

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING

May 10, 2000

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior, Speaker: "I'd like to remind you that there are no cameras or tape recorders allowed in the meeting. We have just one Good and Welfare presentation from Susan Murphy and Kathryn Abrams. I would now like to call on Dean Cooke for remarks."

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "I wish to call you attention to the deaths that have occurred in the faculty this academic year. I'll read them ([Appendix A](#), attached) and then I'll ask you to rise and pause for a moment.

"We have some major reports this meeting, including elections, reports from the UFC on principles of cooperation and consultation, a major report on Computing and Information Science and on discussions we've had throughout the year, a faculty salaries discussion, and a report from Ethics and Student Life. We also have a resolution on TIAA investments and a resolution dealing with distance learning for over the summer.

"I have three special things I wish to do before I yield the podium, and that is to recognize three important people to this group. The first is Anna Gravino, who is the person who has been transcribing all of our minutes for two years and all of the minutes for the Faculty Forums. She is graduating this year. (Applause).

"The second is the Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty, Kathleen Rasmussen, who is completing a three-year term on June 30. She has rendered exemplary service to this body as Associate Dean and most especially I appreciate the dedicated work she has done for the Nominations and Elections Committee, which we get reports from at every meeting. It's an extraordinarily difficult task and one that essentially holds this organization together. Thank you, Kathy. (Applause).

"The third is Judy Bower, who is Executive Staff Assistant Extraordinaire. She will be retiring on June 30 after 27 years in the Office of the Dean of Faculty. She has worked with 7 deans of faculty, Norman Penney, Byron Saunders, Kenneth Greisen, Joseph Bugliari, Walter Lynn, Peter Stein, and myself. For 17 of those years, she was Executive Staff Assistant and for 10 years she was the Administrative Aide. Her duties have dramatically increased in the last few years and she has provided the institutional memory and the good sense to advise the dean to keep him out of trouble most of the time. She is going to be sorely missed. Most of her work is out of your view, things like tenure reviews, grievances, and other confidential matters, but she is very intelligent and handles those confidently and knows not to discuss them. She prefers working behind the scenes so much so that she asked me if it was alright if she didn't come this afternoon. I told her this was not punishment and that would be fine. I'm still amazed by the kinds of things that employees at this University are able to do. Imagine the last two years before you retire being asked to be webmaster for a website that serves the entire University so that if anything goes wrong it is highly visible. That illustrates the kinds of things she was willing to take on that exhibited her professionalism. Because I have been the one who has been most closely associated and benefited the most from her services, I'm going to break my own, self-imposed, tradition of not introducing resolutions or debating them before the Senate. I wish to introduce a motion, a resolution ([Appendix B](#), attached) honoring Judy." (Applause).

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. Professor Stein?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I'd like to just take a moment to add my words of appreciation for what Judy has done for the whole operation of faculty governance. I was her supervisor before Bob for five years, and

she did indeed have a remarkable ability to be the institutional memory for the University Faculty and, as far as I can tell, for all of Cornell. Just as an example, the other day I was looking for some obscure office and I couldn't find it in the phone book and I called several people who referred me to this person or that person. I went back to the first person I had called and she said, 'Why are you wasting time, just call Judy and ask her.' I did call Judy and ask her and she told me exactly where to go. (Laughter and applause). Quite rightly. (Laughter). As I said, I want to echo Bob's words to thank her. I'm sorry she's not here to see it, but I'm sure she will accurately edit this when it appears in the minutes. I want to thank you for all of years of service to the University Faculty."

Speaker Howland; "Thank you. Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion, say 'aye.' Hearing no objections, I hear a unanimous vote. I'd like now to call on Provost-designate Bidy Martin for some remarks and discussion.

2. REMARKS AND DISCUSSION BY PROVOST-DESIGNATE BIDDY MARTIN

Professor Bidy Martin, German Studies, and Provost-designate: "I actually gave five of the ten minutes I was awarded because the agenda is so packed today, so I'll be very brief and even briefer than I had intended to be. You know already that I've been working with the UFC to come up with the agreement that we will discuss later. I just want to say that it was a completely pleasant and interesting experience. I feel very happy with the principles that we have articulated together and to which we agreed. Beyond that, I guess what I want to say is that I'm preoccupied with the afternoon I just had, which reflects many days that I have had over the past several months. I got to spend the first part of the afternoon with faculty from Earth and Atmospheric Sciences watching the storm and I got to spend the latter part of the afternoon watching the pre-fusion interaction of two vesicles - I think from a muscle cell of a horse. Actually, the opportunity and the experience of going from department to department on campus have been extraordinarily enriching. It's been enormously pleasurable. If I could go back to college, that would be what I would choose to do now rather than be Provost. This is a tremendous University, with much more going on than I could have dreamed and the combination of what faculty and students are doing would surprise all of you. I will say that if there's one thing to which I'm more committed to after this experience, it would be making sure that more of you get to know more about what's going on in departments and colleges other than your own. It is really amazing. I think we would probably get a long way in our efforts in the direction of decision-making, with more transparency and openness if all of us knew more about what each of us was doing. It's really heartening and I would like to thank all of you as representatives of your department. You should please go back and thank your departments for preparing the wonderful tours and visits to which I've been treated. I'll be treated to a lot more in the next few weeks, and I am enjoying them enormously. At the moment, I'm preoccupied with visits to departments in Engineering and I've been having an absolutely wonderful time. I thank you all.

"I'm not sure whether I'm supposed to take questions, but before I sit down I want to take this occasion to have us all thank Bert Garza. He has decided to go back to his role as a researcher and faculty member in Nutrition rather than continue as Vice Provost. Though I am sorry that I won't have his services, I think that it is appropriate to thank Bert here at the Senate meeting. I won't ask you to thank Mary because she will be staying on in a capacity that you've probably already read about and will be discussing this afternoon. I don't have any further remarks about how I will manage. When I'm ready to explain how I'm going to organize things, you'll be the first to know, or maybe the second after some people in my household. In any case, I think it would be appropriate to thank Bert for his extraordinary service as Vice Provost." (Applause).

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I'd like to call now for approval of the minutes from the April 12 Faculty

Senate meeting. Are there any corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, the minutes are approved. I'd now like to call on Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty, Kathleen Rasmussen, for a Nominations and Elections Committee report."

4. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I'd like to begin by reporting the results of the recent election. There are about 1,500 and some odd active faculty and we got about 750 votes casts in this election.

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

Charles Walcott, CALS

Faculty Trustee

Peter Stein, A&S

Faculty Senate-at-Large, Tenured

Elaine Wethington, CHE

Faculty Senate-at-Large, Non-Tenured

Antje Baeumner, CALS

Nominations & Elections Committee

David Delchamps, Engr.

Ann Lemley, CHE

Rosemary Loria, CALS

Timothy Mount, CALS

University Faculty Committee

Peter Bruns, CALS

Terrence Fine, Engr.

Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Vet.

"This is also a very busy time of year for filling the normal rotation of committees. Generally about a third of the committees turn over every year. You have seen some of these and you have not seen others. We did conduct a canvass this year for the first time in a while and it was actually quite successful. I thank you and your colleagues for the nominations that we got. Nearly all of the committees are complete, but we have a long way to go on the University Appeals Panel and the University Assembly. If you know of anyone who would like to serve on the University Assembly, please slip me an e-mail, kmr5, because I would love to know.

Academic Freedom & Professional Status of the Faculty

Alan Bell, CALS

David Bendaniel, JGSM

Stephen DeGloria, CALS

Academic Programs & Policies

Mildred Warner, AAP

Affirmative Action

Jean Hunter, CALS

Pamela Stepp, CALS

Educational Policies

Ray Bryant, CALS

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education

William Cox, CALS

Ronald Ehrenberg, ILR

Robert Gravani, CALS

Financial Policies

Thomas Lyson, CALS

Kay Obendorf, CHE

S. Leigh Phoenix, Engr.

L. Joseph Thomas, JGSM

University Appeals Panel

Paulette Clancy, Engr.

University Assembly

Daniel Schwarz, A&S

University Committee on Conflicts

Larry Palmer, Law

University Faculty Library Board

William Arms, A&S/Engr.

Laura Meixner, A&S

University Lectures

Shelley Feldman, CALS

Kenneth Kennedy, A&S

University-ROTC Relationships

Jennie Farley, ILR

John Wootton, Vet.

"I would like to finish by offering you my thanks for the opportunity to serve you in the last three years. I have learned a great deal and met a lot of wonderful people. I really appreciate the opportunity." (Applause).

Speaker Howland: "I'd like to call now on Professor Risa Lieberwitz, member of the University Faculty Committee, for a resolution on cooperation and consultation between the President and the Faculty Senate."

5. RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THE FACULTY SENATE

Associate Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: "I'm here on behalf of the UFC to present the resolution with regard to the [principles of the agreement](#) that we reached with the administration. Before doing that, I thought I would take a quick minute to remind us how we got here. The resolution that we started with, that we adopted at the last meeting, instructed the UFC to meet with the President and to reach an agreement to try to put into writing principles on faculty governance that would avoid some of the problems that we found in the past. We did go through that process and I would echo what Bidy Martin said, which is that I thought that the process of the UFC meeting with President Rawlings and Provost Bidy Martin really was an important process. It was a good process and it was one of cooperation but I would also say that people were quite committed to putting their positions out on the table and working out places of agreement, places where compromise was needed, and places where people understood why the different positions were being put up. I think that we really achieved a great deal through this process.

"Going on to the actual resolution, I brought overheads of the agreement and we can go through that at an opportune moment, but let me take a couple of minutes first. As you've read, we have the 'Whereases,' which give a quick history and the fact that the Provost, President, and the UFC have met to develop the agreement and we've created this set of principles for future cooperation and consultation. It also reads that we present this resolution and that the Faculty Senate ratifies this document entitled 'Principles of Cooperation and Consultation Between the President and Faculty Senate.' The important paragraph is that the Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty and the UFC to meet with the President and Provost at the end of the 2000-2001 academic year to review the effectiveness of these principles and to consider any needed modifications. Any modifications of these principles will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for ratification. I'm going to address that in a moment.

"As we said in the resolution, we thought this was important to present to you since it was really a resolution calling for a ratification of the principles of the agreement, that we're asking the Faculty Senate either to ratify the agreement as it is written or to reject the document as it is written or to refer it back to the UFC for further negotiations. Of course, throughout the resolution, we're recommending that the document be ratified.

"Let me now spend a moment pointing out what I think are particularly important points ([Appendix C](#), attached) that were achieved in the agreement. All right, I know you've all read it, but there are some points that are important, one of which was that we created a process. Another thing is that Section I is an essential point that we have really been debating and dealing with this last year, which is the clear recognition by the President and the administration that the Faculty Senate is a bona fide representative of the University Faculty and everything that flows from that. The agreement is a provision intended to emphasize the role of the Faculty Senate, the UFC on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Faculty on behalf of the University Faculty, and the Faculty Senate as a representative body, to be involved in early consultation, which will require early notification and early information about the kinds of issues that are occurring on campus and the kinds of issues that are in the early stages of being thought about. That was a particular concern and it shows up in the provisions of Section II and Section III, which provide for early and continual meetings, including an early agenda-setting process between the Provost, the President, and the Dean of the Faculty. The UFC is, of course, a part of this important process of early advising and consultation. Then, with regard to Section V, two joint faculty and administration committees are dealt with. One is the actual joint committee while another is committees created by the central administration and our concern was to put in joint creation of charters whenever possible and as much participation as possible at this point for nominations on those committees. Section VI is extremely important in terms of recognition by the administration of the need for the Faculty Senate to be involved in the process of governance, which means early consultation and enough time for Faculty Senate committees to act when they are appropriately involving the issues and enough time for the Faculty Senate to deliberate and consider these actions after their committees or other bodies. Finally, we engaged the issue of timely responses to Faculty Senate motions and resolutions.

"Again, going back to the resolution there is the provision for potential modification. I think that the resolution, which calls for review at the end of the year between the UFC, the President, and the Provost, is essential because what we are now putting into play is a continual process of interaction between the administration and the Faculty Senate to continue to review whether this is working. If there are needs for changes, they will be suggested and brought back to the Senate for ratification."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The motion is now open for discussion. Yes?"

Professor Stein: "I would just like to say that this seems to me to be a very forward moving and positive resolution. I'm pleased to see it and those of us who were involved in the setting up of the Senate, however many years ago, know that this was a concept on which the Senate was formed. Of course, with any new institution, there are bumps along the way, and I'm pleased to see the original vision translated into the specificity of this document. I congratulate the Provost, the UFC, and the President for agreeing to this."

Speaker Howland: "Further discussion on the motion? Yes?"

Professor Joseph Ballantyne, Electrical Engineering: "I didn't see anything in the principles that dealt with the issue of faculty input to high-level appointments. I'm wondering if that was an issue that was discussed in this context or not?"

Dean Cooke: "Yes it was discussed and there is an agreement between the President and myself that it will be dealt with in a reasonable time scale, soon. It was not put into this document because part of it would require some consultation with the Trustees and so on. But there is clear intention to follow through and we have agreed that we would go and do something."

Speaker Howland: "Further discussion? Yes."

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mathematics: "Just a point of clarification. Part VI talks about extraordinary situations and extraordinary happenings, like if we were to declare war on Columbia

University perhaps. (Laughter). Could you give an example, other than the one that I bring up, that would fall in that category that requires such immediate action that the Senate cannot be included in the discussion?"

Professor Lieberwitz: "I think that it's a good idea to talk about that. I don't myself have any particular examples in mind so maybe someone from the administration would, but what we were trying to do was recognize that, in fact, one can't always anticipate exactly what would come up and it's worded that in such cases, the President and Provost will inform the Dean of the Faculty and seek his or her advice about how to provide for input from the Senate. We were concerned with putting in there that the Faculty Senate would still be involved but, in fact, there may be unanticipated instances, like the one that you mentioned (laughter), where one would have to act more quickly."

Speaker Howland: "Further discussion? Seeing no hands, I think we can proceed directly to the vote. All of those in favor of the resolution before you, say 'aye.' All opposed, say 'nay.' It passes unanimously.

WHEREAS, the University Faculty Committee (UFC) was instructed in the Resolution on Academic Decision-Making Processes (passed by the Senate on April 12, 2000) to develop and present an agreement at the meeting of the Faculty Senate to held on May 10, 2000, and

WHEREAS, the President, Provost-designate and the UFC met to develop such an agreement and have agreed upon a set of principles for future cooperation and consultation,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate ratifies the document titled "Principles of Cooperation and Consultation between the President and Faculty Senate", and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty and the UFC to meet with the President and Provost at the end of the 2000-2001 academic year to review the effectiveness of these principles and to consider any needed modifications. Any modifications of these principles will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for ratification.

"I'd now like to call on Vice Provost Cutberto Garza for a report on Computing and Information Sciences."

6. REPORT ON COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

Professor Cutberto Garza, Nutritional Sciences, Vice Provost: "Good afternoon. I'm going to follow up on a discussion that began in February. I'm not going to go over all of the overheads that I presented, but bring you up to date on how we're going about implementing the proposal that I brought to you. I'm pleased to say that the President and Provost have agreed to pursue the proposal that I presented to the Senate in February.

"Just to refresh everyone's memory, there were four parts to that proposal. The first was about the Dean of Computing and Information Sciences. The position had been created with the objective of moving the University's Computing and Information Sciences initiatives forward in a timely and organized way. There was the creation of a faculty for Computing and Information Sciences that will be used to designate a University-wide faculty body responsible for advising the University on the enhancement of teaching, research, and outreach, related to the Computing and Information Sciences and ensuring the cohesive development of this across the University.

"The FCIS is expected to take a key role in enhancing the quality and breadth of the faculty and assisting in avoiding inappropriate duplication of faculty positions. As you will recall from my discussion in February, the first step in setting up this faculty was developing an initial roster of founding mothers and fathers, if you will, of this body, the charging of the Office of the Provost together with the Dean of Computing and Information

Sciences, the Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Engineering to come together and develop such a roster. I'm pleased to say that we have a list that we've come to agreement on. They come from ten different departments and four different colleges. Because we have been unable to reach all of these individuals, I am not free to tell you who is on the list. There are about 18 people on that list, however, and they will be charged to come together over the summer and develop the five-year plan that was described in the proposal that I discussed with you in February. That proposal would serve for adding additional individuals to the FCIS and to develop a format for meeting their charge.

"The third part of that proposal was the development of an executive board whose principal roles would be to advise the Dean of CIS on policies, how to govern the operations of his offices, and to assist the Dean in meeting the goals set forth in the document that was distributed on the 7th of February and other recommendations made by the Faculty Senate. That executive board, it is anticipated, will be appointed in the Fall and they will review the five-year plan that is being put together by the FCIS. Then the Office of Computing and Information Science will be created to serve as the administrative unit for the FCIS and the Dean. That office will report directly to the Office of the Provost.

"So we've got an implementation that is starting with a faculty group that will be meeting over the summer. We intend that their first task will be to put together that five-year plan. The plan will then be presented to the executive board and then forwarded, with their recommendations, to the Provost for implementation.

"I'll take any questions up to this point. Not seeing any hands, let me thank Bob and Terry Fine in helping us get together the list of founding mothers and fathers. A lot of the discussions were quite animated, as you can imagine, but they were very helpful and I want to acknowledge both Terry and Bob for their help. We could not have done it without their continued consultation. Any questions?"

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "I understand that one of the actions of this founding committee would be to assign the FCIS to one of the colleges?"

Vice Provost Garza: "No, if you go back to the original document that was distributed, the FCIS will never belong to any specific college. In fact, the document is quite explicit in that the FCIS will not make any professorial appointments or tenure track appointments. They will have a membership that will be University-wide, but it will not act in the sense of a college or a department. That's quite clear in the document."

Professor Anton: "The committee will also decide the budgetary relationship that the FCIS will have in the future, correct?"

Vice Provost Garza: "No, we expect that the FCIS in its five-year plan will make recommendations and will have budgetary implications. I expect that whenever the plan is put together, we will inform the eventual home for the Department of Computer Science, for example. But even there, I think that the document that was discussed in the Senate is somewhat constraining in that there are three very lacking outcomes. That is, it could stay in the College of Engineering, it could move to the College of Arts and Sciences, or it could be a department that is shared across colleges as other departments are. The plan, we hope, will inform both budget and placement."

Professor Anton: "Okay, so this group will decide where the Department of Computer Sciences is going to end up?"

Vice Provost Garza: "No, the group will make a recommendation if it wishes, but the Office of the Provost will make that decision, hopefully based on a five-year plan. The group itself will not be making that decision."

Speaker Howland: "Further questions for Vice Provost Garza?"

Vice Provost Garza: "I, too, want to thank the Senate, especially Bob, who made the two years I spent in Day Hall interesting and informative. I think he's in for a good time." (Laughter).

Speaker Howland: "I'd like now to call on Professor Thomas Dyckman, member of the Financial Policies Committee, for a report from the committee on their recent conversations with the President."

7. REPORT FROM THE FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Thomas Dyckman, A.W. Olin Professor of Accounting: "I'm pleased to be here to report for the FPC in the light of the fact that the chairperson, Charles McCulloch, could not be with us today as he is elsewhere. The history of the issue of faculty salaries is not a new one to any of you and so I won't go into that history except to say that it's been a difficult and tough time. We had a meeting with the President on the 12th of April. It was, in my opinion, a very cordial and productive meeting. I'd like to describe basically what has happened in the process and I'm going to give the Dean of the Faculty a memo from the committee, under Charles McCulloch's name, that was addressed to President Rawlings with a copy of what the results were of that meeting in a second memo that was sent to him summarizing what we believe were the results of that conversation and what those results mean for you and I and many others.

"I don't intend to spend a lot of time on this but I do intend to summarize it ([Appendix D](#), attached) Perhaps the most important part of this particular item is the first, that is, the reports on the progress of faculty salaries. I want to turn to the second item, showing some more information. It will perhaps become clearer after you see the slide. In both the endowed and the statutory units, the average salary of a peer comparison group will be the goal of Cornell faculty salaries. Let me put that up here so that you can see the good news and the bad news. This is the group of schools that was selected to be in our peer comparison. You will note that there is one group for the endowed and a different group for the statutory schools. These groups were selected in a very specific way, as would be appropriate. We took, for the endowed, ratings for academic quality by the National Research Council. We took five universities that we felt were most like us in our peer group that exceeded us and the five universities that fell right behind us in the salary poll. It is our desire to reach the average of the schools. In other words, we want to be rated no worse than the average of the ten schools that we see in our peer groups. The statutory schools were chosen with input from the Deans of the colleges since it seemed that the peer groups for endowed and statutory ought to be different than just using one group as has been done in the past.

"You will note that if we are successful in reaching the average of our peer group in the endowed, then we will still be slightly below Yale. By the way, salaries are in thousands of dollars and this is the most recent data that exists. Those numbers will change over time and it's our objective to move up as time goes along. You can see that we have a ways to go and the competition will be moving aggressively as well. It will be necessary for this University to move aggressively also. If we are able to do the same in the Statutory, which is going to be a tougher job since the Statutory suffers more than the Endowed, and move up in the same way, we would end up at number 4 in the comparison group. That is certainly a goal that we would like to see happen.

"As I talk about these numbers, there are a couple of facts that are important that the committee worked hard to secure and I hope that you will understand what they mean for us. The first is that there is no cost-of-living adjustment put into these data. In the past, there has been a cost-of-living adjustment, which the University has found useful since it tends, often, to make us look better off than we are. The view is typically that Ithaca is not as expensive as living in Palo Alto, although cost-of-living adjustments don't take into account many things that places like Palo Alto and New York City have that we don't, which include

opportunities for spouses, some people might argue better weather, and some people also might argue that there are cultural things that are not as easily found here as in other places. The agreement with the President is such that there will be no adjustment to affect these data. It's also a nine-month basis. Also, as we do this, the relationships that are going to be compared with the other universities will be adjusted so that the averages are equivalent to Cornell's distribution of faculty. That is to say that we have a certain percentage of full, associate, and assistant professors and when we adjust the data of other universities, they will be put on our distribution scale rather than their own. Those are important factors in making this comparison.

"Some of the other facts that go into this report, which will be similar to the reports that you've seen in the past but which are now going to have different data in them, are weighted average by ranks of the Cornell faculty distribution, a tabular presentation for the current year with peer comparisons and graphical comparison for the last 25 years with peer comparisons. In addition, there will also be percentage differences computing for the first three items in Section I and the percentage change over the past year for all of them, a tabular form for item ID and IE so that we can see what those factors are. This report will be available to faculty. We also saw an incomplete version of what that would look like. Some of the data has already been collected and is being put together by Carolyn Ainslie and will be part of the report that will be available for all of you to see.

"Let me go back again to one of the previous slides, the first one that I had up there, so that you can see a couple of more of the agreements made with the President. Let me go through those briefly because they are important. In the Endowed units, five years will be the normal planning period. In the Statutory units, we believe it will take longer than five years, maybe seven. In the process, the idea is that in the next three years, we will move from 10 out of 11 in the Endowed peer group to at least number 7 in that first three years and to number 5 in two more. That is the objective. We needed a goal because without one, we would never get anywhere. We felt that it was absolutely critical to have goals built into this process. With the Statutory units, it's going to take us longer to get up there. Again, the goal is to rise up several levels in the next three years. In addition to that, this is something that I want all of you to feel that you can play a part in. The President has invited us to help him with ideas as to how this can be achieved. We have ideas but there are an awful lot of ideas out there in this audience and with your colleagues. We would appreciate it, as a committee, if you would inform us of your ideas and your thoughts as to ways in which we could make this happen and happen quicker. It is my belief that the quality of the faculty of this University is its single most important asset. If we don't protect it, in terms of people we have and people we would like to hire, we will not remain in the level of universities that we think we are or ought to be. We cannot do this without your help and I would certainly be happy to take any suggestions you can give me. I'm sure that Charles will be happy to take them as long as he remains with us and I suspect that everyone has the Dean of Faculty's e-mail, and since he doesn't read them directly, but his secretary does, maybe she will collect them for us as well. With your help and the committee's help, we will be able to make progress. I think I speak for the committee as well when I say that we were all very pleased with the progress we ultimately made. It did not come easily, but when it did, we were pleased with what we achieved. We have not achieved it all yet, because it will take a few years to really achieve the goals. I'm not sure that I'm supposed to answer questions, but do you have any?"

Professor J.S. Butler, Policy Analysis and Management: "Why was Ohio State listed twice among the Statutory?"

Professor Dyckman: "Did I do that? They must be a great university. (Laughter). I think it's a typo. I'm sorry about that. Any other questions? Yes?"

Professor Douglas Haith, Agricultural and Biological Engineering: "I'm very gratified to my Endowed colleagues for this report. (Laughter). As a member of a Statutory unit, I'm appalled. You can paraphrase this

and paraphrase that but the goal of salary management at Cornell would be to maintain a \$15,000-\$16,000 difference in the salaries between the Endowed and Statutory faculty, which is what this report argues to do. I do not buy the idea that Endowed faculty members should be compared to faculty at Harvard and Yale and Statutory faculty should be compared to faculty at Texas A&M and Michigan State. I do not accept that peer group for the Statutory colleges and, finally, to add insult to injury you are saying that we will do this in five years for the Endowed colleges but it will take longer for the Statutory colleges. To do it that way, that differential is going to get even larger. I find this completely unacceptable. I think it's a wonderful effort that has been done for the Endowed faculty, but it does nothing for the Statutory faculty. I'm sorry to have to say this, but we have watched this go on for a long time between Endowed and Statutory faculty salaries. I'm sorry I have to say it."

Professor Dyckman: "Well, nevertheless, I'm glad you did say it because I think there's a lot of truth in the comments that you made. What I would hope is that we can find ideas to make that move faster in the Statutory colleges. I think that if you continue to have the strong feelings that you do, and I'm sure many of your colleagues will join you, if you can give us ideas we will do everything we can to move that process forward. We share your concerns, but we do want you to realize that it is a tougher job in the State situation than it is with the Endowed. It's not as easy, but in my opinion, it's very important. I don't disagree with a thing you said."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I'd now like to call on Professor William Arms for an update from the Provost's Advisory Committee on Distance Learning."

8. REPORT FROM PROVOST'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DISTANCE LEARNING

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "I just dropped my transparencies ([Appendix E](#), attached) on the floor and they're going to come up in random order now. (Laughter). As I mentioned at the last meeting, our aim is to find a balance between getting maximum input from the University on complex decisions and trying to move fairly quickly where there is reason to move quickly. We'll start with a slide that I prepared for the Trustee Sub-Committee on Distance Learning and that I showed to the Trustee Executive Committee. This has been influencing much of my thoughts recently. You see on the left here words like 'education' and 'liberal arts,' with links to 'research' and 'teaching' and 'use of libraries,' the sort of programs that we need to give degrees. The argument has been clearly made to the Trustees, and people accept that this has traditionally been done by a not-for-profit organization. I personally know no good examples of top-class education of this sort other than not-for-profit. On the right-hand side, there are words like 'training' and 'skills' more structure courses particularly leading to certificates and diplomas. These are sometimes done for-profit and sometimes done not-for-profit organizations, example being language training schools.

"The pressures for rapid change tend to be coming from the right-hand side. In fact, as we observe the sentiments around the University, I recognize some of my own personal observations. The first is that a University-wide, long-term vision for distance education does not exist. Moreover, to get a University-wide vision is going to take quite a long time and a lot more experience and knowledge than we have. There are widespread concerns that we heard at the Faculty Forum about distance education and undergraduate education. There's a question of if we can do it really well. There are widespread concerns about for-profit degree programs and I think that they were articulated very strongly. These are the things about the left side of my diagram - the left wing, you might call it. On the right hand side under more specific programs, there are a number of programs under development in various professional colleges and mainly concentrated on mid-career and executive education or general education leading to certificates. There are a number of programs around the University where people have good ideas under development and are looking for the green light to go ahead. I think that we have a responsibility to enable these programs very quickly and, moreover, I believe we should find ways so that the University does things as a whole. We do not want to

have a series of very separate activities going on under the Cornell name.

"The strategy that I have advocated in committee is basically shown on this slide and it is to concentrate on the right wing and I should point out here that although some people have looked at this slide and thought that I meant these to be done automatically for profit, I do not mean that. All I mean is that there are examples from the right-hand side that are being done well in a for-profit capacity. So please don't misread the slide.

"In talking with the President and the administration, we have worked on a parallel strategy. Our committee is working on a preliminary report that we're going to focus on these non-degree programs, trying to find a way to let the programs that are under development move ahead in a way that the University will find satisfactory and will enable them to do a good job. We've spent a lot of time on the relationship between Cornell and the organizations that do distance learning because there is a feeling that a separate organization is going to be the way to go and therefore the relationship to the University is fundamental. Meanwhile, the University administration, led by Vice Provost Mary Sansalone, is doing the financial planning. We don't have enough understanding of what this means to sit down with people who have money to say, 'Under what circumstances will you provide money to this University?' I'm going to throw one slide at you for one second, which is a checklist of sorts of interests that have to be addressed looking at distance learning, and which we say something in our preliminary report. We're not so much for general solutions as we are for an understanding of where we can go.

"The next thing fits well into the discussions between the President and the Faculty Senate. Moving quickly, we're going to continue to work on this during the summer and we will keep the UFC informed. We hope that there will be ways to get incremental input and feedback from the faculty over the summer, because I do generally believe that we've got to make these incremental considerations over 12-month activity not 9-month.

"Next, if you will allow me to recognize Mary Sansalone so she can tell you more details of where the plan is going."

Professor Mary Sansalone, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Vice Provost: "Okay, as Bill mentioned, I'm going to spend quite a bit of time over the next six months working on continuing with the plan of a legally separate entity. Much of this planning needs to be completed regardless of whether the entity that we've been calling e-Cornell is for-profit or non-for-profit. Just to give you a little more detail on the financial planning, it's actually moving ahead very quickly and we will have a complete business plan by the end of next week. We are doing a lot of work to evaluate the various investment alternatives and we're starting to look into working with consultants so that we know at the creation and evaluation of business models, all of the aspects that we would need in an entity like this, such as what we are going to create and outsource and how we put all of that together. I'm also spending quite a bit of time on continuing with the academic program planning in conjunction with various colleges and units that have proposed programs. There's a lot of detail work that still remains to be done. These are focusing on executive education, as Bill mentioned, and certificate programs. I've listed just a few that are sort of ready to go, have the most detail, and I'm in the process of working out the business details of the plan and they all fit the model of executive, professional, or continuing education. I'd like to point out something following up on the slide with all of the kinds of activities that are being proposed. E-Cornell really is focused on executive and continuing education. All of the programs that have been proposed are in this category. We're translating what we already know how to do in our executive education programs onto the Internet. I'd also like to follow up and compliment Bill's left and right sides. What e-Cornell is not and has not ever been proposed to be, are undergraduate education, cooperative extension, and degree programs. We're really focused on this special area of executive education certificate programs."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. I'd like to call now on Professor Barry Carpenter, a member of the UFC for a resolution authorizing the UFC to consult with the Distance Learning Committee during the summer."

9. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE UFC TO CONSULT WITH THE DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE DURING THE SUMMER

Professor Barry Carpenter, Chemistry and Chemical Biology: "This resolution directly addresses Bill's last overhead and requests that the mechanism that we thought of for allowing the faculty to have input to the Distance Learning Committee was by the UFC as conduit. We thought that since this was the Distance Learning Committee, that it would be appropriate to use some distance learning so all of the topics that the Distance Learning Committee discusses with the UFC during the summer will be placed on the Faculty Senate's web site and we will then encourage you to read that and give us your input. By the conduit of the UFC, we will get that information to you."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you very much. The floor is open for discussion. Can you all read it? (Laughter). Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I think we're ready for the question. All of those in favor of the motion, please say 'aye.' All of those opposed to the motion, please say 'nay.' The motion carries unanimously. Thank you very much."

WHEREAS, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Distance Learning (hereinafter referred to as the DL Committee) will continue to meet during summer 2000, and

WHEREAS, the DL Committee may want to seek input from the Faculty Senate during this time,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate authorizes the University Faculty Committee (UFC) to act on its behalf in providing advice to the DL Committee until the Faculty Senate reconvenes in September 2000, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dean of the Faculty is instructed to have all issues on which the DL Committee seeks input from the Faculty Senate posted on the Senate's web site, so that Senate members may be informed about such issues and may make their opinions known to the UFC during the summer months.

"I'd like to now call on Professor Seymour Smidt for a resolution from the University Benefits Committee on TIAA's 10-year Exit Restriction. Is he here? No? Okay, then I'm to call on Professor McAdams."

10. RESOLUTION FROM THE UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE ON TIAA'S 10-YEAR EXIT RESTRICTION

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, JGSM: "You have the resolution in writing. It's very simple and it falls up on prior resolutions. The key action is that the Faculty Senate recommends to TIAA that it should relax its restrictions on transfers and withdrawals from TIAA when feasible, i.e., unless these transfers and withdrawals would cause substantial problems for TIAA. The fundamental is that, at the moment, we can only remove funds from TIAA at most at 10% per year, whether we are at retirement point or we are shifting from the current situation to another one. Professor Scott Maynes is the chair of the committee, and he will speak to the motion."

Professor Emeritus Scott Maynes Policy Analysis and Management: "I'd just like to say that I speak on behalf of my subcommittee. We did a careful review of the investment vehicles for retirement for all of the University, and it came with this recommendation. I want to tell you that it was adopted unanimously by our committee and by the University Benefits Committee, and it has already been adopted by the Employee

Assembly. So, why are we back if you adopted this last year? Well, we had some complications, as there always are, so we're trying again this year.

"I just wanted to give a personal example of what happens with this thing. I retired in 1992 and I had accumulations both from my term at the University of Minnesota and from Cornell. I had some of my money from invested in a TIAA Life Investment. One day in 1994, I called up the Minnesota Mutual Insurance Company and said, 'I want to transfer this to the Vanguard Index 500.' I thought it was a better bet. It was done in ten minutes over the telephone, not ten years. I estimate that my inability to do this with my TIAA cost me \$100,000. Yours may be more or less if you wanted to do that, but that's the case. We've had discussions with TIAA and what we want to do now in terms of execution is to change things. How do you change a big organization that suffers from institutional arterio sclerosis? (Laughter). The tactic that we're proposing is that we will not only send this resolution, if you approve it, to the chairman of TIAA-CREF, but we will also send copies of it to all of the board members of TIAA and CREF. We are looking for anybody who might have a personal relationship with any of those board members and who would be willing to send our resolution along with a personal note asking them to consider it. We have found Chairman Bings very unresponsive. How do we get at him? At least this is a possibility. The other thing I might say about the activities of our subcommittee is that we looked at all of the offerings of Fidelity and TIAA-CREF. We have no problems with Fidelity at the moment but we have a lot of problems with TIAA-CREF. Our judgement is that they serve us well, but not nearly well enough. I'll just mention one more thing. Consider that their chief instrument, the CREF stock account, did not bad, but it did 2%, points less than the Vanguard Index 500 and it did 3% points less over ten years than the Fidelity Magellan Fund. They could do better. We also don't think that they provide enough choice. We're not asking you to act on this, but I wanted to tell you that the University Benefits Committee will be forwarding the critique to Chairman Bings."

Professor Abby Cohn, Linguistics: "Are we encouraging our colleagues at other institutions to put forth similar motions?"

Professor Maynes: "I forgot to tell you that we will be forwarding our motions and our actions, if you approve this, to all of the Ivy League universities and to others if you think it is suitable."

Speaker Howland: "Further discussion? Yes?"

Professor David Rosen, Music: "I wanted to ask why you added the 'When feasible' clause?"

Professor Maynes: "There's been a lot of concern that if there was a run on this then they might have to sell long-term investments diminishing the rate of return to TIAA. Now we have had discussions with them, both the University Benefits Committee and Hal Bierman who has been our chief consultant, and they have not discussed the analytical essence of this. Under what conditions might the rate of return be impaired? Two variables are relevant. One is how much uninvested money does TIAA have on hand that could be paid up or shifted to another account. The second one is an empirical problem. How many people would get out, if it was possible, in five years or three years? You can see that the answer to those could give rise to problems that would impair the rate of return of TIAA. We think it's a very real understandable problem."

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor Anton: "Something seems strange about this to me. TIAA is a company that sells a product and we buy that product. Now we're telling them that we don't like the way that they sell their product and we're asking them to change the way they sell it. But it's their business and it seems to me that what we need to resolve to do, if we don't like this, is stop our relationship with TIAA and find another investment. We'll send our money to that place in Minnesota. (Laughter). That would make them respond."

Professor Maynes: "Your comment is nice and easy if you are a young faculty member who is just beginning and had no accumulation in these. For most of the people in this room, who have substantial accumulations, we're stuck with 10 years and the kind of loss that I described in my personal illustration. So the market will work, but it works over a long time but it imposes a severe handicap and penalty on people who already have lots of their accumulation in TIAA."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I think we're approaching the end of our time. Are you ready for the question? Good. The resolution is before you. All of those in favor, say 'aye.' All of those opposed, say 'nay.' The resolution passes.

WHEREAS, the University Benefits Committee unanimously adopted a motion in its meeting of April 13, 2000 and urges the Employee Assembly and the Faculty Senate to adopt it as well,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that TIAA should relax its restriction on Transfers and Withdrawals from TIAA when feasible, i.e., unless these transfers and withdrawals would cause substantial problems for TIAA.

"I'd like to call on Professor Persis Drell, Chair of the Local Advisory Council for a report on the review of environmental research at Cornell."

11. REPORT FROM LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AT CORNELL

Professor Persis Drell, Physics: "I'm chair of the Local Advisory Council and we are a ten-faculty member committee that is appointed by the administration and Faculty Senate. We are instructed to play an advisory role. We advise the administration in the form of Bob Richardson, the Vice Provost for Research, on significant proposals and research having to do with the natural sciences. We will be making our annual report to the Senate in the Fall, but today I just wanted to inform you that we have been given a task by the Vice Provost. Our charge is to review the research support for environmental science at Cornell. Bob writes,

'In the next few years, the federal government will be placing special emphasis on the environmental sciences. On February 2, 2000, the National Science Foundation released a report of the National Science Board, *Environmental Science and Engineering in the 21st century: The Role of the National Science Foundation* (I can get you the URL if you would like to download it for yourself). The report describes, in considerable detail, the scientific opportunities and the recommended NSF strategies for attacking the sciences. Requests for proposals for major centers studying environmental issues will inevitably follow from the NSB report. I [Bob Richardson] am concerned that Cornell is not using its resources in faculty, facilities, and funding from the central administration to its best advantage. If we are to be in a position to respond to new opportunities, we need a flexible structure that encourages the nearly 200 Cornell faculty in various environmental science disciplines to form vigorous new collaborations to compete successfully. The Faculty Senate already has a scheduled program review of the environmental sciences in the academic year of 2000-2001. It seems likely that the recommendations in the program reviews will come too late for effective response to many of the funding opportunities. Our [Bob Richardson and the Local Advisory Council] purview does not include the academic programs and curricula. These are the responsibilities of the colleges. On the other hand, advice about the wisest use of the funds invested by the central administration is very much a responsibility of the LAC. Thus, it would be especially helpful to the Vice Provost for Research if the LAC would study how the resources of the central administration can be most effectively used to promote the strongest possible environmental science and engineering proposals from Cornell. The major support for the environmental sciences coming from the central

administration is that in the Center for the Environment. I ask the LAC to consider whether this center has the most effective structure to support a university-wide environmental collaboration and how university funds could be best invested. I ask you to ignore for the moment what structures exist today and instead consider what Cornell should have five to ten years from now. Then I ask you to make recommendations on how we can evolve from where we are now to the ideal support structure.'

"We have accepted this charge. The process has only just begun but I wanted to let you know that we had been asked to do this. My term ends June 30, but my successor will be reporting to you as the process progresses."

Speaker Howland: "Are there any questions for Professor Drell?"

Professor Ann Lemley, Textiles and Apparel: "This is the first I've heard of this, and as an environmental science researcher, I'm very interested. Do you intend to get more people involved who do environmental work? I noticed several."

Professor Drell: "You bet. I don't think that any of us feel that we are going to, in isolation, come up with the answer. We have already spoken with the Director of the Center for the Environment and we have a long list of people who we want to talk to and we'll be doing that over the summer and the fall. We're trying to get as much input as possible. I don't think that we will answer the charge, I believe the assembled faculty will answer it."

Speaker Howland: "Further questions? Seeing none, we will move on to Good and Welfare. Professor Stein has requested 20 seconds."

12. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Stein: "I want to refer back to the presentation that Tom Dyckman made and I wonder if the two documents that he passed onto Dean Cooke could be read into the minutes? I think that they are historic documents of great significance and deserve to be enshrined in our archives." (Laughter.)

Dean Cooke: "That is the case and they will be on the web shortly."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Stein. I would like to call on Vice President Susan Murphy to speak on Ethics and Student Life."

Vice President Susan Murphy: "Thank you very much. You will remember at your last faculty meeting you heard a brief report from Professors Jennifer Gerner and Isaac Kramnick on a vision for residential life as it pertains to West Campus. Today, we want to introduce you to some early thinking that would be a part of the new North Campus Initiative for all of our first-year students. These are conversations that are part of the reaccreditation effort that is underway. We will be leading to a more fully developed and public discussion of the recommendations in the fall and I'm delighted to introduce you to Kathy Abrams, who is a Professor of Law. Kathy has spent an inordinate amount of time chairing the advising committee, which is the third component of the undergraduate education review as part of the accreditation, and served on the North Campus Committee where she has taken a lead on this topic of ethical decision making and issues that affect students' lives day to day. I want to thank her publicly for all of the work that she has put into this. It is in an early stage and our point today is to introduce the idea to you and to solicit your responses. Kathy?"

Professor Kathryn Abrams, Law: "Thank you. For those of you who made it to the Academic Leadership Session on Monday, this may be a bit of repetition, but I wanted to introduce you to some of the main

features of the proposal. What we're talking about is a mini-course that is going to be offered on North Campus. We plan to introduce it as a small pilot project in the Fall of 2001. Fall 2001 is a particularly significant period, for those of who are familiar with the residential initiative, because that's the time when North Campus will first become an all-first year residential environment.

"The plan is to have a mini-course that is offered during two or three intensive sessions during the Orientation Week. Then it will be offered once per week for approximately four to six weeks of the first term that people are in their first year at Cornell. So it will start during Orientation and extend through to the first month or so becoming less intense and less frequent as the students begin to get other commitments, like a regular course load. It will be offered only to entering first-year students and it will meet on North Campus. I will describe the various kinds of meetings as I outline the proposal, but they will occur in North Campus community centers, dining halls, and resident halls. The program has been brainstormed in two of the committees that are associated with the accreditation, primarily in the North Campus Committee and also in the Advising Committee. It will be administered, assuming we work it through to fruition, by the Program on Ethics and Public Life that operates out of the Arts College. Ethics and Public Life will be responsible for curricular development and the training of faculty.

"The goals of the course as we envision them now are several. First, a goal is to introduce students to the study of ethics. Some of you may be familiar with various initiatives in bringing the study of ethics to undergraduate education that are being considered by various communities and colleges. This is part of that broader program. The thought is that if students are introduced to ethics at the very beginning of their undergraduate careers, literally when they walk in the door, it may help them to understand how important it is to pursue the various course work available in their colleges. The second goal is to engage students in ethics fairly actively by focusing the first ethical inquiry to which they're exposed on problems that relate very directly to their lives as students. In addition, the course is designed to help create or transform North Campus into an environment in which living and learning occur together. As you may have heard from Isaac Kramnick's presentation, that is certainly a goal on West Campus. That is, that we make learning a more critical part of the residential environment as well as the curricular environment that they encounter in the classroom. That is also our goal and we hope that a program like this will help to set up an intellectual tone and a tone of inquiry and exploration in the residence halls at the beginning of the student's experiences. A final goal of the program that we consider to be very important, and this is where the advising committee fits in, was to bring students together with faculty members very early on in their Cornell experiences and to permit them to engage with those faculty members in small group discussions. I'll describe how that occurs in just a moment.

"The content of the course is two-fold. First, we hope to introduce students to major ethical frameworks and principles such as they might be exposed to in an introductory philosophy course, but, of course, on a more introductory and abbreviated basis. Second, we want to encourage students to think about frameworks and applications to issues that they confront in their lives. So the second part of the course content is going to be introducing students to a variety of dilemmas, hypotheticals, and case examples that suggest areas in which ethical guidance is very much needed and controversies that they would want to work through by talking with the supervision of a professor among themselves in small groups. The areas that we would explore as problem areas or as focus areas in the second part of the course are still very much a subject of discussion among the group that is planning the course. Two that seem particular worthy of discussion are a focus on learning across group-based differences and a focus on academic integrity.

"One of the things that we hope Cornell students will notice as soon as they walk in the door is that they are brought together with a group of students that is tremendously diverse in a variety of ways with respect to races, gender, nationalities, religions, and sexualities. Students are going to encounter a variety of people who may or may not look or act like the people in their high schools or themselves. We want to introduce

them to ways of thinking about living in the context of these differences and learning in the context of these differences. This is not simply a question of learning practices of toleration or receptivity, but thinking about how to draw affirmative benefits in the learning experience that can accrue from living and learning in a diverse environment. We might give them hypotheticals that relate to the living part of their residential experience such as, 'Imagine that you have a roommate whose religion or culture gives her a completely different approach to personal privacy than you have. How do negotiate with that roommate? How do you understand her claims and your claims to bring about your personal lives as you choose?' Or, we might ask, 'Let's imagine that you walk into your Western Civilization class and find a syllabus that seems troubling to you because no members of your racial, ethnic, religious or gender group are represented in the readings. How should you think about this? How could you make arguments to your TA? What sorts of strategies are appropriate to address these kinds of issues?' The second area I mentioned was the area of academic integrity. These would be questions that might relate to research ethics, questions that students would confront such as the obligations of observing someone cheating during a prelim and the different perspectives of what one might do.

"The mechanics of the course are as follows. The course is going to have two components. It will operate in large group sessions such as lectures, cinematic presentations, and theatrical presentations that will involve all the people who are participating in a course together. This is probably the area where students would be introduced to ethical frameworks. Second, the students will meet in small group sessions of 15 to 20, with faculty members, to discuss the particular case studies and ethical dilemmas we prepare for them. The small group leaders for these discussions will be drawn from among the Cornell faculty. They may be first-year advisors or faculty members who are already participating in North Campus programs by being Faculty-in-Residence or Faculty Fellows. The large group lecturers will include faculty drawn from Cornell and from other academic institutions. We also hope to involve activists and community leaders who have been actively involved in the resolution of ethical dilemmas in their own contexts. Students would receive one credit, an academic unit of credit, for taking the course. There will be no exam for the course, but we will probably ask students to keep journals or logs to write their reactions.

"The plan is to pilot the course in Fall 2001 with 20 faculty and 350-400 students. The plan beyond that is to increase the size of the course on a year-by-year basis. In the best of all possible worlds, within five to six years we would have enough faculty and financial support to be able to offer it to all entering first-year students. The final point that I want to make is that one of the things that we're most concerned about in the planning of this course is that in this course, which requires a number of approaches for resolving ethical dilemmas, we understand the concern that such a course can easily move from ethical exploration to imposition of moralisms. That is the last thing that we want to do with this program. The goal would be to select problem areas and specific hypotheticals that are extremely challenging in that they are not easily resolvable or don't have one clear answer. They're genuine, entrenched dilemmas that provide an occasion for thinking rigorously about a variety of moral views. So that's the introduction and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Howland: "Yes?"

Professor Richard Baer, Natural Resources: "I'm assuming that insofar as there is concern for diversity and insofar as perhaps 80% of Americans view their ethics mainly within a religious framework that religiously grounded ethics will be well represented?"

Professor Abrams: "Absolutely. Receptivity to a variety of religious expressions is included in the way we're planning this. I'm a little hesitant about your use of an 80% figure because I don't think we plan to create a course by polling what percentage of Americans hold particular views and then representing that numerically in the course view that have that kind of configuration. However, religious ethics are a large part of the way a

lot of people make decisions. On Monday at the Academic Leadership Session, there were a number of chaplains who participated and volunteered their services in connection with the course. Religious diversity is also one of the most important things students confront at Cornell. It would be totally counterproductive to exclude that information."

Speaker Howland: "Professor Lemley?"

Professor Lemley: "When I heard this on Monday I wondered a bit and it sounds a little better today, but I envision this as lectures on frameworks and then eventually getting to case studies and I was thinking of these 17 and 18 year olds who have just arrived at Cornell, as did my daughter a year ago, and so I was wondering if you might consider doing a lot more examples at the beginning and slipping the framework in a little bit. I got a sense that if you did things like that it would work. It sounded a little dry in the beginning."

Professor Abrams: "This may be a personal bias on my part, but I don't consider ethics dry at all. (Laughter). I think it's vital and exciting. But you're right; we're dealing with 17- and 18-year olds. I don't know how everyone teaches ethical principles, but when I introduce frameworks in the context of courses that I teach in the Law School or the Arts College, pertinent problems come away to open up normative frameworks and it would be surprising if most people didn't teach them by reference to that kind of approach. We also hope to have really provocative films and productions like the one I mentioned the other day that David Feldshuh organized that involved the journals of Asian-American students that were presented theatrically. These are ways to introduce ethical frameworks that show their vitality."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. That clock is slow so it is time to adjourn. "

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen

Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty