MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
Wednesday, March 9, 2005

Professor J. Robert Cooke, Biological and Environmental Engineering, Speaker Pro Tem: “The meeting of the Faculty Senate will please come to order. The Chair has the routine announcements that no photographs are permitted and no recordings of the session. If you have a cell phone, please turn it off. When you speak would you please identify yourself and your department for the benefit of the secretary.

“We do have knowledge of one Good and Welfare speaker and I have one additional thing and that is to ask for unanimous consent to swap the order of the two resolutions. One deals with titles and one with professional development. The committee would like to have professional development come first. The Dean of the Faculty indicates that he knows of no reason not to, so unless someone objects we will switch that order.

“We will call on the President.”

1. Remarks by and Questions for President Jeffrey Lehman

“The Secretary should note that my name is Jeff Lehman and I am on the faculty of the Law School. I should begin by conveying regrets from Biddy Martin. Originally this was going to be more of a tag team performance. There is an ILR Dean search going on and there is a candidate performing at this moment. And as Chair of the Dean Search Committee, she needs to be there. Biddy sends her regrets and you are stuck with just me.

“I thought I would just talk a little bit about what is on my mind these days and what I am up to. I know that when the President is invisible for a while, it’s natural to assume that he is up to no good. And so I thought I would just tell you the kinds of things I have been working on and worrying about and leave plenty of time for questions.

“In some ways what is continuing to stay at the center of my thoughts is an extension of what I said in the State of the University address in October, which is the question of how we renew Cornell in the two dimensions that I intend to focus on – the beloved and the revolutionary. I will come back to the beloved part, I think, at the end.

“In the State of the University address, in renewing the revolutionary part, I identified three challenges where I thought Cornell could make a special contribution by drawing on our strengths in the humanities and the social sciences and mixing it together with our strengths in science and technology to address a set of issues that are often bridged too narrowly, in my opinion. I asked the Provost to form task forces to consider what more we could be doing, how could we better draw on our enormous resources, our
enormous human resources, as well as our financial resources. To think about these areas she has assembled the task forces. They are meeting, and I think the task forces also have the capacity to add more members. I expect they will continue to evolve over time, and I am looking forward to what they have to say.

“One of the consequences of the State of the University was a recognition that we have a lot to do, and a lot of what we aspire to do is extensive. And that therefore leads to the second thing that has taken a lot of my attention right now, which is the campaign. In order to accomplish all the things that I deeply would like to do, we need a lot of resources - - many of which will come through a campaign, many of which will come from other sources such as government support, internal reallocations from various kinds if necessary. But, in order to really excel we really need to have an extraordinarily successful campaign. And so as of July 1st, we have been in the quiet but hardly secret phase of the campaign building what we call the nucleus fund. I have been spending a fair amount of time meeting with individual trustees and other good friends of the University to see where they would like to be in this campaign. The response has been very good. It’s still early and it’s too early to really know where we will really end up as far as what the goals are in this campaign. I am optimistic that we will be able to pull off a very ambitious and successful campaign to build endowments in particular, but also other programmatic and facilities needs.

“I will say this about the campaign. The process for identifying campaign priorities has been very impressive to me. It has been more systematic, better organized than what I have seen at other campaigns before. I have been impressed by it. It has evolved initially to be development of long wish lists through the colleges, the schools and the units. Those have filtered upwards to the Provost and she has done a lot of work to try to boil those down somewhat. The next step is then to take this somewhat boiled down set of wish lists and do what is described as a feasibility analysis. Not everything that we absolutely need is something that we can raise money for through a campaign. We desperately need to have hot water in the hot water pipes. But, there aren’t many too donors out there who will give hot water. So part of what is happening in the campaign in this stage, and this stage is actually going on right now, is kind of a search for a reflective equilibrium, which means the development folks and the academic folks identify a subset of things that we really need and that we believe we can pay for through a campaign. For the other complementary subset, we believe we will need to find other ways to pay for. It’s a process that is going forward, I think, quite well right now, but it obviously does have a ways left to go.

“Speaking of other resources, the State of New York is an important supporter of what we do, especially in the contract colleges. The governor submitted an executive budget in January. The executive budget called for a cut of approximately $85,000,000 in the appropriations for the SUNY operating budget. The overall theory of the executive budget was that this would be offset by a roughly comparable amount of new tuition
money that the different campuses would raise through a tuition increase of about $500 per student. Unfortunately because of the way the SUNY budget is constructed, that wouldn’t have, at least as far as SUNY is concerned, carried through to Cornell in that way. That is to say, we would not have been asked to absorb $500 per student’s worth of cut. The way SUNY works is that they would have asked that the cut be distributed in proportion to total appropriations to the University through SUNY. And because we have things like Cooperative Extension and Outreach and because in other respects it costs more to educate our students than it does to educate students on other campuses, the initial formulation of the cut that we would have received would have been much, much bigger. I have spoken with Bob King, the Chancellor of SUNY, about this and expressed the view, that at least in my lights, when a cut is rationalized in a particular way in the legislature, the method of allocating the cuts should be consistent with that rationale, rather than through the traditional SUNY budget mechanism. I did not persuade him of that. We recognized that we are at a point of significant disagreement over a matter of some consequence. We concluded that the best way to avoid that unfortunate situation would be to find a way to get rid of the cut, so there would be nothing to allocate. So Bob King and I are united in a legislative strategy that is asking that the Assembly and the Senate and the Governor and to work together to not have an $85,000,000 cut in the appropriations.

“If you have been following the papers the last couple of weeks, the revised revenue estimates of the state are auspicious. There is a lot more money in the state budget than had originally been forecast and we are asking that some of that go to not have a cut in higher education this year.

“We are receiving support from a number of our trustees who are well known in Albany on both sides of the aisle by the leadership in the Assembly and the Senate and the executive mansion. I guess since I am always optimistic, I am cautiously optimistic but I don’t really know where this will go. What we are being told is that the three leaders, that is to say, the Governor, the leaders of the Senate and the Assembly are sincerely committed to trying to do something different this year about resolving their differences in a more expeditious fashion. We don’t know and people still think it is unlikely that it will actually happen by April 1, which is the official deadline. But they are thinking much, much closer to April 1st than to August this year. All I can say is that this is something that is a paramount part of my personal time and attention because I think it is very important. These numbers are very big. They pass through to Cornell as very big numbers and I would rather not end up where we were two years ago.

“Finally, I’m going to circle back to what I said at the beginning, this question of renewal of the two dimensions of Cornell. In my State of the University address I spoke about a concrete approach to renewing the revolutionary. I had an announcement that I was going to have task forces working on these certain areas and I wasn’t as specific
about the renewal of the beloved dimensions of Cornell. Nor am I going to tell you something specific now. But I just wanted to say a little bit now in this audience because I think that it is the faculty that ultimately will determine how successful we are at renewing the ‘beloved Cornell.’ And I have been thinking about a number of different dimensions of how we are constructed as an intellectual community, and how we relate to one another, and how our students relate to one another that are worth further thought and investigation. The Dean of the Faculty and I have been talking about a number of these over the last few months and I just want to report about the kinds of issues that I am lumping in my head when I think about the sort of beloved community questions associated with Cornell. They have to do with things like authenticity of presentation of ourselves to one another and how we teach our students to present themselves authentically to us as faculty, and to one another. This can come up for example if the students try to understand what it means to have committed plagiarism. And I see that in part as a question of authentic representation of oneself. When one does work for a grade, one is making the implicit statement that “this is me, this is mine; this is my work.” And, helping our students understand the lines around plagiarism really are the lines around being authentic. It is something that we talk to students about; we talk together about it. In the University Assembly there has been a conversation going about the possibility of Cornell adopting an honor code. We are thinking about what our code of conduct looks like. And, I think this is actually a good location for this conversation to take place because it engages students and faculty and staff together in what is ultimately a project of collective self-definition.

“Beyond authenticity I think there are questions more directly about the faculty and how we construct ourselves as a beloved community and not an atomized professional community. For instance, issues around childcare, issues around dual career situations for our faculty, situations around single or unpartnered faculty members who are looking to develop a more robust social life. These matter actually to the kind of community that we are and how it feels to be a faculty member. Again, I think these are issues that I am thinking about and talking with various people about. I don’t have an action plan for all issues. In some areas there are task forces working on these things.

“The third dimension has to do with is a set of issues that I hear a lot about when I travel and represent Cornell in the larger world, and that has to do with intellectual diversity. Intellectual diversity is the way people who are critical of university often portray it. The charge is made that we are actually not serious about our diversity, or when people are really hostile they say we are hypocritical about our diversity and the charge is made, after we construct a community that is diverse or some would say not diverse in some ways, we then don’t really engage in an effective discussion that is real and serious about hard issues that are potentially divisive. Either we avoid them or we shut down before we disagree with established university position. And I am thinking about this. I am not persuaded by the critique in its strongest form. But I think it is, nonetheless, one that we shouldn’t be smug about. I think it is a critique that we ought
to reflect on, listen to, ask what we can learn from it, rather than describing it in a
defensive way. We need to ask what our affirmative aspirations are for how we interact
and how our students interact with one another across all of the different dimensions
that characterize the fully diverse community.

“And so I have been thinking about this too. I think this is an area that I will probably
end up speaking about. I am always fishing for themes to explore. I think it is a serious
question and part of what I worry about is that when we leave the campus and we get
out there in the outside world, there is a caricature of what happens on our campuses
that is repeated over and over and over again. I think that on any campus, or any large,
complex community there is a large amount of activity that goes on that we would all
think of as normal and healthy. Then there is a certain amount of pathological activity
that happens that we don’t particularly like and there are people who are not
particularly sympathetic to universities. These people are latching on to the pathology
of the month and keep repeating it over and over and over again to the general public
so that a lot of friends of mine will call me and say, ‘is this really true, is this what
happens at Cornell every hour of every day, day in and day out?’ And they can
describe an actual event that did take place. So out there, there is a distorted sort of a
fun house picture of who we are. I don’t think the right way to respond to that
distorted picture, maybe it’s the right way, but not the most effective way, is to simply
say, that’s not true. I think we have to do something more than that.

“So that’s what I am thinking about these days. Why don’t I stop there and take
questions.”

Speaker Cooke: “Questions for the President or vicariously for the Provost?”

President Lehman: “I’m happy to answer for Biddy.”

Professor Eric Cheyfitz, English Department: “Speaking to your concerns and I
certainly share them about community and diversity, but if I could just get a little more
concrete and focus in on issues of academic freedom and freedom of speech which are
currently on the agenda across the country. This started I think probably last year at
Hasgrove’s Resolution 3077 and now has focused in on various attacks on tenure at
Colorado, the Churchill case, Columbia University, not a direct attack on tenure but on
ideas that are in this case critical of the administration policies. I am wondering if you
see some way that Cornell publicly through debate, through a forum for example,
might get a discussion going that raises these issues above the kind of low level they are
being discussed at in the media, at this particularly time.”

President Lehman: “My intuition is that yes, there ought to be a lot of things that we
can do to address this. My own thinking has not advanced far enough to know exactly
what my own voice ought to be on this. Hopefully, I think my voice can be helpful on
this but I have to find it first and that is taking a little bit of time. I also think it’s really important that faculty speak in their own voices. I am a believer in the importance of individual faculty members speaking for themselves to large public audiences about issues where they are experts. I think all of us, if we are living in this kind of community, we know a lot about academic freedom. We know a lot about why it is important for individual faculty members to be able to speak in ways that are unpopular in the larger society, unpopular with the government, unpopular with the President of the University. We know why that is so important and I think something is lost in the translation when all you have is a CNN reporter giving a three-sentence sound bite about academic freedom. And something important is lost because I do think the quality of public discussion on this is not very good. The idea of a forum is terrific and I think this is a very serious issue. The House Bill you mentioned, the Academic Bill of Rights as it’s called, if you look at it there are a lot of elements to it that I think most of us could find unobjectionable on their merits. They would say things that we actually believe. What is animating them is more problematic in my view and the originating principle that this is something that the federal government should be dictating to us rather than we evaluating ourselves is deeply troublesome. But I don’t think we are going to be effective in public debate if we don’t at least begin by acknowledging that some of what’s in there is actually what we really believe. I think if all we are doing is standing in a defensive crouch, I think people will dismiss us as just another self-interested political activist.”

Speaker Cooke: “Anyone else?”

Professor Dick Durst, Food Science and Technology (Geneva): “I was curious about these task forces that Biddy is setting up. Is there somewhere on the University website a description of these and their purview?”

President Lehman: “I don’t know the answer to that. I should answer for Biddy and say of course there is, but I don’t honestly know. The place to find them would be through the Provost’s page. Actually our web guru, Tommy Bruce, is here. I don’t know if he knows.”

Tommy Bruce, Vice President for Communications and Media Relations: “If it’s not there, I’ll talk to Biddy and get it there.”

Speaker Cooke: “The answer was to check the Provost’s web page.”

Professor Jane Fajans, Anthropology: “The other major event in the news that surrounds academia is President Summers’ remarks on women in sciences. A lot of discussion has been going on at Harvard around that but not so much around the country. Shouldn’t we also be addressing this? As an anthropologist I would love to be involved in addressing some of these issues.”
President Lehman: “The President has a daughter who is a grad student in mathematics.”

“I do think that the underlying issues of the conference which were about the importance of greater representation of women in math and science are very important. I think that these are issues that ought to be thought out carefully here and the Provost and I have talked about this as well. I might say the working hypothesis that we have is that it is important if we are to be successful in increasing the numbers of women in math and science here on the faculty that we pay attention to some of the elements of community that we talked about earlier. That is to say there are environmental interests that we ought be looking at in a thoughtful and self-critical way.”

Professor Fajans: “I would call them cultural features.”

Professor Cynthia Farina, Law School and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I am very intrigued by your first point of examining how we are contributing to our students' development of perception of self when we talk about how they are presenting themselves. I want to suggest that you think about adding to that something we might call how a sense of personal responsibility is an element of their perception of self. I am thinking of conversations I have had within this academic year with colleagues about students not showing up for exams, not showing up for make-up exams, and then complaining bitterly about how our not allowing them to take another makeup exam will harm their future, as if this were not their problem in the first place. Or a colleague teaching a grad level course who has a great deal of difficulty getting papers handed in on time. One student who e-mailed him, almost as if a matter of courtesy, and said 'oh the paper is coming along very well, I’m not going to be able to get it in on time but I’ll keep you informed of how I’m progressing.' I think from my experience - - over now almost 20 years I have been teaching that there is a growing sense that even the best of our students increasingly approach our expectations as if they are sort of the starting point for negations, and that rules are really something that they don’t have to take very seriously or take responsibility for reading, no matter how often the materials are given to them. They don’t seem particularly apologetic for not having read them when they fail to abide by them and are unwilling to deal with the consequences. I’m sort of astounded that I sound so curmudgeonly about this. But I do actually think that we need to examine our own institutional responsibility for helping to create a group of young people who don’t have much of a sense of personal responsibility. I don’t know that we are doing them any favors any more than we do our children an favors as parents if we relieve them of the obligation of knowing the rules and following them or allow them to use every expectation as a tool for negotiation. I just wonder whether maybe we have gone too far in trying to alleviate some of the rigors of what we remember of the harshness of our own experience in school.”
President Lehman: "What this reminds me of is I spent a couple of years living in France and learning about the tax system there. I remember being told that in France it is understood the tax return is to be an opening bid -- your suggestion that our rules are understood by our students to be the opening bid. But what it also tells me is that this is an area that is a collective action problem, because our students' expectations of what is appropriate for them are shaped not by any one of us. They are shaped by their experience of everyone. I think it means that this is a matter that needs to be a subject of community discussion with the faculty so that at least we understand what the range of views is on this. I think most faculty members would say that their own behavior and what they tolerate from their students is not actually where they would like to be. But they don't feel like they have a lot of choices because the sense of student expectation is so strong. There are members of the faculty -- and I know this from talking to students -- who are somehow able to create a different understanding of what their expectations are. They are able to have the students know that 'oh, that Professor X is not an opening bid' and that they really need to work. The students actually are able to adjust their behavior. It might be helpful for us to find out who those faculty members are and have a serious conversation with them about exactly what they do. I know in this climate today that this is something that requires a conscious decision and a conscious effort and a certain willingness in being understood as a curmudgeon, although often a highly respected curmudgeon by the students. And the ultimate paradox of this is that these are adult students although they are happy to try to push on us, they don't necessarily respect us for our roles."

Speaker Cooke: "We have time for one more at least. Yes."

Professor Steve Shiffrin, Law School: “This probably won't be a very popular position but I'll take it. Cornell, I think rightly, moved from being established as a Christian non-denominational university to being a secular university. And it strikes me that it is perfectly appropriate that Cornell not take positions on what God has to say on any subject or whether there is a God. At the same time so far as I am aware, and there might be one or two exceptions, I believe there is not a single theologian on the tenure or tenure-track faculty. There are some courses which have theology in them. To teach the bible as literature, it's a little hard to avoid it. In the religious studies program there is, for example, a course comparing the Jewish tradition and the Christian tradition and the Islamic tradition, and so forth. But it strikes me that our students, I was thinking, I saw posted on some web site that talks about how people on the secular left would have no clue as to how to respond to people on the religious right, on the religious rights' premises, that they wouldn't know how to engage in a theological conversation, and vice versa. And it strikes me that that's not good education. And the other point I would make is in the program of ethics and public life for example. If there were conversations about war, it strikes me that having people who are both theologians and who are not theologians would be good. Many theologians are pacifists, some believe
in the just-war doctrine. There are debates about which condition should apply for a just-war doctrine. It strikes me that to have a robust dialogue within a university, it makes sense to include theologians along with non-theologians. I don't know how this came about but it does strike me that if you are thinking about intellectual diversity that religion should be one of the things you think about."

President Lehman: "I accept the point. And I am actually curious do you know if there was a time in our history when we had theologians on the faculty?"

Professor Shiffrin: "Yes. There is a book by Madsen. I'll send it to you."

President Lehman: "Thank you."

Speaker Cooke: "If there is a very short question, we take that too."

Professor John Forester, City and Regional Planning: "I was struck by your reference to people asking you ‘if this is really happening?’ There seems to me there are internal and external dimensions to that. Does this kind of thing really go on on the campus? There's an external question which peculiarly is what have you done for me lately? How does the University relate to the outside world as if educated students didn't already answer that question. But it does seem to be still an important question that the University has tried to address very articulately - how it is that we connect to industry, to communities, to international development and so on? I think we have huge opportunities to address that. There are a individuals on my faculty that I think are extraordinarily gifted. If we don't do that I think we are really missing the mark. There's a suggestion and a question to you."

Professor Lehman: "Well if it's a question whether I agree with it, I agree with it. The suggestion is right. It's not as easy to gather information systematically about the University as I had thought it would be. And that is simply a statement about my own extraordinary naiveté. But we are in the process of trying to gather information about that and disseminate it into various ways. We talk about different aspects of it and some times we produce little brochures about certain aspects of it. So for example we would have brochures about our extension programs. We'll have brochures about technology transfer. We will talk about some elements of it. But when I talk to people what I find is that our penetration into the life of action beyond the life of ideas is much, much deeper than was generally perceived. That is true of universities in general. But it is especially true here. I think that goes back to the understanding of what makes Cornell special."

Speaker Cooke: "Thank you President Lehman for engaging in faculty discussions. The Dean of the Faculty is recognized."
2. Remarks by Dean of Faculty Charles Walcott: "I'll be very brief with just a couple of announcements of coming attractions. Apparently the Law School is likely to request the notion of clinical professor and a proposal will be coming forward through the appropriate committees and so on very soon to then be brought before this body for discussion. Furthermore we are in the final stages of the Corporate Strategic Alliances report thanks to Cynthia Farina and we are discussing with the Deans the final stages, at least what I hope are the final stages, of having a suspension policy. And so these are all things that are in the works."

3. Approval of the Minutes

Speaker Cooke: "The speaker will now ask for approval of the minutes. The typically, expertly-prepared minutes. The chair is aware of no corrections. Do you have any corrections for October 13 or December 8? Hearing none they are approved as distributed."

4. Report on Nominations and Elections Committee

Associate Dean Cynthia Farina: "We have a brief report from Nominations and Elections. Two of our colleagues have very generously agreed to fill in for people who are on leave this term. I am going to ask for your approval of these."

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee
March 9, 2005

Library Board
Jonathan Culler, English

Nominations and Elections Committee
N'Dri Assié-Lumumba, Africana Studies & Research

Speaker Cooke: "Is that it?"

Associate Dean Farina: "That's it for this."

Associate Dean Farina: "This is the slate of candidates for the at-large faculty senate positions and there are two elected committees, Nominations and Elections and University Faculty Committee. And I just want to point out to you that there is one additional nominee, Professor Baugher. I apologize we didn't get name on the original mail to you but we are very pleased to have Professor Baugher added to the list. I think we have a very strong slate for you and a slate that is selected as usual taking in account of the people who are ongoing members of those committees and trying to balance them disciplinary and unit membership primarily. Although there also some other
SLATE OF CANDIDATES
(All terms commence July 1, 2005)

AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE (tenured) - 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Philippe Baveye, Associate Professor, Crop and Soil Sciences
Anne Blackburn, Associate Professor, Asian Studies
Charles Greene, Professor, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
Jerome Hass, Professor, Johnson Graduate School of Management

AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE ( untenured) - 1 vacancy, 3-year term

Jakob Rigi, Assistant Professor, Anthropology
Sergio Servetto, Assistant Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Ding Xiang Warner, Assistant Professor, Asian Studies

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE – 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Jonathan Culler, Professor, English
Tove Hammer, Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations
Steven Stucky, Professor, Music
L. Joseph Thomas, Professor, Johnson Graduate School of Management

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE - 3 vacancies, 3-year terms

Rosemary Avery, Professor, Policy Analysis and Management
Richard Durst, Professor, Food Science and Technology, Geneva
John Forester, Professor, City and Regional Planning
Daniel Peter Loucks, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
David Pelletier, Associate Professor, Nutritional Sciences

Speaker Cooke: "Are there any additional nominations? The Nominations and Elections Committee brings the slate to you but you have final approval of the slate. Okay. Is there unanimous consent? Any objections? Done."

Speaker Cooke: "The next item is presentation by the chair of the committee on Educational Policy, Professor Ann Lemley."

5. Discussion of Proposed Revised Final Exam Schedule
Professor Ann Lemley, Textiles & Apparel and Chair, Educational Policy Committee: "Thank you. It's interesting that President Lehman talked about an honor code and that discussion because the discussion actually began in the Educational Policy Committee. Well, actually it didn't begin there. It began earlier than that but an issue arose about excuses for exams and we, among others, went to the University Assembly and as we discussed a different specific topic it was graduate students on the University Assembly who had been to other undergraduate institutions who brought this topic up and it really snowballed. I am delighted that the President was at the next University Assembly meeting because EPC felt strongly, even though we weren't going to have a resolution on it, we were in support of a broader discussion of this topic at Cornell. We saw real interest on the part of undergraduate students, graduate students and some very dedicated employee staff members on the University Assembly. So that's one of the things we have been thinking about and talking about on the Educational Policy Committee. The other thing we have been thinking about and talking about is the implementation of People Soft as a method of handling all kinds of data about students, which will have some implications with how we interact. We'll get back to that at a later date. But today, I want to tell you something about a project that really went on last year when I wasn't on the committee and that has to do with the way the final exams are scheduled. And then I am going to ask you to think about a second topic, which is changing the time.

"And we have to give tremendous credit to Bob Bland in Operations Research and Industrial Engineering and his two colleagues Dmitriy Levchenkov and David Shmoys. As the President said, we are pretty smart about a lot of things and, wow, what a concept! Somebody in Operations Research and Industrial Engineering used his ability to do an optimization program to take the 21 groups of examination periods and play around with what goes in those groups. One of the funniest things about this whole thing is you find that some of the students' conflicts are the ones that occur because students are taking two classes at the same time all semester. That's for real. But they optimized the 21 exam periods and they looked at data for a variety of past semesters and tried to minimize the occurrence of two exams back to back, three exams in 24 hours and so forth. There were significant complaints from the Student Assembly and from students about the three exams in one day. It is recommended you have an excuse but it's not required. They went and talked to the Student Assembly, got ideas, found out what the biggest problems were and came up with a program, which is effect for your spring exams. So if your exams aren't exactly where you expected them to be, the new program is in effect. This new programs gives fewer - 116 less -- three exams in one day, it gets it down to a pretty low number (Appendix 1). Many fewer exams are back to back, fewer three exams in 24 hours and a few more of two exams in one day but not back to back. And that was the tradeoff. They did a fabulous job.

"As discussion went on, the topic of the times of the exams came up - because if you ask students what their complaints are about final exams, you get answers. This came from
the University Assembly and David Yeh, the University Registrar asked me then as Chair of our committee to have our committee talk about it. And as we all know students still live in a different time frame than most of us. There actually is some research that supports that for adolescents and now we find out that they are not very risk adverse until they are 25 or so and not terribly personal responsible either. That's quite a job teaching these kids. They would like to lessen the stress. Maybe if we do these things then they will do some things, they will take some responsibility for showing up for the exams and not wanting to have as many excuses. On this overhead (Appendix 2) you can see our current final exams are these three-hour periods at the top: 9 o'clock, noon and 3:00. At the bottom are suggested changes, and the students would love for us to make these changes, giving them more time in between and giving them at that time when they are really bright. (You know at seven o'clock at night.) Dining has agreed to keep certain dining halls open for longer periods of time. This is not a voting issue. It's not a resolution. It's not a resolution from my committee. It's not a voting issue for the Faculty Senate but I would like some input and David Yeh wants some input. We realize Friday nights are potentially a problem and we would try to make that a make-up night. I don't know if that came up at the University Assembly but we assume that that would be somewhat of a difficulty the same way we don't do Saturdays and Sundays. So I would welcome questions in the time left."

Speaker Cooke: "There are no resolutions for you to act upon but there is time for questions. And if I may I would like to extend my appreciation to Professors Bland, Levchenkov and Shmoys from Operations Research because this is not a trivial piece of work that they did. It really does have an impact on the quality of life and indirectly on the learning environment."

(Applause)

Professor Lemley: "They did a fabulous job. Comments. We'd like comments. I don't have answers"

Professor Ronald Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior: " I look at the schedule and I am trying to imagine that I'm a student and I see one small problem. Even as a student around 9:30, especially after an exam, I still feel wiped out. I remember taking exams up until about 5:30 or 6:00 and becoming replenished with dinner and then would go back to the library to study for the next day's exams. Nine thirty I would go back up to my room and settle down with a list of questions I should have gotten right. It's now eleven o'clock and I would study for my next day's exams."

Professor Lemley: "I think that's what they do now. But that's why they seem to be interested. But that's a good question."
Professor Booker: "The question is are they really quite stressed, or do they think they are stressed. How do you tell the difference?"

Dean Walcott: "It might be worth pointing out that the registrar is running a student survey even as we speak to collect a broad spectrum of student opinion about which they prefer. We should know much more detail from the students. Really the issue we are interested in here is from a faculty perspective. What kind of problems does this cause for us?"

Professor Lemley: "Would you be awake at 9:30 at night?"

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: "I think that I am the curmudgeon that Jeff Lehman was talking about who is kind of hard on the students who gets respects for. I think this stinks. I don't want to have to give exams 7 - 9:30 at night. You know it's just a job. It's a profession and I think working from 8:00 in the morning to 6:30 or 7:00 at night like I do now is probably good enough."

Professor Lemley: "Okay. That's an opinion."

Professor Sherene Baugher, Landscape Architecture: "I actually think this is great because how many exams are we going to give if we are teaching two courses? So it's not going to be an inconvenience. I have to put my vote to have our exams 7:00 to 9:00 so it's going to inconvenience one evening for a whole semester. But if it improves the quality of life of the students, I think we should do it. And I think we should have a test period to see how it works."

Professor Lemley: "The students do take evening prelims as we know in the large courses so there is a fair amount of that."

Professor Kim Weeden, Sociology: "A related question to Dr. Anton's point and that is do we know how many non-traditional students we have? I know I have a few in my class who would in fact be quite inconvenienced by a 7:00 to 9:30 exam. They have families. They drive from Syracuse or wherever so I think yes, the majority of our students might prefer this but there is going to be a cost to a presumably non-trivial number."

Professor Lemley: "Well if they ever took chemistry, they are already taking a prelim at night."

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical & Applied Mechanics: "Actually I like the second plan a lot because I have been here more than 20 years and nobody's complained about an evening prelim. I have done it all my life because usually I teach large courses."
Professor Andrew Ramage, History of Art: “I think part of the problem with this evening one is that you are at risk for a whole week. It may be just one exam that you give but you don’t know until you hit the first day of the semester when your exam might be. And many times one has organized other things in their plans. So I am not too keen about that last block.”

Professor John Forester, City and Regional Planning: "I wish to come back to the non-traditional student question and get some data. Is there some way you poll and find out the number?"

Speaker Cooke: "Any one last question? Okay, thank you. We have two resolutions for consideration. Ten minutes are allocated to each. We have agreed that we have changed the order so we will consider professional development opportunities first. The Chair calls on Professor Norman Scott who is co-chair of the committee that has spent many, many hours working on this."

6. Resolution from Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ad Hoc Committee
   Recommending that the Provost and Officers of Schools, Colleges, and Administrative Units Employing NTT Faculty Create Professional Development Opportunities

Professor Norman R. Scott, Biological and Environmental: "Thank you. I have put up the resolution (Appendix 3) and I will only say a couple of things about it, leaving the rest of the time for any discussion. If you go back to the report which was given in December, you will see that for this particular resolution there has been an additional four words added 'as closely as possible' to the following descriptions. And if you were to go back to that which you have, I would just want to note that there are four primary points that fall under descriptions. And that is a discussion of eligibility, of duration of service before being eligible, and the fact that proposals must be made, and applications submitted to be able to obtain permission and approval for professional development opportunities. And with that I would leave the floor open for discussion and any questions."

Speaker Cooke: "Resolution is pending. It requires no second because it came from a committee. The floor is open first for questions to Professor Scott and then for debate. Clarification questions first. Okay, open for any questions."

Professor Farina: “A clarification question. Am I right in understanding that in the provision for leave without pay, the idea there is that those would be available as a right to everyone, whereas the professional development leave with pay would be a smaller number made discretionarily?"
Professor Scott: "I'm not sure it's easily able to be separated that way because we talk about the fact that it's after six years of service in the case that you ask about."

Professor Farina: "Oh yes, I'm sorry it is for people who qualify with the eligibility standard. But the notion is that unlike the professional development leave the leave without pay would be something that would be routinely available to everyone once you have met the eligibility requirements. Is that correct?"

Professor Scott: "Yes. Certainly, more so."

Speaker Cooke: "I want to call attention to the fact that Professor Donald Holcomb the other co-chair is seated over there and can entertain questions if you wish to send them his way.

Questions? Are you ready to vote? I'll give you 30 seconds to be sure. It appears you are ready to vote."

Professor Muawia Barazangi, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: “Excuse me. Are you discussing the new pages that were sent?

Speaker Cooke: "We are discussing this resolution and the supporting whereases."

Professor Scott: "There were whereases and the following description laid out how the process would be the followed."

Professor Barazangi: "I would like to make a comment. First of all this only mentions the senior research associate and senior extension associate, but there's no mention here of the new title of principal research scientist that we voted for which is supposed to be more superior than these. Is that for later comment when we will discuss that?

Professor Scott: "Yes. It is my understanding, I may be wrong. Let me ask. I don't think those have been officially approved yet, have they?"

Dean Walcott: "Yes they have."

Professor Barazangi: "What you meant was really that these are more that the position was needed more so than senior research associate and of course the other thing which I mentioned last time, there is no mention, but I assume it's being assumed senior scientist, senior scholar, and non tenured professors will be added later."

Professor Scott: "Clearly the committee would have no difficulty with adding those particular titles to this grouping."
Speaker Cooke: "We are voting on the resolution as presented since there are no additional amendments in the hopper."

Professor Barazangi: "The other issue really of concern which again I raised last time that senior research associates work with individual faculty, not all of them but a lot of them, and for them to ask for a leave really it should be, it's a very tricky situation, when supported by grants and has to be worked out with the PI of that grant or unit or section. This needs to be again addressed here."

Professor Scott: "I think it is in the sense that it's first of all begins with the units or the departments so within that context what you raise in terms of the PI and so forth should be addressed there."

Professor Barazangi: "And finally really the issue which you said here the University should work with similar colleges to find funds available for paying for this. Again, this is a really... You are putting a lot of responsibility on the shoulders of deans. I have yet to see a Dean in 34 years of my presence here that did not really claim poverty."

Speaker Cooke: "Professor Shiffrin is a member of the committee."

Professor Shiffrin: "I just wanted to mention what I said in the last meeting in case there are a number of people who weren't at the last meeting. This resolution does not say that all such faculty will get professional development opportunities. It doesn't mandate any amount in a budget. The Provost will decide how much money can be made available for this. But it will give the opportunity for everyone to apply for whatever pot of money is made available."

Speaker Cooke: "I point out that if you have discomfort with the resolution, an amendment had to be distributed 24 hours before the meeting in order to be voted on."

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson School of Management: "Unless you ask for unanimous consent to make the change."

Speaker Cooke: "I don't think so."

Professor McAdams: "I find it a problem not to know what these additional titles that are going to be added before we take a vote. Because if I understand Norm we are saying that those that have been approved will be included. Well, what are they?"

Professor Scott: "Well, there are the two new research titles Research Scientist and Principal Scientist and Senior Scientist. Is there another one?"
Professor Barazangi: "There are the Principal Research Scientist and Research Scientist. We are discussing the issue of should there be Principal Research Scientist but then there are two other titles with only a handful of people, two or three people in each, Senior Scientist and Senior Scholar. Then there is the issue that Bill Arms will discuss later of non-tenure track professor."

Professor McAdams: "Are they being included or not and how do we include them except by unanimous vote?"

Speaker Cooke: "You cannot by unanimous consent. I would like to read. It says non-substantive, that is stylistic, grammatical, or clarifying amendments may be freely introduced at a meeting without prior circulation. The speaker will rule substantive amendments out of order."

Professor Shiffrin: "It seems to me that it would take an additional resolution to add people. That this, if it passes, will then go to the Provost and the Provost will read the minutes of this meeting and is perfectly capable of recognizing that it was not the intent of the committee to exclude these other titles and it would be the Provost who would make the decision in the end as to what titles should be included or not included. So, I don't anticipate that we will need to come back to have another resolution.

Professor McAdams: "Point of Order."

Speaker Cooke: "Point of Order."

Professor McAdams: "How can you call that then non-substantive?"

Speaker Cooke: "I didn't make a ruling. I am just reminding you of the rules."

Professor McAdams: "I would like to know what we're doing."

Speaker Cooke: "You are going to vote, if you choose to, on the resolution as it is presented. If you wish to modify it, you must have 24 hours prior notified your colleagues that you intend to change it. You cannot surprise them and do it on the spot. That's the rule for many, many years now. The Speaker makes no ruling as to what it was until someone tries to change it. Then the Speaker will rule."

Anyone wish to speak? Are you ready for the vote?"

Professor Holcomb: "I have been around this place a long time. I'm surprised at the passivity of this group. I hope that you have all thought through this with some care because we are talking about something that makes a significant effect upon the effectiveness of our learning. And perhaps people have thought this through and that's
very good. What we are talking about here is recognizing that there are people, Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, Senior Extension Associates about which I know less, who are engaged in the same kind of intellectual development, improvement, finding new things, seeing whether they are doing the right kind of thing, in this case either learning or research. It is necessary now because there are substantial cadres to these people who did not exist 30 years ago. The flavor of teaching and learning has really changed and I think this is recognized and I hope that everyone is aware of that when you will, I hope, approve this motion."

Speaker Cooke: "I have time for one more question if there is another one.

The Chair assumes you are ready for the vote. If you are in favor, say aye. All opposed, say nay. It clearly carries. If there are no protests, it's carried." Speaker Cooke: "There is a second resolution from the same committee that deals with titles. And here is the resolution."

7. Resolution from Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ad Hoc Committee
Recommending that the Provost and Board of Trustees Create Emeritus/a Titles to which Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, and Senior Extension Associates may be Appointed

Professor Scott: "Again we will follow the same procedure. You have seen the supporting information (Appendix 4) that describes these conditions so I won’t go into that, but it's got the same kind of expectation. There must be serious, meritorious and distinguished record to justify this type of recognition. And so with that I leave it for questions and discussions."

Speaker Cooke: "There’s a proposed amendment which the chair will entertain first. Professor Arms has it and let me put it up.

Be it resolved that the Senate calls on the Provost and the Board of Trustees to create emeritus/a titles to which Non-Tenure Track Professors, senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates with sufficient service may be appointed and to extend to them perquisites comparable to those available to their tenure-track colleagues upon their transition to emeritus/a status on these conditions:

William Arms, Computer Science: “It’s the underlined words on this slide, to add non-tenured track professors to the list of faculty. I think in all honesty I should admit a vested interest in this, being someone in this category. But I believe that this is an oversight and not a controversial issue."
Speaker Cooke: "Is there a second? The chair is aware that the committee has agreed that this is a friendly change and has no objection to it so let me try unanimous consent. Does anyone object to incorporating those underlined words? Hearing none, it's part of the motion."

Professor Mukherjee: "This is just a reminder but I thought you want to say the other one, this is tenure track and tenured colleagues. --- I mean as you get tenure track and somebody who is looking for tenure and hasn't got it yet. Tenured is one who does.

Professor Scott: "I guess you are looking at this last …"

Professor Mukherjee: "Third from the last."

Professor Scott: "Right there."

Professor Mukherjee: "Yes. Is that tenure track and tenured colleagues? I think that's a friendly change."

Professor Scott: "Actually what it was really trying to say is that we wanted to make this title available as it is now available to tenure track colleagues.

Speaker Cooke: "So do you include both groups as under tenure track?"

Professor Mukherjee: "That's what you are probably saying."

Speaker Cooke: "He is asking whether you include both."

Professor Scott: "My first reaction would be there is no harm done with non tenure being added but I am not 100% sure that there isn't some reason."

Speaker Cooke: "Professor Shiffrin do you care to add to that?"

Professor Shiffrin: "I understand the point that's being made but contrary to the usage of many, here tenure track means tenured colleagues upon their transition to emeritus status."

Speaker Cooke: "So it's taken to mean both?"

Professor Shiffrin: "Yes. The minutes will show that."

Speaker Cooke: "Further questions for the committee or Professor Scott? Are you ready for the vote?"
Professor Mike Shapiro, Communication: "I believe one of the whereases calls for the Deans, etc. to give these emeritus professors voting rights."

Professor Scott: "No."

Speaker Cooke: "There was something about voting later but that's a different resolution."

Professor Scott: "Let's see. Yes. Schools and colleges should be requested to consider revising their policies to permit emeritus/a NTT faculty to obtain all level school rights and privileges of active and so forth."

Professor Shapiro: "My problem with this is that in our previous discussion probably the most controversial aspect was voting rights for lecturers and these other folks. And it's a little peculiar to me that we haven't resolved that issue for people who are active but we are now in this for people who are no longer active saying that the Deans should consider that. So it seems backward to me."

Professor Scott: "Well I think the point is from our perspective it's to consider. It's not a mandate. It's to consider. And you are undoubtedly right in some areas where there is that issue already for those who are in the non title."

Professor Barazangi: "I just want to point out that the same policy can get other motions in the future where you add these titles as we discussed to make a similar motion. That would be really appreciated. The principle research scientist, senior scientist, senior scholar be added. I just want to make another point about what Professor Holcomb said. I said it last time. This is a revolutionary concept what is happening here. And the intention here is trying to give these people the privilege of the tenured faculty. But I would like to really make some other time to have a discussion with the uncapping of the retirement age and the tenure system. Does it need to reexamine those privileges for the tenured faculty, including the sabbatical and the condition of many other universities doing an evaluation at that level? This is really important for the future."

Professor Shiffrin: "I just wanted to respond to the point about voting rights. There was a recommendation by the task force on voting rights, which is not before the faculty. There already are voting rights by the groups that we are talking about. This proposal doesn't change that except that it suggests that if you have somebody who gets to this level that they shouldn't lose the voting rights that they had before they went on to this particular title. That's the only import of this."

Professor Rich Burkhauser, Policy Analysis and Management: "As the chair of a department I am very deeply concerned with this proposal. There is nothing more
contentious - in our department and it may be no different from yours - than the matter of space. My understanding with this proposal is if emeriti faculty are given space as part of their package to go to emeriti, that same space issue has to be granted to non-tenured faculty members. This is, I believe, a very scarce resource that will continue to be a scarce resource in this University. I really wonder whether we are serious if we want to make what I think would be a significant change in the space allocations of our departments."

Speaker Cooke: "Anyone else? We still have another minute. Are you ready for the vote? Anyone else who wishes to speak first and then I'll come back to you."

Professor Shiffrin: "Again on this space issue, I think the space issue is a very good point and I think my response on the task force would be that that would go to the question of who should get such a status. That if there wasn't space that they wouldn't get the status."

Professor Burkhauser: "Well you are going to put tremendous pressure on the chair or other people are going to have to make decisions now about which emeriti faculty are going to be given the space. How do we weigh the needs of the emeriti faculty versus non-emeriti and the non-tenure track folks? That's a hell of a job that you are asking chairs to do. Just be aware of what you are doing, the administrative responsibilities you are going to put on us. There will be a number of people who will second guess on this and the other kinds of issues that are going to come up for what I think is the odd notion that somehow these there is no clear difference between the career development and career aspirations of people who are on the tenure track and people who are not on the tenure track. That's sort of what's driving this. There's really no difference among all of us. We are all good and hail fellows and we should try to break down the barriers between those on tenure track lines and those not. I think there are clear differences in our professional development. I really seriously question whether it's the wise thing to do."

Professor Greg Lawler, Mathematics: "I think this requires clarification in the minutes. In Part 3 of this where it says much of our office space I am asking whether or not it is the intent of this that in fact tenure track emeritus faculty are getting office space then it is expected that the emeritus research associates should also be given space or if you could put it as to the appropriate other lines."

Speaker Cooke: "Does the committee wish to respond?"

Professor Scott: "I think the statement is fairly clear on that as it is written."

Professor Holcomb: "Well perhaps this is not really an answer, but it is strictly a comment about the reality around the university. There are enormous differences
around the University with respect to access for office space and other things. That is, it almost has to be. I suspect that if you looked at the retired tenured faculty, emeritus tenure faculty, you'll find enormous differences with respect to access of space. It seems to me, that one can not imagine legislating 600 square feet or 100 square feet, this just has to be worked out in the reality of people."

Professor Peter Davies, Plant Biology: "I just have a comment here. If you read it, it says depending on the individuals' involvement in continuing teaching, research and outreach. So only if a person is actually continuing to teach or continuing to do research would this apply."

Speaker Cooke: "Time to bring it to a vote unless there is some really compelling question that hasn't been addressed. If you are in favor say aye. If opposed say nay. It carries. If there is no objection the chair rules that it carries."

Unidentified: "Could we have a count of the vote?"

Speaker Cooke: "All right let's have a hand raising vote and we will ask the Dean and Associate Dean to do the counting. If you are in favor raise your right hand.

All opposed, like sign.

The vote was 37 yes, 16 nay. It clearly has the majority and carries (Appendix 5, resolution as passed).

Now we have one final item the Good and Welfare. We have two individuals on the same topic. Professor Martin Hatch and Professor Phil Lewis wish to address the group."

8.     Good and Welfare

Professor Martin Hatch, Music: "We would like to bring to your attention, Senators and other members of the faculty, via this body, a resolution by the Arts and Sciences Council, the faculty of the University of Colorado at Bolder, which is in support of the principal that tenure cannot be challenged and or revoked for ideological reasons. At this time we are asking for support of this resolution from individual members of the university community. The University of Colorado resolution and the facts on which it's based shows that the challenge to the tenure of one of their members was initiated by the Board of Regents and the Chancellor of the University for ideological reasons. This challenge to that member's tenure is going on right now, this week. And thus it becomes a test case for actions of this kind. This case of tenure challenge is not just a test of the effects of externally generated ideological pressures being brought to
bear on academic freedom, it's one of a number of ideologically based assaults on academic freedom taking place elsewhere at American colleges and universities. Cornellians and Cornell as an institution should become informed about these actions and take stands against them to defend academic integrity, academic freedom early on, because freedom of speech and academic freedom are at the heart of the University's vitality and viability. We're taking the opportunity of the Good and Welfare to bring this to your attention now and we hope that should it be of interest to you, that you will join in your support of this resolution by the Arts and Sciences Council at the University of Colorado and we hope to, at the next Faculty meeting, bring up a resolution of our own that speaks to the issue. And Professor Lewis has something to present to you in this regard."

Professor Philip Lewis, Romance Studies: "I appreciate your willingness to hear from a non senator in this body. As many of you will recall the Faculty Senate has had numerous occasions to discuss the terms pertaining to academic freedom and its relation to academic tenure. Two and a half years ago I responded to questions that had been raised by Bob Cooke while he was serving as Dean of the Faculty with a statement that he subsequently placed on the faculty website. In that statement I laid out a rationale for extending the protections of academic freedom now afforded to tenured faculty to non-tenure track faculty and to academic staff. I do salute the members of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate on the Status of Non-Tenured-Track Faculty for recommending strongly in their report to you of last year that the University would formally provide the guarantee of academic freedom to non tenure track faculty. As far as I know the question of such guarantees for academic staff remains open still to be addressed. And I hope the Senate might be willing to play a role in seeing to it that the question is addressed.

"Now, in the fairly recent discussions that have occurred here at Cornell in the Senate and other quarters concerning the institution of tenure, few if any of us I think, anticipated the immergence of situations such as the one we are now observing in the University of Colorado. By way of underscoring what Martin Hatch has said to you with regard to the resolution that was passed by Arts and Sciences faculty at Boulder, let me just cite two sections of the statement that was delivered to the Regents of the University of Colorado by the University's acting Chancellor.

First, the order and I quote, 'a thirteen day internal review to determine if Professor Ward Churchill overstepped his bounds as a faculty member showing cause for dismissal as outlined in the laws of the Regents.' The order was given in response to the resolution passed by the Senate in Colorado. The review, and again I quote, 'the acting Chancellor stipulates that there be a thorough examination of Professor Churchill's writings, speeches, tape recordings, and other works.' The key point here is that the professor's rights to state his views freely is at the heart of the tensions that have brought the academic community at the University of Colorado to a state of crisis. Now
I am bringing this to your attention on behalf of a group of faculty that have been meeting ad hoc to discuss this during the last couple of weeks. I want to emphasize that our purpose is to alert you of the possibilities that a resolution would come before this body in support of academic freedom in the future. And also to the fact that the situation we are looking at in Colorado is very much in flux. Yesterday when the news of President Elizabeth Hoffman's resignation was the main feature on the University of Colorado's web site there was also a small press release indicating that the reports on the internal review of Professor Churchill's work would not be issued as planned this week at the end of the prescribed thirty-day period. And that an announcement on the status of the report, if not the reporting document itself, would be forthcoming by Monday, March 14. Regardless of the outcome of the review, it's clear that in higher education in the United States at the present time, as President Hoffman who has just resigned has noted, we are confronting a chilling climate in which academic freedom does have to be defended. In the weeks and months ahead some of us will be trying to organize forums such as the one that the President alluded to in response to Eric Cheyfitz’ question, that will heighten awareness of this issue on our campus. We hope that both the Faculty Senate and the University administration will be willing supporters of these efforts.

And in conclusion, what I would like to point out to you is that further formal action with respect to the protection of academic freedom for non-tenure track faculty and staff would be one means readily at the disposal of the University to assert itself in defense of academic freedom. Thank you."

Speaker Cooke: "Procedurally, all members of University faculty have speaking rights before this body. Are there any other issues that should be announced or presented before we adjourn in a few seconds? If not, we are adjourned."

Adjourned at 6:00

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Farina
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty
Appendix 1

The Educational Policies Committee reports on changes made to this spring’s exam scheduling. It presents proposed changes to times of exams for the next academic year for discussion by the Faculty Senate. Ann Lemley, Chair, EPC

**Changes to Final Exam Schedule – Spring 2005**

- 21 examination periods (7 days, 3 periods) – no change
- Optimization methodology to change way groups are assigned to exam period

**Results**
- Fewer – 3 exams in one day (-116)
- Fewer – 2 exams back-to-back (-1656)
- Fewer – 3 exams in 24 hours (-235)
- More – 2 exams in one day not back-to-back (+861)
Appendix 2

Current Final Exam Schedule

9:00 am – 11:30 am
12:00 pm – 2:30 pm
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm

Proposed Final Exam Schedule  (Fall 2005)

9:00 am – 11:30 am
2:00 pm – 4:30 pm
7:00 pm – 9:30 pm

Some Dining Halls will stay open later
New draft of Resolution A (III.A of NTTF report of 8/4/05)
date: 2/24/05

A. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Whereas non-tenure-track faculty (NTT faculty) are continuing long-term employees of the University who support the central missions of the institution in teaching, research, and outreach; and

Whereas the University has a positive interest in the professional and intellectual growth of all faculty; and

Whereas equity across college, school, and other administrative boundaries recommends similar treatment of faculty in similar titles,

Be it resolved that the Senate calls on the Provost and officers of schools, colleges, and administrative units employing NTT faculty to create professional development opportunities for these faculty where they do not exist, in the form of paid and unpaid leaves and individual research and travel accounts corresponding as closely as possible to the following descriptions.

1. Professional Development leaves. Senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates should become eligible to apply for paid Professional Development (PD) leaves at regular intervals.

   i. Eligibility. Senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates should become eligible to apply for PD leaves after their first reappointment after six years of full-time service. Part-time service should be prorated for progress toward eligibility. Interruptions in service, unless spent in a comparable PD or study leave or Prestigious Fellowship leave, should not interrupt progress toward eligibility. After a first PD leave, senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates should become eligible for another after seven years of full-time service.

   ii. Duration. Under this proposed policy a PD leave will normally be for a full semester (or in the case of 12-month employees, six months) at full pay and benefits. In exceptional circumstances it may comprise two semesters or 12 months at half pay.

   iii. Proposals. Applicants for PD leaves will present proposals for projects allowing for concentrated thinking on or investigation of substantive topics of interest related to their professional or intellectual commitments. Proposed PD projects need not be related directly to improvements in pedagogy or extension/augmentation of research skills, but they should promise (and deliver) a yield of contributions to the applicant's discipline or department that would not otherwise have been possible.
iv. Application. Applicants will submit proposals together with the endorsement of the chairs of their departments to their school or college deans or other officers of their employing units, or to their designees.

2. Leaves without pay.
   i. Unpaid leaves of absence should be available to senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates after six years of service (and, by negotiation with the department chair or head of administrative unit, before that time).
   ii. Leaves may be for one or two semesters with assurance of reemployment in the same position upon return.
   iii. Under these conditions, unpaid leaves of absence should be granted upon suitable application. University contributions to retirement, medical, and Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship plans of those taking leave should be continued at the level obtaining immediately prior to the leave.
   iv. A senior lecturer, senior research associate, or senior extension associate should not be unduly penalized with respect to salary increases by taking an unpaid leave for which she or he is eligible.
   v. Those in these titles who win any of the prestigious awards which make tenure-track faculty eligible for unpaid leaves with continuing benefits from Cornell should be eligible for unpaid leaves with the same continuing benefits as tenure-track faculty receive.

3. Research and travel support. Continuing NTT faculty in some schools and colleges are already provided with annually replenished individual research accounts and with funding for attendance at and travel to professional conferences. Where these opportunities do not exist, we believe they should be established.

4. Funding and implementation of these proposals. The University should work with the several colleges, schools, and employing administrative units to identify funds available and to seek them where they do not exist. Colleges and schools should keep NTT faculty informed of the availability of such PD opportunities as develop.

5. Adoption of any part of this PD proposal should not diminish travel and research funding already made available to NTT faculty as members of a college school, or department. The granting of a PD leave to a NTT faculty member should not impair his or her eligibility for such travel and research funding as is available to other NTT faculty members in his or her college, school, or department.
Appendix 4

New draft of Resolution C (III.C of NTTF report of 8/4/05)
date: 2/24/05

C. ELIGIBILITY FOR EMERITUS/A STATUS

Whereas senior non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, like their tenure-track counterparts, are continuing long-term employees of the University who support the central missions of the institution in teaching, research, and outreach; and

Whereas senior NTT faculty may continue to contribute to the missions of the University and the campus community after their retirement; and

Be it resolved that the Senate calls on the Provost and the Board of Trustees to create emeritus/a titles to which senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates with sufficient service may be appointed and to extend to them perquisites comparable to those available to their tenure-track colleagues upon their transition to emeritus/a status on these conditions:

1. The emeritus/a title should be made available to Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, and Senior Extension Associates who have retired after ten years of service and who have rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the University in these titles. "Emeritus" is not synonymous with "retired." Just as the title emeritus or emerita is not conferred upon members of the University Faculty automatically upon retirement, so appointment to these NTT Faculty emeritus titles should be contingent upon a history of distinguished and meritorious service and on departmental and school/college recommendation and the Provost's approval.

2. University policy (including, if necessary, Trustee legislation) be amended to effect such an change as this to the description of the emeritus title found in the 2002 Handbook. pp. 31-32.

Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Associate, Senior Extension Associate Emeritus. Any member of school, college, or University faculties who retires after ten years in the tenured ranks of university professor, professor, or associate professor or in the nontenured ranks of senior lecturer, senior research associate, or senior extension associate and who has rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the university, may be appointed to an emeritus or emerita title corresponding to his or her title upon retirement by the provost after recommendation by the members of the particular department and the dean of the college or school faculty to which that member belonged.

A faculty member who does not seek or is not qualified or approved for emeritus status is considered a retired academic.
3. University policy for emeritus faculty recorded in section 4.2 (pp. 64-68) of the 2002 Faculty Handbook should be modified to extend to NTT faculty emeritus/a perquisites comparable to those available to tenure-track faculty, and these in particular:

   i. Emeritus/a perquisites pertaining to use of the approved title, to legal defense and indemnification, and to membership in the University community (directory listing, Chronicle delivery, identification cards) should be extended without reservation to NTT faculty emeriti/ae, as should those providing basic resources for study and communication (library and computer services, mail, and C.U. course enrollment).

   ii. Schools and colleges should be requested to consider revising their policies to permit emeritus/a NTT faculty to retain all of the college/school rights and privileges of active NTT faculty members, including voting rights in the college/school faculty. Emeritus/a NTT faculty are to be welcome to attend departmental faculty meetings. Each department will set its own policies regarding voting rights and privileges, but these policies should be put in writing.

   iii. Depending on individuals' involvement in continuing teaching, research, and outreach activities and on the availability of resources, office space and basic office and clerical support should be provided NTT faculty emeriti/ae by departments, colleges, and schools. Laboratory or experimental space is not an entitlement for emeritus/a faculty. Provision of such space should be made by department chairs for emeritus/a NTT faculty who maintain active research programs meeting conditions for those of tenure-track faculty laid down in the Provost's Policy Statement, 4.a. 4.b, and 4.c (2002 Faculty Handbook pp. 66-67).

   iv. It should be noted that in the Provost's Policy Statement of 1997 (see Faculty Handbook, pp. 66-67) there appears an important qualifier in the matter of providing office and other support facilities to emeritus/a faculty, to wit: "The allocation [of space and support facilities] will treat faculty who have retired on an equitable basis with non-retired faculty, based upon post-retirement levels of teaching, research/scholarship and outreach/extension activities." Said somewhat differently: The provision to provide certain University support facilities to those with emeritus status is based on the assumption that there is a balancing responsibility on their part to continue, albeit at a lower intensity and, perhaps, along different channels, "distinguished and meritorious service to the University." Such an assumption should be equally applicable to non-professorial academics who might be appointed to emeritus status.

   v. Participation in Graduate School faculty responsibilities will be available only to those NTT faculty emeriti/ae who have been members of graduate Fields hitherto.

4. Where appropriate, emeritus/a status should be extended to already-retired NTT faculty on the above conditions.
Appendix 5

Resolution as Approved
New draft of Resolution C (III.C of NTTF report of 8/4/05)
date: 2/24/05

C. ELIGIBILITY FOR EMERITUS/A STATUS

_Whereas_ senior non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, like their tenure-track counterparts, are continuing long-term employees of the University who support the central missions of the institution in teaching, research, and outreach; and

_Whereas_ senior NTT faculty may continue to contribute to the missions of the University and the campus community after their retirement; and

_Be it resolved_ that the Senate calls on the Provost and the Board of Trustees to create emeritus/a titles to which Non-Tenure Track Professors, senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates with sufficient service may be appointed and to extend to them perquisites comparable to those available to their tenure-track colleagues upon their transition to emeritus/a status on these conditions:

1. The emeritus/a title should be made available to Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, and Senior Extension Associates who have retired after ten years of service and who have rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the University in these titles. "Emeritus" is not synonymous with "retired." Just as the title emeritus or emerita is not conferred upon members of the University Faculty automatically upon retirement, so appointment to these NTT Faculty emeritus titles should be contingent upon a history of distinguished and meritorious service and on departmental and school/college recommendation and the Provost's approval.

2. University policy (including, if necessary, Trustee legislation) be amended to effect such an change as this to the description of the emeritus title found in the 2002 _Handbook_. pp. 31-32.

_Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Associate, Senior Extension Associate Emeritus_. Any member of school, college, or University faculties who retires after ten years in the tenured ranks of university professor, professor, or associate professor or in the nontenured ranks of senior lecturer, senior research associate, or senior extension associate and who has rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the university, may be appointed to an _emeritus or emerita_ title corresponding to his or her title upon retirement by the provost after recommendation by the members of the particular department and the dean of the college or school faculty to which that member belonged.

A faculty member who does not seek or is not qualified or approved for _emeritus_ status is considered a retired academic.
3. University policy for emeritus faculty recorded in section 4.2 (pp. 64-68) of the 2002 Faculty Handbook should be modified to extend to NTT faculty emeritus/a perquisites comparable to those available to tenure-track faculty, and these in particular:

   i. Emeritus/a perquisites pertaining to use of the approved title, to legal defense and indemnification, and to membership in the University community (directory listing, Chronicle delivery, identification cards) should be extended without reservation to NTT faculty emeriti/ae, as should those providing basic resources for study and communication (library and computer services, mail, and C.U. course enrollment).

   ii. Schools and colleges should be requested to consider revising their policies to permit emeritus/a NTT faculty to retain all of the college/school rights and privileges of active NTT faculty members, including voting rights in the college/school faculty. Emeritus/a NTT faculty are to be welcome to attend departmental faculty meetings. Each department will set its own policies regarding voting rights and privileges, but these policies should be put in writing.

   iii. Depending on individuals' involvement in continuing teaching, research, and outreach activities and on the availability of resources, office space and basic office and clerical support should be provided NTT faculty emeriti/ae by departments, colleges, and schools. Laboratory or experimental space is not an entitlement for emeritus/a faculty. Provision of such space should be made by department chairs for emeritus/a NTT faculty who maintain active research programs meeting conditions for those of tenure-track faculty laid down in the Provost's Policy Statement, 4.a. 4.b, and 4.c (2002 Faculty Handbook pp. 66-67).

   iv. It should be noted that in the Provost's Policy Statement of 1997 (see Faculty Handbook, pp. 66-67) there appears an important qualifier in the matter of providing office and other support facilities to emeritus/a faculty, to wit: "The allocation [of space and support facilities] will treat faculty who have retired on an equitable basis with non-retired faculty, based upon post-retirement levels of teaching, research/scholarship and outreach/extension activities." Said somewhat differently: The provision to provide certain University support facilities to those with emeritus status is based on the assumption that there is a balancing responsibility on their part to continue, albeit at a lower intensity and, perhaps, along different channels, "distinguished and meritorious service to the University." Such an assumption should be equally applicable to non-professorial academics who might be appointed to emeritus status.

   v. Participation in Graduate School faculty responsibilities will be available only to those NTT faculty emeriti/ae who have been members of graduate Fields hitherto.

4. Where appropriate, emeritus/a status should be extended to already-retired NTT faculty on the above conditions.

Approved 3/9/05