

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor Charles Walcott, Interim Speaker: "I would suggest a maximum speaking time of about two minutes or so, though I don't think we have anything that's terribly controversial just yet. We have one Good and Welfare speaker, who wants about five minutes. So to begin with, Dean Burns, if you would be so kind."

2. REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the University Faculty, Joseph Burns: "Welcome to the first meeting of 2015. As normal, if you would introduce yourselves to people around you, anyone you don't know, just say hey, I'm so-and-so from this department. We'll take a minute or two to do that.

"Very good. As you see, on the way in, we did something a little different today. We have cupcakes. I'm not going to have one. I think probably some folks will pass out maybe during the meeting; but if you orient the C properly, it sort of looks like a V. And we have Valentine's Day coming up, so they may serve several purposes there.

"Among the events, the Stephen H. Weiss presidential fellows have been announced. And here they are: Nina Bassuk from Horticulture, Marie Caudill from Nutritional Sciences, and Rajit Manohar from Electrical and Computer Engineering. These were announced by the president last January 30th to the board of trustees, and then announced in "The Chronicle" a week ago. Please offer them your congratulations when you see them. They have all done just unbelievable things, both in their professional lives, as well as in their effect on our student body.

"So I will just go through a few items that I've been busy with over the past few months, just to bring you up to speed, and would welcome questions and comments, if you have any. So among the things, as you will see on the agenda and may have seen already on the agenda, there continues to be quite a bit of interest in the new titles of professor of the practice. We have two consent votes coming up that were left over from the December meeting.

“If you remember, the December meeting occurred at the first of our snowstorms, and so we didn't quite make quorum. Those concerned approval of the professor of the practice in the College of Human Ecology, and the approval of changing of the title clinical professor to professor of the practice in the Johnson School. Both of those are consent items on the agenda.

“And then this is the first posting today of two more Professors of the Practice, one in each of those categories. The College of Engineering is coming to the community to ask for the Professor of the Practice title among their faculty, and the Law School is asking to change some of their titles over to Professor of the Practice; some of these clinical professorships, which were never quite proper for some of the jobs that Law wants done, and they prepared a proposal.

“Both of those proposals have gone through CAPP -- thank you very much, Michael Tomlan, Chair of CAPP -- and we will post them for the required 60-day notice period, and then move forward, if we don't hear concerns from faculty.

“Also, among the resolutions that were to be presented here was a resolution asking for the cancellation of classes during the presidential inauguration on September 18th. We are going to cancel that cancellation. Just a couple of days ago, the president-elect said she did not want the classes canceled, even though it has been traditional in the past. And the interim provost also said he did not want the classes canceled. So we are withdrawing that resolution. There are times when you should fight the administration. I don't think this is one of them.

(LAUGHTER)

“There will be a forthcoming resolution coming out of some of the activity that has occurred in the late fall meetings. There will be, I expect, a resolution on the agenda for the next meeting, requesting that the Senate move its time to a more family-friendly time, more business-like time, moving it forward in the period, without specifying exactly how that is to be done; but that will almost certainly be on the agenda at the next meeting.

“Let me start in the middle [of the displayed list] here. I have been going to lots of meetings; not as many as maybe Alan Mathios and John Siliciano, but lots of meetings of the deans and the senior staff. The board of trustees has been dealing with Cornell's financial future, and the new budget model has allowed people to see where the university sits. And the administration is coming to

some conclusions about where it sits, and there will soon be a presidential presentation on Cornell's financial future.

“There will also be correspondence from the Provost coming out on the same topic, trying engage the whole community, not only the faculty, students and staff, but to tell the community where we stand and what opportunities we have in the future. So stay tuned for that.

As part of that, many of the colleges may be introducing perhaps more professional master's degrees, looking into online learning, things like that, other schemes to make each of the colleges more financially viable.

“And it seemed to me as though we should therefore try to get the faculty involved in understanding exactly what these plans are like and what we think of them and whether or not they're educationally sound, whether there are other things we ought to be doing. Are there expenses that instead ought to be cut back?

“So we have scheduled a Faculty Forum. Still under discussion exactly precisely what it will be, but it will be here in Hollis Auditorium on March 18, five weeks from today, and there will be a reception afterwards. Those things are set in stone, but exactly how we will handle this in a way that will be productive is to be determined, and I welcome your comments on exactly how we should go forth and do that.

“That's all I have. If anyone has any questions or comments, I'm happy to take them for about one minute. Are there any questions or comments on this? If not, Risa will come up, Risa Lieberwitz, who has been serving as the faculty representative on a subcommittee.”

3. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE (UFC)

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, UFC member: “Thanks. So I asked Joe if I could have a couple minutes, because I thought you would be interested in an update on the campus code. So just to remind you, as I'm sure everybody recalls, the University Assembly revised the campus code to clarify that no permit is required for outdoor demonstrations, protests or rallies on the campus.

“And after that was clarified, the chair of the University Assembly suggested to President Skorton that he appoint a working group to address -- and the way it's worded is the ambiguity between the campus code and various use of outdoor

space policies on campus, and basically to make sure that the campus code is in synch with use of property policies.

“So Joe nominated me to serve from the UFC on this working group. And the working group also includes the chair of the University Assembly, who's chairing the working group -- that's Jim Blair -- there's a student member of the student assembly, a graduate student from the Codes and Judicial Committee, Kathy Zoner is on it, as chief of police at Cornell, a member of the counsel's office, an employee member of the University Assembly, and then there are also several staff members who are involved in administrative roles, things generally dealing with scheduling events and use of property.

“Now, the reason I thought it would be useful for you to know about it is one area in particular that we're working on; we have been charged by the president to develop so-called time, place and manner policies that are consistent with the campus code. And that would include making sure that any time, place and manner provisions are consistent with the provision of the campus code that no permit is required for outdoor demonstrations, protests and rallies.

“So we've been working on this and, for example, one of the issues with time, place and manner restrictions, which are generally restrictions that are actually needed to -- and are reasonable for use of property that are neutral. They don't select out things based on the content of the speech, but they are neutral and reasonable.

“For example, we are working on things like use of amplified sound and that sort of regulation. And I would also note that the campus code gives the president the power to authorize the creation of type, place and manner provisions.

“So the working group has met several times, and we are working towards submitting a report and recommendations to the president, which he's asked to have submitted to him by mid-March of 2015.

“I could tell you so far, I think we are working well together. I think that there is a commitment to free speech and free expression on campus, and so I have found that to be encouraging to work with people to try to figure out how to actually protect and promote free speech and, at the same time, identify reasonable kinds of time, place and manner provisions.

“And then there's also a general charge to the committee to try to think about what's the best way to go about creating provisions about the use of property, outdoor property on campus, how to make sure everybody has access to them; but I thought the time, place and manner issues would be of most interest to you. I don't know if we have time for a question or -- if anyone has questions.

[Question from Audience – Audio Unavailable]

“Well, you know, that's, I think in many ways, the trickiest one; because at this point right now, for example, on Ho Plaza it says between 12:00 and 1:00 you could use amplified sound. One thing we are looking at is are there ways in which we can identify outdoor areas where amplified sound could be used more broadly than currently permitted. Are there decibel levels we would need to think about?

“And so that really is the trickiest one. If people have ideas about that, please send them to me, because this is one of those areas where there's clearly issues of concern about time, place and manner with regard to avoiding description of use of amplified sound, particularly over a certain level around classes, for example.

“At the same time, we want to make sure that the ability to have meaningful free speech so that people can actually hear you through amplified sound as needed; that that is as broad as possible, both in terms of where you could do it and when you could do it and the level at which you can do it.”

“Professor Elizabeth Sanders, Government Department: “On the sound issue, in the original Ho Plaza incident, the group that originally announced the protest had a handheld megaphone. The other group, in order to disrupt them, had brought giant boom box -- huge amplified system that completely drowned out the other group. So I would think you would want to set not just a time for amplified sound, but decibel level or something like that.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Well, that's one of the things that we do have on the list of thinking about decibel levels, because there's also that question, as you are pointing out, about the relationships between multiple groups. So how do you provide the ability of multiple groups to have events, protests at the same time and also promote and protect the ability of people to have their events without being drowned out?

“So it is tricky. If there are people who know a lot about decibel levels and things like that, I would welcome any input. Please do send it. Thank you.”

Speaker Walcott: “We have the approval for the professor of the practice and so on. That's a consent item, so I assume everybody here consents.

“I hear no objections, so we now move on to the scheduling scenarios for prelims and exams, David Delchamps. David?”

4. REPORT FROM EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE (EPC)

Professor David Delchamps, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, and EPC Chairman: “Okay. I'm here because I'm the chair of the Educational Policy Committee, and we talk about stuff like this. And just want to bring you up to date on some things we have been talking about related to final exam schedule, prelim schedules, end of semester activities, and all that sort of thing.

“It is hard to pin anything down about the end of the semester stuff, because so many things are in flux right now. We have this three-year experiment going on with the new academic calendar. Who knows if that's going to persist?

“We are not sure whether that's going to persist; but if it does, assuming it does, we have a lot of work to do on the faculty handbook, because in response to the new calendar and the reduction in number of exam slots, the registrar switched from the algorithm they used to use, which allotted to every class a slot during the final exam period that they could use or not use, if they wanted, switch from that system to a system that, A, solicits requests for final exam slots for early in the semester; and B, only if a course requests such a slot does that course get allotted the slot.

“Then all those answers to the request for requests get put through an algorithm, allegedly optimizing, minimizing bad events such as conflicts, such as back-to-back exams, three in one day, that sort of thing. And as you probably noticed, the first couple times through, the schedules have been a little buggy. Here's an example of the kind of thing that can happen -- and Mike Thompson, my friend in Material Science, told me about this -- that there are not too many material science undergrads, but all the juniors have to take the same 3000 level courses, three of them. And sure enough, the scheduling algorithm put those exams right on top of one another. So everyone in mat sci had a conflict between three exams.

“In the grand scheme of things, that doesn't make for lots of conflicts university-wide, so the algorithm doesn't recognize that sort of local anomaly. So there are bugs. That's not the only one, and I have talked with my in friends operations research, who worked on the old scheduling algorithm, and they claim they could do better with -- there's a lot of info coming in, so it's a lot in the state of flux; but bottom line is if we do stick with this new way of scheduling for exams, where you only get a slot if you request it, we have to change the faculty handbook.

“One of the main reasons we have to do that is now, if you give a take-home in lieu of a final, you are not allowed to have that due until your scheduled exam date. But what if you don't have a scheduled exam date? There's all these problems we have to resolve, and a little bit is sort of floating around there because of the calendar being in flux. So that's what's going on with end-of-semester, final exams and all that.

“We are also looking at evening prelims this semester. We want to take a special look at that. What's going on with evening prelims, the schedule has gotten cluttered. We got a lot of complaints last spring about how people were shut out of giving exams during optimal weeks. They had to give their first prelim in Week 3 and second one in Week 11, crazy things like that. They couldn't find a room big enough to give their prelim in because they were taken by other classes.

“Part of the problem with that is everyone wants the same couple of weeks to give their evening prelims; about a third or two-thirds of the way through, for the most part. We have a rule on the books that evening exams take place only on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Evening classes take place only on Mondays and Wednesdays.

“We asked around. We discovered that, for obvious reasons, the reason for that rule is they don't want to have quote, unquote conflicts between classes and exams; but right now what we have is conflict between exams and exams, because there's so much clutter in the prelim schedule. And the de facto resolution for that for most students, if they have a direct conflict on a Tuesday night, one of their classes gives them their test early, then they go right after that and take the other test.

“So the bottom line is the schedule's cluttered. It occurred to us that classes and exams are different animals in terms of scheduling. Classes meet every week,

and maybe not. For example, lab, my course this semester, I am teaching a sophomore level course that has six or seven labs. They don't go to lab every week, but they have evening labs about half the time.

“And other science courses do the same kind of thing, and some of the ILR classes have long, two-and-a-half-hour lectures Mondays and Wednesdays, but classes meet every week, but exams are all shooting for the same couple of weeks. So what if we allowed people to give evening prelims on Mondays and Wednesdays as well as Tuesdays and Thursdays? That would open up a lot of slots.

“And the response one might give to that would be wait, now you are creating conflicts between prelims and classes. Yeah, but now we have conflicts between prelims and prelims. So if someone has a conflict between a prelim and a class, maybe the answer is they take the prelim early, then they go to their class. Is that worse than going to another exam? I don't know.

“Those are the kinds of things we are talking about. We are collecting a lot of data on number of people taking classes with evening prelims, number of people taking evening class, all that sort of thing.

“Rob Thorne has run some numbers, and there's a lot of stuff going into this, and we've also thought about other possibilities; for example, giving two prelim slots of an hour and 15 minutes each, each Tuesday and Thursday. That results in people having exams that last until 10:30, time pressure that we don't have now. So that's just an outline of what we are thinking about along those lines.

“We are looking at other things this semester that haven't quite cooked long enough for me to share with you; but I'm sure at a future meeting, I will have some things to say about them, and I'd be happy to collect comments and questions, either here or through e-mail.

“And by the way, about the evening prelims, you may wonder how they are scheduled. Well, this Monday morning at 8:00, it was like ten people in a room -- 30 people in a room, okay, including Joe, who kindly agreed to go, because I didn't feel like going to an 8:00 meeting on a day when I had to shovel snow. What they do is they set in stone the evening prelim schedule for the whole next academic year.

“Now, what's wrong with that picture? Several things are wrong with that. First, I don't even know what I'm teaching a year from now, next spring. Am I going to teach a course that has an evening prelim? Well, this 2000 level course I'm teaching now, I was planning to give in-class prelims, but I discovered last year's instructor gave evening prelims; and therefore, I was on the schedule. Students planned their lives around that. And okay, I will give evening prelims on those scheduled dates.

“When I arrived at the room the first day, the room wasn't nearly big enough. So I was stuck with that anyway. It was all set in stone a year ago. Who is on the list for evening prelims? That is a set that monotonically increases in size. If you ever had an evening prelim, you are still on that list. We conjecture that a high percentage of the allotted evening prelim slots are not used and are paper conflicts, that sort of thing.

“These are the kind of things we have to sort of pull apart, come up with rational solutions, and that's one of our missions this semester. Didn't mean to go on.”

Speaker Walcott: “Yes. In the back.”

Professor Ronald Booker, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior: “I have a thing about evening prelims. And the main concern I have is really some of the anecdotal records I get from undergraduates about what happens after an evening prelim. Because most exams come within a very short period, just as you said, it's not unusual for a student to have a prelim on Wednesday, an evening prelim on Thursday, another prelim on Friday; and they said if you have taken an organic prelim Thursday night that lasts an hour and a half or more, do you really feel like going back to your room, settling down and studying for your Friday prelim.

“So in general, the students feel that it results in undue stress. I teach a fairly large class, 360 students. A room is not big enough to give an exam. We should be doing an evening prelim. Basically I ask the students, do you abide by the honor code. They say yes. And so we set up for daytime prelims for the students. And the feedback we get is we feel much more settled in the evening, we can get back to work, we feel less stressed.

“And there are other colleges that do this, where exams are not given in the evening. Essentially, we have an honor code. Either the students live by the honor code or they don't. If we don't expect them to live by the honor code, we

should get rid of it and we should think about how it might affect campus climate if we try to come up with a more innovative approach to assessment that doesn't require the students to go through this undue -- and I think in some ways some faculty are afraid that some students will cheat. The primary victim is the person that cheated, not really the rest of the students, if they have done their job and prepared for the exam. So I think your committee should -- of eliminating evening exams, and one less meeting for you to have to --"

Professor Delchamps: "That is a good point."

Speaker Walcott: "We have time for one more, I would think. Okay, David, thank you so much. We are now going to have a report on the provost search. Alan, are you going to start? John, you are going to have a duet here?"

5. REPORT ON THE PROVOST SEARCH

Alan Mathios, The Rebecca Q. and James C. Morgan Dean of the College of Human Ecology: "Thank you. We are here mostly to listen to you, as we gather the search committee and get our work going in finding the next provost. Just a few comments.

"So the chair of the committee is president-elect Garrett. I'm the vice chair, and we have a provost search description up there that the committee together authored. John took a great role, from his experience doing this. We are working with an external search firm, the same firm that worked on the presidential search.

"All members of the search committee signed confidentiality agreements about the candidates and what gets discussed at the meeting. I think it's a great committee. We are working well together. This is a little new for Cornell, that it is a full-blown search that's an external search, as well as potential internal candidates.

"So in the past, Cornell's largely gone to internal candidates only for provost. So this is sort of new territory, a little bit, for the university. So what we are here to do is, first of all, you are free to nominate anyone that you would like, that the search committee would look at. There's a confidential site that only the search committee will see what your nominations are, and we will discuss all nominated candidates.

“So I want to thank Lisa (Yager). Lisa's been incredible support for the search. She's in the president's office, and just been a great asset for all of us. So there is a web site and a site you can go to, to make nominations. And we are here to find out what you want us to look at, as we consider candidates, just take feedback on that. That's really our main purpose.

“We are going to each of the assemblies, as well as the senate. So we have been to the employee assembly, to the university assembly. We have schedules to go to the student assembly and the graduate student -- the undergraduate and the graduate student professional survey. And we are contemplating doing an open forum for anyone who can't make any of the other meetings we go to, to just talk about it.”

Professor Abby Cohn, Department of Linguistics: “Is there a time frame that's been established?”

Dean Mathios: “Our expectation, as much as a hope, is that by the fall we will announce a candidate. That's our hope. That's where our timing is designed for. It could be sooner, but that's sort of publicly what we are trying to accomplish.”

Professor Cohn: “How does the nomination process and timing fit in? And once we've gotten past the nomination and sort of the solicitation of information process, will there be any other aspect of the search that is public in any sense, or will we not hear anything until there's been an actual announcement?”

Dean Mathios: “It's going to be a closed process, much like the president search. So we talked about is this like a dean search, where there are public forums versus the president search, where it's closed. It will be a closed process, so the president elect will announce the provost.”

Professor Cohn: “So with all of that in mind, I would certainly encourage you to hold a forum for faculty, where it's really emphasized that it's for faculty, because I don't think enough faculty were aware of the process and would be thinking that today was their opportunity, if they wanted to give you input.”

Dean Mathios: “So I think we are talking about should we have sort of a forum for students separately, faculty separately and staff separately. And the attendance, even at the open forum for the president search, wasn't that robust. So we are thinking of sort of putting a lot of effort into finding a time that works for all and having a combined one.”

Professor Cohn: "Could I speak to that, having been one of the few people that attended that forum? Even though it wasn't robust, we had a very good conversation, I believe, and I wouldn't lump together those different constituencies, because I think it would water down the kind of impact those discussions would have. And I personally would take the position that this is an area where faculty input is of absolutely critical importance. And so anything you can do to engage the faculty, to engage and give you that input would be a good investment."

Dean Mathios: "Yes, and it's incentive-compatible for me, because I want a good boss."

Professor Delchamps: "I'm wondering who decided to go -- I say who, just broadly speaking, committee person, whatever -- for a full-blown external search, given the fact that we are getting a new president and we are going to have a new provost at the same time."

"Having all non-Cornell people with not a lot of institutional memory at the top seems, to, me challenging for all of us. I mean, I'm just wondering what militated in favor of a broad external search."

Dean Mathios: "I think it's fair to say president-elect Garrett thought it was best to have a full-blown search, and it's not a preference. I will say there's no preference for an external candidate. That's not what the motivation is. It's really to be as widespread in thinking about who the best candidate is."

"I do believe the search committee has to weigh there are values of having an internal because of the things you mentioned, so it's one of many things the search committee will have to grapple with, as we consider the best candidate. And I will say that everyone is aware of two external people coming at the same time."

"This is what I love about being a dean at Cornell -- there is very much of a shared leadership model at Cornell. So the deans and the provosts meet two hours every week and really -- so you have many deans who have been around for a while. There's a ten-year limit, two-term limit on deans, but there's some seasoned people in there."

“So some of that continuity and institutional memory will be there, but we are all aware of this tension, not to mention the Susan Murphy search as well, which again, she's been here a long time, with great historical importance.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I wonder if you could explain a bit more about the decision to do this as a closed search. I know the standard answer that's always given for closed searches in terms of well, people won't be willing to put themselves up because blah, blah, blah. We all know that answer and this kind of swearing to secrecy thing. Seems to me that's not very healthy for a university generally.

“And also, I think some of the comments we have heard also have to do with the very direct relationship that many faculty have with a provost, in some ways perhaps more similar to a dean than a president. And so I wonder if you could explain that.”

John Siliciano, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs: “I think that's a very appropriate question, and I've chaired way too many dean searches. And this comes up in any dean search, it comes up appropriately in this search and the president search. And you do have a trade-off here between the value of robust participation for the groups that are affected, and that clearly includes faculty, given the provost's role, and the very real demonstrable question of whether you can get the best people in the pool.

“In the dean level, most dean searches these days are quieter than they were 10 or 15 years ago. Some have gone basically to very quiet phases, but many of them still have an open phase. Provost searches nationally tend to be closed. This is a more robust process than we had for the last two provost searches for Biddy Martin and Kent Fuchs. They were done by the president and there was a process, but it didn't have this level of faculty participation and representation.

“This is ultimately President Garrett's call. It is clear thus far in the search that some of the people that we are engaging in that are very promising as provost simply will not engage in the pool. Then you have a tactical decision between whether you have a reduced pool and potentially a weaker pool and enhanced participation or not. It was her decision to follow the presidential mode.

“One way to ameliorate some of the participatory concerns -- and it's not a perfect substitute -- is to have a robust committee. So this committee has eight faculty, one dean, one bureaucrat, two students, and the president and senior

vice president. So it has breadth within it. When you have a closed search, that is how you try to compensate, not fully, but at least partially, for the loss of participatory input."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I understand all that. It's just that there's also that -- seems we should push that consideration. It's not going to happen here, obviously, but seems to me, it is a very real issue, that we shouldn't contribute to increasing the secrecy."

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "I agree both that it's not going to happen here, and we do push that issue. The most recent example is the law school dean search, where we held open the question of whether it would be quiet or more open at the end, but the committee reached a conclusion, which I subscribe to fully, that it was important in that community that any candidate that was considered be willing to go through an open process, and they all were. And it had a very good result. This is a different search and this is President Garrett's preference here."

Speaker Walcott: "Other comments, questions?"

Professor Claire Fewtrell, Department of Molecular Medicine: "I am asking this question perhaps on behalf of Chris Schaffer, who raised the question of the fact that there were no associate professors on the search committee. It was all professorial level, and I believe he raised that with the committee, and I would be interested in knowing why. I think his view, and I would agree with it, is that tenured associate professors are the future of the university and should be having a say in the provost search."

Dean Mathios: "So we did get that comment from the University Assembly, and so one of the reasons we want to do an open forum, not just come to the assemblies and the senate alone was to create more opportunities for people to voice this.

"The search committee was put together by recommendations from many different colleges and from deans, and so it was, in some sense, the first process was having deans recommend who might be a good person to serve on that committee. So it was not designed up front that way. It ended up that way, I would say."

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: "Beth's request in soliciting was to have outstanding faculty, and so you do have eight very visible faculty. There wasn't,

as far as I know, and this was her decision, any sort of age or rank cutoff. She was simply looking for faculty that all of you would look to and see that those people are very significant in terms of the intellectual life at Cornell.

“When we heard this criticism, I know the faculty on the search committee sort of thought wait, I'm not that old. They still viewed themselves as young, but you are correct. They all had a rank of full professor.”

Dean Burns: “Might you comment on the characteristics that you are specially seeking in the candidates?”

Dean Mathios: “Sure. So we try to lay out, in the broadest possible terms in the search document, I think a lot of the discussion is about how we can bring this campus together in a collaborative way.

“It was very interesting, when we went to the employee assembly, it was interesting that they really didn't quite get what a provost did as much as other groups and realized the budgetary authority the provost not only has over academic units, but setting the priorities for the nonacademic units from a budget perspective.

“And so someone who can manage both the -- in some sense, understand the priorities, both of the administration side and the academic side, someone who is a scholar, so that was very talked about. Someone we want very scholarly, who has a reputation in the academy. John?”

Senior Vice Provost Siliciano: “Someone who will be really focused on academic excellence, the highest priority of everything, in the first order is academic excellence, and someone who will strive for that. We specified Cornell Tech and we specified the Medical School, because Cornell Tech is going to take a lot of attention by the provost, since it's in its development stage. And not to diminish what's required on the Ithaca campus, but it is in a very rapid growth period.

“And the Medical School, because there's no formal governance over the Medical College through this provost, because they have their separate provost. The job description mentions it's very important to have a provost who can make connections with the Medical College and create and in some sense follow on the path it's been going; that though they are independent at some level, there's much more collaboration that goes on between Ithaca and Weill. Those are some of the things in there.”

"If you read the statement, what you see called out is Cornell Tech, educational technologies, Weill budget; so they seem to have a prominence that indicates a focus on those. Those are all things that have to be of particular attention to the provost, given where we are right now.

"But the lead thing -- and this, again reflects Beth's priorities, and also reflects the priorities that led to the selection of President Garrett, is this bullet. It's a quiet bullet, but it is purposefully up front -- it is academic excellence, and that is the core function of the provost, which is to further the teaching and research mission of the university. Everything else falls under that.

"So the things that are called out below are things that require particular attention during this period, but the umbrella is the most important thing and what obviously she's going to be focusing on in terms of the next provost."

Dean Mathios: "So I guess, in a way, echoing Risa's comment, but also echoing many of the conversations and discussions that have taken place in this room over the years, I think, from my point of view, and I imagine I would be speaking for many faculty, I think the how is as important as the what.

"And I think all of us in this room would welcome a provost who had a profound commitment to faculty governance and who really understood that as the process and the vehicle through which we collectively achieve our goals of excellence in teaching and research and so on.

"There's been tension over the years, and it often has to do with the individual person and personalities and so on, but I think it really merits underscoring how critical that is and how, when we think about in this room, the energies we've devoted, oftentimes that's probably the unifying underlying point, and so I would emphasize the how.

"And we will certainly bring that to the committee in our discussions."

Professor N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, Africana Studies: "I wonder if in the process the disciplinary dimensions will be considered in terms of what would constitute some kind of complimentary balance in understanding some of the issues. And especially when you mention that the Tech campus is going to play a bigger role, is that a suggestion that the person who's likely to understand or deal with those aspect might have an advantage over others who may not have those disciplinary training."

Dean Mathios: "Yeah, and I will just mention that part of the focus of who was on the search committee was to create disciplinary breadth in the committee structure. So as we put together the committee, it was a lot of attention paid to making sure we had diversity in the disciplines on the search committee. We have talked about is there the value of having a provost that has a different disciplinary field than the president.

"And that's one factor that plays out, out of many factors. That's not to say we will never have someone have the same disciplines. I think Bidy and Hunter Rawlings were both in humanities, and that was a snapshot of history, where they were very similar aligned, then we have had different versions of that.

"So the committee is cognizant of that, but there's no strict rules about that we will hire someone in humanities, we'll hire someone in engineering or with a tech perspective; none of that. It's really let the best candidate rise, understanding that disciplinary breadth is one of the many factors that the committee is thinking about and looking at."

Speaker Walcott: "Are you going to publicize to all of us the web site we could go to, to suggest the candidates?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "There are about 50 job descriptions there with contact information."

Speaker Walcott: "Anything further?"

Dean Mathios: "Thank you so much for having us."

6. REPORT ON ENGAGED CORNELL

Speaker Walcott: "Next on the agenda is engaged learning program update, Judy Appleton and Laura Brown. And you can advance your own slides."

Vice Provost, Judith Appleton: "Thank you. Another duet. So we are here to provide you information about Engaged Cornell, and I am going to start out just giving a very brief overview of the program.

"As I'm sure many of you know, Engaged Cornell was announced in October, when we received a gift of \$50 million from the Einhorn Family Charitable Trust,

\$5 million in current funds over a ten-year period. So it is a substantial gift, and it's an ambitious program.

“The overarching goal is to enhance student learning, personal development and professional preparation through active partnerships that serve the contemporary needs of communities. So our goal in Engaged Cornell is to provide all students at Cornell the opportunity to experience community engagement as part of their education. It's very broadly stated.

“The program has strategic areas that are listed here and have specific aims for scale, scope and research. And I'm going to touch on each of those things.

“So the broad areas of strategic aims are student and faculty engagement. So this program will involve and engage the faculty and the students. It is essential in community-engaged learning that effective partnerships with communities be developed. This is a reciprocal relationship with communities, where the community is informing us what their needs and interests are, and we are engaging with them in a way that serves their interests and also advances our academic program and research programs.

“So those partnerships are very important, and a big part of what we hope to achieve is to develop practices and approaches to effective partnership.

“And then the last strategic aim is transformative influence and leadership in higher education. So this is, as I said, a ten-year program. This is an extraordinary opportunity to experiment, develop new approaches to teaching and learning and community engagement, and to evaluate what we are doing and to share that information broadly.

“So we want to share it across the campus, we want to share it across higher education, and that's where we feel that Cornell, as a Research I university, has a unique opportunity to influence community engagement in ways that perhaps haven't been achieved broadly in higher education previously.

“The scope and scale piece, just to emphasize this, Engaged Cornell includes any student, any subject -- that's a modern translation of something you are all familiar with -- so all students, all levels of education, undergraduate, graduate students, professional students are included. All disciplines, all colleges and schools are included.

“Community in our thinking is very, very broadly defined. So these may be geographic communities, they may be local, regional, national, international communities. They may be virtual communities, they might be business communities, people with shared interests. Veterans would be an example of a community. Very broadly defined. So we are trying to be as inclusive as possible, both for students and the faculty involved and for the community partners that would be engaged.

“And just to give a very brief overview of the initiatives within the initiative, this is a listing of the different programs that are or will be developed as part of Engaged Cornell, and you can see the first two are really co-curricular.

“So we have leadership for the greater good. This is an effort to enhance leadership preparation for students on campus, not only preparing them with leadership skills, but with familiarity with tools that they need to exercise leadership in the community, when they graduate from the institution.

“Living, learning communities is another target of the extracurricular piece of Engaged Cornell. This one is not as well developed right now. It's not intended to roll out probably until Year 3 or later of the program. And then below that are the curricular pieces, some of which I've referred to already.

“The one that you may have heard the most about is the community-engaged curriculum grants. This RFP was announced back in December, and we've just had the deadline yesterday for the submission of letters of intent. We've received approximately 50 letters of intent. as of today, there are few straggling in, maybe a little bit late. It is a very broad representation of interests from across the campus. So we are very pleased with the response, and there's been a tremendous amount of interest in these community-engaged curriculum grants.

“Then below that are programs that will address the question of partnerships, programs that will promote engagement across the disciplines. We probably have a few thoughts along those lines already in these LOIs that we are reviewing now. Community-engaged faculty and graduate student fellowships, and community-engaged student research grants.

“So this is just to give you an idea of the scope of the overall program. It is not just the one RFP that we have announced already. It's much broader than that.

“So the idea -- these arrows across the top are symbols, indicating those different programs -- is to provide every student at Cornell an opportunity for a community-engaged experience and to integrate community engagement in departments and in curricula, and to have a systematic public impact, a broader impact we hope to achieve with the partnerships; and then to disseminate that, as I said before, across higher education, but also across the campus, across our colleges, and to promote collaboration around this.

“The 100% piece here is an aspirational goal. There is no policy attached to Engaged Cornell. So there's no requirement attached to participation in this program. Everything is an opportunity. It is an opportunity for the students, an opportunity for the faculty to develop curricula. No requirements. Only opportunities.

“And then the leadership that worked very hard to prepare the proposal and is launching the program is described here. We have two vice provosts standing in front of you, me and Laura Brown, a vice president, Susan Murphy as vice president of academic services. She is a critical part of this team.

“We also have a provost fellow in public engagement, many of you know Becky Stoltzfus, and Leonardo Vargas-Mendes, director of the public service center and Richard Kiley, who is the director of engaged learning of research. Laura Toy is the major gift officer who stewards the relationship with the Einhorn.

“We are all part of an executive committee. It's a very horizontal leadership structure. You could step any one of us out and step another one in and pretty much have the same experience, I think. So very horizontal leadership structure, with a few hires that we're in the process of securing right now; first of all, an executive director, who is going to be an operations person to help us deliver this, communications manager, and a financial specialist, because if this all goes according to plan, we are going to be sending a lot of money in a lot of different directions across campus and we need someone to manage that.

“So the last piece is to inform you who serves on the Public Engagement Council. This is a group of faculty who are helping now with the RFP. They are going to help with the review. We'll have a peer review process for the community-engaged curriculum grants, and they are representative of all the colleges and schools; extension is represented here, international programs, and some of the special centers that support this type of work. So I'm going to turn it over to Laura now, who's going to provide more background.

Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Laura Brown: "I'm outlining for you the interaction -- I am going back a little in history now. I am going to outline for you the interaction with faculty and the consultation with the faculty senate and senate committees that has been directly relevant to and has informed the development of Engaged Cornell.

"And I will go back to the strategic planning process to begin with and say that that has been a key element in the consideration and design of the Engaged Cornell project. And the strategic planning process, of course, is the key moment in the explicit recent formulation of Cornell's public engagement or land grant mission, but it's really only the most recent one.

"As you know, land grant is in the DNA of Cornell, since 1865. The strategic planning process, many of you remember, got underway in 2009. And by fall 2010, the strategic plan 2010-2015, which is called Cornell in its Sesquicentennial, was announced. The Strategic Planning Council you see on the screen here was named in consultation with the Nominations and Elections Committee, as were the four working groups that supported the strategic plan.

"And so in consultation with the provost and with the Strategic Planning Council and the UFC and the Faculty Senate, the strategic planning process went forward. Also, there are a range of fora on the campus with faculty.

"Now you see, I think, the strategic plan priorities, the fourth of which is public engagement, which expresses the university's commitment to search for knowledge-based solutions to societal and world problems. Public engagement is the interpretation of the university's outreach mission that emphasizes being proactive, actively engaged and having a public impact. It implies the broadening of the historic land grant mission of the university. The strategic plan adopts and develops this concept of the university's outreach mission.

"And here's the detail on that priority, which I will not read to you in whole, except to note the dimensions of it that are very directly pertinent to the design of Engaged Cornell, conceiving of the university's outreach mission as public engagement is an important shift -- half-way down -- because it recasts that mission in broader and more inclusive terms. And the breadth and inclusiveness and scope of this project is something that Judy emphasized.

“Objective 1: make public engagement a distinctive feature of education at Cornell, construct a unified concept and vision, develop rigorous, systematic evaluations, promote stronger collaborations and partnerships. I think you saw that these were featured dimensions of the concept of Engaged Cornell, as Judy was describing.

“Now I am looking quickly at the engagement of this initiative with a range of faculty members as it developed post-2010. So a faculty committee of twelve members met for a year and created an initial report. 20 faculty members were invited to a retreat to discuss and develop these ideas and to promulgate and review them with colleagues in their areas.

“An external review of the Engaged Cornell project was undertaken, which interacted with over 20 faculty members, as well as external reviewers. And finally, the Public Engagement Council was formed. And Judy showed you the membership of that group, which spans the colleges and constituencies at Cornell.

“So I will close by saying this is an intensively faculty-oriented project in regard to the involvement with faculty from 2009 to the present, in regard to the very direct connection with the formulation of the strategic plan in 2010, and in regard to the opportunities that the gift is presenting, in the form of grants that directly support Cornell faculty. So we're open now for your questions, for what remains of our time on the agenda.”

Professor John Brady, Department of Food Science: “I have a couple of related questions. You mentioned evaluation of effectiveness, and I'm wondering, in that respect, if that's going to be used in evaluation of faculty performance. For example, and more broadly, if this is a ten-year program, is it a done deal, or is the Einhorn family going to have some sort of external authority to determine Cornell programs? Are they going to be evaluating the effectiveness as it goes along?”

Senior Vice Provost Brown: “We have a relationship with them, which does require us to represent our progress in accordance with the scenario that we laid out for them at the outset. So we're responsible for using their funds the way we said we would use them at the beginning; but they do not, of course, have any role in evaluation of faculty or of direct evaluation of programs or of student learning outcomes or of courses.

“As far as the issue of criteria for review processes, those belong to the faculty and to the departments, so we are hoping to provide faculty with opportunities to develop their interests, their scholarly and teaching portfolios and abilities and activities in those areas, but the understanding and assessment of their success or of the relationship between their success in those areas and their value to the institution belongs in the hands of the faculty in those departments.

“What we are assessing are the outcomes for students in courses and curricula that support community engagement and that enable our students to explore and experience learning in those kinds of contexts, and the relationship with our partners in communities, local and global, that demonstrate the public role that the institution plays in a broader world, and wanting to understand what the best practices and what the best results are, how those ought to be measured; and then measure them and improve, if we are not as successful as we wish to be in all those areas. Is that making sense?”

Professor Ted Clark, Department of Microbiology and Immunology: “So I guess I’m a little bit hazy on this. Are all the resources being devoted to curriculum development per se, or are some of these other things like partnership development outside curricular development, and will there be RFPs for things like that?”

Vice Provost Appleton: “Yes. So we do have a plan around partnership convenings. So the strongest community engagement learning experiences for students occur when the community engagement is directly connected to the scholarship that’s going on in the department. And that partnership convening is about promoting that. So you can’t separate the scholarship from the student learning and you can’t separate the scholarship from the partnership with the community.

“So the item that was listed on there that was called partnership convenings is meant to promote that. We don’t have that rolled out yet, but -- it’s a different opportunity, yeah. It would be a different opportunity. A convening.”

Professor Dick Miller, Department of Philosophy: “This is partly an expression of confusion, but it may also raise a question that’s important for the leadership and important for the senate. When I think of community engagement, I think of maybe the Tompkins County worker council. They are working on policy issues, like raising the local minimum wage. I don’t think of groups working to create justice as they see it in Israel/Palestine. That’s personally public engagement. I

don't think people working to elect the Democratic or Republican candidates. That raises a question of how political the engagement of students that we want to encourage ought to be, as far as groups are concerned.

“Perhaps this is more amorphous than that, and we just want students to work on writing papers on public issues. So you see one question really is about engagement, is writing papers on public issues enough. I take it that's not the intention, because they sure do that now, at least in my courses.

“If the question is engagement with activities of groups, I'm torn, because I think 100% participation in apolitical community activities would be highly distorting. I don't think they are the most effective publicly, though. Of course I favor the people who are on the right side of the issues, as I see it.

“I think that means that for such a large investment, the faculty time and university resources, there are really quite significant moral questions about effectiveness and social change and about university neutrality that are raised. If I'm on to something, if these are questions, if it's not just a matter of writing research papers, then I would hope that the faculty senate would have a say.

“I admire some people, the people I know on the list that you have shown. I have no idea about whether the process confined to Day Hall will illuminate these issues.”

“Vice Provost Appleton: “So there is process within the process that I described. So when a faculty team -- so we'll just talk about the community engaged curriculum grants. When a faculty team puts together one of those letters of intent, and if they go forward and submit a full proposal, that has to come out of a department or whatever organization in your college or school controls the curriculum. And so it isn't one person's idea. It has to be a team of people who have a goal for a curriculum. It's not one course.

“We purposefully called it a curriculum grant. So I can just tell you from the LOIs that we have seen, they come from a huge spectrum of interest, some of which are very much oriented towards social change and some of them that are addressing environmental issues. It's very, very broad.

“So Laura might have other thoughts about your remarks, but this is something that will be decided by the faculty who put these things together, and the faculty governance that you have in your units that decide whether or not a course is

approved, a course of study is approved, that's -- Engaged Cornell, we have no policy. We are a vehicle for creativity, hopefully. Laura, do you want to comment on that?

Professor Cohn: "So the presentations were helpful, I think, in contextualizing this to some degree, but I kind of have the feeling that, at least from my perspective, my discipline, my teaching and research commitments, it feels like we are getting the cart before the horse here, in a number of ways.

"So while indeed there are colleagues on this campus where their own research segues very nicely with very obvious ways that you could have a community engagement and you could yolk that closely to a curricular component that involved student engagement, where your commitment was for the student experience, that doesn't hold for many of us.

"And I think that for this to be effective and for those of us who don't see those natural connections already as low-hanging fruit, we need to hear how we are going to put those pieces in place.

"I would comment on a couple things. First of all, I'm personally concerned by the language that I have been hearing that kind of emphasized the goal as being the student experience, rather than being the actual outcome of the partnership and the engagement in the community.

"So for me, I would want to start, for example, maybe linguistics could be better implemented in the K through 12 curriculum. I would want to know who's willing to partner with me and how they want to partner, and I would want somebody to facilitate having that conversation. I've tried, as an individual, on occasion to do those things, and it is very difficult. So who can help me have that conversation?

"Another thing that concerns me, it's really not obvious to me that the activities that I might engage in and that my students might engage in would be narrowly defined within a curricular rubric, and I would like to hear us talking a lot more about other ways to achieve those things and not have it so closely tied to curricular goals."

Senior Vice Provost Brown: "Well, first of all, one of our aims -- and remember, we haven't actually started. We are in Year 0. We haven't started Year 1, and we don't have the money yet -- one of our aims is to provide for resources, contacts,

information, channels of potential communication between faculty at Cornell, programs at Cornell and communities or potential partners. So that's an explicitly stated goal of the project.

“As far as the role of the focus on students, I think that we are initially focused on the curriculum. That's the very visible front end of the project, and it's been visible. It's evident that people are paying attention, now that there's potential money for the curriculum grant; but as Judy was showing you on the screen earlier, there are a range of other kinds of opportunities, grants for faculty, grants for students that go well beyond and are different from the curriculum grants.”

Professor Cohn: “I think it is important not to conflict curricular and student. I think to be working together collaboratively with students to be engaged in the community is great, but I think we need to be very careful that we don't assume that can happen naturally or appropriately within a curricular context, so I think it's important to separate those.

“I can't even see launching this thing, unless we already start to know how we are going to have conversations about developing partnerships. Seems to me that's the first thing I need to hear about, to even want to put in any kind of proposal.”

Senior Vice Provost Brown: “Yes. So that is something that's underway. And the information that we've been seeking to provide to potential applicants to the RFP enables them to begin to make these kind of contacts. We do fully intend to engage and create matches with partners.

“I think, Abby, that the opportunities for colleagues in the humanities, which feels to me like what you are describing, initially seem narrow and not organic; but I believe, as we are seeing in the letters of intent and as we have discovered, as we have gone around to talk with faculty across the campus, the potential for making the connection with community engagement in the whole scope of fields and areas of study at Cornell is broad and deep.”

Professor Cohn: “So I would actually reframe that. I don't see the potential connections in the humanities as narrow. I see them as having less obvious linkages, where we have to work more systematically to make those linkages.

“I have been trying to do outreach in linguistics for about ten years, both within my professional organizations and locally, and have gotten zero support to do

that. And so I feel that there are institutional impediments, and I feel like what I have heard so far reinforces a very narrow interpretation of how we are going to do these things, not that those things -- not that I don't have ideas about how I could do them."

Senior Vice Provost Brown: "Then we need to learn from you and others how to make it broader, because our goal, as Judy has been emphasizing, is breadth, making these opportunities as widely available and as visible and we can. So that's where we are dependent on you to help us see where we are not sufficiently visible, where we need to educate our colleagues, where we need to make better connections and make these kinds of things more evident.

"So I think that's definitely a role that we could play in listening to what's needed out there in the departments and by individual faculty. That's what we intend to do, yes. Thanks, Abby."

Speaker Walcott: "I think that's it. Thank you so much. We have one Good and Welfare speaker, Professor Grossman."

7. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Yuval Grossman, Department of Physics: "So I wanted to talk about this new health fee that we all heard about, and I'm worried about a few things that actually kind of different from what the students are worried about.

"What I really wanted, I wanted to have probably the president come and talk to us. And when I talked to Joe, he said he thinks it is not -- we will not be interested in hearing him, and I think we should.

"And the thing that really bothers me is until now, when the fact that we have very few fees at Cornell, I found useful things that Cornell have the freedom to move things around. The fact that Cornell start -- it seems start to move into kind of a model that have a lot of fees, it would not be a good idea. And just reading what the president wrote in his thing that -- like other universities have fees.

"So I just looked up a little bit and see like what universities has fees and what universities don't have fees. And you can guess what you can find. If you look at Binghamton University and you see like -- they start with health fee, but when they have athletic fees and you have a fee to get your card, a fee to use the computer, et cetera.

“At the end of the day, seems like all the nonacademic units going to get directly their money from the student, and they have nothing to worry about. And we know where we are. And at least in Arts and Science, we know we are down by a lot of money that somehow cannot come.

“So I don't know what the situation is; but for me, in particular, after having go through all this new finance model and suddenly change it so dramatically, it's something I would like to hear someone talking. So I'm here, say if you guys agree with me, maybe we should have the president or someone else who really knows what's going on to come and talk to us. That's it.”

Speaker Walcott: “Thank you very much.”

Dean Burns: “You sent me this suggestion three days before the meeting started, four days after the agenda was set for the meeting. And what I said was that I didn't think a \$350 fee was the purview of what the senate should be spending its time doing.”

“And I can also tell you the president will be here next month for 45 minutes, and what he talks about, you can ask him, yes.”

Speaker Walcott: “I think that's it. I believe we're adjourned.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED)