

A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor and Chair Department of Science and Technology Studies and Speaker Bruce Lewenstein: “Good afternoon, everyone. Call the meeting to order. The day when we have a very full agenda is the day we are having technical difficulties, so of course we don't have anything to present there at the moment.

“I want to remind everybody, please, to turn off your telephones, tablets, the sound on your computers, and anything else that beeps during the meeting. Also, a reminder that there's no recording of any kind during the meeting, except for the official record, so no tape recorders, no record buttons on your phones, no digital recordings, anything like that.

“When it comes time for questions and comments from the floor, we will recognize -- as usual, senators first will have priority, although anybody else may speak, if we have time. We will hold people to two minutes, as usual, and Parliamentarian Sam Nelson will have his iPad up with a counter to give you a sense of how much time there is.

“I have had no requests for Good and Welfare, but I believe we have one item that will happen at the end of the meeting. There is, in fact, one semi-request that I have received that I think will interest people and that they should do their best to remain for during Good and Welfare at the end of the meeting.

“With that, we will move to the first item on the agenda, approval of the minutes of the [December 10](#) meeting, 2014; and [February 11, 2015](#). Did anybody identify any concerns with the minutes? Are there any objections to approving the minutes? Minutes are approved.

“The second item is that you received by e-mail a notice that we wish to substitute a slightly different agenda than the original agenda that was circulated. This is in order for us -- we have the pleasure of having both the President and the Provost here today, and we wanted to allow time for that. Any objections to [substitution of the agenda](#)? Okay. We will move on the new agenda.

“The first item on the agenda has to do with [reappointment of the dean and the associate dean](#). So at this time, if I could ask Dean Burns and Associate Dean Fontaine to step out of the room, and close the door on the way out, please. So the dean and the associate dean are elected according to the procedures of the faculty for three-year terms. Both Dean Burns and Dean Fontaine's terms will end at the end of this academic year. Because of the transition in president and provost, they have agreed to be considered for reappointment for another year in order to help with the transition across to the new administration. They both agreed to a one-year extension, and our rules are that although they are elected by the full faculty, a reappointment of up to two years can happen just from the senate, for each of them.

“Do I hear a motion to reappointment Dean Burns for an additional year? A second? Okay. Any discussion? All in favor of reappointing Dean Burns? Opposed? Any abstentions? A couple of abstentions are recognized. I declare the vote as being positive. He is reappointed.

“Do I hear a motion for reappointing Associate Dean Fontaine? Any second? Second. Any discussion? All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? The unanimous vote to reappoint Dean Fontaine. We will invite them back in.

(APPLAUSE)

“I'm sorry to tell you that you have both been reappointed. Next on the agenda are remarks from the dean of the faculty, Joe Burns.”

2. [REPORT OF THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY](#)

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: “We still don't have slides. I had two items I wanted to announce, or at least remind you about, and then talk about some data, which will be harder to talk about if we don't have slides.

“So first, before getting on to my own items, I would like to thank the President for joining us today, and the Interim Provost, David Skorton and Harry Katz, for both coming at a very important time for the University. It is so good that you are interacting with we faculty to find solutions to the various problems that are out there. And we'll find out what the future brings and what the present brings. So we appreciate that very much.

"I'm going to skip over, for the reasons of time, my normal dance routine of having people shake hands and all this sort of stuff, and just move directly to these two announcements. One is that we have a Faculty Forum a week from today in this room. That Faculty Forum is entitled "Revenue Enhancement; At What Cost, To What Benefit." And the title is meant to be a little bit provocative, but what we are trying to do is there are lots of schemes on the books or being considered nowadays about how to improve the financial posture of the University, and it is important that the faculty be involved in these conversations.

"There are things that we can benefit. There are certain educational niches where we might be able to help out by introducing new degree programs or new schemes to bring that information out to the public, but there are also costs. We should recognize what the costs are and ask if we want to improve our revenue side or we want to cut our cost side. How do we do this? This has profound educational implications and we need to be brought into that conversation.

"So for this panel, we have brought together Ron Ehrenberg, an expert on this; Kathryn Caggiano, who's run a survey in the Engineering College about the MEng program; Charlie Van Loan from Computer Science, one of our colleagues here who has run a very successful computer science MEng program. We also have Paul Streeter, Vice President of Budget and Planning who will tell us what the budget situation is and how we compare to our peers, and we'll hear as well from Francesca Molinari from Economics, who is co-chair of the Arts and Sciences revenue enhancement scheme, to see the big picture, what are we gaining, and what are we losing. I think that will be a fascinating panel that we'll have here in a week's time. After that, we have wine, so that makes it even better.

"The second announcement is that I have been asked to remind you that we have a Charter Day Weekend coming up in six weeks. This is celebrating the 150th anniversary, something like 40 really exciting events that are happening here April 24th, 25th, 26th, and then a grand academic procession on the 27th of April to celebrate the signing of our charter.

"In particular, I was asked to remind the faculty that the grand procession is going to have lots of faculty marching, we hope, behind their colleges and doing good things. So please register for that. Registration does cost \$20, because we are sure that there will be an overflow otherwise, but that \$20 is being donated to the CARE program to help our staff and our colleagues and students. So please

do register. And some of the events are already filled up, so I encourage you, for your own well-being, to register for that event. So that's the faculty forum. Here's the registration.

"Now I wanted to spend just a moment showing you three slides of data. I realize this is very small, but the message is quite easy to pick up from this. You may have seen at the beginning of last week, there were a bunch of articles in "The Cornell Sun," some with explosive headlines. "The Sun" called me up and asked if it is true, as the President says, that -- I immediately said yes, whatever it was -- but is it true the faculty is at its largest number ever?

"I went back and looked on the public database. And lo and behold, we are now, as of the fall, at 1,652. That was the all-time high for the number of faculty, but that number differs by only 0.3% from the previous peak that occurred just before the budget blowout in 2008. So we've crept up a little bit, or come back, I should say. We have come back just a little bigger than we have ever been before.

"An interesting fact is to compare that to the number of students that we have. So the next slide shows the number of students plotted. It's undergraduates, then it's master's people, some research masters, professional doctoral degrees and so forth. That runs from 2002 up to 2013. We have data for 2014 as well. The thing that's noteworthy to me is that in the period that the faculty has barely crept up, the student body has increased by 10%; a remarkably large increase. And that increase has mostly occurred across the professional master's degrees.

"So it has implications for the way we will have some of our budget discussions. We are moving in a certain direction, and the faculty ought to know that and see whether or not that is the sort of thing that we think is good and how we make those programs as effective as possible, so that we accomplish what we want to accomplish as academicians. And that got me to look a little bit more at the demographics of the faculty on the next slide. And the last slide shows the demographics, starting from the bottom, people under 35, 2001 up to 2014. Thirty-five to 44, 45 to 54, you get the pattern. Fifty-five to 64, 65 and above, then 75 and above. A remarkable transition. There are demographic changes at least in these preliminary data. We need to understand them better, but I think these are very provocative data.

"The younger folks are pretty much staying the same. Should I be the person to tell you that the number above 65 is growing, and we are doing our exercises?

We are going to stick around and try and stay productive, but that number has grown from about 9% to 21% in the last 15 years or less. And that has come at the expense of the people 45 to 54, what one might think are the most productive of us individuals. So we need to understand these numbers, make sure they are right, and see what the implications are going forward. I will just leave it at that. I think this is a topic for future discussion and something that I hope you bring back to your departments and discuss fully the implications of this.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you, Dean Burns. Next item on the agenda is a resolution to change the time of faculty senate meetings. Cynthia Leifer, Jill Frank and Mike Fontaine.”

3. PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE TIME OF FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS

Professor Cynthia Leifer, Microbiology and Immunology: “Thank you. On behalf of my two co-sponsors, Mike Fontaine and Jill Frank, who couldn't make it today, I am here today to bring forward the resolution to change the meeting time of the senate. At our December meeting, we heard from Yael Levitte, the Associate Vice Provost of Faculty Development and Diversity, and she presented data from the 2010 Work Life Survey. And she requested that the senate consider changing its meeting time. And in collaboration with my two co-sponsors, we investigated this, we found out some information that I would like to share with you, and then I will propose a resolution that we drafted. One key piece of data from the 2010 survey at the top indicated that 48% of faculty found that meeting times were stressful. We have been so consumed with reducing student stress that we often forget about our own stress. We need to do a better job of reducing our own stress. And if moving a meeting time could do that, maybe we should consider it.

“Also for the faculty senate, the meeting time is often cited as a barrier to participation. In fact, I have heard a story where a faculty member was really excited to participate as a faculty senator and, after a short while, had to rescind being a faculty senator and had to find someone else to take their place, simply because their family obligations conflicted with the senate meeting time. This story illustrates a larger problem. It's not just a family issue. It is not just people with children. It is people dealing with elder care and various other issues outside of their normal work time. We need to worry about the people who are representing us in this body, and we need to broaden our representation. And so moving the faculty senate time will broaden the number

of people who can participate as senators from our faculty and better represent our faculty in this body.

“Cornell is always interested in how we compare with our peers. And you will see here I did a quick search the other day on Google and typed in "faculty senate meeting times," and took the first 20 universities that I could find. And I only found one other university, higher university that has a senate time after 4:00 p.m. So we are in a unique and a class of universities, maybe one we don't want to be in.

“We heard at one of our recent meetings also that the President, who's here today, wants to accelerate our progress towards carbon neutrality. One way to do that is to encourage people to take more mass transit. With meeting times that end as late as this one does, it limits our access to alternative transportation. And furthermore, the provost and the deans agreed in 2013 to conduct official Cornell business during the hours of 8:30 and 5:00 p.m., and I think that we should consider doing that as well. I want to tell you in one short week, with one e-mail, I received an overwhelming response in support of this from faculty of all ranks, as well as chairs, associate deans and vice provosts. So this is widely accepted across the university.

“Lastly, I want to acknowledge that no matter what solution we have, if it's changing this time, there will always be faculty that are disadvantaged. An example is that a senate meeting time of 3:00 to 4:30 would overlap with 7.6% of the 2,153 classes held on Wednesdays. So I think there's never going to be the perfect solution for everyone; but if we move this faculty senate meeting time to a different time, other than starting at 4:30 and ending at 6:00 p.m., we can increase the diversity and representation of faculty senators. And this will allow the future leaders of this University, as we just saw from the changing demographics, to participate in decisions that will affect their future tenure here at Cornell University.

“I want to read the resolution quickly:

“Whereas the 2010 Faculty Work Life Survey indicated the timing of departmental meetings and functions was stressful. Whereas women and underrepresented minorities are more affected by this, by long distance, dual career situations and elder care responsibilities.

“Whereas at least three local day cares close at 5:00 p.m., and others close at 5:30; and whereas more dual career faculty members are at Cornell than ever before.

“Whereas 46% of women faculty and 16% of men faculty are in dual career situations that require them to live separately for at least part of the year or commute at least one hour from home.

And whereas the provosts, deans and departmental chairs agreed to conduct university business at core meeting times between the hours of 8:30 and 5:00 p.m. to support work/life balance of all faculty,

“Be it resolved that the faculty senate move its meeting time to start and end within the regular university hours of 8:30 and 5:00 p.m.

“Be it also resolved that the Dean of the University Faculty, in consultation with Human Resources, the Registrar, the Provost and/or his representative will be charged with identifying the new senate meeting time, which will go into effect in fall 2015.

“Thank you.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have time for perhaps one or, at most, two questions, comments, before a vote.

“Yes. And please keep remarks short, because we have limited time.”

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: “And I strongly support these things. I want to say in general, I think we should keep the fact that we should have our normal five days a week, between 8:30 and 5:00, and it should be a really good example for us to keep it all over. So I am really supporting it.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Any other comments? Okay, the resolution's –”

Professor Phil Nicholson, Space Sciences, Astronomy: “A quick comment on the other side. I accept all the points you made. I think they are all valid points in favor. Speaking on the other side, as one who doesn't have any children or elder care responsibilities and who usually works until 10:00 at night, I find this perfectly acceptable; but more relevantly, those of us that do all the work involving tele cons with colleagues and other places, especially all over the country, this is about the earliest time you could have it without interfering with typical tele con times organized for the benefit of people in California.

I just came from one that ended at 4:30. If we move to starting at 3:00 or 3:30, I think I would just have to give up my senate position to somebody else, because of the number of meetings that are typically scheduled during that period. So it does have some drawbacks as well."

Speaker Lewenstein: "So at this time, we'll have a vote on the resolution. You have your clickers. Senators should be voting at this time. 1 or A would be a yes vote. B is no, C is abstain. Voting is open now.

"The choices again are A is a yes, in favor of the resolution; B is a no, against the resolution. C is abstention. The light should be on, on our blue clickers. We have a couple of malfunctioning clickers, it looks like. Does anyone need more time?

