

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2009

Call to order by Speaker Steven Beer: "I would like to call the May 13, 2009 meeting of the University Faculty Senate to order. I would like to remind people present to please turn off your cell phones or silence them. There will be no audio or video recording except by the authorities. I would like to ask all of the people who wish to speak to please rise and identify yourself as to name, department or other administrative affiliations."

"We have three good and welfare speakers that will be heard towards the end of the meeting. The Associate Dean of the Faculty has just arrived so I will ask him to present his report on behalf of the Committee on Nominations and Elections."

1. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

"The Nominations and Elections Committee filled a few vacant seats recently and I have the list here, several appointments for assembly committees and the Advisory Board Information Based Technology. We have forty-four more vacancies to fill in the next couple of weeks and members of the Nominations and Elections Committee will be calling your colleagues seeking volunteers to fill these committees and I hope you encourage your colleagues to volunteer. I ask to defer voting on the reports; we don't have a quorum."

Speaker Beer: "That is correct. We don't have a quorum, so we will delay approving these reports until we have a quorum."

Associate Dean Brad Anton: "I am finishing my term as Association Dean of the Faculty. I want to thank those of you who have helped me get the job done and I also want to thank Sandie Sutfin who will be leaving the Dean's Office, retiring. She has been there for over twenty years and has been a cheerful, always willing, able assistant during my time as Associate Dean and I am very, very thankful for her help and I wish her the very best in retirement."

Dean of Faculty William Fry: "Sandie was in the Dean's Office for twenty-five years and at Cornell for at least thirty years. She and Diane LaLonde have been wonderfully helpful and we do appreciate them. I would also like to take a minute to thank Brad Anton for his competence as Associate Dean. Brad has done a great job."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much. I would like to now call on Senior Vice Provost Bob Buhrman to speak to us on new developments concerning conflicts of interest."

2. REPORT FROM SENIOR VICE PROVOST BOB BUHRMAN ON NEW DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

Vice Provost Robert Buhrman. "I appreciate the opportunity from Bill to come here today to give you a brief update on things. Unfortunately, what's occupying my mind since I started this position about a year and a half ago and just to give you an update about what's going on. We will be back in the fall to update you much more about this. I first want to mention research compliance. I work in the physical sciences, the applied sciences. Basically, those of you who do work in certain research areas, we have a major burden on research compliance and it is getting bigger every year. We currently have forty sets of regulations that apply to research that we do on this campus that have to be implemented and carried out on our various operations, including sponsored programs. There are new regulations that were proposed in 2008. We have 700 subcontracts go out to other institutions that we now have to track electronically and update physically. Homeland Security now requires that we verify citizenship and we have to implement training oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research this past year."

"Some areas of concern and the greatest impact on researchers, faculty and their associates are effort reporting and certification. We are under law review from the NSF. We are not training the faculty well enough in those areas. In the area of research integrity and assurance, just to give you examples. Export control – in 2005 there were no cases. However in 2008 there were 144. In animal care and use, we have 776 active protocols, that's a 150% increase from 2005. We have 114 facilities on this campus that we have to make sure are accredited and we're undergoing a re-accreditation right now. Biosafety, we now have 288 active protocols which is a 50-60% increase since 2005. Human participants, we now have roughly 1500 active protocols at this point and that's a 200% increase since 2005. This is a major burden on the faculty. Now I'll talk about financial conflicts of interest which is the main subject.

We have to identify, manage and disclose appropriately any financial conflict of interest that is related to research, particularly sponsored research for federal agencies. We will talk about real conflicts and situations where someone who is not part of our institution would look at it and say there is likely a conflict. In many cases this can be quite innocent but someone else might not see it that way. We don't have to remove conflicts, we have to identify, report, and manage it. That is a very important point. That is what

we have to do and we're not yet doing it well enough, according to the outside world. There is a lot of attention on this recently. Senator Grassley has made very public inquiries to NIH and NY Times and elsewhere and Cornell researchers predominantly researchers at the Medical School have been pointed out. There have been more flagrant issues at Emory and Harvard, fortunately for Cornell. All of the higher institutions of learning and research are involved. Last year there was a report from the Association of American Medical Colleges and Association and the Association on Universities (AAMC/AAU) on financial conflicts of interest and how we weren't doing well in these areas, particular focus is on clinical research which we don't do much of on this campus, but we associated with the medical school and the reports on this campus which involved drug discovery which is pre-clinical, which is drug discovery, which is pulled into clinical studies and that's going to engage us in this concern.

Many of our counterpart universities are updating under pressure their financial conflict of interest policies. The most recent one is at Columbia and a colleague of mine down there just shared that with us. They just announced this on April 3rd is an update and still responding what the NIH is now requiring and we are not there yet. If you're interested in that, the link to the Columbia policy is http://evpr.columbia.edu/files_sponsoredprojectprocedures/imce_shared/COI_Policy_4_3_09_new.pdf and you can google it quickly.

Finally NIH has done mail reviews of current conflict of interest policies at universities including Cornell. We responded and they responded to us and they found our current policy wanting. They have made pretty strong demands that we update it to be compliant with their current regulations. We said we would try to do that by the end of the calendar year. As of last week, NIH put on the federal register a request for comment on enhanced regulations of conflict of interest identification and management which we expect will resolve after the comment period and discussion ends. We currently get, on this campus, about \$65M/year from NIH. NSF has similar regulations that are focusing on other issues but if NIH says we have to do it, NSF who gives us over \$100M a year, we are going to have to do it for all federal agencies.

Currently we have a policy that we'll adopt that was written by Provost Barker in 1986. It was amended shortly thereafter. In 1992 we established a faculty committee to go with it, the University Conflicts Committee which we are currently working with. In 2000 the current annual electronic disclosure process was established. Hopefully, you have read that document here. I won't ask you to read it right now, we can incorporate them into the minutesⁱ. Currently we are in the process of annual disclosure. We have already done it or soon will be doing it. This has to do with reporting confidentially,

internally to Cornell what external relationships you had, if you had any, or external business you have which relates to research and other conflicts.

Reporting is an employment requirement at Cornell and most people do this every year. There is Part I and Part II. Part II was completed by 600 people last year. Part I was completed by 3,000 to give you the scope. Of that, Part II is the one where you have potential conflict that has to be examined and looked at and of that we identify the ones that need to be matched. I cannot report to you that we are confident we are identifying all those that need to be identified and all those that need to be managed. We don't have any major problems, but we don't have the ability to report to the NSF and the NIH that we are in great shape. We are not in full compliance.

What we are currently doing internally is reviewing and getting ready to update our policies and procedures on research related conflicts of interest. That is being done through my office and working with the University Conflicts Committee with Bill Fry, the Counsel Office, the legal team, the Audits Office which comes in and assesses and has written several reports over the last years and essentially saying we are not fully up to where we need to be. President Skorton felt when he came here, he has a significant background in this issue from his experience at Iowa, he felt we had to look at this issue both at the faculty level and administration level and trustee level and he asked last summer that we put together a task force of administrators and trustees that can look at the issue on both campuses. This is a task force that is chaired by myself and my counterpart is the Dean of the Faculty down at the Medical School and what we're doing is looking at what other institutions are doing, what the ranks require and what is Cornell to do to ensure that our research integrity is respected. No one questions our work. When we publish data it's not because we can make a little money on the side, but because the data is true. It is a very good objective. That task force, we're nearly at the draft report stage, but that's not the detail stage. The detail stage is likely updated research conflict will be done internally and it will be done by the Conflicts Committee. We will consult with this group and other faculty groups for discussion in the fall and we'll take it from there with your input.

The hope, the result in the fall we will have a research related conflicts of interest policy procedures that will be in compliance with current regulations and any expected changes will come over the next year or two from the federal government. The title will be something like Policy and Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research. It will be a supplement to the existing policy that we will continue that applies to Cornell's expectations about us as employees in respect to commitment and conflicts and things of that nature.

What is the impact on you? If you have no research related financial conflicts of interest, there will be no impact. There will be a different form next year but it will be simply somewhat differently phrased questions where we get the same answer. If however you have an interest that is related to your research, hopefully in a more helpful way to report that interest, confidentially to the university and give the details to the extent that a trained group of people can look at that and decide whether or not there is a conflict that needs to be managed and reported to the federal funding agencies if it is related to a federally funded contract, contract or award. That is a requirement which we're not fulfilling at this point. We have to do that every time we submit a proposal. This is why people in medical school, if you do a clinical study you have to ensure you are not trying to prove that a drug works that you have intellectual property ownership of or that you are getting paid to be a consultant in the company that's doing it without disclosing that information. Those facts are allowed as everyone knows those facts are out there rather than you not say anything.

There is a great poster child story about a researcher at Emory this year who took speaking fees from a drug company and accepted \$800,000/year and he spoke about how great the drug was but he never disclosed in his speeches or his publications that he was getting this \$800K. A neutral observer may assume that there might be a conflict there. It was assumed by NIH and Emory was put on the death watch, that is if you didn't update your conflict of interest procedures within a few months they would be spotted in proposals in NIH. That got the attention and I don't want to do that here and I don't want us to have people questioning our research at all and I assume the faculty don't either.

I go back to the beginning we are going toward administrative burden on the research. That is the nature of the world we are in and we have to deal with it and we're going to try to minimize it. We are going to try to clarify it and so we are going to try to move forward to meet the needs."

Speaker Beer: "Questions? [none] I am sure the Vice Provost will take questions by email."

Vice Provost Buhrman: "I take them by email and I'll be back."

Speaker Beer: "I would like to now call on Professor David Gries, member of the Education Policy Committee for a resolution on behalf of the EPC to remove public availability of median course grades."

3. RESOLUTION FROM THE EPC TO REMOVE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MEAN COURSE GRADES

Professor David Gries, Computer Science, Engineering: "The Senate voted in 1996 to put both median grades on the transcript and to make them perhaps available on the internet and that was done. Professor Lemley came here in 2006 and proposed that the public availability of the grades be removed and the Senate turned it down. Since then, we've received more information. There is an article by Talia Bar, Vrinda Kadiyali and Asaf Zussman on a study done on Cornell's median grades. There had been a few other studies on median grades and so on and on of what they do. You can see them on the slides. I won't read them to you. They were very small studies. They show that students tend to choose courses from instructors who grade leniently and so on."

"This wasn't a big study. Cornell study actually looked at all A&S students taking A&S courses from 1990-2004 and they had the advantage of being able to study the effects, the change leading to the publication of the median grade in 1996. They also used the task force of some students who were attracted to leniently graded courses. Here you can see a graph that shows that during pre-enrollment and add/drop periods, students looked much more heavily at the median grade website, these are all of those periods where add/drop or pre-enrollment and that shows that incidence of students, during that period, of what the median grades of courses are. The findings that people came up with that, and you can read a long, very well done paper with graphs and statistics in it, that students who take median grades into consideration, tend to be drawn to the leniently graded courses and more importantly, the most talented students are less drawn the leniently graded courses.

Here you see the median grades starting back in 1990 here at Cornell and it's fairly even, even going down a bit until median grades were published and that's about the time the median grades were first published. They also tried to determine just what drives this? Is the quality of the students? The teachers? It showed that one third of grade increase could be due to increase in quality of students. They figured that out based upon a task force. The major influence was the publication of the median grades."

Question from Unidentified Speaker: "What you have just said is contradicted by this data. The biggest jump is before the median grade. I don't want to take your time but I'm just telling you that this is basically adrift across the screen."

Professor Gries: "Well, I would say that this is going up and down, not straight across. This, to me, is a big jump. If you read their paper carefully, statistically they say that the

grade increase is due to the median grade being published. You will have to read the paper carefully for that; that's their finding of these grades. There are two things for me. One, there were students with lower grades who tend to take these higher graded courses, not the talented students, so they are choosing not based upon the kind of knowledge they want to get but on what kind of grade they might be able to get in the course. Secondly, they do say that this has contributed to grade inflation and the more grade inflation we get, the more grades are compressed, the less meaning these grades have. It is very difficult for any employer if three-quarters of the students get A's and what the translation means."

Speaker Beer: "We have to move to the resolution."

Professor Gries: "This is the resolution. I won't read it unless you want me to read it. The EPC based upon the study felt that it would be best for Cornell not to publish the grades. I should also say only one other university that I know of that does publish median grades and that's Dartmouth and they started about 1997."

Speaker Beer: "The resolution by the Education Policy Committee is before the body for discussion. Any discussion?"

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computing Engineering: "A little bit of history here that I think is relevant. In 1996 when the Senate voted to put the median grades on the web for everyone to see, part of that was an effort to shame the faculty into cutting down on grade leniency. They were worried students would see data exactly as they have and therefore they said well, we'll put the grades on the transcripts as well and that would be a check against such student misbehavior. As it happens, it was easy to put them on the web, harder to put them on the transcripts until PeopleSoft came along. Therefore, they have not appeared on the transcripts for anybody until the class had entered last fall. The bottom line is that to check against this kind of student misbehavior has never been in effect and it's obvious that these data that are following that. Now, Ann Lemley, when she came before this body three years ago, I was on the committee who drew that motion, when she was chair, the motion actually said "we would like to take the median grades off the web until we can put them on the transcripts because one without the other is not going to work." I have not decided how I will vote on this motion. I am ambivalent about; I'm eager to hear what everyone else has to say, but in my opinion we should have it either both places or neither place."

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: "I am unimpressed with the analysis. I could think of a lot of ways of doing the analysis that was shown by those graphs. One could try three squares fit to two linear functions that have different slopes at the time

when the median grades were started. One could compare that rise in median slope, median grades to other institutions that didn't publish them and to see if there was any systematic effect but as the gentleman who spoke before I don't know whether my impression is to what that graph says would be borne out by analysis, but we could certainly make the analysis."

"The other is a little more industry that David Delchamps is right about the time when that was put into effect and I remember it vividly at that time, but no one at that time assumed it would take more than a year or two to get these things on the transcripts. The natural assumption was well, let's get people used to it a little. Lets start publishing them and in a couple of years they'll be on the transcripts. We thought it was not beyond the power of emerging computer technology to put another line on the transcript but it turns out it took fifteen years. I am always surprised by that. The argument for putting it on was neither to restrain nor to encourage grade inflation. It was much like what Bob Buhrman talked about before, namely he talks in full disclosure. It was full disclosure. It was truth in grading was the name that was given to the motion. The idea was, you tell employers what the median grade is and you tell the students what the median grade is and with that good information, both them can make their decision. If you take the information out, students will still make the same decisions and they'll make it on the basis of what they hear from other students. If they're going to make decisions on whether courses are graded easily or not, it seemed fair to let them make their decisions on the basis of data that was good. My feeling is that, now that it is coming on, this is the wrong time to take it off. That everyone will now know what the median grades are and can make their decisions intelligently."

Professor Gries: "Let me respond to the first part. I just took two graphs out of that article to show you some of it. I could have presented many of the tables. These people are very sophisticated, educated, far better than I, and have done a very good job."

Speaker Beer: "We will consider that a point of information and will take comments from members of the faculty who wish to speak in favor of the resolution."

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "I am still trying to understand what the logic of it is. Is it to shame the faculty to give more information to potential employers? I am not sure what the logic was and therefore I'm not sure on what basis I should decide whether it was or wasn't useful in the first place or whether it has or has not been working."

Speaker Beer: "Lets have a debate and hear from someone who wishes to speak in opposition of the resolution. Gentleman in the red tie."

Speaker Richard Burkhauser, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE: "I first want to say a few things about this paper. I believe this paper was done credibly. It's been published in the Journal of Economic Perspectives which is a peer reviewed journal of the American Economics Association. But I don't believe it has anything to do with the current situation. What the paper shows is that it would be really foolish to put grades in front of students as we have done without also putting them in the hands of employers. By doing so rational students would realize that getting high grades in a course that gives high grades is not going to be very valuable when that information is given to their future employers. Failing to do so will encourage that same rational student to use the information we provide to find the easier graded classes and take them. Hence we should never have provided this information to students without also providing it to their future employers by putting this information on their transcripts. But since we are finally going to do this, the paper is irrelevant to what will now be the way to do things, and we should not worry about its conclusions. Finally we will provide this information to the other side of the job market by putting those median grades on each student's transcript. So at last students will have to bear the cost of taking watered down classes. Hence, I oppose the motion."

Unidentified Speaker: "I don't think that's quite accurate as I understand it, the median grades are only going out to freshmen this year, so we have three more years where the grades will be on the web unless we take them off and the median grades will not be posted against the course they are taking. Virtually, uniformly everyone wanted them off. I think it's a scandal. I think the initial intent was of course to put both together and hopefully when faculty looked at these grades they would be ashamed to have given 300 people in a course all A's. That didn't happen. That was wrong. I really think, for the next three years, we should certainly take them off so we don't have this situation where the median grades are standing there and then three years later we can consider it again. I am certainly not going to vote for this motion and for taking those grades off the web."

Speaker Beer: "Can we hear someone who wishes to speak in opposition?"

Professor Richard Talman, Physics, A&S: "I don't believe that trend for one moment. But let's say it is, in fact, the trend is as you describe caused by the availability of these median grades. How is a person to interpret the grades right today? Whatever the cause of this trend is they don't know what the median is? The point as Peter Stein describes was truth in grading and grades become meaningless if people don't have access to the scale on which the grading is performed."

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Vet School/Biomedical Sciences: "I just have a question about information which seems obvious that's not in here. It is just that if this passes, the grades will still be listed on the students' transcripts and that did not specifically say that?"

Professor Gries: "We are not questioning that at all."

Speaker Beer: "Any further comments?"

Professor John Weiss, History, A&S: "I guess my comment is really a form of a question since I teach both a number of seminar courses and small courses which in fact students do well and they get high grades and I teach larger courses, up to 200 students where there is a wide range and I wonder if in fact by publishing these median grades would put the burden on employers to figure out whether this is a small course in which students receive a lot of intensive teaching, a lot of attention and therefore everyone is expected to do pretty well. The employer has to look at this and figure out what's going, whether this is a course of that type or whether it's another course and there is of course that middle range where an employer would be able to figure out what's going on and what that median grade really means."

Speaker Beer: "The gentleman in the back."

Professor Fred Gouldin, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Engr.: "I would like to speak in opposition to the motion as it stands now. As I understand the motion has since been removed the student access to strengthen the courses they are taking and yet the median grades will be on the transcripts. I wouldn't think that's fair because the Ag students wouldn't know how to interpret their grades until they see their final transcripts. So if you leave it on the transcripts, we ought to put the results on the web."

Professor Ellis Loew, Biomedical Sciences: "Does that mean that a student looking at his/her grades on the web would be just as fair as someone who would not see median grades on the web? So in other words this resolution does not remove anything from the printed transcript only from the web?"

Speaker Beer: "Faculty member in the back."

Professor Philip Nicholson, Astronomy, A&S: "I wonder if we can consider a friendly amendment that adds a brief clause at the end saying that until the median grades are

available for graduating seniors transcripts which would effectively delay it for three years.”

Speaker Beer: “That would be an official amendment. The speaker is unclear if a friendly amendment can be offered to a motion that is made by the committee.”

Professor Emeritus Peter Stein, Physics, A&S: “I am sure the rules forbid substantive amendments. There are substantive amendments and the question is whether you consider this a substantive or just a minor change in wording. If it’s substantive, then it’s forbidden. If it’s just a minor change in wording to clarify then it’s allowed.”

Speaker Beer: “Any other persons who wish to speak? “

Professor Gouldin: “I would like to add to my comment. The implication that putting median grades on transcripts is in my mind that As are not As anymore. There is no absolute grade and what we’re going to tell employers, and admissions departments, and graduate schools are meant by A’s in one course vs. A’s in another by giving the median grades. If we’re going to do that, then we should do it in a timely way.”

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson School: “I think one way to do this is to cease publishing the median grades on courses that have already been taken. That means that students need to make a judgment on the basis of getting a meaty course. The other is an interpretation of what they actually did at a given time.”

Speaker Beer: “Are we ready for a vote?”

Professor Tarleton Gillespie, Communications, CALS: “If people are concerned that they might have information as long as I can see my course, my grade, my median, it’s not the same as here are all medians for past courses which might have occurred in past decision making. I don’t know what people have access to, or is it just like the actual official applicant that has the grade or will have the grade. There are actually two online spaces where it could be, the collective and the individual render.”

Speaker Beer: “Would you qualify that question?”

Professor Gries: “I don’t know whether I can. Right now it’s on the web and it’s on the transcripts and you’re suggesting putting it in a third place?”

Speaker Beer: “We have to move to consider the resolution of the publication of median grades on the website will continue or will cease. Are we ready for the question?”

Unidentified faculty member: "I don't have anywhere near enough information to decide whether I can decide. I am not if sure some of these statements are too controversial to correct. Is this contributing to grade inflation at Cornell? I am not sure I understand how the grades appear on the website. I don't know how this question was resolved; the difference between a seminar which everyone would get an A and a large class with resources. It seems to me it would be irresponsible for me to vote on this now and I would like to do whatever one needs to do have this tabled. Make a motion that it's tabled and we request the Dean or the Committee to bring much more information to the faculty to make a decision which clearly impacts the lives not only the students but the faculty who have to make decisions about how to they are going to grade. I would just like to add that shame is not a good way to teach me how to grade."

Speaker Beer: "The speaker feels that there is some confusion and further study of this matter may be in order. So we could entertain a motion to refer this matter back to the committee."

Unidentified Senator: "I so make the motion."

Unidentified Senator: "I second it."

Speaker Beer: "I refer the matter to the Educational Policy Committee to lead the discussion of that vote."

Professor Rosemary Avery, Policy Analysis & Management, CHE: "We don't discuss a table motion. It can't be voted on."

Professor Emeritus Stein: "Point of order. There are two motions here. A Table motion has not been made. The motion on the floor cannot be debated and must be past by a 2/3 margin."

Speaker Beer: "We will now vote whether the motion to publish mean grades is to be tabled. It requires a 2/3 vote. All those in favor of tabling the median grades motion, say "aye."

"Aye."

Speaker Beer: "All those opposed?"

"Nay."

Speaker Beer: "The motion has been tabled. We will now go back to a procedural question. The Report from the Nominations and Elections Committee; a quorum is now present so it would be in order to consider accepting this report. All in favor of accepting the report, signify by saying "aye"."

"Aye".

Speaker Beer: "Opposed, Nay? [no response]. The report has been accepted and now we will consider the matter of the minutes of the April meeting of the University Senate. Are there any objections to accepting the minutes of the April meeting as distributed this morning? The [minutes](#) of the April Meeting are accepted as presented. We move on to Professor Tim Fahey who will report on the President Climate Committee."

4. [REPORT](#) FROM PRESIDENT'S CLIMATE COMMITMENT COMMITTEE

Liberty Hyde Bailey Professor, Tim Fahey: "Bill Fry asked me to update you on the President's Climate Commitment. I am sure some of you have already heard something about this. If you'll permit me, there's a little history I'd like to begin with. About ten years ago, there was a group of students who sat at Day Hall and demanded the president sign a pledge to abide by the Kyoto Protocol which was to reduce carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions back at 1990 levels. There was a tent city in front of Day Hall for about three weeks before the president signed the pledge. I think the people in the facilities department said yes we can do this. There was some doubt about whether this was reasonable with Cornell campus growing at the rate it is growing could we really ever achieve the Kyoto Protocol. We were supposed to be a leader and so we said we would. It is amazing how these things changed in the last ten years. Two years ago, a group called the American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Committee, ACUPCC, came to us and said why don't you propose going climate neutral? So they were asking for a pledge of neutrality at universities. We wrote a white paper on it and within about two weeks, the president signed it, so we are going climate neutral."

"That is a pretty radical thing to say. This is what it says. We have to go climate neutral in our time. At this point there are 700+ signees to this commitment. We were one of the first. In fact, President Skorton is one of the founding members of the ACUPCC, so we're out front on this whole thing. What we have been doing for the last year and half or so is developing a plan by which we can actually come into compliance. This is a sequence of activities that will be in the development of the climate action plan.

The first thing that we did is create an emissions inventory so we knew where the greenhouse gases were coming from as well as a base case against which to compare our future progress. The best case then, we're going to have a third more square footage on this campus in forty-fifty years, so we would, business as usual, have a lot more greenhouse gases.

This is where our greenhouse gas emissions come from. This is the result of the inventory. About 55% of our emissions is heating the buildings at the central heating plant and burning mostly coal and maybe a little electricity. We purchase a lot of electricity from the grid which makes up a little over a quarter of the greenhouse gas emissions to compare to grid emissions. About 17% is from travel. These are the categories that we have to account for and it comes to about 319,000 metric tons of CO₂.

How can we go about this with zero returns emission per year? We are going on the assumption that it's not impossible. This inventory for the climate commitment are now right in the plans. We got matching funds from NYS energy reserve to hire consultants to help us development this report and there is a dozen or more staff members who are putting in a lot of time figuring out how we're going to meet this commitment.

The second step in the process was to gather all this from everyone on campus: staff, faculty, students. We received 706 ideas for reducing carbons emissions on campus and we have what I call four "wedges" in the climate change. Energy conservation would be reducing in buildings that already exist -- reducing their carbon footprints. We will be making new buildings smarter. Third, we're going to be changing our fuel mix probably from coal to other renewables and other low emissions sources. And then there's transportation. Most of our ideas fall in those four categories.

We are going to take those ideas and figure out how to whittle them down to ones that are reasonable. This is a big deal. There is a lot of reference going into this and I think that the Climate Action Plan is sort of putting campus sustainability in prime time. The climate action plan is going to make us do triple bottom line accounting. It is going to convince everybody on campus that we have to take into account not just the economic bottom line but also the social bottom line, the environmental bottom line, etc. when we are making decisions about the future of the campus.

The consultants have developed a decision tool that's going to form decisions in a different way, a fundamentally different way. Just to illustrate, on the life-cycle cost analysis of the changing of the heating plant and that cost will include the cost of the

value of carbon dioxide. Today we don't get any carbon dioxide tax but ten years from now carbon emissions won't be free. There will be compliance. There will be rules. If we make a decision to put into place a change facility then I think we can figure out how much it's going to save us in carbon emissions cost. The consultants took the 25 or so studies of future trajectory cost of value carbons and put them into this curve. In 2030 the anticipation is that it will be about \$60 per CO₂ and that's going to make a difference to decisions, so if you make a decision now you ought to be thinking about how much carbon is going to be worth in the future and that will be part of the economic equation, the economic bottom line.

We have all these options and we have to come up with a portfolio and sequence of activities. There will be short term activities; there will be activities that may be carried over fifteen years in an intermediate term and then some things that will happen when new technology comes available, hopefully from activities and research at Cornell. There will be a demand side and a supply side and there will be technological options and there will be changes in behavior on campus.

The portfolio that we finally come up with is being developed with the attitude that we should take into account certain principals. The bottom line is, trustees are going to be interested to know the options will save us money and might save us costs. If the trustees sign on to these recommendations, they are going to be taking the stand that Cornell could be a leader in this and we can advertise ourselves as helping to lead the nation in sustainability. Finally, these have to do more so with opportunities more so than with cost. Campus sustainability creates a lot of education and research and outreach opportunities on campus. It says right in the President's Climate Commitment, that we will make neutrality and sustainability a big part of our educational experience. Whether we do that with campus life activities or education programs, promoting more course work, we'll probably be changing. Availability of research opportunities; this is an example. In the development of the climate action plan we arrange for grants co-funded between the centers for sustainable futures and facilities department to support people doing research that attribute to the plan. It is a group from the Development, Sociology, Natural Resources, who are doing the survey of what we're moving towards, the major possible alternates we have to changing transportation, wind power, biofuels, etc. and we'll get primary data to know how the community will react and publish those stages.

I don't want to dwell on this, but this is the draft portfolio and it has those same four "wedges": fuel mix, renewables, transportation, green development, and energy conservation. There are two sides to the diagram. The supply side which we aren't going to use often or to any significant extent but it does create research opportunities and it does create changes in the way that facilities does their business. For example,

it's more than likely we won't be burning coal in the near future and in the meantime all you've heard about is biofuels, upgrading the hydroplant, etc. Some of these are technologies that Cornell faculty are involved in doing research to develop these technologies. They are testing them in the engineering college. On the left side are things that are probably more likely to affect our day to day lives as faculty, students and staff.

Two final comments: If the final action plan is approved by the trustees, they will not be approving specific activities, it will be approving in principle that this sort of activity in general is a good idea. When a specific activity is considered, it will be considered as an individual item and all the information that pertains to that particular option will be considered in detail in a normal decision making analysis.

The second point that I wanted to make clear or promote is that the problem of top down vs. bottom up responses to climate change and sustainability in a more general sense. I have sought from day one that the climate action plan, the PCC, provides the real opportunity to really promote widespread change in people's day to day attitudes toward sustainability not just in climate but in all aspects of sustainability. I ask folks to bring it back to your department and tell your department that this is going on. If they can get involved, if they have something in their courses that they can contribute toward better understanding of sustainability problems or climate change problems or the day to day activities of the building – these are the kinds of problems, sustainability problems, that can't be solved by top down – it's from top down and bottom up. Sustainability is all of our problems and we have to get involved to solve it.

Laney Joyce from the facilities department has been very much involved and the last thing I would say is that you folks would not believe the quality, talented, hard work that the facilities department at this university does. It is extraordinary."

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics, A&S: "These are wonderful initiatives. One of my concerns is how do we make sure that, in the different spheres we're operating we really hold ourselves to these goals and in particular I'm concerned with respect to green development. There are projects that are currently on the planning table that are now under the construction pause where it has been said that these buildings are grandfathered in, relative to our current and future initiatives. I find this deeply concerning. This is the rhetoric we heard around the Milstein project, which is still under the pause and then also around the discussion about other buildings. This body had a discussion about these matters and passed a resolution relative to the review in decision making of current and future funding projects and also the concern about being sure that all construction projects did meet the sustainability guidelines. I am just

wondering how we start doing that right away and not say, “well, we already planned this before so we will do it in the future.”

Professor Tim Fahey: “This plan is due for the trustees approval in September and part of the plan will be how will we do it? What is the structure that’s going to be created to implement this? One of the reasons they gave us a bunch of money to do this is then we can create tools that other universities and institutions can use to develop their own climate action plan. These are written documents – not a pile of paper on a shelf, it is going to be a website with a suite of tools that allow you to make decisions on a daily basis. Hopefully that will make a difference.”

Professor Gregory Poe, Applied Economics, CALS: “I’m worried that you don’t have a timeline set.”

Professor Fahey: “We do. There will be timelines in September. The trustees have to approve it and we are not going to go public with it until September 15th There will be a timeline and it will be in the 2050 range.”

Professor Poe: “2050, and if we haven’t met that, are we going to buy offsets?”

Professor Fahey: “We will probably do some offsetting along the way to local offsets and local community offsets.”

Professor Michael Louge, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering: “This is a wonderful initiative, a wonderful thing to do. Unfortunately I am a little bit of a skeptic when it comes to this kind of issue and that has to do with what my colleagues in Economics have said. If we don’t have any incentives to do this, chances are it will not happen. We don’t have a history of putting in the appropriate maintenance costs of rebuilding and this, in some sense, has to do with rebuilding. We built Duffield Hall and Duffield Hall cost us \$200,000/month in utilities to heat during the winter season. We can claim many things we want about sustainability but it is a fact is that that amount is rather large. If you would like to consult cornell.edu you will see a disclosure of all the amounts with respect to each building and Duffield requires about 7% of the entire utilities on campus. Unless we have incentive, having initiatives that come from top down as President Skorton just did, it’s totally meaningless. What will happen is people will go on as usual – we have lights burning 24/7, 365 days a year even when students are not around.”

Unidentified speaker: “Clearly we will have to spend money to save money. What we found in doing the analysis is that there are many opportunities that will have a

positive rate of return and they will save more than they will cost on a life cycle cost basis when you include the cost of carbon and low cost of money that Cornell has typically had. At most you do spend money to just reduce carbons and that point is really certain because of how much society has put on the cost priority. That will change the equation over time and so we did our best to estimate the future. The future needs to be dynamic and will be.”

Professor Emeritus Stein: “In listening to you talk it seems to me that there are two kinds of initiatives that one can consider. One is where reducing the carbon footprint actually saves you money and the other is where reducing the carbon footprint actually costs you money. There are lots of things that go into this, like assuming a future carbon tract, and assuming a life cycle cost, etc. No one could argue against changing your incandescent bulbs putting in your little florescent bulbs because, not only does it reduce the carbon footprint, it saves you money. Who could argue against that but there is another class of things, like putting up solar panels in Ithaca which costs you money yet reduces the carbon footprint. Are you limiting yourself to only things in the first group where you actually pay dollars to reduce the carbon footprint or do you consider things where reducing the carbon footprint actually costs you money?”

Professor Fahey: “There is no way we can get to zero climate neutrality without it costing us money.”

Unidentified Faculty: “I would like to know where we are in the process of planning such that the Board of Trustees will not only approve the list but also a notion of how to make decisions that will get us through the list, going back to Abby Cohn’s question, how do we solve the point that people are saying, this is grandfathered in so we’re stuck with this building. Is there a process for deciding that?”

Professor Fahey: “It is going to be in the climate action plan.”

Speaker Beer: “We will now take a report from Dean William Fry.”

5. [REPORT](#) FROM DEAN OF FACULTY

Dean Fry: “I would like to take just a few minutes to talk about issues that have come up in the last several months. First, we have a strategic planning process. It is going to take a fair amount of time and effort. It is going to be happening over the next two years and you will be hearing a lot more about it. There is a going to be considerable activity on the part of the faculty. Second, I would like to indicate that there is a search in place for the new Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education. Michele Moody-Adams

is leaving. David Harris is chairing the search. The Nominations and Elections Committee has provided us with a list of suggested faculty members and you may recall that it is an internal search. Fourth, there is also a search for the Vice Provost for Budget and Planning. Paul Streeter has filled this position wonderfully during the interim, the last nine months. The candidates will interview with the Faculty Policy Committee. Fifth, we all learned last week that Steve Golding is leaving his position as Executive Vice President and we are determining whether or not it is necessary to refill that position. That decision has not yet been made.”

“I would like to talk about the Strategic Planning Process. We have this \$215M budget problem and we have taken a third of that cut so far for FY10. It is up to 2/3 yet to go. Hopefully that will be informed through the strategic planning process. Provost Kent Fuchs has asked that each college create a task force and their goals are to assume a 15% reduction. They are to consider reconfiguration and they are to be consultative. I think the Arts College is further along on this topic than any other college. In addition to that there are cross-disciplinary task forces – a few of them are the Life Sciences, Social Sciences, Management/Business. You can see that they are chaired by one or two provosts. There are also two student-related task forces. The first is Enrollment and it is chaired by David Harris and Susan Murphy. The Nominations and Elections suggested a candidate for that task force. There is another task force, the Student and Academic Affairs and chairs have not yet been identified. The charge has not yet been identified.

The administration has a series of task forces and the administration is planning to take larger budget cuts than are the academic units. There is a budget task force that looks at the budget process, co-chaired by Paul Streeter and Cathy Dove and that task force will include representation from the FPC and will look at all issues across the campus. There are additional task forces in the facilities, information technology, general administration and risk management. They are not as far along as the previous task forces are.

I also want to indicate that the administration will be hiring a consulting firm to aid with the planning of the various planning steps that will happen. My concern is that there is a fantastic amount happening. It will happen during the summer and into the fall. We will have something in place, sometime in October or November of next fall. We will have the FY11 budget and my concern is that many people will be asked to serve on these task forces and I hope that when asked people will be willing to do it and commit for the next year.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks, Dean Fry. We will go on to Good and Welfare, starting with Professor Emeritus Charlie Walcott. “

Professor Emeritus Charlie Walcott. "There is a substantial budget problem coming. You have 5% cut this year and probably another 10% or so next year. A faculty member brought up a proposal with the Financial Policies Committee this year. Unfortunately we really didn't have the time to discuss this thoroughly, in which he suggested it might be possible for tenured faculty to go half time for a brief period of time, if their circumstances made that seem like a desirable thing to do. The basic reason is that in some departments, these budget cuts are going to be borne on the backs of the lecturers and the non-tenure track faculty and dismissing a lot of those folks might have a really serious effect on our instructional program. His suggestion was that there some faculty in the university who would be in a position where they said, for one reason or another, that they would be able to go on a part time basis. This is already permitted if you will notice. It is in the faculty handbook on page 18 or 58, I guess. It is possible for a tenured faculty member to reduce to half time in consultation with the department chair and the dean. The basic proposal that came up is that this might be something that some folks might like to do and the savings that accrued to the department and might spare the cut of a non-tenure track faculty. The Financial Policies Committee tabled this until the fall until they have had a chance to think about it and discuss it. The basic principle is embodied in trustee legislation so that's not an issue. What is an issue is whether it might be possible to sweeten the pot to some degree. For example, perhaps if you went half time, it might be possible to pay full time benefits or it might be possible to establish a discretionary research account with the equivalent of half of your benefits in it. It might be possible for example to not count that half time as half time, in terms of sabbatical leave. There are various proposals that might make it more desirable to do and I really wanted to warn you that this is under discussion. The basic principle is approved at faculty legislation. The details of this proposal are found on a single half sheet of paper in case you are interested."

Speaker Beer: "Thank you very much Professor Emeritus Walcott. Professor Terrence Fine."

Professor Terry Fine: "Shortly after the formation of the Faculty Senate I was looking for mechanisms by which Senators who did not know other Senators could gain the Senatorial support needed to introduce motions. I mentioned that to my wife Dorian, who told me about "Good and Welfare," and that is where it came from. The uses to which Good and Welfare has been put have almost always been other than that original purpose, and I now turn to use it in yet another way. This is a good opportunity for me to say goodbye. Over my forty years I have been a member of all of the variously-formed faculty self-governing bodies that preceded the Senate. Looking back today, I conclude that the current Faculty Senate is by far the most successful

form of self-governance that I have experienced. We owe the creation and initial leadership of the Faculty Senate to my friend, former Dean of the Faculty, Peter Stein, sitting nearby. Folks I want to thank Peter for that. I have watched him work – I’ve watched you closely Peter! – for something like forty years, and he’s incredibly hard-working and persistent and innovative and devoted to Cornell. I also want to thank J. Robert Cooke, Peter’s successor as Dean of the Faculty. Bob Cooke led us through the most difficult times this Senate has faced, a time when Faculty elements were deeply divided and some strongly opposed to decisions made by then-President Hunter Rawlings, Bob always managed to ensure that the divisive forces did not divide us. He kept us united by being endlessly patient, patently fair and wise enough to always lead us through or around an impasse. I have not had a chance to work with either of Deans Charlie Walcott or Bill Fry, but I do thank Charlie for his efforts, and Bill, I wish you the best. Finally, you the Senate have my best wishes as you continue the noble tradition of Cornell Faculty self-governance in what will be financially challenging times.”

Speaker Beer: “We have one more Good and Welfare speaker, Dean Bill Fry.”

Dean Bill Fry: “Concerning the resolutions that Charlie identified, it sounds like a nice idea to help out with some of the financial concerns of the university. The university has a lot of challenges financially and whatever help we can give because there will be considerable cuts. I also want to identify that the charge to the individual colleges in terms of these half times, if you want to consider it, these half-sheets are available to you. Please take this discussion of Reduction in Effort that Charlie Walcott brought up to your departments to discuss.”

*Note: The speaker misspoke at the May 13, 2009 meeting and an explanation can be found in the September 9, 2009 minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 5:59pm.

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Fry
Dean of the University Faculty

ⁱ Research-related FCOI covered by overall Cornell Conflicts Policy - www.policy.cornell.edu/Conflicts_Policy.cfm
-- Adopted May 31, 1986. Amended January 29, 1987;
-- October 29, 1992 (established University Conflicts Committee);
-- October 28, 2000 (annual electronic disclosure process established)

The University encourages academic personnel, consistent with university policy, to engage in sponsored research, to participate in professional practice as appropriate and necessary to sustaining intellectual output, to consult widely, and to engage in entrepreneurial and other activities that may benefit not only the participants but also the university and the larger public. The academic community at Cornell strives toward these objectives in a context of freedom with responsibility. Cornell's conflicts policy recognizes and affirms the settled tradition and expectation that members will conduct their relationships with each other and the University with candor and integrity.

...Cornell does not require individuals to avoid all situations where there may be a seeming or potential conflict of interest. On the contrary, some types of conflicts are unavoidable and completely acceptable.

...The obligation to disclose external financial interests and time commitments stems from the public trust vested in a University, is required by the Cornell University Conflicts Policy, and fulfills legal reporting requirements to funding agencies. (preamble to Part I disclosure)

Recent NSF and NIH audit findings indicate that Cornell is not in full compliance with federal FCOI regulations.