Faculty Issues: Year in Review: 1999-2000
A Report to the Trustees

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty
May 27, 2000

Faculty governance has dealt with some complex and challenging issues this year. Some of these have been new issues; some were visible on the horizon last year. Some remain incomplete, but many important issues have reached closure.

General issues: Our department-based Faculty Senate continues to develop as an effective voice of the faculty, producing a few formal resolutions on major issues. For example, we dealt with content issues such as how to deploy and to help the faculty benefit from and exploit the dramatic developments occurring in computing and information technology. This affects all disciplines throughout the campus. We've also made recommendations on how to adapt the rapidly emerging technology-mediated information technologies to support and extend the mission of the university. We must find an approach that is free of unintended side-effects for our highly valued existing programs. We also dealt with a major process issue – how to enhance the level of cooperation and consultation between the administration and the formal governance system.

Specific issues: Through vigorous debate we have achieved a consensus on how to organize a vital, campus-wide thrust in computing and information technology. We found a way to nurture cooperation across traditional departmental and college lines for this rapidly evolving technology without rupturing our existing relationships and organizational structures of the colleges. We settled on an approach that we believe will optimize the work of the university – for both the theorists and for the applied practitioners. We achieved agreement on principles to facilitate appropriate and timely consultation between the administration and faculty (Exhibit 1). We believe that we have harmonized process expectations in a manner that will nurture mutual respect and trust.

Distance (or preferably distributed) learning has become a major issue that is sweeping higher education. The faculty does not yet sufficiently comprehend its implications for Cornell – either its positive or negative aspects. A strong committee with a broad charge has been formed so we are now able to move both quickly and thoughtfully. Plans for intense committee work, including continuing efforts through the summer, are in place and the Faculty Senate will give distributed learning high priority attention in the Fall.

We have made a conscious effort to complement the traditional legislative function with a consensus-building component because the university's work is so dependent upon collegial relationships. To help clarify the issues and to begin building a basis for embracing aspects of distributed learning appropriate to Cornell and its mission, we convened two University Faculty Forums on this topic this semester. Vice President McClure and I will organize additional opportunities for the entire faculty to participate in the dialog about one of the

major changes of our time. We likely will experience a fundamental paradigm shift in higher education, including Cornell.

Along with the technological changes, we are facing significant financial challenges to our university. To explore this, one aspect of the 'Symposium Honoring Dale R. Corson: Strategy for a Great Research University' was devoted to an examination of long term financial issues (Exhibit 2). In addition, long-term financial issues were discussed in one of the two strands of the recent Academic Leadership Series (Exhibit 3). Traditionally the faculty has treated cost saving measures as a secondary issue. We need to change that.

Perhaps the most important issue requiring community-wide discussion is that of campus climate, i.e. how we deal with diversity and inclusion issues. We are continuing our long-term commitment to this. A bottom-up effort involving all the major governance constituencies this year resulted in a document 'Open Doors, Open Hearts, Open Minds'. All the campus-wide governance groups, including the Board of Trustees (Exhibit 4) endorsed this statement. Aside from its value as a statement of our aspirations on this vital topic, this effort also has historic significance as the first instance of such broad cooperation among all the major governance groups. We're delighted that the efforts of the Campus Climate Committee have been recognized and honored as recipient of the Perkins Prize. Trustee Jones participated in that recognition ceremony.

We also devoted attention to an issue known to be dear to the Trustees – how we interact with our undergraduates. A University Faculty Forum on 'Connecting with Students: Some Best Practices in Teaching and Learning at Cornell' was held this semester. Four of the recent Weiss Presidential Fellows (our only university-wide honor for teaching) and two distinguished undergraduate leaders shared their views and interacted with the largely faculty audience. (We are interested in soliciting essays from all the Weiss Fellows and publishing a book of 'Weiss Wisdom'. We wish to recognize these superstars, to share their experiences with others in order to stimulate the rest of the Cornell faculty and perhaps to focus national attention on our interest in undergraduates.

We also held a forum on the Social Sciences (Exhibit 5) that led to a dialog of the President with the Social Sciences faculty. These formal Faculty Forums have been supplemented by an online dialog. The University Faculty Website (Exhibit 6) is operated with oversight by a Faculty On-Line Forum Advisory Board. This innovation functions as an enhanced editorial page for the faculty to exchange views.

Despite the enthusiasm with which the faculty has embraced the Internet, we have encountered some negative aspects too. We found it necessary to debate and adopt a policy to assist faculty members who object to the unauthorized, unedited posting of summaries of their lectures on the web for free, public dissemination.

To encourage intellectual exchanges across departmental and college boundaries, we have created a common online database for listing all academic seminars.

(The next step will be to create an Internet-based notification system to alert faculty members to the richness of the seminars in a timely and convenient manner.)

We have also expressed our views on other matters, e.g., we want TIAA to remove its ten-year requirement for withdrawal of one's assets. (Perhaps some members of the Board could advise us on ways to effect this change.)

We've had continuing discussions about enhancing faculty salaries and conversations with the administration and Trustees. We appear to have reached a mutual understanding of the problem and an institutional commitment to address this core problem (Exhibit 7). (However, there is some statutory faculty consternation because the goal proposed by the faculty's Financial Policies Committee, using two sets of peer institutions would institutionalize a substantial average salary differential between the statutory and endowed colleges of 'one university'.) Our discussions have focused on salaries for full professors because salaries are competitive at the assistant professor level. Attention to statutory salaries is quite critical, as shown in Exhibit 8 – a figure I used in my oral presentation last year. Nevertheless, the 'cure' must not be allowed to become more damaging than the 'disease'. (I also urge the Trustees to review staff salaries as well; there exist some serious problems there too.)

While I've cataloged faculty activities here, I must salute the Board for its role this year – especially for making a serious commitment to the need-blind admission policy and for providing the financial resources that make this a reality, not simply a dream.

On the horizon: While the planning for next academic year remains to be done, it is clear that in addition to the unexpected issues, much of our attention must be focused upon an examination of the multiple aspects of distributed learning. The endangered status of the statutory colleges deserves more thoughtful attention. Our Statler Club has faded as a vehicle for promoting discourse across institutional boundaries and no longer fulfills its community-building role. We must find ways to reinvent that role. We will sustain our efforts to improve the campus climate and we must devote even greater attention to improving our sense of community (within and among the faculty, staff and administrative groups, as well as among the disenfranchised groups).

Closure: This has been a challenging year. We've made a good start, but we must continue our efforts to reclaim our sense of mutual respect, trust, sense of well being and community.

Exhibit 1: Principles of Cooperation and Consultation Between the President and Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate and the President acknowledge that a positive working relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Cornell central administration (hereinafter referred to as the administration) is vital for maintaining and improving the quality of Cornell University. To enhance coordination, communication, and consultation, the Faculty Senate and the administration affirm the principles that are enumerated below. These principles are in conformance with the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty (OPUF), and are subject to the University Bylaws, which is the overarching document that sets forth the authority of the Board of Trustees, the President and the Provost, the University Faculty, and the Deans and faculties of the individual colleges and schools.

I. The President and the administration recognize the Faculty Senate as the bona fide representative of the University Faculty.

II. The President and the administration recognize the Dean of the Faculty as the principal liaison between the Faculty and the administration. He or she will be included in all meetings of the Vice Presidents' Group and the President's Council. The Dean of the Faculty will meet regularly, at least monthly, with the President and Provost, who will inform the Dean of the Faculty of the agenda for the Academic Cabinet and will advise the Dean of the Faculty of issues under consideration that come within the purview of the Faculty Senate.

III. The President and/or the Provost will meet with the Dean of the Faculty at the end of each academic year to plan a shared agenda for the following academic year, identifying two or three major issues of concern to the administration and the university faculty. The parties recognize that additional issues of concern to the administration and the university faculty may be identified during the course of the year, which may also be addressed by the Faculty Senate.

IV. The President, the Provost, and the other members of the administration will look to the University Faculty Committee for advice and consultation on all major educational policy issues that affect more than one college or school. To facilitate that advisory and consultative relationship, the President will meet regularly, at least twice a semester, with the University Faculty Committee. The Provost will meet regularly, at least once a month, with the University Faculty Committee.

V. For joint faculty-administration committees, the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost will work together to create the committee charge and to appoint the faculty members to such committees. The Associate Dean of the Faculty will seek nominations for committee members from the Committee on Nominations and Elections, and will meet with the Provost to discuss these nominations. For committees established by the administration in which the university faculty has

a stake and to which faculty members will be appointed, the Provost and the Associate Dean of the Faculty will meet to discuss committee membership after the Provost has made the final decision on the charge for such committees. Whenever possible, however, the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost will work together to create the charge for committees established by the administration. For both joint faculty-administration committees and committees established by the administration, the Provost will make the final decision about faculty membership, half of which will be selected by the Provost from the nominations submitted by the Associate Dean of the Faculty.

VI. Meaningful faculty governance requires adequate time for consideration of issues and development of recommendations. To that end, the President or other members of the Administration will not reach final conclusions or take action on major multi-college educational policy issues until the normal steps for securing faculty input, including a reasonable period for relevant Faculty Senate Committees to act and for subsequent deliberations by the Faculty Senate to occur, have been completed. Adequate time for deliberations by the Faculty Senate on such issues will include at least two consecutive regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meetings, unless the Faculty Senate completes its deliberations in fewer meetings. The President and the Faculty Senate acknowledge that there may be occasions when it will not be possible to plan months in advance to bring an issue to the Senate. In such cases, the President and/or Provost will inform the Dean of the Faculty and seek his/her advice about how to provide for input from the Faculty Senate.

VII. The Provost will attend the Faculty Senate meetings, will address the faculty and answer their questions in the time allotted for that purpose. The President and/or the Provost will make a timely response to the Faculty Senate on Senate motions directed to the administration. The President will inform the University Faculty Committee and the Faculty Senate of his/her decisions on major policy issues of interest to the faculty and explain his/her reasons for them.

Ratified unanimously by the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2000

Exhibit 2: Corson Symposium
An abbreviated version of the video, *Dale R. Corson: Cornell's Good Fortune* was shown at the January Board meeting. Loan copies of the complete (19 minute) VCR tape are available from the Office of the University Faculty.

Exhibit 3: Academic Leadership Series
Important resource documents for the May 8, 2000 Academic Leadership Series are available at:
http://www.ipr.cornell.edu/ALS_Web/ALS_HomePage.HTML#ALS
Additional materials will be posted there soon. The two principal discussion topics were: 'The Undergraduate Experience and Learning Across Difference' and 'Planning for the Financial Future of Cornell University'.

Exhibit 4: Cornell's Statement on Diversity and Inclusiveness

Open Doors, Open Hearts, and Open Minds:

Open Doors

"I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study." This statement, made by Ezra Cornell in 1865, proclaims Cornell University's enduring commitment to inclusion and opportunity which is rooted in the shared democratic values envisioned by its founders. We honor this legacy of diversity and inclusion and welcome all individuals, including those from groups that have been historically marginalized and previously excluded from equal access to opportunity.

Open Hearts

Cornell's mission is to foster personal discovery and growth, nurture scholarship and creativity across a broad range of common knowledge and affirm the value to individuals and society of the cultivation of the human mind and spirit. Our legacy is reflected in the diverse composition of our community, the breadth of our curriculum, the strength of our public service, and the depth of our commitment to freedom, equity, and reason. Each member of the Cornell community has a responsibility to honor this legacy and to support a more diverse and inclusive campus in which to work, study, teach, research, and serve.

Open Minds

Free expression is essential to this mission, and provocative ideas lawfully presented are an expected result. An enlightened academic community, however, connects freedom with responsibility. Cornell stands for civil discourse, reasoned thought, sustained discussion and constructive engagement without degrading, abusing, harassing, or silencing others. Cornell is committed to act responsibly and forthrightly to maintain an environment that opens doors, opens hearts and opens minds.
_____
Endorsed by the Employee Assembly and the University Assembly, December 1, 1999; the Student Assembly, December 3, 1999; the Faculty Senate, December 8, 1999, and the Graduate & Professional Student Assembly, January 24, 2000, and by the Board of Trustees, January 29, 2000.

Exhibit 5: Social Sciences Forum
See http://www.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/OnLineForum.html

Exhibit 6: Faculty OnLine Forum
Access is limited to users from within Cornell.
http://www.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/OnLineForum.html
Exhibit 7: Faculty Salary Discussions
Meeting with President Rawlings: Consensus

Future reports on progress in raising faculty salaries would follow the format detailed in the attached document.

In both the endowed and statutory units, the average salary of the peer comparison group will be the goal for Cornell faculty salaries.

In the endowed units, five years will be the nominal planning period for reaching this goal; in the statutory units, it will take somewhat longer.

The administration invites the Financial Policy Committee to make suggestions for strategies to meet this goal.

Comparison Institutions and Adjusted Salaries '99 – '00

Endowed		**Statutory**	
1. Stanford	100.8	Pennsylvania	96.7
2. CalTech	100.1	U.C. Berkeley	89.0
3. Chicago	98.6	North Carolina	79.6
4. Pennsylvania	97.3	U.C. Davis	77.1
5. Princeton	96.1	Minnesota	76.0
6. Yale	94.2	Penn State	74.3
7. Columbia	92.6	Ohio State	74.3
8. UCLA	87.6	Wisconsin	73.9
9. Michigan	85.6	Michigan State	69.9
10. Cornell	84.7	Texas A&M	68.8
11. U.C. San Diego	82.9	Cornell	68.7
Average (excluding Cornell)	**93.6**		**78.0**

Note: Penn appears in both columns; the salary figure differs because of the differences in the faculty rank distributions in endowed and statutory.

I. Nine Month Equivalent Salaries by:
    A. Endowed and Statutory Separately
    B. Full, Associate and Assistant Professor
    C. Weighted Average for all Ranks by Cornell Faculty Distribution
    D. Tabular form for Current Year with Peer Comparisons
    E. Graphically for Last 25 Years with Peer Comparisons
II. Percentage Differences for Items 1A – 1C
    A. Tabular & Graphical as in 1D – 1E
    B. Percentage Change Over Past Year

Exhibit 8: Salary Trends for Several Universities

Adjusted Faculty Salaries

Legend:
- Harvard
- Stanford
- Chicago
- Princeton
- Pennsylvania
- NYU
- MIT
- Yale
- Northwestern
- Columbia
- Duke
- Georgetown
- Carnegie-Mellon
- Michigan
- USC
- UCBerkeley
- **Cornell (Endowed)**
- UCLA
- Johns Hopkins
- Virginia
- Rutgers
- Dartmouth
- North Carolina
- Brown
- Illinois
- Penn State
- UCDavis
- Minnesota
- Texas
- Maryland
- Purdue
- Wisconsin
- UWashington
- **Cornell (Stat)**

Y-axis: Dollars, nominal

X-axis: Year (1987-88 to 1997-98)