"Let's close the voting. This is the meeting with the crammed schedule and the technological difficulties. We now can't see the vote on either screen. It's disappeared.

"I could tell you that I was watching it, as the votes were coming in. If you will accept my word, we had about, last time I checked, 57 votes. That was not unanimous. It was about two-thirds in favor, approximately one-third no or abstentions. On that basis, I will at this moment declare the vote in favor. And should we be able to get the details later, I will do that.

"At this time, what I would like to do is move to remarks from the President, David Skorton.

4. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT DAVID SKORTON

President Skorton: "I have lived in various places in my life. In some of them, the voting went like this, just the way Bruce did it. Somebody said I can't really tell you, but trust me.

(LAUGHTER)

"I do want to congratulate the senate and the people who brought this up because of the work/life balance issues. I also appreciate our colleague's remark about how this will affect availability of some people during the day; but I convene a committee periodically of faculty, staff and students to advise me on work/life issues, and this is a big one for a whole variety of reasons, including

child care, elder care and other issues. So I congratulate you on that vote, whatever it was.

“This is an emotional time for me. It is my last time addressing you as president. I'm sure you'll have me back at Cornell many times as former president, but maybe not to speak. One of the most important recurring opportunities that I have had at Cornell and at Iowa, before coming here, was to speak to the faculty senate as a committee of the whole.

“When I first arrived at Cornell, Charlie Walcott was the dean, and then Bill Fry, and then Joe Burns. Among them, there's over 125 years of combined service to Cornell. Joe, I will not say how that divides up among the three, but I have gained a lot of wisdom and gotten a lot of very good advice and guidance from you, and also had the opportunity to spend a fair amount of time with individual faculty at Weill Cornell and, more recently, with faculty at Cornell Tech. And very recently, within the last month, I had an all faculty meeting at Cornell Tech, which was held in a smaller room than this, but I have always enjoyed and gained greatly from these conversations.

“As faculty members -- and this is our cherished prerogative -- we often don't agree on everything, but I always take your opinions as among the most important pieces of guidance that I get, and I have appreciated your insights over the years that I have been here. And it is bittersweet to be with you for the last time in this role.

“I decided to accept a very gracious invitation that Joe gave me to speak about just a few of the opportunities and challenges that I see going forward for American higher education, and then talk a bit about Cornell specifically. Whenever a bureaucrat says he's going to talk about challenges and opportunities, I can just see the looks on your face, but I'm going to try to be as blunt and direct as I can about where I think higher education is going. And I am about to leave 35 years in higher education in three months. So I have thought a lot about these issues, right or wrong.

“The first and most commonly discussed issue in America related to higher education right now is affordability. Affordability was cited as the top factor affecting the future of higher education; not the top issue that the public is concerned about, but the top issue felt to be affecting the future of higher ed.

In an annual survey of 2,800 chief academic officers, conducted by Babson Survey Research Group in 2014 and released just last month, 62% of the chief academic officers cited cost and/or student indebtedness as the top concern for the future. As I'm sure you know, concerns about affordability figured into the Obama administration's controversial proposal for a so-called college scorecard to help students and families determine the best value for their higher education aspirations.

There's no doubt, despite strident voices to the contrary, that higher education has major impact on graduates' economic success for that side of the value equation. And please excuse a crude comparison, but unlike other major expenditures that one might finance with debt, like a car, the investment in higher education economically appreciates and doesn't depreciate over time.

“Just a couple of data examples; the income differential among various educational levels now in the United States is striking, to put it mildly. In 2014, the median weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers age 25 and older, with less than a high school degree, was \$488 a week. The median for high school graduates with no college exposure was \$668. And for those with at least a baccalaureate degree, it was approximately \$1,200 a week. These are from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. And Joe, I'm glad to share the source of these in a link to you, if you like.

“A study released in January, also by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, noted the unemployment rate now for workers with a bachelor's degree or higher was 2.8%, the lowest level since the beginning of the recession. And the jobless rate, as you know, for the overall population is 5.7%.

“These figures prompted Bloomberg, Inc. to consider the prospect that we soon may have a shortage of new productive people to employ; in other words, not enough people to fill the jobs, as opposed to the other way around. And the wages for these scarce and in-demand workers will undoubtedly increase.

There's little doubt about the economic value of higher education, despite frequent and strident comments to the contrary. However, for many students and for their families, the entry cost of starting this higher education journey and the prospect of student debt can make higher education seem out of reach. And this is true at Cornell, even with a very dramatic increase in student financial aid that we have had since 2009.

“Without a degree, the chances of improving one's economic circumstances are significantly blunted. Of course, I believe, and I know you believe that the broader salutary effects of higher education are at least as important as these economic ones. And in that respect, the discussion publicly is largely toward the STEM disciplines. And the social sciences, arts and humanities are major contributors, as you know, helping students gain cross-cultural knowledge, critical thinking skills that apply beyond a particular discipline, skills in oral and written communication, and a deeper understanding of international and domestic issues. And most important to me, study of these subjects teaches us all what it means to be fully human and to better understand ourselves and others.

Why is it that the public doesn't appreciate this? I believe that we, as a national professoriate, bear much of the responsibility for the lack of understanding of the importance of non-STEM disciplines, because we have in some sense failed -- and people like me who are paid to do this have failed to make the case frequently and clearly enough and in a larger sense, failed to develop generally accepted measures of student learning outcomes in these non-STEM disciplines. I hope that we can move forward together as a professoriate in this direction.

“Cornell has a long tradition of providing educational opportunity to talented students from a very broad variety of economic backgrounds. We currently rank in the top ten universities in the country for the economic diversity of the undergraduate student body, where the comparison group is the top-ranked research universities in the United States. We have need-blind admissions as a tradition and need-based student financial aid. And in the depths of the great recession in '08-'09, we radically increased the university's commitment to student financial aid, making Cornell much more affordable for all aided students.

“For all students, as a group, who receive aid across all of the quintiles of the U.S. population income, it costs less to go to Cornell now as a percent of the so-called sticker price than it has in 20 years. According to the most recent figures, for Cornell undergraduates who borrowed -- that's fewer than half the students, the mean total debt at graduation -- that includes all federal and Cornell and private loans that are packaged through our financial aid office, the mean total debt was \$21,000 at graduation. That's compared with a national mean for private four-year colleges of \$30,000.

