen its foundation for a knowledge economy. The selected institutions, which include MIT, Johns Hopkins, Georgia Tech, and Stanford (among others), represent the best in their respective fields. Singaporean academic, government and industry leaders view this prospective alliance with Cornell and the Hotel School as an important part of this strategic vision.

While the proposed program will initially be small (approximately 50 students per year by year five) and focus on Singapore and the region, it has the potential to have further substantial impact in the future through research, the development of executive education and distance learning programs, and an Executive MMH program. This relationship and its long-term potential is one of the Hotel School's key international strategies for the next ten years. However, these additional educational offerings are not part of the endorsement of the joint graduate degree proposal being requested and will be brought forward for review and approval as appropriate.

The SHA's mission of "*Shaping the global knowledge base in hospitality management*" is indicative of its commitment to creating educational and research opportunities for students and faculty that have a global impact on the hospitality industry. Within the last decade, the Asian economy and specifically the hospitality industry have grown exponentially. This has been recognized by the Hotel School's competitors (both hospitality management schools and business schools) who are moving rapidly to develop joint relationships or stand-alone institutions to exploit this educational opportunity. The School of Hotel Administration has meticulously explored partnership possibilities throughout Asia for the past several years. We

believe that this relationship with Singapore will keep the School of Hotel Administration ahead of the growing Asian competition.

Why has Cornell chosen the NTU Business School as a partner?

For several years, the Hotel School spent significant resources investigating various opportunities and potential partners in Asia. Singapore was chosen for the reasons noted above and in the belief that the Nanyang Business School was the right partner as it complemented the Hotel School in a number of important dimensions. NTU is a very good business school that wishes to become a premier business school in the region and eventually the world. The key for NTU is focused, specialized programs, investment in quality faculty and facilities, and research. NTU realizes that its goals will only be achieved through a long-term commitment of resources and attention to quality in all of its efforts and activities. NTU is a school that recognizes the opportunity presented by the growing Asian hospitality industry and is excited by the opportunity to partner with the Cornell Hotel School. Previously, NTU tried to develop a hospitality management school in the early 1990s and closed it after several years due to its inability to increase academic quality. Thus, NTU recognizes the difficulty of developing a quality educational program in a specialized field and the value of Cornell as a partner. Overall, the faculty is comparable (in educational credentials and research capability) to that of the Hotel School's faculty. They hire well-trained Ph.D.s from the best business schools in the United States; they emphasize research and publishing in the better academic journals; and they espouse the same values as the Hotel School: Innovation, quality, rigor and relevance in teaching and research and service with impact. For all these reasons we believe they are the right long-term Asian partner for us.

Program Quality and Operational Commitment

Key Operational Considerations. The MMH program will be a three-semester, 45-credit program taught over 12 months. Students will spend half the time at Nanyang Business School in Singapore and half the time at Cornell in Ithaca. NTU will provide the facilities for the Singapore site which are relatively new. The program will commence in June where the students will spend approximately the first six weeks in Singapore. Students will then spend the next seven months in Ithaca where they will complete an intensive, full-semester summer session and the normal Cornell fall semester. They will return to Singapore for the final semester and graduation (five months). There may be some adjustments to ensure that students complete two full residence units (RU's) in Ithaca necessary to earn the MMH degree.

Once the program is stabilized (approximately year three) MMH students entering via Cornell will also have the same educational opportunities as those entering via Singapore; to wit, they will be able to receive half their education at Nanyang. Our goal is that all students in the MMH program will be *required* to spend time on both continents.

The initial term of the agreement will be ten years and automatically renew every five years thereafter. There is an early exit provision for "cause" or "emergency." Termination for convenience cannot take place for the first ten years and requires a two-year notice. The damages for material breach by Cornell are capped and very favorable. Thus, we have a clear exit strategy if the relationship fails. NTU funds termination costs.

Cornell will control the curriculum. All courses and sequencing must be approved by the Hotel School Graduate Faculty. The Dean of the program will always be a CU employee chosen by CU and will also hold a joint appointment at NTU. Our goal is that the Dean will always be a senior tenured Cornell faculty member selected from the ranks of the Hotel School faculty. Instruction in Singapore will be by both NTU faculty and by Cornell faculty. The Dean will also do limited teaching. Part of the agreement includes two endowed chairs at Cornell (\$6 million USD) which will require the chair holders to spend significant time teaching and doing research in Singapore. Also included is a significant gift (\$4 million USD) which will be used for Cornell faculty to be in Singapore for short teaching appointments and to conduct collaborative research. The agreement also requires Cornell to train six Ph.D. students, completely funded by the Singapore government under a bond arrangement, who may become program faculty in Singapore.

Oversight of the program will be through a joint academic committee (controlled by Cornell) and a joint advisory board reporting to the Deans of the two schools. Provisions have been made for an independent audit of the academic quality and overall operation of the program in year three and thereafter as necessary.

Key Financial Terms. There will be no financial risk in this program either to Cornell or the Hotel School. Besides the \$10 million USD gift mentioned earlier for the endowed chairs and related educational initiatives, Singapore will pay for all expenses except those incurred in Ithaca. Singapore has agreed to provide financial security for the program via letters of credit, comprehensive insurance and reciprocal indemnification. Ithaca instruction will be at full Cornell tuition. Present fees at Nanyang Business School are substantially below Cornell's, but they will be comparable within five to seven years.

Legal Safeguards for the Protection of Cornell. The principles of non-discrimination and academic freedom are clearly spelled out in the contract. As mentioned earlier, oversight is through the two committees to the Deans of the respective institutions. If an issue cannot be resolved, there is a provision for resolution through international arbitration. New York State law will apply in all legal proceedings. Nanyang University and their Business School have a variety of educational initiatives with other American universities. Cornell's counsel's office has engaged in due diligence with MIT, Carnegie-Mellon, and Duke to assess their satisfaction with Nanyang. All information received was positive.

Timeline and Contracts. Since the original presentation to the General Committee of the Graduate School and the CAPP Committee and the approval from both committees, a dispute arose between Cornell and Singapore regarding the translation of the term sheet, agreed to by both parties at the conclusion of the original negotiations in Singapore in July 2003, into contract language and interpretation of several items. We met in New York this summer and through intensive discussions over several days resolved all issues in the contract. In fact, the resolution is even more favorable to Cornell than the original term sheet. Since that meeting both parties have reviewed the contract and accepted all items and wording. The deal is done. All Singapore authorities have agreed to the written contract. Thus, we seek the necessary approvals from the

University Senate in order to present this contract to the Board of Trustees for discussion and approval.

Conclusion

The Asian markets have the potential to contribute to the overall stability of the world economy, especially through the projected growth of the hospitality and tourism industry. Singapore and NTU clearly understand that for this type of market growth to be positive, there must be an educated and trained managerial and executive workforce to support it. The Hotel School sees little risk in development and implementation of this joint MMH degree program and looks forward to increasing our global reach through a partnership with NTU in Singapore.

Appendix 2

**Resolution to Recommend Establishment of the Titles
Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist**

WHEREAS, the College of Engineering has proposed the new titles of Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist and;

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Non-tenure Track Faculty has endorsed the creation of these new titles, and;

WHEREAS, the Provost's Office has proposed guidelines for the use of these titles;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost and the Board of Trustees that the two titles of Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist be established as outlined in the following descriptions.

UFC approval
October 5, 2004

TITLE DESCRIPTION

RESEARCH SCIENTIST/PRINCIPAL RESEARCH SCIENTIST

Research scientists and principal research scientists are expected to initiate or lead research programs and to create new knowledge at a high level of achievement in an academic area of importance to the academic department. The differences between these titles relate to the balance in the individual's career between promise and achievement in establishing highly successful independent research programs.

Research scientists and principal research scientists are responsible for initiating or leading research activities; creating and managing research laboratories; seeking funding opportunities, submitting proposals, and fulfilling the terms of research grants and contracts; planning, conducting and reporting on original research; and representing their research groups externally. [Note: upon approval from VP Richardson, which is anticipated with authorization of these titles, add "Persons appointed to these titles may serve routinely as principal investigators on grants and contracts [link URL to PI policy]."]

Research scientist and principal research scientist titles are academic and should not be used for those whose positions are primarily administrative, even if the responsibilities include some

research. Administrative responsibilities, however, are unavoidable in creating and managing research laboratories, and this should not be interpreted to preclude appointment to these titles.

Research scientists and principal research scientists are appointed in academic departments. They are not members of the University Faculty. [The following sentence will require amendment of the Bylaws by the Trustees ... Research scientists and principal research scientists are non-voting members of their college or school faculty and may be given the right to vote by that faculty.] [Language to propose to the Graduate School: They are eligible for general membership on the Graduate Faculty if their responsibilities qualify them or if supervision of graduate students makes membership on special committees appropriate; general members of the Graduate Faculty may serve on graduate students' special committees [link URL].]

Research scientists and principal research scientists normally are not permitted to teach courses for credit. In the event that some teaching of courses for credit is desired by the individual and requested by the appointing department, this teaching must be consistent with the terms of their funding and must be approved by the dean (and, if different, the dean of the college responsible for the teaching). Where teaching is assigned, care must be taken not to shift teaching expense inappropriately to research grants or contracts. In no case should such an individual teach for an extended consecutive period – such an arrangement could indicate responsibilities appropriate to a professorial title [link URL] and should be subject to tenure policies.

Research scientists and principal research scientists must hold a research Ph.D. degree (or foreign equivalent [link URL]) from a reputable accredited institution, in a field appropriate to the position. Proof of Ph.D. conferral may be required [link URL]. To qualify for the title, research scientists and principal research scientists also are expected to have achieved significant stature in the scholarly discipline, to have demonstrated the quality of research accomplishment appropriate to initiating independent research programs, and to have demonstrated a trajectory that promises a continued high level achievement. General appointment restrictions, such as valid visa status, may apply [link URL].

Appointments to these titles must be salaried and are subject to affirmative action/equal opportunity (AA/EEO) search requirements [link URL]. While there may be a transition period before non-university funding supports the position, appointments are expected to be supported by non-university funds; the offering and reappointment letters must state that the appointment may be terminated or modified if funding is withdrawn or reduced. (This wording in the letter does not designate the appointment as “terminal” – a terminal appointment is one in which the appointee is notified that the appointment will not be renewed. Appointments of research scientists and principal research scientists, even on non-university funds, are subject to the provisions of the policy governing notice of non-renewal [link URL]). Provisions regarding start-up funds, facilities and support should be articulated in the initial appointment letter.

An individual may be appointed directly to the principal research scientist title or promoted from research scientist. The line of progression in these titles is limited to principal research scientist and research scientist. There is no routine expectation of promotion from senior research associate. There is no routine expectation of promotion from these titles to senior scientist, a title reserved for appointment of individuals of special distinction. If an out-of-progression title

change is warranted, an AA/EEO search or approval of a waiver of search [link URL] is necessary.

Search procedures should follow those used by a department to fill professorial positions. Appointment length for principal research scientist and research scientist may be for up to five years. There is no “time-in-title” limit or restriction on the number of times the appointment to either title may be renewed. Benefits eligibility may be affected by the length and percent-effort of appointment [link URL]. A dossier-based review must be conducted for initial appointment. Through an exception approved by the department chair and the dean, the dossier-based review may be conducted during the first year, with continued appointment contingent on successful review. This dossier shall include letters from confidential external referees [link URL to difference between a search letter of reference and a confidential external referee’s dossier letter], letters from participants in current or recent research programs, an analytical transmittal letter with report of the faculty vote, and the report of an *ad hoc* committee to advise the dean, who makes the ultimate decision about appointment. Reappointment is based on quality of performance and on the availability of work and funds.

As for all academic titles, reappointment is not a right. Reappointment may be denied for such reasons as resource constraints, unreliable funding prospects, diminished interest in the research area, diminished relevance to the appointing unit’s research mission, or performance.

Promotion from research scientist to principal research scientist is based on quality of achievement, productivity, national and international stature in the field, leadership of the independent research program, effectiveness with colleagues and with participants in the research program, and service to the field. Promotion is not automatic, for example after a particular number of years in title. A formal dossier review is required for promotion to principal research scientist and follows the procedures for the dossier-based appointment review [link URL].

(9/27/04)

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (LZW) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.