

Minutes from the February 9, 2011
Faculty Senate Meeting

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: "Good afternoon. I would like to call together the meeting for the faculty senate for February 9th, 2011. I would like to remind people present that there will be no photos taken, nor any tape recordings made of the proceedings during the meeting. "

"I would like to ask everyone to please turn off or silence your cellular phone; and I'd like to ask people when they speak, please raise your hand and rise and identify yourself after you receive the microphone that will be brought to you. When you have the microphone, please identify yourself as to name, department or other administrative unit."

"We have at this point no Good and Welfare speakers; and therefore, the ten-minute interval allowed for Good and Welfare will be distributed as needed for further discussion."

"So at this point, Dean of the Faculty Bill Fry has some remarks."

1. DEAN OF FACULTY REPORT

William Fry, Dean of Faculty: "Thank you, Steve. Can you hear me? Okay. What I'd like to do in my remarks today is just to congratulate the four new Weiss fellows who have been named publicly in the last couple weeks and to also solicit your nominees for Weiss fellows. I'd like to also comment on the administration's response to various resolutions that the senate has passed last year; and finally, to make a couple comments concerning the meeting with the UFC and the provost two weeks ago and also a little bit of an update and what the calendar committee is doing."

"The Weiss fellows for 2010 are Paul Sawyer, Robert Thorne, Bob Smith and Harry Greene. These fellows were announced at the trustees meeting in January, and I think this is a wonderful honor for these men in this case. I would suggest that we need some more women nominees."

"Paul Sawyer is in English. He was nominated for a variety of reasons, but he teaches a legendary course in politics and culture. Rob Thorne has done wonderful curricular innovations in physics. Bob Smith in ILR has been a brilliant teacher and mentor, even though he's an associate dean. Harry Greene is a really inspiring teacher in

Introductory Biology, biology for nonmajors. And I think one would have to agree that he has passion for his study, if he can hold his snake like that.”

“So congratulations to these Weiss fellows. Please, if you can solicit nominees for this really wonderful award, we need them by March 4th of this year. Next I wanted to comment on resolutions the senate has passed. We have earlier suggested there be a response, that we identify to whom the resolution is directed and that there be a response within 45 days. This information is now on the university faculty web site (<http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/>), and this is what that web site looks like. These are the several resolutions that needed responses.”

“And if you click right over here, for example, on academic integrity and matriculation, you'll get the responses that the administration has identified. And here is an e-mail to me from Barbara Knuth concerning academic integrity. And what we had asked is that students who matriculate at Cornell commit to academic integrity at Cornell.”

“So what she has said is that these three letters all have wording in them to that effect, an early decision letter, early decision welcome letter and the transfer admission letter. As part of her response, she did send me this template, if you will, of an early decision freshman admission letter; and if you look at this highlighted point, this is what we had requested and it's what has gone into the letter. “

“It says, "Please note by accepting our offer of admission, you are acknowledging that you will adhere to Cornell University's code of academic integrity." That appears on these three letters that will go out to matriculants.”

“This is Kent Fuchs's response to the resolution on a faculty lunch. What he has said here is that there was, and maybe still is, a \$700,000 deficit in that account. He would work with the dean of hotel to work and eliminate that account. He has deposited in the dean of office -- dean of faculty office \$60,000 for you to subsidize a faculty lunch. Some of you know what the faculty lunch is like and some of you have not appreciated it so much, but there is a lunch in the Regent Lounge for faculty to eat. You can bring your food or you can get your food at some other place, such as the terrace restaurant. My understanding, it has not been terribly well-subscribed at this point.”

“This letter also says that I and he will investigate whether the academic deans are willing to contribute funds from their budgets to sustain an economically viable faculty lunch. So far, that has not been successful.”

“And finally, this is response to two resolutions concerning academic integrity. We had a broader resolution calling for some significant effort on the part of the university to address academic integrity and another resolution which enabled faculty to use Turnitin, if they wished. I would just like to read this paragraph.”

“He said first I would like to thank the Educational Policy Committee and faculty senate for their consideration of the issues around academic integrity and for their formulation of these approaches. I agree academic dishonesty presents a significant challenge at Cornell and at other colleges and universities across the U.S. and that the most effective response begins with a proactive initiative and includes a means of detection and deterrence. He's in charge, with Vice Provost Laura Brown, with the effort to focus on academic integrity.”

“So let me say a word about a meeting that the University Faculty Committee had with the provost last week. It really concerns one of the resolutions that come before us, and what the provost was interested in is working on a way to -- so we could have proper consultation. And he wanted to work with a small group so we could work on those steps; so I think the discussion today on that resolution will help inform that consideration.”

“And finally, the calendar committee, there is a calendar committee. They have been meeting quite regularly. We have come up with a significant number of obstacles, I would say, and constraints. We are working on to see which of those obstacles and constraints are absolute and which ones we can finesse, if you will. Given that we will be able to finesse them, I think the committee will vet a series of principles and, shortly thereafter, a couple recommendations for an academic calendar.”

“And Steve, that's my comment for today. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to address, if we have time.”

Speaker Beer: “We could take a couple minutes for questions for the dean, if there are any. Thanks so much.”

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM **DECEMBER 8, 2010 FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

“I would now like to call on the senate for approval of the minutes of the December 8th, 2010 minutes of the University Faculty Senate. First I'd like to thank former dean of the faculty, Charlie Walcott, for acting as speaker during that meeting. If there are any

additions or corrections to those minutes? Seeing none, I'll call for approval of the minutes of the December 8th, 2010 minutes."

"All those in favor, please raise your right hand. Opposed? Right hand, please. Seeing none, any abstentions?"

"The minutes of the December 8th, 2010 University Faculty Senate meeting have been approved unanimously. I would like to now call on associate dean of the faculty Fred Gouldin, for a report on behalf of the Nominations and Appointments Committee -- Elections Committee."

3. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary: "Thank you, Steve. Okay, so my report is for the Nominations and Elections Committee, and you can see it before you. For the Financial Policies Committee, Professor Ronald Ehrenberg will be chair of that. He is from the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. Joint Assembly Financial Aid Review Committee, Kent Hubbell will serve on that. He is the dean of students. And finally, for the University ROTC Relationships Committee, Christopher Barrett of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences will be serving on that."

"So that concludes my report. Are you going to ask for it to be approved?"

Speaker Beer: "The senate may receive the report without objection. Seeing none, we'll consider the report received. Thank you."

Associate Dean Gouldin: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Beer: "I would now like to call on senator Abby Cohn for a resolution on senate procedures. Abby?"

4. RESOLUTION ON SENATE PROTOCOLS

Senator Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "So I want to introduce a resolution that is sponsored by twelve senators or alternates, and two additional faculty members who aren't currently senators."

***WHEREAS**, the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty (OPUF) recognizes that "University leadership functions best when it is derived from the consent of the governed and is able to strike the delicate balance between the twin needs for broad consultation and decisive, timely decision-making," and that "[t]he appropriate role of faculty governance is to facilitate communication between the faculty and the administration, ensuring a full consideration of*

faculty views, thereby building a faculty-administration partnership that will serve as a firm foundation for effective leadership,” and

WHEREAS, *OPUF further provides that the Faculty Senate carries out the functions of the University Faculty “to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic unit, or are general in nature,” and*

WHEREAS, *the Faculty Senate, on May 10, 2000, ratified the document titled "Principles of Cooperation and Consultation between the President and Faculty Senate," which includes the agreement between the President and the Faculty Senate that: “Meaningful faculty governance requires adequate time for consideration of issues and development of recommendations. To that end, the President or other members of the Administration will not reach final conclusions or take action on major multi-college educational policy issues until the normal steps for securing faculty input, including a reasonable period for relevant Faculty Senate Committees to act and for subsequent deliberations by the Faculty Senate to occur, have been completed,” and*

WHEREAS, *the report by Faculty Senate Committee to Review Faculty Governance in 2007 concluded that “the problem of a lack of early and adequate consultation has persisted” since the “Principles of Cooperation and Consultation” were ratified in 2000, and*

WHEREAS, *the Committee to Review Faculty Governance made recommendations that “focus on openness and meaningful consultation between faculty and the administration and the trustees, toward a goal of consensus as decisions are made,” including the recommendation that “issues for faculty consultation ...shall be raised early enough to provide time for meaningful consideration by appropriate Faculty Senate committees, ad hoc faculty committees, or joint faculty/administration committees,” and*

WHEREAS, *the Cornell administration did not engage in early or meaningful consultation with the faculty prior to reaching its recent decisions to close the Department of Education and to relocate the Africana Studies and Research Center to the College of Arts and Sciences, which affect faculty in those units and in other departments and colleges, and*

WHEREAS, *issues concerning restructuring of academic departments are likely to be raised again in upcoming years as part of university strategic planning initiatives,*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED *that the Faculty Senate calls upon the Provost and President to follow agreed upon faculty governance procedures, including OPUF and "Principles of Cooperation and Consultation between the President and Faculty Senate," and*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED *that the University Faculty Committee (UFC) shall negotiate with the Provost and President to clarify faculty governance procedures, including: reaching a clear definition of consultation; creating protocols for the administration and the faculty to ensure early and meaningful consultation with academic departments and the Faculty Senate on issues affecting the faculty, such as restructuring academic departments; and defining as narrowly as possible the restriction of information based on confidentiality.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED *that the UFC shall report back to the Faculty Senate with the results of the negotiations about faculty governance procedures, including submitting principles and/or procedures to the Faculty Senate for ratification.*

Eric Cheyfitz, Senator, UFC member, English

Abby Cohn, Senator, Linguistics
Carole Boyce Davies, Senator, Africana Studies and Research Center
Carl Franck, Senator, Physics
Shelley Feldman, Development Sociology
David A. Levitsky, Senator, Nutritional Sciences
Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial Labor Relations
Ellis Loew, Senator, Biomedical Sciences
Satya Mohanty, Senator, English
Elizabeth Sanders, Senator, Government
John Sipple, Alternate, Education
Shawkat Toorawa, Senator, Near Eastern Studies
Sofia Villenas, Education
Vicki N. Meyers-Wallen, Senator, Biomedical Sciences

2/1/11, Cosponsors added 2/7/11

“For those of you who were at our December meeting, I think that most of us felt quite a bit of dismay as we found out the circumstances under which the Africana Studies and Research Center administrative reporting structure was changed by the provost and, around that same time, though not discussed as extensively at our meeting, were issues surrounding the dissolution of the Department of Education, which is contained -- was contained within CALS; but nevertheless, that decision bore on many other academic units. So by definition of the senate purview, both of these are matters that do fall, we believe, under the senate consideration.”

“And as we thought about it, a number of us spoke after the meeting and felt that it highlighted some areas that we could be having more successful and effective interactions with the administration, and the resolution that we present today is purely procedural in its approach. There are many substantive issues raised by these and other recent decisions and we didn't attempt to address those here.”

“As we thought about it, we realized -- we were reminded of the fact there are already two formerly agreed-upon documents that exist that state agreements about such matters between the senate -- or the university faculty and the administration. One of these is the organization and procedures of the university faculty, which is available to all on the university faculty web site, which comments on the nature of these deliberations and decision-making processes.”

“And there's a further document that was ratified in May 2000 called the Principles of Cooperation and Consultation Between the President and the Faculty Senate, which actually is a document that arose out of similar issues at an earlier period. And Bill, I

don't know that's available on the web site or not, but it certainly might be a document.”

“So we realize many of the issues of concern were already covered by these documents and, in addition, we -- many of us were involved in the work that was done by the Faculty Senate Committee to review faculty governance in 2007, as these issues were again touched upon there.”

“Okay, so what we felt was that the administration really had not engaged in the earlier meaningful consultation with the faculty prior to reaching these recent decisions, and that in fact this was not consistent with these existing policies. And we were concerned because, as we all know, we're at a time when all kinds of strategic planning discussions are taking place, and in fact many of us share the sense that these are likely not to be isolated incidents; and therefore, it highlighted to us the need to not just ask to call upon the administration to abide by these existing agreements, but in fact to take this opportunity to further clarify and refine some of the areas that have apparently been ambiguous.”

“So first, we, in our resolution, we call upon the provost and the president to follow these signed agreements -- here's our whereases -- and we further resolve that the University Faculty Committee shall negotiate with the provost and president to clarify faculty governance procedures, including reaching a clear definition of consultation, creating protocols for the administration and the faculty to ensure early and meaningful consultation with academic departments and the faculty senate on issues affecting the faculty, such as restructuring faculty academic departments and units and defining as narrowly as possible the restriction of information based on confidentiality.”

“And we further ask that the UFC report back to the faculty senate about the results of these negotiations. And we are pleased to report, as Bill Fry has just told us, there's already been productive and substantive discussion between the UFC and the provost regarding these matters, and so we are quite optimistic that there is good room for a productive movement in these records.”

Speaker Beer: “And you are moving --”

Senator Cohn: “I am moving this resolution on behalf of this group of senators and faculty members.”

Speaker Beer: "Very good. Are there any points of information at this point before we discuss the proposed resolution? The gentleman on the aisle, would you please stand, identify yourself."

Senior Vice Provost John Siliciano: "I am John Siliciano, the senior vice provost. I think this is a point of information, at least its information about the provost's view of the resolution, so I hope it's useful. Kent is traveling today, so he asked me to come and speak to this resolution."

"There is a lot in it that we agree with, and I just want to give some additional context to what Abby has said. We take no position on the resolution that's a matter for the senate. There are some issues in the resolution, some factual statements and suggestions that we would probably disagree with, but there's very much that we do agree with. And the most important thing we agree with is that we do need to get better clarity on these issues of faculty participation and consultation, not only for the faculty's interest, but for the administration's interest. "

"In many cases, I think we are just perceiving situations quite differently, situations in which deans or the provost perceive ample consultation or ones in which groups of faculty or the senate perceive just the opposite. And so this is really, I think, a critical and mutual undertaking."

"As part of this and as was suggested, the provost quite some time ago, on his own initiative, asked to meet with the UFC. And we did meet last week with the UFC and with Bill Fry and proposed a joint study of these issues of consultation and participation by the faculty. And the UFC agreed to that, and we are going to get that process underway and are looking forward to how this works."

"So I'm interested in the rest of the faculty discussion here; but in terms of the resolution, if it's passed, that we will respond to it, I suspect, in just what I'm saying now. We agree this is an important issue and we are already in the stage of trying to work with the UFC on this."

"I am a little anxious about the term "negotiation." I think it's much more trying to come to a common understanding. I think -- and this is my own view, having studied this question for a bit. I have looked through years and years of issues and documentation on this -- I think it's really not a question of sort of good faith and bad

faith or the administration trying to avoid rules. You know, mistakes are made over time.”

“I think what really is the problem here, in my perspective, is that we have never pushed to a sufficient degree of detail in rigorous analysis what we mean by these terms. And so these are these periodic problems that come up, and then there are resolutions; but looking at them, they don't have enough depth and rigor. I think the issues of consultation are multilayered, they require a matrix of understanding. They depend on what the issue is, who the appropriate participants are, what the right context and locus is what the nature of participation is. Is it simply being informed or is it all the way to the other end in terms of approval?”

“These things are critical in understanding it issue by issue. It is not a generic question. I think that's what's been lacking in the whole dialogue for ages about that. It's not a simple question. If we develop an understanding of what participation means in terms of issues, participation, locus and the nature of this, I think we'll be better able to figure out where we agree or disagree.”

“I think there will be many areas of agreement. I think there will be some areas of disagreement, but we will know what they are. So that's simply the sort of report from the provost's office on this issue. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks very much for clarifying the provost's position on this resolution. Are there any points of information that Senator Cohn could address? If not, we'll first hear from someone who wishes to speak in favor of the resolution. Gentleman, I believe a cosponsor –”

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: “I agree with John –”

Speaker Beer: “Would you kindly identify yourself.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “While there are some things in here that are not quite defined or understood the same way by everybody -- for example, what's an inter-college matter, right? So that someone can't say no, that's just a CALS matter -- I think that's the kind of detail that is going to get ironed out by this UFC working with the provost; but for now, I think it's really important that we make this statement. And therefore, I plan to vote for this motion, flaws and all.”

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Is there a person who wishes to speak in opposition? Are there any other members of the faculty that wish to speak in favor of the resolution, as presented? Senator Sanders."

Senator Elizabeth Sanders, Government: "I am a cosponsor and endorse this. If I had my druthers, instead of using a very vague word like "consultation," I would use a word like "deliberation." It seems to me just looking at things that have upset us in the faculty over the last 15 years, that what the administration means by consultation is, as in the Africana case, "well, gee, a month or so ago, we told a few faculty we were thinking about looking into the status of Africana." And that is claimed to be "consultation." That is not consultation. Telling us what they are going to do is not "consultation." "

"Deliberation, on the other hand, implies that you have a mixed group of people, including representatives of the faculty, perhaps representatives of students, and in some cases of the town; perhaps you have at least ten people, people who can bring their expertise and knowledge and positions to the table and really talk about them."

Speaker Beer: "Are there any further discussion? The gentleman on the other side." Professor John Sipple, Department of Education, or the former department, should say. We can still smile. Point I wanted to make is we work forward on this to have clarification on consultation with faculty in general or consultation with faculty involved – or what faculty will be most impacted by the decision? And I think in our case, there was consultation with faculty; but as best I can tell, there's not consultation with faculty most directly involved or being impacted by the decision."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Any other member of the faculty wish to address this resolution? Yes. Would you kindly await the arrival of the microphone?"

Senator Carol Boyce Davies, Africana Studies. "Our preference would be for something much stronger. We would like to have it rescinded, actually, until the provost consults us formally and appropriately. I think Siliciano's administrative statement is just that. It is a statement which tries to represent what did not happen in our case, but we would like it stronger; but since this is not possible at this point, we want to support the logic of some sort of procedural discussion where this is put on tape, but I want to at least record for your purposes that we would have preferred a much stronger resolution, which asks that it be rescinded until the decisions recently made, until there's proper consultation following the formal procedures you identify, Abby."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Would anyone else like to address the resolution? Are senators ready for the vote? Have all senators picked up a clicker? Senators who did not pick up a clicker, please come forward and do so."

"Now, this is specifically -- clickers are for senators at this time, not for non-senator members of the faculty. Okay, I would remind the clicking senators that the way you operate this high-tech device is first turn it on by clicking, I believe, the bottom button. And then to vote, you click the A if you are in favor of the resolution. You click the B if you are opposed to the resolution, and you click C if you wish to abstain from voting."

"Now, wait just a moment till I turn on the clicking mechanism. Okay, so the resolution that's before you is displayed on the screen. All those senators in favor of the resolution, please click the A button. Those opposed, click the B button. Those who wish to abstain, click the C button."

"We will wait till the display indicates that everyone has clicked, as indicated by the number. Okay, it appears that 57 persons have clicked, and now we'll reveal the nature of the clicking, if I can figure out how to do that. Now, this is all very high-tech."

"Here we are. So it appears that we have 50 senators who have clicked A, voting in favor of the resolution. Four senators in opposition, three abstentions. So the resolution as presented on the screen clearly carries. Thank you."

"So now we'll move on to the next resolution, which will be presented by Professor Levitt."

5. RESOLUTION FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON "ACADEMIC WORK DURING BREAKS"

Dean of Faculty Bill Fry: "I am not Bruce Levitt. He is sick and asked me to present this resolution to you today. It comes from the Educational Policy Committee, and I will read it for you. And if there are members of Educational Policy Committee, I would appreciate it if they would comment also on this resolution.

WHEREAS student workloads have become an increasing cause of concern in relation to student mental health, and

*WHEREAS short breaks from academic requirements are generally regarded as healthy,
BE IT RESOLVED that framing assignments in such a way that necessitates academic work for students over fall break, Thanksgiving break or spring break is strongly discouraged. Students*

should have sufficient time to carry out the assignment without having to work during the break."

"And I'll just say a few words about this. It just seems that what the Educational Policy Committee is suggesting is that you should not surprise students on Friday before a break and have an assignment that is due on the Wednesday after fall break, for example. What they are suggesting is that if there's an assignment scheduled on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester and there's an assignment due after break, that's okay, because students have time to plan for that; but the idea is if it's unexpected and they have no choice except to work during the break, that that is to be strongly discouraged. So that is the resolution. Steve?"

Speaker Beer: "Thanks, very much, Dean Fry. We'll now have discussion on this resolution, which is displayed before you. Is there anyone who wishes to speak to this resolution; in other words, speak in favor of it? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to this resolution? Wait for the microphone, please. In the front, on the left side. Ah, here."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English: "My problem with it -- it was my problem last time, and I e-mailed Bruce earlier today -- the language doesn't express the intent that the Educational Policy Committee seems to have. There's nothing in here about surprising students right before breaks. There's just a kind of ambiguous set of terms that doesn't explain what's going on here."

"So for example, when you set a syllabus -- I think this is true. Certainly in the English Department it's true -- you have typically readings over the breaks, so students are preparing for the classes after the breaks. Those readings are announced when you pass out a syllabus in the class the first day, so students can prepare ahead of time; but the way this was framed, it doesn't indicate exactly what the intent is."

"So it's hard to vote for, because it just seems to say don't assign work that -- don't assign -- make assignments that necessitate academic work for students over fall break. A lot of us do that all the time, but ahead of time, so students can plan, whereas the explanation just given specified surprising students, assigning work at the last minute will necessitate them doing things over break. So it's not worded carefully."

Speaker Steve Beer: "Thank you. The speaker interprets the last speaker as speaking in opposition, and so it would be appropriate to hear from a person speaking in favor of the resolution."

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: "I would like to take the resolution as its worded and say that reading assignment would be in violation. I don't think that's right. I think we should not have -- I think this is well-worded. It says you shouldn't be assigning work over breaks."

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman in the center section, in the dark sweater."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Department. "I want to speak in opposition, because I also think that the type of wording is not specific enough in that respect, because especially if you have something like "discouraged" in a resolution, then nobody finds that in any way binding necessarily, including myself. And so I think if we call it "discouraged," then we have definitely to specify what we mean by that. I totally agree with what you said earlier."

Speaker Beer: "Okay, are there any other speakers who wish to deal with this? The lady on the extreme right."

Professor Rose Batt, ILR: "I am Rose Batt from ILR. I am just wondering if we have any information on particularly this issue of surprise assignments at the end, right before breaks. Do we know how much of a problem this is?"

Speaker Beer: "It is a reasonable question. Is there a member of the Educational Policy Committee who can address that question present? Dean Fry? Okay. Would you kindly rise?"

Professor Shawkat Toorawa, Near Eastern Studies: "I am not with the EPC. I agree that the wording is imprecise, well, insufficient -- I disagree that it should be reworded. I would like to speak in favor of this as a notion, though. I think it's really important we move away from assigning work over break. I think I've said before, I live in a north campus dormitory with freshman, for four years now, so I know very well what they deal with and what the mental health issues are."

"I just came from the Council on Mental Health and Welfare. There are lots of issues our students face. I, like Eric, routinely assign things over break. I have stopped doing

that. I have stopped doing that. It has played havoc with my syllabus, but that's just life. And it seems to me it is entirely reasonable to expect students to take a break. We should probably take a break. And we should stop calling them breaks if they are not breaks, if they are just long extended reading and working sessions."

"I think this is a reasonable expectation of ours and graduate students, but it's increasingly becoming an unreasonable expectation of undergraduates. I'm not happy that's the case at all; but it is the case, so I speak -- not sure if I'm speaking for or against it. I agree it's not well-worded. I would change "strongly discouraged" to "forbid," but maybe people thought it wouldn't pass. In the absence of a better-worded amendment, I plan to vote in favor of this."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman behind the former speaker, please. Could you rise and identify yourself."

Professor Ron Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior. "I believe it's considered best practice to have students prepare for the lecture before they attend the lecture. It usually results in lower anxiety for those students to come prepared, having read the assigned readings. If I follow the suggestion here in this resolution and if I had a class on Wednesday after a break, the students should not have been assigned that day's reading, and yet the data shows that really results usually in underperformance on the part of the students and then results in enhanced levels of anxiety on the part of those students."

"So I think it's extremely ambiguous when you actually look at this and try to figure out what their intention is. So essentially they want the students to come to lecture unprepared, be confused by the lecture, shrug their shoulders and move on to the next class. And I think they have good intentions, but they just have bad wording in the resolution itself."

Speaker Beer: "Are there any other further discussion? Again, on the extreme right."

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: "I have to disagree with that, Ron. I read that and understand what it says, and I understand the intent. I think I would have understood the intent if Bill hadn't explained it to us. I want to give the benefit of the doubt to the committee for coming up with this language, because it was probably really difficult to come up with language that was more assertive."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Any other speakers, perhaps on the dean of the faculty?"

Dean of Faculty, Bill Fry: "I guess my personal view is I would hate for this resolution to be voted down if there were problems with the wording, and I personally don't have those problems; but for example, if one could insert "necessitates unexpected academic work," if that would clarify it, that would be fine, but then I'd ask for a motion to table the motion, send it back to committee for amendment, but it would -- my personal view, I would hate to see this voted down."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering." I am with Shawkat on this one. I will vote for it; however, Bill, I don't think it's just about a surprise test before the break. I think it's about giving the amount of work in your course that a student can do in the weeks that aren't breaks, okay. Like "necessitates" is ambiguous here, because say I give enough work so that a student has to do something over break if he didn't plan ahead and do that work. And I say, well, you could plan ahead and do that work before the break. All the other professors of that student do the same thing, right?"

"So really, we all argue that none of us is necessitating work over break, but collectively, we are, okay. So really, I think what you said is right on the money, that we've got to stop giving too much work in the sense of giving them enough work so they can't do it over break -- or they have to do it over break. That is my opinion. Despite the motion doesn't say that, I plan to vote for it, because Ted, having chaired the EPC, I know what you say about coming up with words. It is really hard."

Speaker Beer: "Any further discussion? Senator Cohn."

Senator Cohn: "I am concerned that we are using ambiguity in the language of the resolution to mask much deeper questions we haven't fully engaged in about our expectations and understanding. I right now don't know how I'm voting, so --"

Speaker Beer: "Gentleman on the aisle."

Professor Toorawa: "One of the questions is are we cognizant of the pressures on our students? I think that it's reasonable to expect a student to prepare for the next week. An example: It's spring break. If you teach a Monday/Wednesday/Friday class, seems to me reasonable on that Friday, you would assign the amount of work you expect on Monday. What we are hoping people aren't doing is assigning work for the following Monday. Well, there's a whole extra week, so I would assign extra work."

"I would want to move away from the "unexpected." I may be wrong; I don't think the issue is oh, suddenly someone decides to assign an extra novel to read over spring break. The novel is assigned over spring break. So what you are proposing is a friendly way to move this forward. I would not vote for it if it only concerned unexpected or surprise things."

"I think the reality is that we need, as a professoriate and teaching culture, to begin to realize what the demands are that we make on our students and be more sensitive to their need for a break over, say, Thanksgiving. How reasonable is it to expect one to prepare over Thanksgiving break? It's unreasonable. Maybe we did. I certainly did, but the reality is, they are getting a lot of work and they are not getting it done."

"All I'd have to say in favor of this, if you don't believe me, come to the dorm I live in any opening day after any break and look, and you will understand what the problem is."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Any other points? Again on the extreme right."

Professor Batt: "Yes, same person, same department. Again, I mean, unless I'm missing something, they tell us in terms of how we should teach that best practice for students is to come to lecture prepared. I think the problem with this particular resolution, it will be difficult for others outside of this conversation to understand clearly what the intent of this resolution is, and when you have an issue that's really important for students, I think it's very important for us to have a clear wording of the resolution so they do not misinterpret the intent."

"So if I come to class -- so you're right, but it's funny. At least in the courses we have, many students come to the first lecture of the semester having read the assigned reading for that day. If I follow this resolution, they'll come prepared for the first day of class in August, but if they come back from vacation, are they not to have read the reading for the first class afterwards?"

"And I just -- I'm confused by it, because it seems as though some people believe that would be okay, but yet they tell us in the best interest of the students to encourage them to do just that; come prepared to lecture, to understand the message that you are trying to deliver."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you. Down on the right side and the front, please, in the dark blue --"

Professor Franck: "I think you look at the calendar, figure out the rate of work, you annihilate those days. They don't exist, and you assign the work accordingly. If you are given homework assignments, it has to be the same rate of work. It's pretty clear. I agree with Dr. Clark. It's easy to read it."

Professor Beer: "And the gentleman just behind, in the brown shirt."

Professor Wojciech Pawlowski, Plant Breeding and Genetics: "I want to follow up on the speaker in the aisle, and I think a lot of us will agree that assigning reading that would -- can only be done during that break would be not -- something that we don't want; but I think by having this vague language in this resolution, at the same time the stick is not there. It says "strongly discouraged," I think will be inviting a lot of our colleagues to basically disregard this resolution, because I don't understand it. I'm not required, so what."

Speaker Beer: "Any other points? Gentleman toward the rear, in the black vest."

Professor Mike Van Amburgh, Animal Science: "So in the program I'm in, we'll do study trips over spring break. Would this forbid a study trip over spring break, with 50 or 60 kids? Because that's really the only time to do it."

Speaker Beer: "Dean Fry, can you address that?"

Dean Fry: "I don't think it would prevent that at all. That's in your syllabus at the beginning of the semester, and they plan for it, plan for it when they sign up for the course."

Speaker Beer: "Any other points?"

Professor Batt: "It seems to me, as you can see from the comments around the room, that we're dealing with a lot of different disciplines here and a lot of different work expectations, and it's really impossible, it seems to me, for the senate to start to dictate the way individual people work their class, the way fields work."

"And my suggestion is that also the stress on students is coming from a lot of other places than reading a novel or a short story over a break and that we're trying to solve problems here, problems of mental health that really lie in various different areas that

need to be dealt with; but not by a resolution like this, which is ambiguous in the first place and tries to impose a standard work pattern on diverse disciplines and diverse practices. So as far as I'm concerned, this is not a good resolution for all of those reasons. And if we want to solve student stress problem, we ought to deal with them head-on, not through this kind of operation."

Speaker Beer: "Well, seems the senate has a couple of options: One is the resolution could be sent back to the committee or, if you have heard enough discussion, we can act on the resolution. So are you ready for the question?"

"We have another speaker? Okay. You can have your third voice.

Professor Toorawa: "I sympathize with you. I want to say something that I think there's an implication in what you said that's dangerous. You said reading a novel or reading a short story is not necessarily the cause of stress. I think something that we can say safely is that stress isn't necessarily caused by just one thing. It's a holistic thing and it has to be handled holistically as well."

"Sounds like you were saying let's deal with it the other way we should be dealing with it. I think the assignment could very well be part of it. It's a global question. There's no question in my mind that I have colleagues, the ones I know about, who assign an unreasonably demanding amount of work on our students over break."

"I mean, I'm not going to do it here, but I could document it. It seems to me important to sensitize them to this, say we have to take this into account. They could ignore us or ignore the resolution; but not to be aware that we are also contributing -- if we're not the problem, we are contributing to a larger culture of stress is to be in self-denial."

Speaker Beer: "If we can have some order. Professor Earle, please."

Professor Lisa Earle, Plant Breeding and Genetics: "This is clearly not a binding resolution, and I don't think anything is likely to happen to faculty who assign a chapter to read before a lecture. I think it has merit, because it's a wake-up call to faculty, like me, who might really never have thought about this issue."

"When I became aware of this resolution, I really thought about my syllabus and the date at which I was assigning a term paper, and I decided to -- because part of the time went over spring break, although there was an additional week -- I thought about whether I could move the deadline a little bit, to make things easier on students. So I

think if we pass this and it becomes publicized, a lot of faculty will think about the kinds of assignments they are making, and the net effect might be beneficial.”

Professor Beer: “Professor Cohn.”

Senator Cohn: “I guess a point of information. I'm wondering whether it is possible to send it back to committee with some specific recommendations, and if that is a possibility, then I would propose some language around that.”

Professor Beer: “It would be in order to move that the resolution be returned to committee.”

Senator Cohn: “So I would like to move that the resolution be moved to committee, with the understanding that a significant number -- members of the body -- found the resolution unclear; and another significant body, which may have overlapped with that first body, felt this addresses deeper and broader issues and this needs to be brought up in the context of a more encompassing conversation addressing those issues.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, I don't see the presence of our parliamentarian, but the resolution has been made to return -- the motion has been made to return this resolution to the committee. Is there a second? There is a second.”

“I don't believe this is discussible, but we'll now take a vote by clicking. All those in favor of returning this resolution to the Educational Policy Committee, click A. Those opposed, click B. Those abstaining, click C.”

“Oh, one moment, please. Okay, go. It appears the senate has clicked away, and we'll now display the results. So based on voting, 30 senators have voted to return the resolution to the Educational Policy Committee. 19 in opposition, 5 abstentions.”

“So the resolution will be returned to the Educational Policy Committee and presumably, at some later date, a revised resolution will come before the senate.”

“So at this point, I'd like to call on Professor Marin Clarkberg of Institutional Plans to discuss university and department rankings.”

6. DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENT RANKINGS

Marin Clarkberg, Director, Institutional Planning: "I am not a professor. I am an administrator. Bill Fry asked me to come here today after doing a similar presentation - - no -- for the board of trustees. You want to click in the middle of the screen. Now you have to hit stop."

"All my backgrounds gone, but I'm sharing with you informationally, really, a presentation I gave to the Board of Trustees. I am in institutional research and planning, which is within the provost's office. Let's see. Just to give a broad overview of what I want to do today is talk about the proliferation of rankings, give a brief analysis of "U.S. News and World Report" rankings, the big one that most people are familiar with, and then to talk about sort of how to put rankings in context."

"For those of you who are familiar with the strategic plan, you may recognize this statement. This is, I think, an illustration that rankings are very important to a lot of the leadership of the university; and that includes the president, the provost, and certainly the board of trustees, and that's reflected in this overarching aspiration of the strategic plan."

"I wouldn't be the first person to point out there's nothing here about defining what it means to be a top ten institution or top ten research university, and I think that's now sort of the problem with which we are faced in thinking about what that means and whether or not we attain it. It's very important to remember there are a great many ranking enterprises out there, and what I have done here is collected a very selective list of enterprises that are out there, but there are a great many more than this. I'm not sure that I could even create a full list, if I tried to, because new rankings are coming out every month."

"I think a good example of the proliferation of rankings is "Newsweek" magazine, which of course is a primary competitor the "U.S. News and World Report." They first dabbled with rankings in 2006, when they had their list of top 100 global universities; but that effort fractured, "Newsweek" went into many different lists."

"They have gone into multiple lists, so in 2010, for example, "Newsweek" had a list issue called Schools for Every Kind of Student. In that issue of "Newsweek," Cornell was ranked the third most desirable large school, the eleventh most stocked with jocks, the 25th best school for brainiacs, and the 20th most gay-friendly school."

“Just in the last month, three weeks ago, I think we received news that Cornell was ranked seventh on the Trend Topper Media Buzz Ranking of Brand Equity. Yay.”

(LAUGHTER)

“And just this month, we were ranked fifth university in the world, according to the webometrics ranking web of world universities.”

“So why so many ranking enterprises? Because it's possible to put together the data in so many different ways, depending on what it is you care about. So some rankings pivot around the issue of undergraduate education, and that's a primary thrust and focus of "U.S. News and World Report." Others judge us by subjective evaluations of Cornell web pages. Others are concerned with the quality of the faculty and so on.”

“The last two I mentioned, the Trend Topper Media Buzz Ranking of Brand Equity, is based on data collected from Facebook and blogs. The webometrics metric is based on a count of how many external web links connect to a Cornell.Edu domain -- page in our domain. Here's one I contributed to: A count of how many PDFs we have on our web pages. So I'm working on that one.”

(LAUGHTER)

"U.S. News and World Report" is probably the most familiar ranking to most of us, and this ranking is the oldest ranking institution on the scene and started in the mid-1980s. In the early years, they adjusted their methodology year to year, and there were big shifts in the relative positions of schools each year; but as the methodology settled down, so did the rankings. The methodology and position the school is in go hand-in-hand. So we have been 14th five times, 15th twice, and we've been as high as 12th in the last decade. Just in looking at this list, I want you to note that there are no public institutions on the list.”

“We also tend to be 14th year by year in this ranking, and this is produced by sort of the British analog to the Chronicle of Higher Education, the Times Higher Ed Supplement, and so although we are 14 on one list and 15th on one list, the lists are actually quite different. And part of that's going to be the international component, and I've underlined the schools here that were not on the other list at all, but it's also the case there are public institutions on this list: Berkeley, UCLA, Michigan.”

"On "U.S. News and World Report," we are outranked by Duke, outranked by Washington University in St. Louis, Brown and Dartmouth. In this particular ranking, which is, again, another very well-respected ranking, those schools are 24th, 38th, 55th and 99th, respectively. So depending on what you look at, the lists come out very differently. That is because the methodology is different."

"So this is why they are so different? This is just a sort of synopsis of the rankings. Both of those rankings -- and this isn't that common, really -- both rankings rely heavily on a peer assessment piece, shown in red here. Both of these rankings have something.

"U.S. News" has something called faculty resources, which is a reflection of the student-to-faculty ratio. In the case of "U.S. News and World Report," it doesn't look at faculty productivity, but the blue one's referring to what faculty are doing; but "U.S. News and World Report" really places a large emphasis on how undergraduates are proceeding through the university. So different rankings, different outcomes."

"Taking a slightly broader look, different rankings measure different things, sometimes wildly different things; so the fact Cornell comes in the top 15th -- we have a home on a lot of these things, in that range, so the high teens or low teens -- seems to me pretty remarkable, as remarkable as doing very well on any particular one ranking. So we do a wide breadth of things very well."

"As one already said out loud, one ranking we do poorly on -- and we are up out of the 200s now. We used to be into the 70s -- which is Forbes ranking. And that ranking takes into account debt levels at graduation. So all the elite privates tend to do poorly on that one. The top schools in this ranking include West Point, the naval academy, Air Force academy, for obvious reasons."

(LAUGHTER)

"So this is -- what you see in that column there is how the different components of "U.S. News" get crunched and added up together. I wanted to spend a minute talking about the top three components here which account for 62.5% of the total ranking score, but what you can see on the right side there is that -- some of the things we do better than others. And together they combine to make us the ranked 15th school."

"The first one is peer assessment. So what they do is send out a survey to university presidents and provosts and admissions officers, and I believe now they are surveying

high school guidance counselors, and you get a questionnaire. And it has 265 schools on it, and it says rank each one of these on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 -- I forgot -- 5 is distinguished."

"So we are supposed to go through these, or the president and provost are, and rank the schools. You can imagine how well-informed that might be. On the peer assessment thing, however, we do very well. The way I have labeled this access is that the overall

"U.S. News and World Report" ranking number comes into the titles here, so 15. If our ranking was based on other people's opinions alone, we would come out to be 8th. So there we are meeting our strategic plan aspiration to be wildly recognized as a top ten research university."

"So why are we 15th overall? Because there are other things we don't do so well on. Faculty resources -- I think this is kind of oddly named, because it has a couple of different pieces: One is faculty resources like compensation, and the other has to do with student-faculty ratio and class size issues."

"On faculty compensation, frankly I'll say we do very well, and it's the fact we do well on this and we do lousy on the rest of it, the other pieces, that we come in 16th on that overall."

"For example, here are small classes. Out of the top 250 institutions or whatever that are on the list, we come in 54th with respect to the number of -- percent of classes that are small. And we are just totally not in the same league as the schools that rank above us."

"This is also reflected in our student-to-faculty ratio, that most folks that rank above us are sort of between 6 and 8, and we are not. And this is one where we -- the ratio has been 10 to 1 for many years, but it was like 10.4 to 1, 10.46 to 1. You could see it going, and it tipped to 10.6 to 1. In "U.S. News" eye, we are 11 to 1."

"Retention. This matters a lot, undergraduate retention. We ranked 15th overall in that. Six-year graduation rate counts for a lot. This is to say our six-year graduation rate is very high, compared to the national average, which is 56%. Like all these schools are astronomically high. We are not as high as everyone else, but we are -- we are not as high as some of the schools that rank above us, but we are high."

“That just illustrates some of what goes into the rankings, but I think if I go through the exercise of thinking about what makes a college or university a great place to send a student, if I'm sending my own children to college, I don't end up with a list of attributes that merits "U.S. News" rankings or probably any other single rankings. And one of the things that comes to mind first to me when I think about Cornell, and any person, is the breadth of offerings; but certainly I think what would come high on many of our lists are quality of the classroom experience and the quality of the student experience outside the classroom. And there are no rankings that take those into account.”

“However, what I wanted to convey to the board of trustees and now to you is that we do take those things seriously and those are things we pay attention to and measure as we track how we are doing. So in this graph, I draw a red line, which was supposed to correspond to the top of the red bar, which is Cornell; but the red line moves, depending on which computer you are on. So you can make that go away mentally.”

“So this is an example of what we are tracking. This comes from the senior survey when we survey your students before they graduate and we ask how satisfied they are. We happen to have all schools here that rank higher than us in "U.S. News and World Report," but I can't tell you who they are.”

“We do very well and, in fact, we do better than some of the schools -- several of the schools that rank higher than us on "U.S. News and World Report" in this overall satisfaction measure.”

“How satisfied are you with overall quality of instruction? We are not at the top, but something we are doing we are very well. That low gray bar is a school that I'm not going to name, but is somebody -- a school that has a fabulous student-faculty ratio, and I think that's just an indicator that while we think student-faculty ratio is a good indicator of the quality of the pedagogical experience, it is not capturing the whole thing.”

“This is one measure of the tremendous offerings of Cornell: How satisfied are you with course availability essentially. These are things we do very well on. And one more not inside the classroom, but social life; we do very well again.”

“So one problem with institutional rankings in general is that institution-wide rankings dilute everything out and make an average across the whole institution and, as we

know, colleges are different and programs are different. One thing that we know in our data-sharing consortium, for example, is that engineering students tend to be less satisfied, tend to have more of a grind in their sort of student experience, less glowing reports of what happens in the classroom; so when we compare ourselves to a school that has an engineering school or in which engineering is the primary focus, versus comparing ourselves to someone that doesn't have an engineering school, that kind of thing -- that's going to matter."

"When we think of the "U.S. News and World Report" list and the fact no state schools are on there, I think that's also reflecting what it means to make these institution-wide comparisons, and it waters down the dilution. So the measures that I just showed in the past about students' perceptions of the quality of the student experience are things that we calculate in my office, we provide these things at a detailed level to college deans; so when the numbers permit it, we provide to college deans the survey results for the majors in that particular program or department, so that deans can say hmm, it's this program where students are saying their writing skills are not advancing as much as in a different program, so we can begin to address the problem."

"So one exciting new realm of data -- and I should have said when I talked about rankings, I was not going to talk about NRC rankings, which some of you may be very familiar with, but the data that was supposed to come out of NRC was supposed to be more helpful than it turned out to be in terms of looking at faculty productivity and measures of faculty excellence. What I'm showing here is another source of data that the university will be working with soon that allows us to do sort of that fine-grain analysis of how we are doing at the program level as well as how we are doing at the university level, and this has to do with faculty productivity and faculty excellence."

"So we are acquiring this through a commercial product, and it will allow us to come up with some pretty cool summaries by department. I will say that the data we are acquiring is impressive, but it does not and should not allow me or the provost to look at individual level records on productivity. And wisely, the company that makes this is not doing that because we -- they don't want to get involved in like tenure lawsuits about whose records are best; but with this data, we can look at things like this."

"This is a department. This happens to be the Department of Anthropology at Stony Brook. All those measures are weighted, but we can play with all those metrics. And what this graph is doing is the darker pentagon in the middle is the national average on these various different dimensions, and this particular department, how they compare

in terms of percentiles with respect to books, citation, grants and articles and so on. This would allow us to look at a university overall and at department levels about how we stack up.”

“And then this is another slide that comes out of their materials that we can look at, and individual departments. This is more detailed information, citations for faculty members. This department ranks 7th in the nation. There's like 600 schools in the database. Citations in the 95th percentile and so on. This is the kind of information I think we use more seriously or examine more seriously when thinking about institutional improvement. And I think that's it.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Director Clarkberg. So we have some time for questions or discussion. You are willing to answer questions?”

Director Clarkberg: “Sure.”

Speaker Beer: “Any questions for the director?”

Professor Thomas Bjorkman, Department of Horticulture: “One of Cornell's important aspects is being out in the world and making a difference in the world, in my piece of the university through extension and the land grant mission, and it seems that the metrics you showed us in the last two slides don't capture that distinctive aspect of our activity. I wonder if you could address that.”

Director Clarkberg: “No, they definitely don't. So I was expecting that question from a humanist, which I could respond to, but -- no, they don't. And even grants, they have got an amazing amount of information about grants, but it doesn't have state and private sources of grants, so some of that's going to be missed. So I think that's an important thing to keep in mind as we institutionally look at this. It's the best we can do.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman toward the rear.”

Professor Dick Miller, Philosophy. “I suppose this is really in the nature of a comment. I would be interested how it connects with discussions that are going on. When I talk with people in the U.K. and Australia, who have to take quantitative rankings of their department by productivity and journal articles, books and the like very seriously, they tell me, and, I believe, this is a plague. It is a terrible discouragement for taking time to

think things over, changing your field, not saying yes to lots of offers of publications, but taking time for the gestation of a major idea that may have false starts, that may itself be a false start.”

“It really is degraded, intellectual life and philosophy and I think in other fields in, for example, the U.K. And that it's not individual professors doesn't matter, because we care deeply about our departments. We don't want to be looked down on as dragging our departments. These numbers are magnetic. They have enormous appeal. I hope the thought that at least in my field, and I expect others, this is a plague has some impact on the administration.”

Speaker Beer: “The gentleman just next.”

Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences. “I would like to second those comments. It has the potential to become a tyranny. And for a huge part of our aspiration and of our mission as a land grant and as part of our legacy to not be captured in any of the rankings, not just these five components here, but all the rankings you showed, I didn't see anything related to impact. And that's a huge oversight. And we need to be careful for what we ask for, because we will get it. We would look terrific if we had metrics on our impact in the real world. It's a real lost opportunity.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other comments or questions? Gentleman in the extreme rear.”

Professor Michael Tomlan, City and Regional Planning. “I would like to suggest that she take the time to poll the members of FACTA; that is, those of us who have served and evaluated the faculty excellence across the university, including medical school, know that all those things that you stated there, those five little boxes are important, but they are just the tip of the iceberg.”

“The question -- the comment's been made in public service. We see the university faculty in federal, state and local government. We see the faculty on any number -- quite frankly, those things are things we value. I'd like to see much more in what it is that you're presenting to the board of trustees resonate with the board of trustees who are interested in what we're talking about here. Thank you”.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So as an illustration of impact, I want to say there was work done in the '70s when the parvo virus outbreak occurred in dogs worldwide. Can you hear me?"

Director Clarkberg: "Yes."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "The people at Cornell worked very hard and were very successful in creating a vaccine for that, that protected dogs not only in this country, but worldwide. Now, they certainly have an NIH grant for that. They probably got some citations, but the impact of that is far greater than anything on that slide. So I don't see anything that you've said that really touches on that kind of thing, which is really, in my view, the important thing that some of us do here. It wasn't my work, so not saying my work."

"And also, I know when I go abroad and talk to people about -- say I'm from Cornell, the first thing they say to me is wow, I know Cornell's really important in agriculture and how they worked with plants and we've gotten so much information from Cornell that's really helped us. I don't see that up there either. And they may be getting grants for that, but probably not NIH grants with high overhead. "

"So I think the trustees need to get a balanced view of not only what are the ten top research universities, but they have to understand what we really are contributing to the world."

Director Clarkberg: "And you know, with all the comments which I feel entirely sympathetic with, my role is as a data person, but my role is not to make decisions about departments or faculty salaries or any of those things. What I can bring to the conversation are some numbers. We consider our mission for our unit to be informed decision-making, but it's not the decision-making."

"And I think it would be a false representation of what we are doing to imagine that any data that we collect in this very simple and quantitative way is enmeshed with a gear that drives some other decision-making and that the provost is just sitting on some sort of machine and has no insight or intellectual ability to judge something more nuanced than what I'm presenting."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman on the extreme right, with the brown shirt. I might mention we have seven minutes for discussion and comments."

Professor Pawlowski: "I have a question and comment. What is the use of this data, other than the presentations to the trustees? And my comment is that I worry that all these numerical approaches, in addition to missing entire ranges of things that we do, kind of encourage a very simplistic superficial view, rather than reading into somebody's papers and trying to figure out what these ideas are."

"It is much simpler to just take a number of citations, but doesn't really tell -- I see very little value in that. And I often review grants from Europe and recently I got a few of them where, rather than listing their recent publication, they provided a number of -- it was a number of publication times the impact factor of the journal times the citation number, which is supposed to be really easy for me, but it's not --"

Director Clarkberg: "I understand all these things are fundamentally unsatisfying, just as it is to assign a numeric grade to an essay or get a number on your grant application or so on; but I think that the more specific we get with an individual, whether it's an essay or faculty member or whatever, the less helpful this kind of information is. I think in an aggregate, are citations a general indicator of intellectual impact? I think in the aggregate, it could be a summary."

Speaker Beer: "Any further comments? In the front."

Professor Cheyfitz: "President Skorton -- and I don't know if people saw it. They should look at the "Huffington Post" editorial he wrote on reducing costs in higher education. One of the three points he made was accountability, which includes post-tenure accountability. The question is, that given categories like this, which have no impact, tell us something about the way the administration is thinking, and he does not define what that accountability is going to amount to and obviously has something to do with the way productivity is measured. What becomes troubling then -- just echoing some of the concerns, how that faculty accountability, accountability in quotes, is going to be measured."

"If we look at what's being given there in relationship to what people have been pointing out here, there seems to be a discrepancy and something for faculty to worry about. One of the issues that's been raised consistently in this reimagining Cornell business is the quote, unquote -- and I put in heavy quote -- the unproductive associate professors who have not been producing according to very strict quantitative sort of standards, books, articles, this sort of thing; when in fact if we measure productivity in other ways, interactions with students, for example, counseling, those sorts of things,

we'd have an entirely different measure of what's going on here. So it is concerning in terms of the way decisions are going to be made in the future about course loads, salaries, that sort of thing."

Director Clarkberg: "Right. And I would just like to reiterate that none of this is done at the individual level, so none of this can inform any decisions about -- not without other information, anyway, about an individual's outcome. And then I would like to add that we do try, with data limitations as they are, to measure other things you talked about, including involvement and advising and interaction with students and teaching and so on."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Clearly, if you are going to try to be a top ten research institution and you are competing with other institutions with these as major categories, that it's going to start to reflect on the people -- on individuals, even though I understand that this is not being used to assess individuals."

Speaker Beer: "I think we have time for one final point by a member of the body. Gentleman."

Professor Dan Buckley, Crop & Soil Sciences: "Looking through the NRC data, there were a lot of errors in that. One of the only ways to address that, or even as an individual unit assess the data and try to respond to it or try to improve, the individual units need to be able to see the data the administration is eyeing."

"Is this a kind of tool the individual units are going to be able to see? How do we have the ability to respond, either to improve or to correct inaccuracies in the data? Is there a method for that?"

Director Clarkberg: "So I guess the answer here is that I don't know. So the data hasn't arrived at the university yet, and I don't know when it will arrive at the university. In general, my office has a very -- strives to be fairly transparent about what kind of data are being shared. The hope is that it is useful for self-diagnosis as the NRC data was. I mean, programs were able to look at time to degree and how that compares to other universities and consider whether or not something else is possible or important to do; but I don't know specifically with these data, which really are just one item in the toolbox at this point."

Speaker Beer: "Well, Director Clarkberg, thank you very much. We have reached the point of hour of our adjournment. So University Faculty Senate meeting is adjourned for February. Thank you."

Respectfully submitted

Fred Gouldin, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty