

A Meeting of
The University Faculty Senate
Wednesday, May 13, 2015

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Professor and Chair Department of Science and Technology Studies and Speaker Bruce Lewenstein: "I would like to call the meeting to order. I'm Bruce Lewenstein, Speaker of the Senate. I'd like to remind everybody that there are no photos or any recording devices to be allowed during the meeting, except for the official recording, from which the minutes are taken.

"Please turn off your cell phones -- I remembered to do that, my own, about a minute ago -- and also any tablets or any other chiming devices, such as computers that open and so forth.

"I remind you that when you speak, please wait for the microphone. We need that for the minutes, and then identify yourself and your department, when you speak. Senators have priority in speaking, although any speaker who wishes to speak after that may, if we have time.

"As in the past, we will keep time, asking you to limit your remarks to two minutes. And Sam Nelson, the parliamentarian, will have an iPad with a counter on it, so you can see how you are doing.

"Senators or their alternates may speak, may vote. We have had no requests for Good and Welfare speakers, so I am going to allocate that time to the final resolution on the conduct of the investigation.

"We have quite a full agenda today. I'll begin by asking for approval of the minutes of the last two meetings ([March](#) & [April](#)). Are there any corrections to those minutes?

"Yes? Have those minutes been circulated? Some people are saying no. Some people, yes. Normally, we post them, so they have been posted.

"Karen? They were sent out. They were sent to senators. Okay, so you have had a chance to look at them. Are there any corrections? I declare those minutes approved.

"I announce that CAPP has finished the 60-day notice period for the Law School's introduction of the professor of practice title, which has passed without comment; and therefore, CAPP has now approved the Law School's use of that title. I remind all senators, especially if you came in the back, that you will need to sign in and you will need a clicker today.

"Next on the agenda is report from Associate Dean Michael Fontaine."

2. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Michael Fontaine, Associate Professor of Classics: "Hi. So I'm here to announce we have the slate for elections next year, and we'll be running the election next week. Make sure to keep an eye on your e-mail for this. We have two open seats for the UFC, from the senate, the University Faculty Committee. We have one non-senate seat for the UFC, and then three open seats for nominations and elections.

"Here are the candidates: For UFC, there's John Brady from CALS, Tom Brenna from Human Ecology, David Pizarro from Arts and Sciences, and Michael Tomlan from Architecture Art and Planning.

"For the UFC non-senate seat, there's Ross Brann from Arts and Sciences and Paul Soloway from CALS. And lastly, for the Nominations and Elections Committee, the committee that staffs all the other committees, there are three candidates: Tom Fox from CALS, Steve Hilgartner from Arts and Sciences, and David Feldshuh from Arts and Sciences.

"Keep an eye out in your e-mail for the election information. It will be out next week. Thank you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you. Next on the agenda: Report from the Dean of the Faculty."

3. [REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY](#)

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: "Thanks for coming at this busy time of the year. I want to just talk about a few things on the agenda and discuss some of the items that are active at the present time. So on the agenda, there are two major items. As you can see down here, in about 20 minutes or something like that, the first concerns, enabling legislation for the title of Research Professor.

“There are a couple of unusual things in that case. That came in front of CAFPS some time ago, is now on the agenda, and we put up a Wiki page. We are trying to get discussions of this going. The Wiki page already contains comments from six deans and nine department chairs and one other person. So I encourage you all, especially those on the opposite side of the question, to please weigh in on the Wiki page, to keep that going.

“This was discussed by the UFC at our agenda-setting meeting, and there was some debate about whether it should be put up for a vote here or not put up for a vote. The group that ended up at the end of the day said don't put it on the agenda, but if you took the full UFC, they would have put it on the agenda. So we'll see. It is up to you folks what you want to do.

“There will also be, as you know, a proposal to start an investigation of the handling of the student protesters in events back a couple of months ago. This also is a little bit unusual. It was a resolution that was submitted to the UFC the day of the UFC meeting about the agenda. And at the meeting, the UFC agreed to co-sponsor this, because they thought it was an important item to get on the agenda.

“Subsequently, a few days after that, we met with the President in a confidential meeting. Some of the UFC decided not to come to that meeting or decided to leave the meeting, because of the confidentiality restrictions. Following that meeting, the UFC suggested several changes in the resolution. They were accepted by the original proposers of the resolution, so you have a slightly modified resolution that's in front of you and was sent out yesterday. So those are a little bit unusual handlings of things on today's agenda.

“I wanted to report that we are moving forward on changing our meeting time to a family-friendly time. We will have a vote at the time of the election that Mike talked about, next week. That vote will ask what schedule the full faculty would prefer because we are going to allow all the faculty to vote on this. And we are proposing one of five times. These are times at the beginning of either Tuesday or Wednesday, at the end of Tuesday or Wednesday, or a mid-day Tuesday setup, so as to lie atop only one of the long, 75-minute periods at that time.

“These are not perfect choices. Everybody will be unhappy with most of them, but tell me what you are most unhappy about, if you think there's something wrong. We've got to make a decision, and those are the choices I decided were

the best, but we're willing to hear from you all; but we will make a decision, once we get those votes in.

“There is a Shared Governance Committee that's been revived, a six-member committee. It met once after the last senate meeting. We talked about what were the recent events that drove people to want the Governance Committee to start working again.

“And this committee started to lay out what are the responsibilities of the administration, what are the responsibilities of the faculty, and what is that large span in-between of issues that fall sometimes to the faculty, sometimes to the administration, trying to decide what this committee would deal with.

“You could imagine faculty should deal with class content, the administration should deal with -- I would make a joke, but I won't. And we will meet again on Friday. And part of that will be to decide what is meant by matters of educational policy -- that is what topics the Faculty Senate is supposed to be involved in -- and when exactly should the various constituents be involved in these discussions.

“There are activities among some of the other committees, but because of the fullness of the agenda today, I decided not to bring them in, but I wanted to mention them. The most interesting one is the first of these. There is a plan to revise the policy on romantic and sexual relations between faculty and students. This topic is under discussion and a proposed policy was reviewed by CAFPS. It's been seen by the office of workforce planning, workforce policy and labor relations, the dean of students, the vice president for student affairs and academic services and the counsel's office.

“And the proposed changes, but not yet through the system, proposed changes are, one, that any sexual or romantic relations should be forbidden between faculty and any undergraduate student; that there should be no such relations between TA staff and undergraduate students in any class. That relations between graduate students and faculty should not occur, if those faculty have any possibility of having a supervisory capacity over those graduate students. And the other change is to make violations punishable by penalties, up to dismissal.

“These policy changes are under discussion, and I thought you should be aware of these. They’ve been brought to us because of difficulties that other peer institutions have had.

“I just got this morning a request from CALS to institute the title of Professor of the Practice. That proposal has not yet started through the system, but will be going through the system very soon.

“We have decided that we will have a Faculty Forum in the fall and this would look at financial aid policies. Are we doing this right? Are we accomplishing what we want to accomplish? Are there ways that we could spend that money better?

“Should we spend more, should we spend less? Controversial, but something that plays into the budget very big-time. And if it plays into the budget, it has enormous educational policy implications, and so the faculty should be involved in it, I believe.

“And finally, we come to sadness. And the sadness is lots of people are leaving our hallowed halls. David Skorton is departing. Harry Katz is still going to be around in some capacity; we're not sure what. Susan Murphy is leaving, as we'll hear at the end of today's session. Charlie Phlegar, whom we have been trying to get to come to a senate meeting, decided to skip town instead and go back to VPI, his alma mater. Three members of the UFC, Clare Fewtrell, Andre Kessler and Shawkat Toorawa, who have been loyal for three years, are all departing and being replaced. And then many Senators are also leaving. So I thank you, from the bottom of my heart, for your service to this institution.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Thank you, Dean Burns. Next on the agenda is a brief report on faculty hiring from Interim Provost Harry Katz.”

4. REPORT FROM THE INTERIM PROVOST

Interim Provost, Harry Katz: “I think it's fair to say we are all concerned about the level of faculty hiring and how it might be affected by budgetary stringency and other matters, and so I collected data on that. I mentioned that to Joe, and we both thought it would be useful for me to report what the data show.

“I wanted to remind you what the faculty hiring numbers have been since 2009, just to put the current plans for next year and the year beyond in context. And

I'm going to report on the data that Joe put up on a slide a few weeks ago regarding hiring and departures.

"In 2009, when we were still feeling the effects of the financial crisis, 42 new faculty came to Cornell. 2010, 26 came. And then the numbers recovered to look pretty similar to what they had been in the five-year period before the crisis. 2011, 73 faculty were added; 2012, 76. 2013, 74. And then, 2014, 88. That's just a setup for what I want to report to you.

"I requested that the deans report to me -- actually, to report to Patty Ard, who ably collected the data, how many new faculty were being hired, were committed and were coming next fall. And then I asked them to predict how many faculty searches they were going to launch next fall and winter for the following academic year. Then we totaled them up, and the numbers are quite strong. I'm pleased about them, although we would always prefer to have even more hiring, and we'll continue to work on that.

"So the numbers are for next fall. We already have 67 new faculty, who have agreed to come, starting in the fall. And there are 19 offers still outstanding, and we're hopeful that some—and maybe many of those—will agree to come next fall.

"We are learning that academic markets seem to be occurring a bit later and later; not just for us, but for our peers. And that's, in part, while there's still 19 offers outstanding.

"So with regard to planned searches that will be launched next fall and winter, the deans reported that there are 82 planned faculty searches, and there already are seven faculty who have agreed to start here in the fall of 2016, who had been involved in either this year or last year's search, but delayed their arrival time. So that, too, is solid news. Thanks."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Related to whether or not we can attract faculty is the question of faculty salaries. So we have a report from Larry Blume."

5. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Lawrence Blume, Professor of Economics and Chair of the Financial Policies Committee: "Thank you. Several members of the Financial Policies Committee and the current dean, Kevin Hallock, who was not a dean at the time, of ILR,

began in the fall looking at faculty salaries, trying to understand what's going on with faculty salaries at Cornell. What I'm going to present to you today is mostly publicly available data. Not entirely, but most of the data I will talk about are publicly available.

“And I just want to show you what the landscape of faculty salaries looks like, both across disciplines and Cornell, relative to its peers. At the end of the day, I have to say that we don't know very much, but I'll share with you what it is that we do know.

“So when we think about salaries, there are really two kinds of questions that we ask. A common question we ask is, is the distribution of salaries fair? I don't propose to say much about that, because I don't think there's an agreed-upon notion of what fair is.

“We do all believe that faculty salaries are going to depend upon different characteristics of the faculty; so for instance, maybe how bad a faculty member is in the classroom or how good a faculty researcher is, productivity, these kinds of things matter. The expertise that faculty members have. So I hope that's why older faculty get paid more than younger faculty, because we are so much wiser.

“I think we all agree there are certain things upon which faculty salaries should not depend; for instance, gender and ethnicity. It turns out there's a lot of data in the public domain about that. You could find reports about that at Cornell that are available on the web site of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, so I'm not going to talk about the gender or ethnic distribution of salaries.

“Another set of questions I put under the technical term of art, efficiency. This has to do with what kind of impact do faculty salaries have on faculty behavior. And I have listed a couple of things here that I think we have all experienced.

“When our departments put out offers, are they laughed at, or do people actually come? Are we successful in retaining faculty? I suppose we all know colleagues, for example, whose plans for retirement have changed because of the financial crisis of 2008. There's no question that all of us respond, to some degree, to financial incentives, as well as to many other incentives. And so this is something that the university, I think, does and should think about.

“And I guess one thing I want to say about this is there is a great deal of variation in the way in which departments hand out raises from the

departmental raise pools. We have some data on that, which I'm not allowed to share or even display, but if you look at the distribution of faculty wages, faculty salary increases within departments, it is clear many departments do different things.

“There's one thing, actually, I want to say about fairness, and I think this is good news. I have forgotten to mention this earlier; that the university itself, I think, is very concerned with fairness. And one thing that we learned from talking with Marin Clarkberg -- and also I think she said at the forum that was organized on faculty salaries that happened a couple of weeks ago -- I don't remember under whose auspices it was, but essentially what happens every year is that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning prepares the equivalent of some kind of plot -- they do a fancy statistical version of this, plot out all the different salaries for all of us.

“Then they sit there and look at the outliers. They look at salaries that seem to be very high and other salaries that seem to be very low. Then they sit down with the deans and talk about why that is the case, on an individual by individual basis. So it is good to know that there are some checks in the process. I found this particularly reassuring.

“And since IRP doesn't have access to lots of data that the deans use in setting salaries, there are outliers; and then these are discussed. So there is a process in place, I think, which promotes fairness, to some degree.

“So what I want to talk about now is what does the landscape of faculty salaries look like. You know, we might like to live in a world where all faculty are paid the same, regardless of discipline, but that is not the way the academic market works, and for reasons I think that are rather obvious.

“So what is this chart telling us? This comes from a report which is actually compiled every year by Oklahoma State University, from a large data set that includes data from Cornell, but many, many other universities. And there's very fine-grain data in this report.

“I don't have a copy of the report. This is a summary table that I copied from elsewhere, and it's very detailed. If there are any condensed matter physicists in the room, you can look up salaries and raise amounts for condensed matter physicists, and I suppose for all the other kinds of physicists out there as well.

“So what this chart is recording is how much more or less are different disciplines paid than our English professors. And here's a plot for a variety of disciplines. These groups, they are overlapping, to some degree; but the point I want to make is that you will see that the red bars come from 1980/81. The blue bars come from 2010/2011. You will see there's an increase in the divergence in faculty salaries and spread of faculty salaries.

“It's even worse when we look at assistant professors. Since this is the base, which we are going to be building on in the future, you will see I would expect the trend would continue and we'd expect to see a similar pattern emerging in full professors in a few years' time.

“Here are salary numbers for Cornell, and these numbers should be taken with a grain of salt, because we're not controlling for faculty composition in these numbers, we are not controlling for cost of living. It is very difficult to do that; but some years ago, I guess the deans sat down with IRP, and for every department, they set up a list of comparable departments with whom they wanted to be compared.

“I know nothing about how these lists were constructed, but we asked IRP, by these broad categories, to indicate how our faculty are doing relative to our peers, through this self-identified peer process. And the answer is, you can see in most cases, it looks as if we are paid better; but we should remember that doesn't mean we actually are paid better. For instance, we might have an older faculty, and we would expect an older faculty to be paid more, but it doesn't mean that on a comparable basis, faculty are paid the same. So all these numbers have to be taken with a grain of salt.

“Salary growth rates. So here is a plot that indicates the rate of increase of salaries per year, over the period from 2002/2003 to 2007/2008. And you can see that during that period -- I'm actually a little suspicious of the Yale number. I might have misreported it, but during that period, we had higher raises than this set of peer institutions, which I have to say, I chose somewhat arbitrarily.

“That trend has begun to reverse, when you look at the period from the financial crisis up through '13/'14. If you look at the last couple of years for that, it is even worse than that. On the other hand, we should remember that we are really interested in long-term trends here. It might well be in the next five years it will switch back a little bit, but this is the pattern that we see so far.

“Here, this is percent differences from Cornell in the academic year 2012/2013. Again, not much can be made of these numbers, for all the reasons I've already talked about; but I anticipated some of you would want to know, so I made this plot.

“I'm almost out of time. I've talked too fast. I have a slide that is missing. I had a concluding slide, and -- I have it here. I can read it. I wanted to lay out a bit of an agenda, recommendations, things I think the FPC should take up, things I think the senate should take up. So I'm just going to read this. This comes from the web page of the Institutional Research and Planning office.

“It says: ‘The mission of Institutional Research and Planning is to provide official, accurate and unbiased information and analysis about the university in support of institutional planning, decision-making and reporting obligations.’ I wish it were the case that consulting the faculty or reporting to the faculty were actually part of that mission. So IRP largely serves the administration.

“And I have to say that Marin Clarkberg and others in the office have been very generous in their time with us, but I wish that were actually official, set in stone, rather than dependent upon the good will of a few people. It used to be the case, I'm told, many years ago, at least in a preceding version of the FPC, the committee was actually staffed by someone from IRP. And I wish we could make a tighter and more formal connection.

“There are a lot of data-privacy issues that IRP correctly raises, when we want to see faculty salary data; but we have experts on this campus, world-class experts on this campus who know a great deal about those kinds of things. And I wish that we could get IRP to consult with them, so we could learn more about what is going on with our faculty.

“And the last recommendation, or the last thing I wish we could do is, I wish we could find a way for faculty to have a seat at the table during the budget planning process, rather than finding out later -- and institutionalize that. There have been committees that have been set up. Faculty get to sit on them, but not in a systematic way.

“So the faculty is not building institutional knowledge about -- we don't have a lot of institutional memory, actually, about what's gone on in the budget planning process, and it would be good if we had that. And that's something I think the FPC would like to push for next year. And that's it.”

Speaker Lewenstein: "Questions? Okay. Thank you."

(APPLAUSE)

"I apologize that we have such a crowded agenda today. I found the missing slide. It's coming up in about five slides."

"Next on the agenda is a report on the enabling legislation for research professor, and Kimberly O'Brien and Robert van Dover."

6. **REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDON AND PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF THE FACULTY (SLIDES)**

Professor Kimberly O'Brien, Nutritional Sciences: "I'm Kimberly O'Brien, a member of the Committee of Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty. You can see that Elizabeth Adkins-Regan chairs this committee. She is out of the country, and I drew the short straw, so I will be presenting this today. Fortunately, there's several other members of the committee here, so they are available to help answer questions, if anyone has any questions following this presentation.

"So as a brief preamble, as you are all aware, in 2002, the University Faculty Senate approved legislation to make titles for non-tenured track faculty that had primarily teaching roles, so that was the clinical professor title. And then last year, additional legislation was passed to approve another title, the professor of practice title. So those two titles are for individuals that have primarily lecture roles. At the 2002 period, I guess there was discussion of enacting a research professor title, but that was tabled at that time.

"So from that period of time, what Cornell has been utilizing is an alternate set of titles that is non-standard in relation to our peers. So what we have is a senior scientist, a research scientist and a principal research scientist title. So this legislation is to replace those titles with more comparable titles to our peer institutions, which is assistant, associate and full research professor titles.

"So over this past year, our committee met twice to discuss this legislation. During our meetings, we considered feedback from multiple other leaders on campus and how enactment of this legislation would impact their units. We also considered feedback from President-elect Garrett. That feedback has been

circulated to you. Hopefully, you have had opportunities to read her opinions on this legislation.

“We compared the duties and the benefits of individuals with this title in relation to individuals that hold the existing nonstandard titles that have comparable roles. We also delineated the restrictions of these titles and how these titles would differ from individuals that hold tenure track titles. And the goal today is just to present to you an overview of our discussion, highlighting some of the advantages and disadvantages that came up during their discussion of this legislation, with the goal of either voting on this now, if you see fit, or tabling this until the fall.

“So there were a number of arguments put forward in favor of this legislation. First and foremost, Cornell really is one of the only major universities at present that does not use the more standard title. Princeton also doesn't use this research professor title. While that alone would not be sufficient to adopt this, there is feedback from individuals that have found that use of this nontraditional title has been problematic at a number of levels, particularly in individuals that are looking for research funding and in a number of other examples that I'll provide to you shortly.

“So adopting these titles is thought, from the leadership and the individuals who wrote in, it was a strong opinion from many individuals across campus that adopting these titles is going to aid Cornell in recruiting individuals. This is particularly true in the dual-career context, when there are not two tenured-track faculty positions available; and you're trying to recruit a highly qualified scientist who is renowned in their own regard. These individuals they are not looking for a tenure-track position, yet they are not satisfied with the type of titles we have available, since they would be able to find a position elsewhere that has a more standard title available. They believe that such titles would be more amenable to them finding external funding and also to be a more sustainable title.

“Some of these issues have been raised by individuals and leaders on campus as really limiting their ability to both hire new faculty and retain faculty that they have currently. Others on campus have mentioned that adoption of these titles would help in building their research enterprises and their research programs. Furthermore, having additional individuals with research capacity that's not split between teaching and research, they would be able to build particular programs. Research Professors could help manage labs; they could submit grants as principal investigators; they could help go externally and present research. And

this would be an added benefit to programs that would help sustain Cornell and make many of the departments more competitive externally.

“As you saw in the memo that was submitted by President-elect Garrett, she was highly supportive of this legislation. She was surprised that we didn't already have this legislation, and she mirrors many of the same comments that we got from individuals across campus; that this really has facilitated in her mind their retention and recruitment of faculty at her institution.

“There were arguments against this. Some of the primary concerns raised by individuals is that by adopting this non-tenure track title, it would eventually erode the need for tenured positions and eventually dissolve tenure at this university or tenure-track lines. That wasn't something that was a huge problem, but that was the primary concern that was raised.

“So on balance, the committee thought the benefits of this legislation outweighed the disadvantages. There were clear delineations between these non-tenure track research roles and the tenure-track positions. These titles are truly research positions that are meant to supplement, not replace, the tenure-track lines. The ground rules for these new titles are the same as the existing titles that Cornell already has.

“The use of these titles would need to go through a multi-tiered adoption process within individual units, so units would need to adopt them with a two-thirds majority vote internally, of both tenured and non-tenured track faculty, within their individual units.

“No more than 10% of the faculty within individual units can hold these positions. If units deem it necessary, they can restrict that even further. So this was an additional criterion put into place to alleviate some of the concerns that people have with this title replacing the tenure-track faculty, and that these appointments are meant to be for highly qualified research scientists who would have term appointments, but these term appointments could be renewed indefinitely.

“So that's basically a summary of what we have discussed at the last two meetings. Anyone that's on the committee wants to add or elaborate on anything that I've said -- yes, Bruce. “

Professor Bruce Van Dover, Materials Science: "I'm on CAFPS. One point is that these research professors would not be allowed to teach. They could teach on occasion one course or something like that, but it's actually explicit that they cannot teach consecutive terms, for example, so they would not replace teaching positions."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Okay, discussion. We have about 15 minutes."

Unidentified Speaker: "I wonder if the committee has looked at other peer institutions who have these titles and see what happens long-term to individuals who are hired with those titles. And I have to admit that I'm biased. My spouse and I came here at the same time to two tenured positions, and that is actually a reason why we're here. When I look at my friends who were hired as tenure-track faculty and spouses hired into positions of this kind, I would say the sample size is small, but it's been problematic."

Professor O'Brien: "Right. The committee wasn't tasked to trying to garner information on satisfaction with these titles at other institutions, per se, so I don't know if any other individuals on the committee want to talk about this particular issue.

"I also came from an institution that had probably more non-tenure track positions than tenure-track positions. Came here from Johns Hopkins, and there was also a lot of dissatisfaction from faculty who were in those non-tenured track positions; but that was just the way that the university was run on soft money. So it was just an issue with the financial infrastructure. So a lot of people were disgruntled, even those in the tenure-track line, based on how the finances were run.

"Does anyone else on the committee want to respond to that comment?"

Professor Charles Brittain, Classics: "I was interested by your phrasing, when you said that the idea that it would not be a huge problem on tenure because that seemed like a pretty huge problem to me. It's clear, from your committee, you have decided it's not a huge problem, but I don't understand why it isn't a huge problem.

"And so some of these measures of limiting the damage that no more than 10% and trying to get rules, as you just mentioned, sort of saying that you can't teach if you are a Research Professor, they seem like positive ways to try to mitigate

the threat of this; but the idea that it is a threat seems to be clearly admitted by those very procedures.

“And it seemed to me that if we have a few people who we can't hire because they're too proud to be called senior research scientist, that weighs almost nothing compared to the danger to the tenure system. And the danger to the tenure system is a real danger. You are looking around the country at what is actually happening, and we can't just say it is paranoia. It is happening at what used to be peer institutions, so I don't think that's not a huge problem. I think that it is a huge problem, the huge problem of this proposal.”

Professor O'Brien: “Yeah. I didn't mean to downplay that concern or to disparage people's concerns with that issue in general. I meant to insinuate, or to try to convey, that was a lot of attention to that concern and that there was a lot of criteria put into place to try and manage it, in a much more structured way. For example, the cap on the number of faculty that could be brought in with this position, to keep it at a level that was considered to be reasonable. Maybe others on the committee can comment on or elaborate on that. Do you want to say something, Tracy?”

Professor Tracy Stokol, Population Medicine and Diagnostic Science: “I'm on CAFPS, and I would agree with what was said. And just to reiterate that we really did discuss this a lot, because that was the biggest concern raised with the committee in discussion with John Siciliano about this. And we did think that putting these limitations in place would help mitigate it, but it's definitely not going to alleviate the concerns of having this title in place.”

Professor Ken Birman, Computer Science: “I don't want in any way to belittle your concern, because I understand it deeply, but it seems to me that there's another concern, which is the professional courtesy that we do or do not extend to our colleagues.

“We have prominent research centers at Cornell, the Atkinson Center that works with CARE International on agriculture for the world's poorest, and helping people climb out of that kind of poverty; or the nano-fabrication facility, where they work on artificial retinas, and the kinds of researchers who come to work full-time at Cornell on research and who don't have any significant teaching activity are funded on soft money, and these individuals are inhibited in their career.

"We harm their career, if they come here, because they're unable to have the professorial titles they would have at any of our peer institutions, with the one exception being Princeton -- and even Princeton debates this issue. Furthermore, they are harmed in their ability to bring in soft money, which is the sole form of support for this type of title.

"So while I completely understand your concern about tenure, I actually do not see this title as a threat to tenure. It's limited as to numbers. These individuals can't replace us as teachers, and yet the crux of the tenure system is that we are supported by the university because we teach in support of our research. We are not full-time researchers.

"I also think this title would offer a type of a phased retirement for a person who's been active, successfully bringing in research, but who hesitates to become emeritus, because they might lose access to their labs and to research funding. And as noted, and by several of the deans and President Garrett, the research funding success for people who apply for major grants without professorial titles is much inhibited. Lance Collins speaks specifically to this in his remarks on the Senate web site.

"So some of our colleagues would be afraid of losing something that they depend upon. This type of a title would mean that some of our heavily paid, more senior faculty might be able to stage a retirement and be replaced by junior people. I strongly support this. I have colleagues who I would like to be offered this type of a title, and I hope that the senate will support it as well."

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Earth, Atmospheric Sciences: "Two issues. The first one, the document does not specify whether you can have this appointment based on one FTE or a half-FTE. This is important. Most of the money for this will be coming from grants and contracts. It's not easy to raise one FTE. So I hope there's flexibility in the FTE, especially for dual-career people. They may need that.

"The other issue: traditionally, the research title and scientist usually are really second-class citizens here for the 40 years plus I'm at Cornell. So I support this. However, I don't like this issue of nonvoting members. For God's sake, you allow emeritus professors to vote, you should allow these hard-working, money-making scientists to be able to vote. So this really needs to be reconsidered and looked at again."

Professor Ted Clark, Microbiology and Immunology: "I'm also strongly in support of this title. Personally, I'm quite concerned about the replacement issue; but in fact, these titles already exist. I mean, people already exist in these positions. We're just changing the title that they already have to one that I think could benefit them greatly and benefit the units in the colleges, where the title is appropriate.

"And given the restrictions, I don't really see this as that big of a problem. In the last 20 years, since I've been here, I haven't seen an increase at all in the number of people that fill these positions. It's pretty steady. I don't have an actual record of that, but just from what I've seen, it's not as though those positions have increased significantly over time."

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical, and Computer Engineering: "I support the resolution. However, I think that we have to be careful going forward. For one thing, when I read the text accompanying the resolution, it never really defined what unit meant. And if you define a unit to be big enough, then chicanery can take place.

"For example, a good way for a dean to kill a department would be to approve searches only for that department for a clinical, who only teach and do research, and then have those people all of a sudden all serving at the pleasure of the dean. And then boom, there goes to department. That's a danger. So I think we have to be careful defining what the unit means.

"And of course, the evil limiting case that the 10% rule is trying to prevent is a situation where you have a department consisting only of folks who only do research on soft money, who get routinely renewed every ten years, and folks who only teach and who get routinely fired when there's a budget cut. And that's what I worry about, if the unit is not carefully defined."

Professor Thomas Björkman, Horticulture: "So one of the questions is that the titles that we have now haven't been successful. Do you have a number on how many people actually hold those three titles right now and how many roughly senior research associates do we have who might be interested in changing?"

Professor O'Brien: "It's like 15. There's about 15 people who have those existing titles. And people can apply that don't have those existing titles now, but they would be subject to all the criteria that are necessary to get into these titles. They would need to have the level of independence and professional criteria needed to

get into these titles. They wouldn't just be able to move, if they don't really have the existing titles that they are replacing.”

Professor Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology and Genetics: “My department strongly supports this resolution. We have several senior scientists -- research scientists already in our department, and they are significantly hindered in their ability to compete for funding as independent researchers, so this would significantly impact them.

“It certainly would not preclude dual hires, when both people are of the caliber that we're looking for in terms of tenure-track faculty. So I don't see it having a negative impact in that case. And the research scientists that we have in our department are people who have chosen that path, and so it's not a negative thing for them. They are here because that's what fits them.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Seeing no further discussion, shall we move to a vote?”

Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine, and a member of the University Faculty Committee: “I wasn't quite sure when to say this, but I would like to move that we delay the vote until the fall. And I would be happy to give my reasons for that, if this is the appropriate time to do that.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Why don't we have a discussion on whether or not --”

Professor Fewtrell: “Okay, so I think we have raised a number of concerns here, we've raised a number of very strong reasons to support this, but my reason for wanting to delay the vote is that I only heard about this ten days ago.

“I'm a member of the UFC. I wasn't aware that this was about to come before the university. So I would imagine that people who are less connected than I am only found out about it when they got -- a week before the meeting.

“This is a really important issue, it's one that affects the whole of the university, and I think that anything that comes before the faculty senate should not be conveyed to the faculty a week before, and then voted on immediately. And I was really surprised that happens.

“In the Vet College where I am, any important motion is brought before the faculty a month before it comes up for a vote, so I would like to allow the

university the time to discuss this over the summer, and then vote for it at the first meeting in the fall.”

Professor Birman: “I would like to argue we should go forward with the vote on the motion, and I'll give several reasons. First of all, this language began to circulate four years ago. It reached the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty two years ago. When the professor of the practice title was introduced, we were informed as a senate that there was also a research professor title under discussion. So this is a proposal now that's been under discussion by committees of the senate for years, and has been greatly perfected, I would say, from the version that originally was circulated.

“So although it reached the UFC and the Senate at the last moment in this session, I do think there's been awareness of this among those of us pushing for it. And this is four years -- since 2002, many years that our colleagues have been inhibited by the lack of a title with stature comparable to what they would have at other institutions.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “So it's been moved to table. Is there a second for that motion? Motion is seconded. Let's use the clickers. Be sure it's turned on. And A will be yes. B will be no, to not table. C is abstain. Make sure your clicker is on. A is in favor of tabling, B is a no, not to table. And C is to abstain.

“Does anybody think they haven't voted, and are meaning to? Stop the vote. 21 votes to table, 39 votes to not table, which is over 50%, which is what is required for a motion -- so we will not table the motion, in which case we now move to a vote on the motion for the resolution for the research professors.

“So again, A is in favor of the resolution for research professors, B is against the resolution for research professors, and C is abstain. A is in favor of research professors, B is against the resolution, C is to abstain. Looks like there's still two votes outstanding. A is in favor of the resolution, B is against it, C is to abstain. I have one fewer vote than we had last time. I hope it's not a deciding vote. Does anybody think they haven't voted who wants to? We'll stop.

“Vote is 73% (43 yes, 16 no) in favor of the resolution to establish the title of research professor, and so the resolution passes. Thank you. We now move on to the next.”

7. [PRESENTATION BY RISA LIEBERWITZ, MEMBER OF THE UFC - SLIDES](#)

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations and a member of the University Faculty Committee: "So part of the [resolution](#) that I'm talking about shows up here. It's not all fitting on this screen, but hopefully, you have had a chance to read it and, as necessary, I'll move the screen so you can see more of it; but at any rate, the resolution I'm talking about today concerns events and issues that have very much been in the public eye as of late.

"As noted in "the whereas" paragraphs of the resolution, the initiating events concerned recent reports of intimidating and aggressive interrogation and threats by Cornell police towards students. And this was alleged to have taken place in April of this year. The resolution we are considering today calls for the Faculty Senate to charge the UFC with creating an independent ad hoc faculty committee to investigate these events that have been reported and to investigate the issues raised by the events.

"As I said, this has been in the public eye. There's been a significant amount of reporting in the local and national media on these incidents. The reports on the situation describe Cornell police conduct. The reports also describe the complaint being investigated by the Cornell police as a complaint that concerned an alleged event of somebody putting up a screen saver in a computer in the Hotel School, in a room where the trustees were scheduled to meet.

"Now, the reports on this situation led to public statements of concern by many Cornell faculty about the Cornell administration and Cornell police conduct. As you may know, more than 100 Cornell faculty signed a letter that was sent to Cornell administration and published in "The Cornell Daily Sun," expressing a grave concern about the situation.

"Since that time of the initial reports and that letter, some faculty, including the UFC -- and I am also on the UFC -- have heard the audiotape of the Cornell police officers' interview with the student in question, Daniel Marshall, on April 21.

"And the tape includes statements by the police officer attempting to get Mr. Marshall to answer questions by telling him things about pending charges, pending criminal charges existing, the D felony of burglary, which carries a sentence of three to seven years, as well as two misdemeanor charges.

“The police officer says that if Mr. Marshall cooperates, the Cornell police will use their discretion to make the felony charge go away and even have it reduced to a disorderly conduct charge. If Daniel Marshall doesn't cooperate, in the interview, the police officer says he will likely walk into one of Daniel's classes, walk him out in handcuffs, take him to the Sheriff's department, process him and put him in front of a judge, who will decide whether Daniel should go to jail.

“And the police officer emphasizes the consequences of a felony on Daniel's record. "It will stick with you forever," he says, "and you will not get a job."

“Now, these are to give you a sense, if you haven't already read or heard about it, of the kinds of statements that were made in that interview. Now, as I'm also assuming that most of you have heard, the Cornell administration has issued a public statement. They issued that on May 4th, informing us that it has withdrawn the complaint that it filed, the administration filed with the Cornell police in this manner.

“The Cornell administration statement also says Daniel Marshall, the student, has acknowledged a violation of the Cornell campus code, though it's not clear what part of the code. The Cornell administration's withdrawal of the complaint does not obviate the need for an independent investigation by a faculty committee. What I'd like to turn to now is to discuss the multiple reasons why an independent faculty investigative committee is and remains appropriate and important.

“So first, generally, faculty have a concern with fair and just treatment of our students. This includes policy about how the Cornell police and administrators conduct themselves on this campus, and whether the Cornell police and administrators' responses are proportionate to the nature of complaints being investigated.

“Now, in this particular case, there are additional concerns beyond general fairness, and those additional concerns are raised by the reported actions of the Cornell police and the Cornell administration, which will be part of any faculty committee's investigation.

“And concerns raised by the reports that will be part of a faculty committee's investigation concern the fact that the police interrogation by the Cornell police and other actions targeted students protesting university policies.

“As noted in the resolution, the Cornell administration is responsible for the Cornell police actions and, indeed, the Cornell administration has made public statements about its role in this case. The nature of the reported conduct by the Cornell police and the administration raises significant issues about the potential chilling effect on free speech and academic freedom of students and faculty. And those are the particular concerns related to the fact that we have student protesters involved.

“Now, academic freedom and free speech both include the right of students and faculty to dissent from university policies and practices; therefore, the reported incidents raise concerns about whether the Cornell police and administrators interfered with academic freedom and free speech of the student protesters. And as importantly, the reported actions of Cornell police and administrators raise concerns about the potential chilling effect on other students and faculty who may now fear engaging in dissent.

“Now, as noted in the resolution -- that's at the top here -- as noted in the resolution, the Faculty Senate has had recent experience with such an independent faculty investigation, of reported misconduct by Cornell police and administrators. The faculty investigating committee of the Ho Plaza incident -- and that incident was in November 2012 -- provided an independent faculty report, issued in May 2013, concerning the conduct of Cornell police and administrators and the academic freedom and free speech concerns that were raised by it.

“That was a very successful investigation, and so the resolution today calls on the Faculty Senate to initiate another independent faculty investigative committee to engage in a full investigation, to provide a report of its findings and to make recommendations, as appropriate.

“That's the “be it resolved part.” So there's also the “be it further resolved,” about what we are asking the investigative committee to do.

“Now, as I noted earlier, the Cornell administration's withdrawal of its complaint does not obviate the need for an independent investigation by a faculty committee. The concerns raised about the conduct of the Cornell police and administrators remain. We need a faculty committee to determine what happened and whether there has been a negative impact and a chilling effect on student and faculty rights of free speech and academic freedom.

"These are policy matters that are crucial for the Faculty Senate to address. The faculty investigative committee would gather information and would make recommendations, as appropriate, on policy matters listed in the "be it resolved" and "further resolved" sections of the resolution.

"So there would be, for example, information about investigative techniques that the Cornell police use, about protocols governing the role and conduct of the Cornell police, investigation about the role of the Cornell administration in these events, and information and recommendations concerning academic freedom and freedom of expression, whether that was interfered with, whether there's a chilling effect on others, and recommendations, as appropriate, to ensure that the Cornell police and administrators take active steps to protect freedom of expression and academic freedom at Cornell. And so I urge the Senate to approve this resolution."

Professor Birman: "I just want to express a concern about the scope of the motion relative to the event. As I understand the event, Mr. Marshall has actually admitted to breaking into a locked room at Statler, which we operate -- which we operate as a private hotel. And Cornell was previously charging him with breaking and entering and has agreed to drop those charges, and he'll be referred to the Judicial Administrator.

"This seems to be an appropriate response, and the description of the police officer describing the consequences of being found guilty of breaking and entering, while colorful, don't strike me as terribly inappropriate. And I don't understand why we need such a broad inquiry, triggered by what appears to be a single event."

Professor Lieberwitz: "Could I just make a quick response? First of all, there hasn't been any report about what Mr. Marshall actually admitted to with regard to the campus code, so we don't know that, but I think that there's two points: One is that we need an independent faculty committee to look at everything and to consider everything, including whether there was a disproportionate response by the police in the threat of bringing a felony that would stick with you forever, and believe me, you won't get a job, those kind of statements; but that's the nature of the investigation.

"Plus, the UFC considered this and, in fact, believed that it was very important not to focus only on a single police officer, but also to look more broadly at the way in which protocols are being used and whether there are police protocols

that, in fact, encourage inappropriate behavior, since we are a university. This is not any old place. This is a university, with academic freedom and free speech.”

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: “Let me say, the issue of the fee is extremely bad. I was standing there and thinking, and it's very unfortunate we have a fee for so many reasons. And I completely agree with the students that it's absolutely no need to be a fee for so many reasons, okay.

“Given that, I'm going to vote no for this resolution for several reasons. The number one reason is that for me, I feel that the big problem at Cornell is not the problem that the police is imposed on the student, but the problem is the real, very aggressive students who pose a problem on us.

“And I, myself have been -- really felt threatened, and other people had been physically violent against them, where the Cornell police didn't do anything, mainly because of being afraid and that, oh, we should not do. If there's something to be done, the Cornell police should make sure that I can go here on campus for free.

“And the second reason is this committee that happened in 2012. Unfortunately, while you said that this was a successful investigation, unfortunately, it was an extremely bad investigation. I was there, and I testified to the committee. And as you remember, the anti-Israeli people came with dogs against us. And when we were -- oh, no, there was no dogs. There was puppies. There was puppies. There was no dogs. There was no dogs, huh? There is absolutely dogs, okay? There were dogs, okay? No, I think it's extremely important. I think it's extremely important they don't interrupt me. There were dogs, okay?

“Now, we were there, and they asked me what's happened. I said, it was extremely bad that people come with dogs, just because of political disagreement. Then, when the report came, when the report came, there was no mention of the dogs. Then we asked why you didn't mention the dogs. They said we forgot. That was the committee remarks, okay. Now, if the committee remarks want to do whatever they want, if they have an academic agenda, what are we gaining? A committee should come and look for the facts and talk about the facts, okay. So I think -- yes, okay. Okay.”

Professor Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering: “I would like to encourage you to support this resolution. I don't think it's appropriate to talk too much about the details of the case, but maybe very briefly; this was triggered by a picture on

Facebook of a different screen on a computer monitor in a room that is often used as a classroom, and a piece of paper posted on a wall.

“So if, in fact, those are the events that triggered a police investigation that threatened students with felonies, I think that's something that would be very concerning to many of us. We don't know yet. Right now there's not enough information to know whether this student broke into a room, in which case, I would agree with Professor Birman, but we currently don't know that. That information is not available, and I think we owe it to ourselves, as a faculty, to take the time to discover this information, to understand what happened, and to determine whether or not there needs to be changes in protocols for engaging the police and investigating student behavior and how the police interact with students.

“Right now, we don't know, and the goal of this committee is to find out what happened, who made decisions when, and to determine whether or not there was any wrongdoing on the part of the police, the administration or potentially the students. So I would strongly encourage you to support this resolution.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Professor Walcott.”

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: “I've been asked to read a statement by Kathy Zoner, Cornell's chief of police. And I do this as Ombudsman; therefore, I take no position. I am simply reading a letter.

Letter from Police Chief Zoner:

"I apologize for not being able to be here in person tonight as I have a family obligation during the time of this meeting that I am unable to reschedule. I have asked Bruce to read this statement from me and to emphasize that my preference would be in front of you delivering it personally. As many of you know, I am open to having conversations on any matter that does not violate someone's right to privacy or confidentiality, so if, after you hear this you wish to contact me, please do so.

“The Cornell Police investigate a broad range of complaints, from serious felonies to non- criminal violations of the Campus Code. By law, they have the authority to enforce the general criminal law of the State of New York; by oath, we are committed to impartial and respectful service to our community. Whether a suspect in a criminal act is a student or not does not dictate the manner in which we investigate or conduct our interviews, and I learned long ago that a person's

enrollment or affiliation in any institution of higher education does not preclude them from committing or being held accountable for criminal acts.

“I will not comment on the specifics of the case under review. However, I can tell you that we currently do not have any complaints filed by anyone, student or otherwise, who claims to have been subjected to improper treatment or interviewing tactics. The Cornell Police have a robust internal complaint process. We investigate all complaints of misconduct received from aggrieved individuals and disciplinary action will be taken against an officer who is found to have violated policy, procedure or law. I am not aware of any instance where the current oversight process has not worked.

“I am familiar with the issue you will be discussing this afternoon, and I have no concern sharing with you that the officer used widely accepted, approved and legal procedures for interviewing. I can understand why one might interpret certain words as unnecessarily harsh, particularly where they involve potential police actions inside a classroom. I and my leadership team, even without a complaint, have spoken with the officer and are reviewing our policies and procedures. As you might suspect, if we accepted at face value responses from people we interview without further pressing, the vast majority of crimes on campus would go unsolved.

“To be clear, students interviewed by the Cornell Police are permitted to have lawyers, advisors, or the Judicial Codes Counselor attend interviews. Students who are suspects in criminal cases are given their constitutional rights and may voluntarily waive them. No student is compelled to speak with the police. A student is permitted to stop an interview at any time. These same rules apply to non-students. I am not aware of nor would I condone any effort to intimidate, coerce, silence, or punish protestors, and in fact we operate in quite the opposite vein. My officers have always made attempts to work with individuals and groups to assist in having their voices be heard, regardless of the message or who is delivering it. To do so otherwise would be biased- our efforts are directed toward maintaining public order and enforcement of the law within the bounds of permissible free speech. Most times, in my 24 years here, the efforts were appreciated and often sought after.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “We reached time.”

Professor Walcott: “That is not the end of the letter, but I have read what I can.”

Portion of Police Chief Zoner's Letter that was not read at meeting due to time constraints:

["Currently that may not be the case; we accept that and will continue to offer our expertise and assistance for all events, including protests. I can tell you unequivocally that, although we were asked to investigate criminal acts that were committed prior to the Trustee's meeting on March 26th, we did not - and would not - take any action intended to discourage protests on campus.

"I have personally witnessed outrageous conduct where criminal charges and/or Campus Code proceedings would certainly have been warranted, by police discretion or by complaint from others. Had such conduct occurred in your offices or your classrooms or at your homes, I suspect you would have wanted intervention by law enforcement, and you would have received it if requested. Our officers are very well trained in matters of the constitution, the law, and our campus code. They receive ongoing in-service training in community interaction, case law and police procedures. While most often we are received well on campus, officers are still subjected to condescending, derogatory comments from non-affiliates, faculty, staff and students on a regular basis. Despite this, my expectations for my officer's behavior and tolerance for this type of address are very high, and they will always be so."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you. The gentleman with his glasses on his head, along the aisle."

Professor Ronald Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior: "To be honest, I don't see a reason not to have a committee look into this, but it seems as though we really don't know what happened. And what I see in this particular proposal or resolution is that you're almost assuming that there will be a need for disciplinary action.

"I think it would be better just to have an investigation, as opposed to actually outlining possible disciplinary actions, procedures, primarily because I think the task of doing that would be somewhat cumbersome, if you think about first doing the background work to find out exactly what happened, and then the follow-through. There must be other -- let's get a report back first, and then talk about how we actually go through this process of changing procedures.

"Secondly, to be honest, and this is why I'm a little ambiguous, the door to my office is open all the time. I have several computers and other technical equipment that I would like people not necessarily to touch. If there was a computer in a room, that even if it's unlocked, and someone who does not have

the authority to deal with that equipment, I want to know which faculty member in this audience would say it's okay, if someone touched their personal computer, their work computers, and feel as though it's okay.

"Well, you would do that? Okay. I wouldn't, because it --"

Speaker Lewenstein: "Order."

Professor Booker: "So if they screw your data up, that's fine?"

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Franck."

Professor Carl Franck, Physics: "I strongly, deeply appreciate the UFC and the committee for bringing us this proposal. I would refer anyone to Dale Corson's speech about his experience regarding -- as President and making use of the police. And I think he was very prudent, and I think there could well be a lack of judgment apparent here. And I'm frankly offended by the kind of interview that the student occurred, and I wasn't too clear on this until I heard your words. Thank you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "We've reached time on this item. We have gone beyond time on this item. Somebody wish to call for action?"

"Question has been called. Is there a second? It's been seconded.

"Requires a two-thirds vote of those present, because the rules for calling the question -- am I correct, parliamentarian?"

"Fifty percent. Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I was thinking of something different.

"So, on your clickers, A is calling the question, calling for a vote. B is not calling for a vote, C is abstain.

"We're not actually voting yet. This is on whether or not we should vote. So A is calling for a vote, B is not calling for a vote, C is abstaining.

[Unrecorded question]

"No, because we are out of time on the discussion. It's tabled automatically, I guess. Would that be what's happened? I believe that would mean the resolution could be brought back in the fall, if we -- procedurally, we need to

make the decision on calling the question. After the vote on calling a question, there can be a vote on extending time.

“So we are voting on whether or not to vote on the resolution, in which case A is for having a vote, B is against having a vote, and I think I can predict that there will then be a motion to extend time. And C is to abstain.

“So the question has been called.

“We will now vote on the resolution. So there's a new vote now. A is in favor of the resolution to appoint the committee, B is against the resolution, C is to abstain.

“Any additional votes? The resolution passes to appoint the committee.
(APPLAUSE)

“We have one last item on the agenda, for which I call Dean Burns or Rosemary Avery. Dean Burns.”

Dean Burns: “So before we move to the last item on the agenda, I call upon you all who voted for us to have a committee to give me some names and some reasons why those people should serve on the committee; even volunteer yourself, God forbid. So that's that.

“The last item on the agenda is to recognize the retirement of Susan Murphy. Rosemary Avery was going to speak, but she has ceded her time directly to Susan, so we could finish our meeting on time. Susan, we'd like to hear your remarks.”

8. RECOGNITION OF SUSAN MURPHY ON HER RETIREMENT

Vice President Susan Murphy: “My remarks will be very brief, other than to say thank you very much for 37 extraordinary years here at the university. I began as an associate director of admissions and began my work with this Faculty Senate as director of financial aid, when we were debating policies about our financial aid policy. So it's rather timely that come this fall, there will be a faculty forum on the future of financial aid.

“Then-Dean Peter Stein and I, and many of our colleagues literally visited almost every faculty department to talk about the challenges of financial aid. In 21 years as vice president, I have worked closely with many of you in your committee

structure, particularly the Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education, and with the whole Senate.

“Mostly, I want to say to you and hope you will convey to your faculty colleagues, your role as advisors and as teachers for our students make all the difference in their world here, and especially your roles outside the formal definition of being a faculty member. As faculty fellows, faculty in residence, house fellows, house deans, team advisors, organization advisors, you bring an awareness to our students about a faculty life, the excitement of the life of the mind and this faculty as human beings and concerned adults in their development. And it's been my privilege to have you as partners in what has been a treasured career. I thank you.”

(APPLAUSE)

Speaker Lewenstein: “Before we adjourn, I would like to invite everyone to partake of the goodies that have been brought in honor of Vice President Murphy. I wish you all a good summer, and I declare the meeting adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)