“Of course, students pursuing post-baccalaureate education can borrow much more money than that. Took me 21 years to pay my debts off, including medical

school. And perhaps some of you were in that circumstance; but for the undergraduate population, those are the data.

“At least partly related to the renewed commitment to need-based financial aid, our student body is more diverse and more representative of America and of the world than ever before. And the current freshman class is the most diverse, and the most selective at the same time, in the history of Cornell; but finding ways to balance this commitment to need-based student financial aid and the financial realities that we will talk about later in this meeting will be a continuing challenge for Cornell. And I fervently hope that, no matter what the challenges are, that in the future, the university will stay the course with substantial financial aid. That's the first issue; affordability.

“The second issue for all of higher education, as well as for Cornell, which I believe we need to talk about more at Cornell, is the evolution of what has been called competency-based education. Competency-based education, as many of you know, refers to a wide array of degree and non-degree certificate programs, in which credentials are based on a demonstration of skills or competency, rather than prescribed periods of time in class or number of credit hours.

It has been described recently by Joel Shapiro, Associate Dean of Academics at Northwestern University School of Continuing Studies, as, “the greatest risk to traditional higher education as we know it. It's also been suggested as a way to control the cost of higher education, to increase college completion rates, and to enable nontraditional students who may need to work full-time to pursue higher education successfully.

“Non-degree programs, as I know you are aware, often apply to specific industries and specific jobs and teach industry-oriented, industry-defined skills. The programs certify the learner has successfully completed training designed to impart a particular skill, and the resulting certificate can be used directly with an employer as proof of competency in a given area.

“One single example, AT&T used so-called nano-degrees offered by Udacity as a qualification for entry-level work in fields like front-end web design, data analysis and computer programming. It turns out that more than 30% of U.S. adults hold an alternative credential. And that's about the same proportion of people who have a baccalaureate degree in our country. Most of the people who have alternate credentials also have a baccalaureate degree, so there's considerable overlap.

“Cornell, as you may know, already offers a variety of certificate programs in ILR, in Hotel, in the grad school at Weill Cornell, and through eCornell. Some of these programs provide intensive classroom experiences, and others are offered completely online, and some are a mix. Some competency-based programs allow students to earn academic credit through a combination of assessment and documentation of experiential learning. Competency-based college degrees -- not certificates -- are now offered, for example, by the University of Wisconsin system, Western Governors University, Southern New Hampshire University, Excelsior College and others.

“I do foresee a time where more students who enter Cornell will present credits earned through competency-based programs to be considered toward a Cornell degree, much as they now present AP credits for college-level courses, as well as credits earned through online courses, such as those offered to high school sophomores, juniors and seniors through our school of continuing education and summer sessions.

“I think this is one of many areas where the faculty need to take the direct leadership, both in determining which, if any, competency-based credits Cornell will accept, and whether we will expand competency-based programs for academic credit.

“Another potential use for competency-based certificates that has been proposed is to permit entry into graduate or professional school, without a baccalaureate degree. And as unlikely as this may seem today, I believe we will see movement toward this approach in the next five years.

“A third issue nationally is the future of libraries. I wanted to spend a few minutes talking about libraries. There's a general discussion happening -- more in some places, less in others -- asking the question, in this era of the Internet and downloadable books and other online resources, whether physical libraries with shelves and shelves of books has or will soon become obsolete.

“We have had some of those discussions here on particular capital projects that have been brought forward. The Cornell Library, as one of the top libraries in the world, offers many digital resources, including e-books and audio books on OverDrive, and these can automatically disappear after a certain period of time, removing the need to transport physical books back and forth to a building.

“The library has a growing collection of digital primary sources, including the recently added British Library's Burney Collection newspapers. Yet, I believe, for some scholarship and some areas of interest, there is at present no adequate digital replacement for primary sources in the form in which they were created. And many of us and our students -- and I put myself in that group -- in going to the library physically to find one thing, have found something else of great interest by looking through the stacks.

“I do believe libraries of the future will be an evolving mix of digital resources, including collections shared among institutions, which we have at Cornell; but that the physical library and the physical book are not likely to disappear any time soon. Again, I hope that the faculty will take a lead in discussing this, because at a time of financial stringency, there's always going to be concern about maintaining physical structures.

“Turning to additional issues beyond those three that will be of ongoing concern here at Cornell specifically, one of the top challenges is how to maintain and increase excellence across all aspects of the university mission, while dealing with the financial challenges that we face. I'm convinced, and I know you are, that Cornell will continue to be extraordinarily effective, despite any amount of financial stringency; but we all need to understand more clearly the factors that are constraining financial flexibility now.

“The good news about this whole area -- and it's very hard to keep one's eye on the good news at a time of continuing stringency -- is that only six years ago, the university had an in-year structural deficit of \$148 million on an unrestricted budget of \$1.3 billion for the Ithaca campus. So over 10% deficit, structural deficit, not just a deficit for that year. And six years later, we have a break-even budget.

“So the good news is that because of a lot of sacrifices of a lot of people -- and you remember what those draconian things were in '09 and '10 -- we have regained a barely balanced budget, but a balanced budget; but everyone will need to understand much more clearly, and I mean the faculty, as well as the students and staff, more deeply exactly what the university's financial situation is.

“I have not done an optimal job of bringing this transparency broadly to the campus. The deans and the rest of the senior leadership, vice presidents and vice provosts and others every month get a several-page spreadsheet that I send out

that lists the monthly updates on the university's budget in cash and accrual accounting and debt and how the faculty are doing on garnering research grants and so on, but we haven't opened that concentric circle more broadly.

“To increase transparency around this issue, Friday of this week I'm convening a meeting with the heads of the shared governance bodies, so Dean Burns will be there, along with the head of the EA, UA, SA and GPSA, and I'm going to go through about a half hour PowerPoint presentation that I'm going to repeat on Monday -- you should have gotten a note from me yesterday -- in a town hall meeting that will be webcast and will be in G10 Biotech at noon on Monday.

“I hope that, if you can, you will consider going. Obviously, G10 Biotech will have limited seating, but I hope you will either go there or watch it while it's happening. And I will post over the noon hour all those slides on the university web site, and I'll be looking for, hopefully, a reaction from you and others, especially in the shared governance groups, to tell me what I left out, what isn't clear. And there's a lot of data slides and a lot of word slides in there that cover a lot of issues, and I'll hear more from you after Monday, I hope.

“Three other issues, from my perspective, will be important to the future of this university. First -- and Joe alluded to this gently, in showing the data slides about faculty demographics -- is how do we assess each other's continuing productivity at a time when the workforce is graying. And I'm a proud member of that second-to-oldest age group in there, hoping to live long enough to get to the top age group.

“The data are revealing. Just to repeat these numbers for 2014, on this campus, which includes Cornell Tech, there are 903 full professors, 456 associate professors and 293 assistant professors, making full professors the largest group, which is the case in every university that has widespread tenure.

“So it is something to think about carefully, and that's something that's very much in the faculty's hands. I do believe that something else that ought to be in the faculty's hands and the faculty only should be rigorous peer post-tenure review. I know this is an unpopular proposal. I've made this before to this faculty senate, but I think it's absolutely essential to maintaining the quality of the faculty, particularly as we are in a more competitive environment for everything, including grants.

"I'm going to show some more data on how we are doing in that regard on Friday and Monday; but one thing I will tell you, the faculty and staff at Cornell have achieved an enormous increase in the amount of sponsored research funding here over the last 20 years, a breathtaking increase, but during that same period of time, we have fallen in our ranking nationally on research expenditures from 3rd to 16th. I will show more details of that coming up.

"It's a more competitive environment, but I think we need to push harder, and we need to think about peer review of (sorry!) post-tenure productivity in all fields. And I think the faculty need to be the ones to do that.

"A second issue is our built environment. We have had decades -- those of you who have been here longer than I know more about this I do -- decades of very steady and, in some cases, dramatic growth in space by new construction. Much of this construction, despite philanthropy, is supported by long-term debt. At this point, in part because of financial stringency and in part because of sustainability concerns as well, I believe we need to focus on maintenance and optimal utilization of the current buildings. And I believe, for a while, this should take precedence over new construction. It doesn't mean no new construction. It means that maintenance should take precedence in general over new construction.

"We all need to be aware that even if the costs of new construction are met entirely by philanthropy, as is the case in Klarman Hall and Gates Hall, new space always generates additional cost. In a figure I thought you might find interesting, since 2008, since the recession began, the additional incremental cost to the University for operating, maintaining and other costs related to the new construction that's happened since '08 is \$37 million a year. That would take care of most of the provost deficit.

"The September 2014 capital project funding guidelines, which are updated periodically indicate, "Units should first meet program needs through reuse and redevelopment, without the addition of net new space or infrastructure." I believe this approach will continue to be essential for the financial integrity of the university, at least for some years to come.

"Thirdly, and the last point I want to make before we open it up to questions has to do with whether the center of gravity of Cornell is moving toward New York City. And many faculty in e-mails, in casual encounters -- my favorite casual encounters are always at the grocery store, and the favorite encounter is you

know, I really wouldn't bother you with this at school, because I know you're busy, but since I caught you here in the rutabagas, can we talk about this. And I do want to share a couple interesting statistics about that center of gravity. The budget for Weill Cornell Medical College is now 44% of the overall university operating budget. And the faculty, full-time salaried faculty at Weill Cornell constitute 49% of our professoriate. By fiscal year '20, which is as far as we have projected -- and you know, those projections get weaker and weaker the farther you go -- Weill Cornell is expected to be 47% of the operating budget. And I believe by around that time, the overall activity, as measured by operating budget, will be more than 50% in New York.

“Now, the Ithaca campus should and will, I believe, always remain the heart of the university and the mother ship, so to speak; but it is important to know that there's a lot of growth in New York in the clinical operation. And one thing I wanted to mention to you was all the provosts whom I've worked with since I have been here -- and Harry has continued this -- have maintained a strict firewall, as does the CFO, between Weill Cornell and Ithaca. And now there's a firewall walling off Cornell Tech financially as well. So the difficulty about a firewall is that means that each campus has to sit on its own bottom, but the advantage is that, especially at a time of very dramatic growth in any one area -- and two out of the three areas are having dramatic growth: Cornell Tech and the Medical College -- there's always a danger of temporary deficit spending. I want to reassure those who are leading faculty governance on the Ithaca campus that those have been firewalled off by the budget process and the CFO.

“The old adage that's said to be Yogi Berra's -- a lot of these things, you don't know if it's Yogi Berra or Joe Burns. It's always one of the two -- predictions are difficult to make, especially about the future.

“I'm terrible at predictions. When I was in California, I bet somebody \$50 that Ronald Reagan would not win the gubernatorial race in California. I lost that one. When he ran for president, the same wag called me up and said do you want to go double or nothing on the presidency, but I was smart enough to let that one go by; but I will say that these items that I had mentioned to you are the ones that I think about.

“You may be surprised by the choices of discussion today, but I do worry about libraries, I do worry about competency-based education, I do worry about the issue of affordability overwhelming people's calm and reasonable assessment of

where higher education is and what it does for society. I'm also very confident that Cornell will be in good hands when Beth Garrett comes here on July 1.

"I have had a chance to spend quite a bit of time with her, and I know that she will value very heavily the insights of the faculty, and I hope that you will be as open and blunt with her and helpful and honest as you have been with me. And I thank you very much for your partnership and friendship over nine years. It's meant a lot to me. Thank you very much."

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Lewenstein: "We have time for one or, at most, two questions, especially if the president is able to respond quickly. A microphone to the back, please. Professor Cheyfitz."

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, The Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters, Department of English: "Thanks for the presentation, David. Just perhaps another opinion about the humanities. I don't think the burden, either nationally or locally on the sort of publicity for the humanities or the promotion of them falls on faculties. I think it falls on two things. I think it falls on the fact that universities themselves are investing much more in STEM fields than they are in the humanities. And I think that the economy itself is stressing that, because this is really, despite the job numbers coming down, a really bad economy. Sixty-two percent of workforce participation; wealth inequality's incredible, so I think people sitting at home, thinking about how we're going to make a buck are not thinking about the humanities."

President Skorton: "I agree with you in general, which is a surprise, Eric, that you and I agree on something in general, but this University actually has spent a lot of money on the humanities recently, hired a lot of humanist faculty through faculty renewal, and built the first capital project just for the humanities since 1905.

"It's also true that the statistics on employability are still good for humanities graduates; but not as good as the STEM fields. There's a gradient, but they're surprisingly good. But I agree with you, it shouldn't all fall on the faculty.

"I spent almost ten years lobbying for the NEH budget. Every year I have lobbied, it's gone down, until they finally told me why don't you work on the physics budget; but what's really missing are people like you lobbying, because

you have much more credibility in doing this than a cardiologist does. So we can agree to mostly agree on that, which I think is a milestone for us. I think that's great."

Speaker Lewenstein: "One more. Professor Birman."

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: "First of all, I want to thank you for your service to Cornell, which I think has been extraordinary and during a very tough time, but I do want to express a concern about your remarks.

"So I'm in a unit that's experiencing unprecedented growth in load, advising load, teaching load. If you go back to Joe's slides, you would have noticed that where, as other parts of the university, the faculty has caught up, and Engineering and Computer Science is down from 239 faculty to 199. In effect, we are losing stars, and we are losing stars in part because faculty salaries are not keeping up with the pressures we are seeing from our peers and also from industry, where there's just a feeding frenzy for highly talented people.

"So I feel concerned that faculty salary, which was a strong theme of Hunter's, right up to the end of his administration, wasn't one of your themes. For me, as I look around, I am very concerned that we are not investing in our stars and we are losing them, demonstrably losing them."

President Skorton: "I completely agree with you. The reason I wasn't able to keep a stronger focus on faculty salaries was the recession. And now you may think that's an excuse.

"I want to be blunt, however, regarding overall faculty numbers. We didn't have a faculty retirement incentive. We had a staff retirement incentive.

"The faculty numbers are stable. I won't say they are up, but they are not down. The staff numbers are down 8%, and we still barely have a balanced budget. So the university faculty and leadership are going to have to face some realities. We have a very heavily tenured faculty, which I'm proud of. And I don't know if you know, but I have talked a lot, publicly, nationally about the importance of retaining tenure, and no mandatory retirement age.

"So there's going to have to be some faculty turnover to open up more opportunities across the country. And I believe that as the financial flexibility returns to Cornell -- and I believe it will return, and people even closer to the

budget that I am believe it will return quickly -- I think that's where you will see the expenditures go, hopefully maintaining the level of financial aid and going into more faculty hiring, but there's no question that's actually correct.

“And at the most senior ranks, we appear to have lost the most ground on faculty compensation, compared to peers. I'm sure there are people in middle career, in very competitive fields where they are falling behind, but the most consistent areas we have fallen behind is at the senior ranks, full professors. And Joe and I have talked about that on multiple occasions, so I agree with you.

“The only thing I would point out is the faculty did not have to bear the brunt of these budget balancing maneuvers, except in so far that things didn't get better than they were. So we've maintained -- except for the full professors, we've maintained our position where we were after Hunter and Bidy had those several years of increasing faculty compensation, but not at the senior ranks; you're right. Thank you, everybody.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you, President Skorton.”

(APPLAUSE)

“I know there are additional questions, but I think it is important for us to stay on the agenda, in part because the next item is of equal importance, a conversation on Cornell finances. And I invite the Interim Provost, Harry Katz.”

4. REMARKS BY THE INTERIM PROVOST ON CORNELL FINANCES

Interim Provost, Harry Katz: “Thanks for inviting me. I have been meeting with various faculties and colleges to talk about the budget, and I'm happy to have this opportunity to discuss what's going on with you. This handout is the letter that I sent, with input from President Skorton, incoming president Beth Garrett, the deans and others, trying to explain both the source of the provost deficit, how we can be in a deficit situation in the provost budget, while we're, as David pointed out, in balance in the overall university budget; and also the steps that we're taking that I'm sure you are hearing about and talking about at your college level.

“This letter was sent on February 25 to deans, directors and department chairs, and I asked the deans, directors and department chairs to consider or encourage them to send it out to those in their units. David and I decided not to send this letter en masse to everyone individually, in part because we thought it might

freak them to get a letter directly from the provost, but also because we wanted to encourage the deans, directors and chairs to engage in conversation with those in their unit, and we encourage them to have follow-up discussion. And I hope you have been involved with that, and I hope you will encourage others in your units to stimulate such discussions.

"In addition to those 800, I also sent it to Gabrielle Leei, the reporter at "The Cornell Daily Sun," who was asking me for an interview and for information. I sent her this as background, and you read the headlines after she and I also spoke. So rather than repeat what's in the letter or other matters that have been described, I thought it might be better to have questions or statements, if you wish, about what's going on. And I would be happy to respond, as best I could. No, I'm happy to field the questions or statements.

Unidentified Speaker: "... Quality of the research faculty, and the way the costs and revenue are being allocated to the colleges really prevents us from doing that. So some of the discussions in the formulas are really making it impossible for deans to do that effectively, so I can give an example of kind of how individual people making decisions that seem to make sense for their little piece results in something that's very bad for the university. So we are trying to hire faculty in my department. The allocation model for the college really doesn't justify hiring faculty with a substantial research appointment, because revenue is based on the credit hours. And then we also need for the department to raise money to help match the start-up cost; that's a substantial cost.

As we were accumulating that money, we also got an extra-large bill for Gannett because we happened to have money sitting around. Well, we aren't going to be able to hire, if these policies -- three different policies that seem to make sense, add up to no hiring research faculty. That's a big problem."

Interim Provost Katz: "So we should talk more if the budget model is actually heading to those distortions, because its structure is not. I mean, the structure of the new budget model is that colleges pay a tax to the center, and the tax is based on the tax on graduate and undergraduate tuition revenue, and there's no other refined taxes.

"Then the colleges get allocations back from the provost's office, but the allocations are not manipulated based on particular activities in the college. So the structure of Cornell decision-making, whereby the deans make decisions about how money is spent within a college, continues. And the budget model is

not formally structured in a way that leans towards research or away from teaching or this and that.

“Its structure is quite simple, in many ways crude, as a way of preserving the autonomy and discretion that exists at the colleges. So if it's working out differently for you, that's a distortion of the way the budget model is structured, because again -- I also add, people are asking how are we making these allocation reductions. I am not, as the Provost, making discretionary judgments and saying oh, this college is emphasizing research and I'm going to reward them or punish them. The allocations are essentially on a percent basis, pretty much across the board.

“So again, the decisions that were made were to preserve the decision-making within the college structure and not to have the Provost or the President or some super-committee that decides whether you want to spend money on research or teaching or student services. That's really at the college level. So we should talk more. I mean, we are reconsidering the budget model after we let it run for a couple years. And if there are distortions that we are not anticipating, then we need to address them, because the intent is not to have the center make those kind of judgments. Those are judgments to be made by the faculty and the deans at the college level.”

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences:
“And it is good...”

Interim Provost Katz: “Are you in Arts and Science or CALS?”

Professor Barazangi: “We are in Engineering, Arts and Sciences and CALS.”

Professor Katz: “Oh, you are in all three. We bless you. We are in favor of integration and cross-college collaboration.”

Professor Barazangi: “But I am professor emeritus anyway. It's good that you give the dean the final responsibility how to balance this problem with the provost budget, but you have to monitor how they do this, because I saw a document -- it's a draft; it is not yet final -- that CALS is considering increasing the taxing on gifts and what they receive, the faculty or the units. That's counter-productive, really ill-advised. It should not happen. If you let deans do things like this, you are really -- it's absolutely ridiculous to think to go that way.”

Interim Provost Katz: "Okay, that is a good point, and we are doing that, in that I, as interim provost, meet with the deans over the next four weeks and have what used to be called budget hearings. I'm a labor relations guy, so hearings sound way to adversarial, so I am calling them budget discussions, with Paul Streeter and Mary Opperman participating.

"We are reviewing the plans with the deans. And not to get into the allocated judgments that were asked before, but to try and address the very problems and questions you are raising. So if you think there really are distortionary and inappropriate things going on, you should let me know, because we are trying to stop perverse incentives and tactics that may serve the interest narrowly of a unit or a subgroup, that don't serve the interests of the university. So your point is well-taken. I'm not saying we are going to be perfect in monitoring behavior, but we are going to work at that. And we'd appreciate suggestions, if we are missing things, because your point is well-taken. There may well be behaviors stimulated that serve the interests narrowly of units or individuals that don't serve the university's interests. We had to worry about that with the old budget model. That is not a new problem, but the particularities may be different because of the new model."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Birman."

Professor Birman: "Harry, thank you very much. Ken Birman, Computer Science. I want to elude back to my question to David, but with a slightly different focus. He responded that there had been an 8% cut in administrative costs and that the faculty had been..."

Interim Provost Katz: "That's for staff."

Professor Birman: "The question I have is whether we understand the degree of growth that's occurred over the last 20 years in administrative cost and whether it's manageable that the degree of cut that should occur could be 30% or 40%, particularly in a period when computing is giving us efficiencies, although they are hard to grasp, as David would know very well; but it does strike me that saying that a cut of a certain size has occurred in a certain portion, the university, without talking about the relative growths that have occurred is awkward. And I say this from a unit from where we have seen attrition from -- on the order of 12% of the faculty during this period.

Interim Provost Katz: "I think that's a good point, and we are concerned about administrative costs. I will say, as is pointed out in the letter, but just for your information, the allocation, provost allocation reductions that are occurring are also being directed at central administrative units. They face a 2.3% cut in their allocations, and that's part of our effort to try and constrain the growth in central administrative cost. And then it's at the unit level, again, that is up to the deans and the administrators in the colleges to decide how they are going to spend the unit level money, but we are concerned about that matter.

"Now, another way we are addressing it, is I have asked Mary Opperman to work with me on a committee that is specifically targeted at trying to get at redundancies and inefficiencies in centrally organized tasks, whether it's related to IT or other matters. We did a lot of streamlining after 2008, in response to the really severe pressures. We called it the administrative streamlining process. And we think we accomplished a lot, but we don't think we finished the job. And we were continuing to work at that.

"Again, we welcome suggestions from you about areas where we could do more, and we have a task group that's launched, trying to focus in on that. So I think it is an issue. We need to think about how do we pursue the central mission of the university, teaching research and outreach, and how do we control a tendency, which exists in all organizations, for periodic slack to appear on the administrative side.

"And I think it's a never-ending effort. I think we can do better. I think we are going to try and do better, and you should remind us not just in general terms, but in very specific terms, if you think there are administrative efficiencies that we're not taking advantage of. I'm not professing that we've been, by any means, perfect on that. I think we can work much harder. I will say as a dean, I was very frustrated. I was the dean in ILR for nine and a half years until November 13, and I was very frustrated by the fact that the overhead charge under the old model was called the CAM rate, kept going up.

"When the CAM rate was constructed, Dave Lipsky and others told me it was designed to be a percent of the revenues of the university, with the notion that it would be a constant percent. Originally it was 9%. It grew to 16.6% of revenues, while the revenues were growing dramatically.

"And many of us deans were encouraging the provost, and the provost listened and then started working with us to try and reverse that tendency. So I think we

do, like many organizations, have a tendency to generate inefficiencies in our midst, and we all have to work at them. I don't think we're perfect on that, by any means."

Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: "Very disappointed that both David and Joe neglected to mention what to me is the most important part of that demographic graph, which is we've got to replace 20% of the faculty. And that means that just looking at -- I think the difference was three new faculty. And the administration in this rash of articles that they sent to "The Sun," which "The Sun" dutifully published, really gave a one-sided picture of that.

"Okay, three more faculty over the last decade, and yet that heralded an all-time historic high; but what's really significant in that chart is we'll have to replace a fifth of the faculty in the next decade. And we should be hiring a lot more faculty now.

"The gist of those articles sent by the administration to "The Sun," everything is awesome -- that's from the Lego movie, in case you don't recognize it -- not to worry. But what's very important to me, and I haven't heard any of this yet, is that the administration take ownership of this deficit.

"And a lot of this occurred in the Rawlings-Martin administration and -- if we overbuilt and overspent, and this very senate and the University Assembly told the administration that in 2007 and '08, we had special meetings to tell the administration, thought they were doing too much debt finance building and so on, but it would be nice to hear the administration say mea culpa. We spent too much money, we didn't spend it wisely, and we didn't consult you at all and here's how we are going to change all that. I would really like to hear that, but I want to say one thing about the demographic cohort, and this is --

(APPLAUSE)

"Thank you. Thank you. I'm glad we all agree on that. On the demographic cohort, Pete, you have to keep in mind that those of us who are older are doing, I would imagine -- in my case, it certainly drew an incredible amount of advising, letter-writing, reviewing manuscripts and promotions for colleagues around the world, and that takes so much time. And I expect that older faculty probably do more of that. And it counts for something as far as the good of the entire university community."

Interim Provost Katz: "So I agree with some of what you said. I guess I'll say we are determined to have substantial faculty renewal, even in the face of the budget stringency. As made clear in my discussions with the deans across the university, there will be significant hiring this coming year. Not in every single college, because the colleges vary substantially in their financial situation, their ability to generate new revenue, their grant-raising. So there is faculty hiring that's going on at Cornell, even in the midst of this period, and we are determined to generate the resources to do more.

"As to who's to blame to where we're at, I would rephrase it as, we're a collegial partnership here. I think we did step up to the budget problems. That's the point of the letter. We said we have a problem, but it is a 'we.' We are not a hierarchal organization. It may feel like that at times to you, but I don't think we are. I don't think we are. I think we are a partnership. I honestly do. I seriously do.

"I'm willing to be an administrator, because I feel I'm an administrator within a partnership. And we all have to work at the problems that exist. We were all responsible for the problems that emerged, and we can all do better. I think it's a common task, and that's what universities are about. And we ought to address it that way. I seriously believe that.

"David, you want to comment too? They were blaming you as much as they were blaming me."

President Skorton: "I guess I challenge you to find any president in the country that has accepted more responsibility and said mea culpa more times than I have, but let's talk bluntly about some of these things. We didn't add five faculty. We added a bunch of faculty, because the faculty ranks went down at the recession. So don't compare us to 1,647 eight years ago. The world changed since eight years ago.

"Can you put Joe's slide up again? While she's doing that -- you see it went down by about 80 faculty. Went from 1,647 to 1,574. And despite the recession, we brought that back to where it was. This is in the face of enormous pressure on the budget. And I've said in press multiple times in the last two months that I miscalculated some of the things we had to get done; but please, Elizabeth and others, you take your side of the responsibility as well.

“Here's one, for example: We are gaining but \$30 million a year of saving on procurement, and yet I was the one who stood in the way and said the procurement changes could not touch the faculty. In other words, procurement things would affect administrative processes. So now I have been talking to some faculty about, for example, could we -- Joe is witness to one of these discussions. I wouldn't say he was part of it. I don't want to impugn him, but for example, could we buy reagents or other things that faculty need for grants in a way that would demonstrably save money, but take away the number of choices faculty would have. And decisions like that, the faculty are going to have to make.

“I hope the next administration will encourage the faculty to take part in some of these discussions better and more than I did, but some of these things are going to have to change the way people work. And in terms of the issue about faculty continuing to be productive, of course the faculty are very productive, but the bottom line is, undergraduate -- can you go to the slide that shows the stripes here? Undergraduate education, the number of undergraduate students has not gone up, as you can see, not appreciably. And the research doctoral burden of the faculty is bearing has not gone up, 2,949 to 2,939. So professional master students have gone up.

“And so let me just posit the idea that if we're orienting ourselves as a research university and the amount of research funding the faculty bring in is stable, which it is, and the number of research doctoral students is stable, shouldn't the faculty complement approximately be stable as well? At least I would raise that for your consideration. If the faculty complement should be stable and there is a shortage of space to bring younger people in, then there's two ways that we can do that. You can do that, because I'll be an ancient memory.

“One is that faculty can decide to change the nature of their appointment. Some go part-time, some retire. It's got to be an individual decision, 100%, just like the staff retirement was a voluntary decision. And the other would be to purposely orient more revenue toward hiring new faculty ahead of anticipated retirement in a statistical sense.

“So you might say someone my age -- I am going on 66 -- likely will retire in the next ten years. Why not bring people in on appointments that could last that long. And that's what the faculty renewal program that Kent Fuchs set up was, to hire ahead of anticipated retirements, based on philanthropy.

“And I would say that program was somewhat successful; spotty. Some areas, it was very successful. Others, not. So I think of all the things that you said, which most of them I did agree with, the most important one was that we should have consulted more on particular issues, but where we are now is we have a balanced budget, we have roughly stable faculty size, roughly stable undergraduate and research doctoral size, and a lot of discussion is going to go on about ways to do revenue enhancement that will probably involve more pressure on professional masters being admitted.

“And so it is a great time that the dean, Joe Burns, is going to have a faculty forum on this issue Wednesday of next week, the 18th. So Elizabeth, I think those are very important points. I think as the faculty do get more engaged -- and part of the reason for me doing the thing Friday and the thing Monday is to get all the data out so people can look at it. I hope you will also think about what changes in faculty life can occur that will help us save money for things we already know we have to do.

“And one last thing, then I promise I'll shut up. To Ken's point about cutting administrative cost even more, that's exactly what they are trying to do right now. I think 30%, 40% is unlikely to be doable because of regulatory compliance issues that are not helped by computerization -- because the government doesn't work by computerization -- but in general, I do think it's necessary to cut administrative costs even more.

“And we got rid of two vice presidencies at the beginning of the recession. We haven't brought them back. And maybe we can even do more streamlining than that. Time will tell. So I basically agree, but just wanted to add those points.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We have time for one brief question.”

Professor Charles Brittain, Classics Department: “I wanted to ask more about the administrative cuts, because 40% is unrealistic, but 2.6%, it doesn't seem like anything. There's a huge amount of saving that could be made from -- you and I discussed some of them the other day. And I didn't know what massive numbers of administrators are being hired or what they are getting paid. You say we are not a hierarchal university. I don't want to reveal how small my pay is, but I think you'll find that there's hundreds and hundreds of administrators who are getting paid more than me, who are not productive members of the university, because they are not serving the main mission. You

say it's teaching and outreach. Administrators should be paid less than full professors.

“And what's happening is it's close to a complete reverse. Seems to me if you really wanted to make some difference, hire some faculty, don't give them a pay raise, and make them the vice president, the provost. We don't need these other people. And then maybe you could cut it by 20%, the cost. And that would be much more than your \$55 million.”

(APPLAUSE)

Interim Provost Katz: “I would revert to the similar answer I said before; we do need to be more efficient. I don't think it's simple. Administrators do a lot of hard work. I was amazed as a dean actually how hard the administrative support staff actually worked at my college. I have been impressed within Day Hall, how hard the people work. I don't think they're twiddling their thumbs. I don't think there's a simple answer. I do think we have to work harder at being more efficient, looking for redundancies; but I honestly don't think there's a magic solution that would say oh, let's just get rid of half those administrators or pay them half and we'll solve all our problems. If it was that easy, we would have done it. We're not ill-meaning. David is not ill-meaning. There isn't a quick fix. It's going to take a lot of hard work by us all to get at those inefficiencies.”

Dean Burns: “This had been a very productive meeting, and I think we are moving forward. Our special treat at the end of the meeting is to hold the sweets that we normally have at the beginning of the meeting, so that we can celebrate David's departure--we are not looking forward to it.

“We heard that your favorite cake over at the Statler was chocolate cake, so we had them bake you a giant chocolate cake. We've got some chocolate cup cakes and things like that, so please join in, and thank you so much for what you have done for the university, David.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Lewenstein: “So first, I invite you to come and enjoy the cake. And second, I declare the meeting adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED)