AGENDA

- Call to Order
- Report from Nominations & Elections Committee (Fred Gouldin)
- Report on Advising (Carole Bisogni)
- Approval of Minutes from October 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting
- Faculty Lunch Resolution (Yuval Grossman)
- UFC Report
- Report from Robert Buhrman
- Update on Reaccreditation (Alan Mathios)
- Dean of Faculty Report (Bill Fry)
- Good and Welfare
REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Childcare Services Subcommittee
   Stephen L. Morgan, College of Arts & Sciences (reappointment)

Educational Policy Committee
   Bruce Levitt, Chair, College of Arts & Sciences
   John Muckstadt, College of Engineering

Faculty Committee on Program Review
   Jane Mt. Pleasant, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences

Lectures Committee
   Jonathan Ochshorn, Chair, College of Architecture, Art & Planning

Nominations & Elections Committee
   Susan Suarez, College of Veterinary Medicine
North Campus and Collegetown Council
  John Belina, College of Engineering
  Jennifer Gerner, College of Human Ecology
  Joe Regenstein, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences

Professors-at-Large Selection Committee
  Graeme Bailey, College of Engineering (reappointment)

University Benefits Committee
  Michel Louge, College of Engineering

University Sustainability Committee
  Anthony Ingraffea, College of Engineering
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER FACULTY SENATE MEETING

NOVEMBER 10, 2010
FACULTY LUNCH RESOLUTION

YUVAL GROSSMAN

November 10, 2010
WHEREAS most major universities in the world have a “faculty club” or a “faculty center,” and

WHEREAS Cornell University has had a faculty club and/or luncheon facility for over 50 years, which has important benefits to the university such as increasing professional and social interactions amongst faculty members, thereby improving faculty productivity, and assisting and enhancing recruitment and retention of faculty,

WHEREAS the existing faculty luncheon facility is to be closed at the end of the Fall 2010 semester, and
WHEREAS the Cornell Dean of Faculty conducted a survey of faculty members about the need for a faculty luncheon facility and the results indicated that a significant number of faculty members felt that keeping the facility is important, and

WHEREAS the 2010-2015 Cornell University Strategic Plan calls for “develop a revamped faculty club on campus,”

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

The Senate strongly urges the Cornell Administration, and in particular, the Provost, to reverse the decision to close the current faculty luncheon facility and keep it open until a suitable replacement is found, and recommends that a serious planning effort be undertaken, with Administration support and involvement, to ensure a sustainable faculty center that includes a luncheon facility.

Senators supporting: Elizabeth Earle, Don Hartill, Harry Kaiser, Michael Nussbaum, Tim Mount
REPORT FROM
ROBERT BUHRMAN,
SENIOR VICE PROVOST FOR
RESEARCH

November 10, 2010
The goals and direction of Cornell research administration

Reorganization of the Office of Sponsored Programs

Faculty Senate
November 10, 2010
Research Administration

Vision and Mission

• Vision
  – Cornell’s research administration will achieve a level of effectiveness that is as superb as our faculty and the research results that they produce

• Mission
  – Support and facilitate the advancement of Cornell’s research while upholding institutional principles and adhering to external regulations
Cornell Research Scale and Scope

- $480M research expenditures (26% of Ithaca campus budget)
- 1,871 graduate students (GRAs only) and 3,940 personnel supported with sponsored funds (current)
- 1,906 new proposals last year
  - paper, dept. systems, Grants.gov, Fastlane; PI/RA mgmt of agency forms/rules, institution rates
  - manual routing, verification of compliance regulations
- 3,700 active awards; 608 active subcontracts
- 1,109 principal investigators with active awards (current)
- >225 department and college research administrators (RAs)
- 2,490 research protocols submitted for review
  - paper, web forms, eSirius
  - manual tracking, verification, reporting
Tactics

• Internal focus primarily to date
  • Enhance staff leadership and expertise
    – Leadership changes, reorganization, position and qualification redefinition, training, mentoring
  • Develop culture of service and quality; utilize risk-based decision making
    – Customer surveys, response standards, risk assessment, cost/benefit analyses
  • Obtain and act upon stakeholder input
    – Faculty/staff involvement in hiring, engage assoc. deans, faculty user groups, researcher participation in improvement projects
  • Measure and benchmark performance
    – Key performance indicators, peer comparisons
  • Conduct program assessments
    – Animal care program review, communications study
  • Address internal compliance issues
Tactics, continued

• Moving to external focus
  • First step: Reorganize OSP to better serve internal customers (PIs) and external customers (sponsors)
  • Other steps pending – possible subjects of future reports
Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)

JoAnne Williams – Director (as of Dec. 2009)

Realignment and Reorganization

- Current State
- Reasons for Change
  - Internal
  - External
- View to the Future
- Expected Outcomes
- Metrics
- Next Steps
Customer dissatisfaction with services provided by Office of Sponsored Programs . . . Why?

- Varying levels and quality of OSP support to Cornell PI’s and departments/units

- OSP Grant & Contract Officer (GCO) research administration skills and understanding of spectrum of sponsors are not “standardized” among GCOs

- PI’s and departments have incomplete understanding of scope of GCO role perception is that OSP provides minimum added value to process

- Sponsors and PIs experience inconsistent terms and conditions in similar agreements

- Minimal feedback mechanisms between OSP and its customers - researchers and department administrators
Internal Reasons for Change

• Need to change perception of OSP from being a barrier to being a partner

• Need to provide a consistent high quality level of administrative sponsored program support

• Need to “standardize” OSP personnel core skills and knowledge and required continuing education

• Need to improve low morale and sense of contribution among GCOs

• Need to define, document, and disseminate sponsored program administrative processes and/or process improvements

• Need to help implement the Cornell Strategic Plan
  
  – Strategic Initiative # 5: Implement strategically focused, cost-effective enhancements to the infrastructure in support of research, scholarship, and creativity.
Increased, administratively burdensome federal and state regulatory compliance requirements

- Over 40 sets of separate federal regulations that apply to OSP activities
- At least 216 FAR clauses and 79 DFAR clauses (in addition to numerous agency specific clauses) that can be included in a contract.

Increased complexity of:

- Sponsor-driven requirements
- Contracts and other transactions
- Funding mechanisms

Competition for research funds demands quality OSP administrative performance, and skilled negotiators to compete for the funds while consistently following Cornell policies.
Center of Expertise:
Operations

- Customer Support
- Research & System Support
- Audit Support

- SOP & Policies
- Training/Event Coordination
- Metrics/Dashboard/Reporting

- Outreach
- Website

OSP Realignment
# Center of Expertise

## Functional Responsibilities

### Federal Government

- **Proposal & Pre-Proposal Review & Submission**
- **Award, Sub-award and Out-year Action Negotiation**
- **Subcontracts, & Other**
- **Outreach & Education**

### State & Foundations

### Industry

### Contract Support/Oversight

### Administrative Operations & Support

### Operations

- **Infrastructure & Office Management**
- **Proposal Services & Award Services**
Outcomes of Change

- Improved support to researchers and Cornell departments/units – *quality and speed*
- Improved relationships with Sponsors
- Increased level of skills and quality of OSP resources
- Business process improvements
- Improved team work within OSP
• Research system (EZRA) modifications will allow measurement of:
  – Cycle time for (examples only):
    • Proposal receipt to proposal submission
    • Award receipt to award acceptance
    • Other document receipt to conclusion
  • Response time to customer calls
  • Number of proposals/awards received and successfully processed
  • Research funds processed per GCO
  • Customer satisfaction survey
  • Establishment of OSP points of contact (liaisons) for each college
    – Attendance at department administrator meetings
    – Response time to departmental requests
  • Continuing professional education requirements
UPDATE ON REACREDITATION

ALAN MATHIOS, DEAN OF COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY

November 10, 2010
Cornell’s 2011 Reaccreditation

Process and Progress
November 2010
Accreditation thru Middle States

• Renewal in 2011
• Decennial process involves
  – In-depth institutional self study
  – Three day visit by external review team
• 14 standards for accreditation
• Covers the entire institution: Weill, programs with professional accreditation, etc.
• Requisite for federal financial aid
Fourteen Standards

Institutional Stewardship

1. Mission and Goals
2. Planning, Resource Allocation & Institutional Renewal
3. Institutional Resources
7. Institutional Assessment

Student Admissions & Supports

8. Student Admissions and Retention
9. Student Support Services

The Faculty

10. The Faculty

Integrity, Governance & Administration

4. Leadership & Governance
5. Administration
6. Integrity

Educational Offerings

11. Educational Offerings
12. General Education
13. Related Educational Activities

Assessment

14. Assessment of Student Learning
Organization

Steering Committee
Mathios & Hubbell, co-chairs

Institutional Stewardship
(Standards 1, 2, 3 & 7)
Kathleen Rasmussen, chair

Integrity, Governance & Administration
(Standards 4, 5 & 6)
Charlie Walcott, chair

The Faculty
(Standard 10)
Amy Villarejo, chair

Student Admissions & Supports
(Standards 8 & 9)
Kraig Adler, chair

Assessment of Student Learning
(Standard 14)
David Gries, chair

Educational Offerings
(Standards 11, 12, 13)
Laura Brown, chair

Trustee Task Force on Accreditation:
Elizabeth Altman
Ronnie Chernoff
Ezra Cornell
Asa Craig
Stephen Ettinger
John Noble

Steering Committee and Six Working Groups
Steering Committee

Alan Mathios and Kent Hubbell, co-chairs

Working Group Chairs +

Marin Clarkberg, Director, Institutional Research & Planning
William Fry, Dean of the Faculty
Barbara Knuth, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Susan Murphy, Vice President for Student & Academic Services
Elmira Mangum, Vice President for Planning & Budget
Kristin Walker, Institutional Research & Planning
Gina Ryan, graduate student, Microbiology
Nikhil Kumar (until May 2010), undergraduate student, ILR
Vincent Andrews (after May 2010), undergraduate student, ILR
## Timeline overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee first convenes</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States approves Cornell’s self-study design</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Working Groups research, analyze, evaluate</td>
<td>AY 2009 - 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group reports due</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee drafts comprehensive report</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft shared with campus constituencies</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary visit from team chair</td>
<td>December 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final self study submitted to Middle States</td>
<td>February 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team visits Cornell</td>
<td>March 27-30, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience for the Self Study

“The primary audience is the institution’s own community, and the secondary audience includes external (or public) constituencies.”

— *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, The Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Purpose of the Self Study

“The primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement. The self study is most useful when it is analytical and forward-looking rather than descriptive or defensive, when it is used both to identify problems and to develop solutions to them, and when it identifies opportunities for growth and development.”

— Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
Relationship to Strategic Plan

• Self study activities were initiated before strategic planning began

• The work of the self study has informed, facilitated, and complemented strategic planning efforts at every stage
  – Overlapping participant lists
  – Overlap in the questions that were asked

• Strategic Plan, in turn, became a basis for developing recommendations that have been incorporated in self study
2011 Self-Study for Accreditation through Middle States

Documentation

Self-Study Design Plan

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education formally approved Cornell's Design Plan on July 15, 2009 in a letter from Debra Klinman, Vice President.

Draft of Cornell’s Self Study (October 29, 2010)

A first draft of Cornell’s Self Study. The final draft will be submitted to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in February 2011. Comments welcome before December 18. (See left for contact information.)

For More Information Contact:
middlestates@cornell.edu
Marin Clarkberg
mec30@cornell.edu
607-255-9101
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cornell University: An Overview</td>
<td>21 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach to Self Study</td>
<td>6 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional Stewardship</td>
<td>26 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integrity, Governance and Administration</td>
<td>18 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Admissions and Supports</td>
<td>39 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Faculty</td>
<td>28 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educational Offerings</td>
<td>40 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment of Student Learning</td>
<td>28 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>14 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conclusion</td>
<td>7 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227 pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 14

Assessment of Student Learning

• Clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, college, major, course)
• Documented, organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning
Learning Outcomes for Cornell

**Disciplinary Knowledge**: demonstrate a systematic or coherent understanding of an academic field of study

**Critical Thinking**: apply analytic thought to a body of knowledge

**Communication Skills**: write and speak articulately

**Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning**: understand cause and effect relationships; use symbolic thought

**Self-Directed Learning**: work independently; take initiative

**Information Literacy**: access and evaluate information sources

**Engagement in the Process of Discovery or Creation**
In addition, Cornell graduates should develop a deeper understanding of:

**Multi-Cultural Competence**: engage in a multicultural society

**Moral and Ethical Awareness**: embrace moral/ethical values

**Self-management**: demonstrate awareness of one's self in relation to others

**Community Engagement**: demonstrate responsible behavior
Recommendations

“The primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement. The self study is most useful when it ... identifies opportunities for growth and development.”

— Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
The chapters make recommendations for which we will be held accountable at the periodic review five years hence. These fall at the ends of the chapters. For example:

**Chapter 4. Integrity, Governance, and Administration**

1. Leadership and Administration
   - Board of Trustees; University Assemblies; The Assemblies and Shared Decision Making;
   - Administration; Policy Development; Selection and Evaluation of Leadership; Communication

2. Integrity
   - Ethical Conduct Policies; Enforcement Efforts

3. **Recommendations**
   - Leadership and Administration; Integrity
Spring 2011 Site Visit

• Chair: Rebecca Bushnell
  – Dean of Arts & Sciences at University of Pennsylvania (2005-present)
  – Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, Princeton

• Dates: March 27-30, 2011
  – Sunday afternoon session through Wednesday afternoon exit interview
Evaluation Team

Rebecca Bushnell, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Penn
Susan Boswell, Dean of Student Life, Johns Hopkins
Ann Dodd, Assistant Dean for Strategic Initiatives and Graduate Education and Associate Professor of Agricultural Leadership, Penn State
Thomas Elzey, Senior VP of Finance, Drexel
Daryl Nardick, Director of Strategic Projects Integration/Senior Project Consultant, Georgetown
Glenn Starkman, Professor of Physics, Case Western
Karin Trainer, University Librarian, Princeton
Donna Waechter, Associate Dean for Medical Education, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
## Outline of visit agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday (27)</th>
<th>Monday (28)</th>
<th>Tuesday (29)</th>
<th>Wednesday (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair &amp; President meet</td>
<td>Interviews &amp; visits</td>
<td>Chair &amp; President meet</td>
<td>Finish report writing, Chair prepares oral report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus people</td>
<td>Campus people</td>
<td>Team only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon</strong></td>
<td>Reception, First working session of the team</td>
<td>Interviews &amp; visits, Team dinner</td>
<td>Interviews &amp; visits, Team Dinner</td>
<td>Oral summary for President, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Team meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final report may make...

- **Suggestions**: action optional
- **Recommendations**: requires the institution take action and report in:
  - Next periodic review report (5 years)
  - Progress letter (6-24 months later)
  - Monitoring report (6-24 months later)
- **Requirements**:
  - Signals that accreditation is in jeopardy
Your comments

middlestates@cornell.edu

• Kent Hubbell, Dean of Students, klh4@cornell.edu
• Alan Mathios, Dean of the College of Human Ecology, adm5@cornell.edu
• Marin Clarkberg, Director, Institutional Research & Planning, mec30@cornell.edu
• Memorial Statements now on line
  • (Thanks to Bob Cooke)
• Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Calendar Committee
• CCCC Resolution
  • Response
  • Reaction
The Memorial Statements are on eCommons.

The University Faculty Archive (lists both the volumes (collections) and Individuals)
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17811

Two subsets:

The Memorial Statement Collections (books containing a decade of statements)
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17838

The Memorial Statements Individually
http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/17813

Thanks to Bob Cooke!!
Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Issues before the EPC
  • academic integrity
  • assignments/exams over a break
  • diversity issues
• Calendar Committee
• CCCC Resolution
  • Response
  • Reaction
President’s response on Monday noon ➔ Charlie Walcott, Bill Fry
(previous request for extension of the response time)
➔ public on Monday afternoon

Previous conversations ➔ considerable time and effort
(report from ad hoc committee, Senate Resolution, report from HR, correspondence with diverse constituent groups, Resolution from UA.)
From: Stephen L. Morgan  
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 10:19 AM  
To:  
Cc: William Earl Fry  
Subject: endpoint on child care center resolution  

Dear faculty endorsers of the March 2010 resolution of the Faculty Senate (cc William Fry, Dean of the Faculty),

As you may be aware, most parents and teachers at the center have indicated that they are now very pleased with current conditions at the center, and I am certain that everyone can agree that this is a very positive development for Cornell. President Skorton has appealed to the community that “we go forward in a spirit of collegiality and civility.” I am sure you will all join me in hoping for the best at the Cornell Child Care Center, honoring the President’s request that the campus now come together in support of the center.

Best,

Steve
Observations (WEF):

• The most emotive issue that I’ve seen
• Much angst, much anger.
• Communication awkward/wanting
• There have been improvements
• There will be changes
• Some (not all) recommendations adopted
• Senate Resolution/ad hoc committee
  → big impact

Move forward with civility and mutual respect for all involved
CCCC needs to become an excellent facility
  best if we work together