MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULY SENATE
Wednesday, November 12, 2003

Professor Mary Beth Norton, History and Speaker: "The Senate will come to order. The secretary has informed me that a quorum is present. Thank you all for coming. I will remind you that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting, and I would also ask everybody to turn off their cell phone. I have turned mine off. I will ask you all to identify yourselves and your department when you speak. At the end of the meeting there will be two Good and Welfare speakers, each of whom will have five minutes. I first call on the dean for remarks."

1. REMARKS BY DEAN CHARLES WALCOTT

Professor Charles Walcott, Dean of Faculty: "Thank you very much. I have some fairly brief remarks. First, sounding rather draconian, I would remind the faculty, including particularly the senators, that classes are supposed to be held prior to Thanksgiving. We have learned from our student survey last spring that some 72% of our student body claims that at least one of their classes prior to Thanksgiving had been cancelled. If you read faculty legislation, this is prohibited without special permission of the dean in the college. I am going to remind the department chairs of this who may in turn remind their faculty, and I just wanted to bring it to your attention.

"Secondly, at the last meeting the question was raised on the FACTA report, the faculty committee that advises the provost on tenure decisions, that the provost disagreed with two recommendations from FACTA. The question was raised: were these positive recommendations or negative recommendations? It turns out the provost disagreed with two positive recommendations from FACTA.

"Finally, my last item is that for a variety of reasons, most importantly being that the provost and the president both have a Board of Trustees meeting which conflicts with our next scheduled Senate meeting, so neither the president or the provost could be there; we have decided to postpone it one week to December 17. So the next Faculty Senate meeting instead of being on December 10 will be on December 17. Are there any questions?"

Professor Francis Kallfelz, Clinical Sciences: "Is the Board of Trustees aware of when our faculty meetings are scheduled?"

LAUGHTER.

Dean Walcott: "My suspicion is no."

Professor Kallfelz: "Then perhaps it would it be a good idea for whoever is in that liaison role to let them know, so that we could avoid these sorts of problems."

Speaker Mary Beth Norton: "The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of September 17. I ask for unanimous consent, unless there is anyone who has any amendments. Seeing none, all those in favor, please say aye."

AYE.

Speaker Norton: "All those opposed? By unanimous consent the minutes of the last meeting are approved. I will now call on Cynthia Farina, chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee for her committee report."

2. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty and Chair, Nominations and Elections Committee: "There are only two items I want to point out to you from this report which you have received. The first is a nominee for the Nominations and Elections Committee. You doubtless know that's one of the two committees that are elected not appointed, so you might have wondered why you were getting a nomination here. This is a single year replacement for one member who is on leave, and this has been the practice of the committee for several years to handle leaves in this way. You may be getting a suggestion from us in the future about changing the legislation to regularize that practice.

"The other item is an additional University Assembly nomination, Randy Wayne. His acceptance came in after you got your paper copy so it doesn't show up on what we distributed."

Speaker Norton: "Are there any questions? We need to vote on this. All those in favor of accepting the report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, please say aye."

Report from Nominations & Elections Committee
November 12, 2003

Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty
Peter Stein, A&S

Committee on Academic Programs and Policies
Richard Feldman, (fills Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer position), A&S

Educational Policy Committee
Vernon Briggs, ILR
David Stipanuk, Hotel

Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education
Matthew Miller, Engr.

Faculty Advisory Board on Information Technologies
Ronnie Coffman, CALS
Theodore Eisenberg, Law
Kent Goetz, A&S

Faculty Committee on Program Review
John Forester, AAP
James Jenkins, Engr.

Institutional Biosafety Committee
Susheng Gan, CALS
Mark Roberson, Vet.

Local Advisory Council
Nelson Hairston, A&S
Paul Kintner, Engr.
Thomas O'Rourke, Engr.
Susan Riha, CALS

Nominations and Elections Committee
N'Dri Assie-Lumumba, AS&RC

Professors-at-Large Selection Committee
Andrew Clark, A&S

University Committee on Conflicts
Kate Bronfenbrenner, ILR
Kurt Gottfried, A&S
Michael Kazarinoff, CALS

University Faculty Library Board
Douglas Haith, CALS
Francis Kallfelz, Vet.

President's Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs

Melissa Hines, A&S
Rebecca Stoltzfus, CHE

University Assembly
Kenneth Hover, Engr.
Robert Kay, Engr.
Timothy Setter, CALS
*Randy Wayne, CALS

Campus Planning Committee
Paula Horrigan, CALS

Codes and Judicial Committee
Kevin Clermont, Law
Martin Hatch, A&S

Cornell Store Administrative Board
Jan deRoos, Hotel
Wayne Knoblauch, CALS

Board on University Health Services
Cutberto Garza, CHE
Ellis Loew, Vet.

Committee on Multicultural Issues
James Gillett, CALS

Transportation Advisory Committee
Ronald Minor, Vet.

University Hearing Board
Timothy DeVoogd, A&S
Cynthia Hazan, CHE
Jeevak Parpia, A&S
David Sherwyn, Hotel
Yervant Terzian, A&S
David Wilson, A&S

AYE.

Speaker Norton: "Opposed? The report is accepted. I will now call on Professor Elaine Wethington for a report. She is chair of the Committee on Research on Human Subjects."

3. Report from Committee on Research on Human Subjects

Professor Elaine Wethington, Human Development and Chair, UCHS: "I would like to take this opportunity with the faculty to describe some new changes that are coming in human subjects at Cornell having to do with the organization of our committee and also the way that faculty will be interacting with our committee in the future. Cornell University, after a decision by the president and provost, has decided to apply for voluntary accreditation of its human subjects research program through the American Association of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP). The standards applied by AAHRPP are somewhat higher than those that are laid out in federal regulations, and the aim of AAHRPP is not to regulate just the human subject committee itself or to lay down regulations in complying to human subjects research but also to encourage universities to establish, top to bottom from the administration down, human research protection programs, which currently Cornell does not have. We have an IRB (Institutional Review Board) that has been relatively poorly supported in terms of staff time since 1967 when it was established. The chair and its members have been coping with an increasing burden of applying compliance standards and also keeping up with an increasing number of applications for use of human subjects in research.

"The thing that is the most important to know about AAHRPP accreditation is that two bills produced in congress, the last congress, which did not pass and which will be reintroduced this year, would require that all universities go through an accreditation program of sorts. We also expect, although we don't know for sure, that the National Institutes of Health will be encouraging universities to acquire this accreditation in order to continue accepting funding. Let me tell you what this is going to mean for Cornell, although I have no idea how it's going to develop. I'm the IRB chair, and this will be a joint administrative/faculty effort. The specific changes are that there will be a campus-wide educational initiative in order to educate faculty and students in human subjects regulations. We also must meet a new National Institutes of Health requirement for continuing updated education of all people engaged in human subjects research, and the first thing that those of you who do human subjects research will notice is that we are going to be replacing our current educational program, which is quite outdated, with something much more sophisticated and wide-ranging and we hope better suited to the type of research that we do here at Cornell, which is primarily social and behavioral.

"There will also have to be two other things as part of the accreditation review. The university will have to establish an auditing mechanism of some kind for compliance to

UCHS requests for the conduct of research at the university. A number of other universities have already established these auditing mechanisms, and those of you who have anything to do with animal research or research using various types of hazardous agents at the university are already aware that auditing mechanisms are in place for compliance in those types of work. We will also have to have updated faculty legislation, because in my opinion our current faculty legislation makes us regulate too much. It is very broadly written and regulates even classroom exercises done by undergraduates. A goal of the new faculty legislation will be to narrow what it is that we have to regulate here at Cornell, as well as to get more faculty input into the review system."

Speaker Norton: "Questions or comments?"

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering: "Just an observation. It seems to me that many businesses engaged in market research routinely call us at the dinner hour and work through extensive surveys. That kind of research is not covered by the standards, and yet these standards are applied to very similar kinds of activities that go on every day around the campus. So I would just urge the committee to do whatever it can in its power to apply a rule of reason to these decisions."

Professor Wethington: "Well, I hope that we do. You may not be very happy to learn that the Kennedy version of the new bill regulating human subjects in the United States will regulate market researchers, so it will be applied to everyone."

Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "As a social scientist myself I often do surveys and things like that. I understand the reason why the committee is there, and I see the legislation getting tighter and tighter. Sometimes it seems as though it's less about keeping the work ethical and more about protecting the university from frivolous law suits. Is there an opportunity for faculty input about the policies? I guess we don't have much input into what the congress passes down."

Professor Wethington: "Unfortunately, no. I wish we did. I wish that you would. I'll tell you where we must be compliant, and this has been a long-standing issue with Cornell. Faculty members at universities may not exempt their own research from review by a human subjects committee, and for many years this has been the rule at Cornell. Right now what I have been charged with for the past three years is to try and figure out strategies for everyone to learn just to check with us about it. The other thing that we have been trying to do is to make sure that human subjects review is as fast as it can possibly be. Surveys are typically turned around in ten days, sometimes as little as three days."

Professor Simons: "It actually still might make sense for us as a university to try and have some voice in the legislation process that we will ultimately have to answer to."

Professor Wethington: "I urge all of us actually to write Kennedy about this."

Speaker Norton: "Other comments or questions?"

Professor C. C. Chu, Textiles and Apparel: "Does the voluntary accreditation apply to medical schools or are there different rules?"

Professor Wethington: "It depends on what type medical school we are. You have your choice of either AAHRPP, which is specializing in social/behavioral, and there is another accreditation group that is exclusively for medical centers and schools, which has higher standards in terms of compliance than AAHRPP."

Professor Chu: "So then it would be different at the Ithaca campus versus the medical college?"

Professor Wethington: "Exactly."

Speaker Norton: "Actually the speaker has a question, if I may. I read recently that the federal government has now exempted oral history from all human subject standards. Is that going to follow in this new procedure too?"

Professor Wethington: "Yes, it has. We are already doing this."

Speaker Norton: "Great. That's a problem for us historians. One more comment."

Professor David Levitsky, Nutritional Sciences: "The current test that one must pass in order to get certification in a research area is absurd to say the least. It's a joke among all my students who have to take it. They all pass it, but when it was initially suggested I wrote to them asking that they show come indication that taking this test makes for a better experiment, because they constantly put up these hurdles and there must be a reason why they put up these hurdles. No one ever answered me, of course. Can our committee at least take a more active role in piercing some of this hot air that is coming out of Washington?"

Professor Wethington: "Well, you know if you give me another 100 hours every week. … Right now I do this as a volunteer, as you much remember yourself. We do all of this as volunteers; this comes out of my teaching and research time. We are acquiring a different test, a much better program. I hope that meets some of the objections that our current test is not very good. And I agree with you, that it is not very good. The aim of the test is not to make you a better researcher. The aim of the test is to teach the three

principles of the Belmont Report. The new version of training will have many more applications to more types of research, but has nothing really to do with research per say, but just the way to apply those three principles—respect for persons, beneficence and justice."

Professor Levitsky: "The problem I have is demanding that all researchers take this test, when they haven't provided us with any evidence that taking this test actually improves human subject compliance or better experimentation or anything."

Professor Wethington: "It will be the first of multiple tests, probably. You have heard of the Responsible Conduct of Research Initiative, which was stayed by congressional order in the year 2000? It has reemerged at NIH. Those of you who are engaged in putting in applications for training programs, as I have been, realize that now as part of a training grant we have to document that our students and we are receiving education in eight different areas—responsible conduct of research. Right now the wind in Washington is to somehow certify us in all of those different areas and to do it at the university level. I look only at human subjects; I have no idea how the university plans to respond to that."

Speaker Norton: "Thanks very much Professor Wethington. I now call on Associate Professor Ron Booker, chair of the Affirmative Action Committee."

Dean Walcott: "He's not here."

Speaker Norton: "He's not here. I didn't think I saw him. We will move on, and I will call on Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty, Cynthia Farina for a report and discussion of the faculty forum on strategic corporate alliances.

4. Report and discussion of faculty forum on strategic corporate alliances

Professor Cynthia Farina, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty: "The handout (Appendix 1) is a copy of the overhead. As many of you know from being there, on Wednesday, October 22, we had a university forum on this topic. There were six speakers; about sixty people attended. I think those of us who were there would describe it as a thoughtful, helpful and very civil discussion. A transcript of that is now available on the web site.

"What it seemed appropriate to do today was to talk with you about what seems like the right next step, which is the preparation of a document that would represent the faculty's view (as articulated by this body) of the practices and principles which should be operative in these alliances. I don't want to glide over the more fundamental question of whether Cornell ought to go forward with these kinds of alliances, but it

appears that that decision does not rest with us. The trustees have already authorized a Cornell University Strategic Corporate Alliance Plan and are having that go forward. So where we seem to be is how we will go forward, whether than whether we will.

"That plan has evolved. The version that you saw last spring has been superseded by a version that is dated July 30, and that is what we will be referring to from here on out. That version clearly bears evidence of faculty input. For example, you recall the motion that was tabled last spring was to add Local Advisory Committee approval of these plans before they went forward. The element has now been written into the Cornell Strategic Corporate Alliance Plan. Also the plan contains many elements that are responsive to the kind of academic freedom and autonomy concerns that people voiced in the forum, so it would not be accurate -- and it certainly would not be politic -- for us to act as if the issues that we are raising are ones that are not on the table and that people are not attending to already.

"So we might ask, why should we have a separate document that addresses practices and principles? It seems to me there might be several reasons why that's a good thing. The first is that the provenance and the authority of the Cornell University Strategic Corporate Alliance Plan are still not completely clear. It's not entirely clear where this document came from, who wrote it. It's not entirely clear how it gets changed, what its authority is, whether we have any input on major shifts in it. Secondly, LAC is at least in part our committee. It's a joint committee, but in part it's our committee, so it seems like it ought to have directions from us. Third, there are items that the current plan does not address that may be important to us -- one of the principal of those being public access to information about the terms of these agreements, at least once they are finalized. Finally, least concrete but maybe most important, this is a big step for us in which the faculty has an intimate interest. The Berkeley-Novartis agreement certainly illustrated that these things have the capacity to be threatening to core values. Even if that capacity isn't realized, certainly what that agreement demonstrated was that they can be profoundly disruptive and controversial in the institution. So it seems like this is something we should speak to, to emphasize to the trustees, to the administration, to ourselves, that this is close to the bone for us.

"If we are going to do that, how are we going to do that? After consultation with the UFC, the Dean of the Faculty has decided to create an ad hoc committee, and at the end I am going to ask for volunteers for that, but what we thought might be useful was to have a discussion today that might help inform the committee on how to go forward in putting that document together. I don't want to over-determine that discussion, but it occurred to me that it might be helpful to take what was said at the forum and what emerged in some of the enormous literature on the Novartis agreement and begin to identify areas that probably should be addressed, see if we have some agreements with preliminary resolutions, and see if there are additional questions. It's clearly not a time

to ask you for action but for some guidance that many of us who are going to be on this committee and are sitting here right now, then can use.

"The list you have is what seems to have come out as being appropriately on the table. First, a collection of issues about academic freedom—no coercion on faculty or graduate students part to participate. However, these are enormously powerful programs where there is a lot of money on the table. Is it possible to identify any indirect forms of pressure that we might want to speak to in advance? Are there issues for graduate students, that are perhaps different than for faculty, that we ought to attend to? What is the permissible scope of the right that a corporate sponsor should be given to limit work sponsored by competitors? The current plan offers that right to sponsorship of work by the same investigator and similar work. Is that the right dimension? What would "sponsorship" mean? Pretty clearly, I think we could all agree that there should be no right to censor the content of presentations or publications at least beyond the data that the corporate sponsor would identify as proprietary. Are there other things that we ought to be thinking about there? What ought to be the permissible scope of pre-clearance requirements or 'first look' rights? I think that includes both what should be pre-cleared and for how long. The Novartis agreement for example covered not only publications but also presentations, dissertations. Are there other sorts of faculty interchanges that should be out? Which interchanges or what kind of work? Again, the Novartis agreement included pre-clearance of all work not simply funded work, unless other sponsors barred this. And for how long—thirty days, sixty days, ninety days?

"Conflict of interest. The Novartis agreement provided Novartis with the right to prevent publication of the fact that certain research was sponsored. Could we live with that? There was a lot of the discussion at the forum about trying to deal with fraud and issues of individual and institutional conflict of interest. We might at least think about whether our existing policies in that area are adequate to deal with this new territory. "Desk drawer effect"—there was a lot of interesting discussion about that at the forum: not literally misleading publications or misleading inaccurate fraudulent results, but rather the suppression of results that don't accord with the sponsor's interests. Are there any ways that we can provide antidotes for that pressure?

"Intellectual property—obviously the core of these agreements, or at least one of the cores, from the perspective of the corporate sponsor. What is the appropriate scope of licensing rights? Should it extend only to funded work or to all work? Again, the Novartis agreement extended to all work. Should there be any percentage limitations? Terms of the license—exclusive license versus more limited forms, for example, where the university retains humanitarian use rights, that was suggested at the forum, or that a cap of some sort would be imposed.

"A number of potentially very thorny governance issues. The idea is to create a joint steering committee that will manage this comprehensive partnership. So what is going

to be the process for allocating funds to the projects? Will there be direct donor participation? The Novartis committee was three people from the department, two people from the corporate sponsor. The current plan anticipates that corporate sponsors representatives will sit on the joint steering committee and that the joint steering committee will be who gives out the money. How about involvement in other aspects of the lab/department functioning? What exactly is the jurisdiction and the scope of this contemplated joint steering committee? What is the nature and extent of what the plan calls for in terms of facilitated access for the sponsor to department facilities, faculty and students, and for opportunities for the company to have employee training? Are there other terms that we want to think about that should be in or should be out?   The forum raised the idea -- and this actually is in the plan at the moment – of a requirement of, or at least the attempt to get, an accompanying unrestricted gift to try to provide funding for projects that will not be funded through the interests of the corporate sponsor itself. At the forum this was talked about as a "crowding out" problem.

"Then there is a set of issues that you might define as process issues. How is faculty review going to go forward? Now we have LAC as the designated review organization. What is the extent of the LAC's power? Do they actually have veto power or it is merely advisory? What composition changes might we want to the LAC, given this new role that they are being assigned? What is going to happen with respect to access? Is there going to be full publication after the agreement is finalized? The Novartis agreement was eventually published in full. If not full publication, some minimum pieces, essential terms, have to be published. What would those be? And when and how does the LAC report to the faculty?

"Oversight process. Do we need to think about a process for registering complaints? There is potentially an enormous amount of pressure within the department to keep the corporate sponsor happy. What happens to people who feel that the basic rules are being violated? And again, do we have special needs of graduate students?   How do we assure periodic assessment of performance, and re-evaluation of these principles and practices? There is some element of this in the plan that is proposed.

"Finally, which is really the first question, what kinds of arrangements are actually going to fall within this whole set of rules and practices? We have heard a lot about the fact that these agreements are not that different than what we are currently doing. Well, what we are currently doing is not subject to all of these limitations. We have to be careful not to set up a set of incentives for somebody (who would that somebody be?) to characterize agreements that really ought to be within the parameters of these principles and practices as not within them in order to escape them. There is a definition in the current plan. Do we need to work on that? So, I think the committee would benefit from your comments on any of those or suggestions of more to add to the list."

Professor Richard Durst, Food Science and Technology, Geneva: "I am a little surprised that you say that they went ahead, the trustees, and approved this without our input. This has never been done before by the administration. I would like to say that it wasn't clear from what you said whether the LAC was invited to provide advice or consent to these activities or the formulating of these strategic corporate alliances or is this something that we would like to have the LAC do so that we are informed and can have some kind of input? From past experience, they have done so much of this sort of thing as a fait accompli before it is brought before the Senate."

Professor Farina: "I know that what Inge Reichenbach said very forcefully at the forum was there was a great deal of faculty involvement with this in putting it together. So she would say to you, I think, that there was all sorts of faculty involvement, discussion with the new life sciences faculty, but you are right, there was not formal Senate input. It was not asked for. Brad, do you have something to say on that?"

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: "Charlie, correct me if I'm wrong in this, but we received a document last spring that we discussed at the spring meeting. It was this proposal for the strategic corporate alliance, and then in the summer a new version of that document appeared. That new version of the document included significant amendments; it had written directly into it that the Local Advisory Committee would be given authority to review and approve these alliances. So what happened was the authors of the document saw the way we behaved at the spring Faculty Senate meeting and amended that alliance to address the concerns that we showed, and I thought that was actually quite reasonable of them. So that the agreement that the trustees have approved has this significant amendment in it that addresses the concerns that were raised in the spring, so I'm much less worried about it than I was in the spring when I moved to table the motion."

Professor Farina (pointing to overhead containing text of university plan, Appendix 1): "This is part of the operative language that to approve memorandums of understanding in the way that the proposal is structured, memorandums of understanding are negotiated at the highest levels at both places but don't have binding effect. They are still subject to review at the university level by the counsel's office, by LAC, although it is not clear what the role of LAC is, I think, from the document, whether it is advisory or actual veto power. The lawyer in me wants it to be clearer. How about that? That's the primary clause."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "I think that what you have done, Cynthia, is really important for laying out the scope of the kind of issues that the ad hoc committee is going to be looking at. I'm going to be one of the members of the ad hoc committee, and I hope that other people who are really well versed in the sciences will want to come and be on that committee, because there is so much to cover

and we all have different areas of expertise. It seems to me that the first speaker from Geneva, that you raised some really important issues that I think also foreshadow the discussion we are going to have today with regard to the questions that President Lehman has raised for us to look at. One of those deals with the issue of how the university should be organized. So the organization of the university is not just a question of what do you call departments and how do we divide ourselves up that way, but how do we run the university and what is the nature of faculty governance and what is the scope of faculty governance. It seems to me that this is one of those issues that we can deal with as an ad hoc committee but that we can also incorporate into this broader question of how do we feel about faculty governance in relation to these very basic ideas about financing and funding and how they affect our basic principles. Let me just say that it seems to me that the document that we are looking to put together as a faculty does not necessarily have to say, 'Well, we accept as a fait accompli that these new strategic alliances will exist.' We can also put in there affirmations of our basic principles that govern us as faculty members, as members of a community that relies on academic freedom and that we can state those principles; we can state our preferences and our requirement as faculty to maintain those principles, and we can also include specific things that have to do with issues of openness of these agreements and review by the LAC and who should be on the LAC. We can be both principled in what we put in this document and also very specific with regard to the kinds of provisions that we would like to see followed in order to promote those principles."

Professor Farina: "I just want to second what Risa said about volunteers for this committee who come from the sciences and so live this stuff much more than lawyers like us. I think the jurisdictional question is enormously important, how are we going to know one of these things when we see it? Because we know that we have a lot of sponsored research now that is going along just fine, and we are not going to undo privately sponsored research; we wouldn't want to if we could. What is it about these things that make them different and at what point have we crossed the line? I think that is something that only those of you who do this privately sponsored research all the time can help us identify."

Professor Chu: "Regarding the intellectual property issue in your document, license rights. I thought this is mainly the responsibility of the Cornell Research Foundation, which is doing the licensing negotiation and determining whether they are exclusive or non-exclusive license, and I don't believe the university is involved in that part. Another issue regarding academic freedom, the long presentation of these, I think some of the issues probably get into what we call micro-management issues. Maybe we shouldn't get involved with that except setting the major policy.

Professor Farina (pointing to overhead containing text of university plan, Appendix 1): "There is a relevant provision in the plan that speaks to that, at least in part. Actually, that's the development piece. There it is."

Professor Chu: "As I know all the licensing agreements are negotiated between the company and CRF. I never heard of the dean of the college or the dean of the faculty involved in that negotiation."

Professor Farina: "OK. That's useful. I expected the idea would be, as you say, to put in some general principles about exclusive licensing and the extent to which, the kinds of work it covers and things like that. It would be useful to know where you think that we dipped into micro-management."

Professor Chu: "Whether the university, outside of CRF and the inventor, should be able to say, 'well, these should be exclusive or these should not be exclusive.' That I would consider as micro-management. I think CRF will protect the university's best interests in deciding whether it should be exclusive or non-exclusive. They are experts in that area."

Speaker Norton: "The chair would point out that the time for this agenda item has expired, so we will move on to the nextitem. People who wish to volunteer for the committee, please come up and speak to the Associate Dean of the Faculty after the meeting, and any further comments I'm sure you would be happy to receive, right?"

Professor Farina: "Yes, crf7@cornell.edu. If you just want to send ideas or comments, whatever."

Professor Stein: "Whatever happened to Ron Booker's time?"

Speaker Norton: "He is not here."

Professor Stein: "Can we add that on to this item?"

Speaker Norton: "Actually, we have pretty much used up his time, too. The chair turns the meeting over to Dean Walcott."

5. DISCUSSION OF HOW TO PROCEED WITH PRESIDENT LEHMAN'S QUESTIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT

Dean Walcott: "Thank you. I come before you with somewhat of a puzzle. As you know, President Lehman in his inaugural address set out a number of questions about the future of the university, and they are in somewhat more explicit form on the piece of paper that I handed out to you (Appendix 2). His request is that the university community—community writ large including faculty, staff, students, employees, and alumni—that any of this community consider these questions, mode of consideration left open, and communicate with him their thoughts on all these various issues. I have

talked with him at some length about how on earth to proceed with this, particularly from the point of view of the faculty, because it was not obvious to me how one could have an intelligent discussion of these things, how one could gather ideas most effectively. What I believe that he is trying to accomplish with this process is to get a large pot full of ideas and suggestions and concepts. He agrees to review the contents of this pot, and look it over and consider it, and then in the fullness of time to begin to develop some sort of plan for his vision for the future of the university.

"Exactly how that is going to be achieved is not very clear, but more particularly how we should address this issue is not at all clear to me. You could imagine a variety of potential techniques. Everybody will get this double-sided piece of paper. It includes an e-mail address and so one could imagine faculty members sitting in the quiet comfort of their office, reflecting upon these issues and working on the word processor to send him memoranda, either long ones or short ones. That would be one possibility. I call that the 'disorganized e-mail option.' Another possibility would be to have a series of faculty forums to talk about these things. On the other hand what he really is interested in, as far as I can make out, is not an overall considered view of the faculty. He is interested in a brainstorming session. He is interested in a variety of ideas; he's interested in faculty thoughts; he's interested in concepts. He is not interested in position papers. So in a way faculty forums might not be a productive way to go. Another alternative would be to refer some of these questions to existing committees; some of these questions, for instance number three: 'whom should we be teaching?,' or number two: 'how should we be teaching?,' could well be referred to the committee on educational policy for their discussion. One could also argue that maybe the thing to do is create a whole bunch of ad hoc committees to think about this. The thought fills me with some horror. One could encourage these kinds of questions to form a subject at various departmental faculty meetings, with somebody to write down bright ideas if they should appear. "

LAUGHTER.

Dean Walcott: "Those are the kinds of things that occurred to me. I really would like to throw the discussion open to get some ideas from you folks as to how we might proceed in some useful way to engage the president and to provide some of our ideas to him. We are clearly being asked, and I think it is important to respond in some kind of positive and helpful way, but what that way is, is not, as I say, intuitively obvious. So I thought it would be useful in this group to have at least a brief discussion and see what kind of ideas occur around the room as to how we might organize ourselves or not, to do this process. There is no reason that one size fits all. I mean there is clearly an invitation for anybody that feels so moved to write memoranda on any subject, as they say to the president."

Professor Steven Shriffin, Law: "I don't have very strong views on this, but I have views that could at least continue the discussion. It strikes me that you are exactly right that one size does not fit all, that if you look at this from the perspective of Senate faculty governance that these questions might be dealt with differently. I think that Senate sponsored forums would be a good idea with respect to question two, and I would include parts of question one. It seems to me it's a good idea in any year to have a senate sponsored forum on how we should be teaching—what ideas people think work and don't work - and have some of our finest teachers participate in that. It seems to me that it would be a useful thing to do which would help in the brainstorming process. I also think with respect to question five, and this may reflect my ignorance because I really know nothing about question five, but I take it from the wording of it that there is controversy about what the land grant mission should be today and how it should be implemented. If that is correct, then a faculty forum on that subject would be a good thing to have. I think it's also possible to have a good faculty forum on the question of essentially what the requirements are that we have at the university and whether they need to be re-thought.

"A number of these questions I think are best handled in a reactive way. That is if somebody formulates a proposal, the senate should look at it. There I have in mind the mix of undergraduates and graduate students, etc. in question three; where we ought to be present in question four; how we should collaborate with other great universities. It seems to me that getting specific proposals would be helpful for that. What special domains of research emphasis—give us a proposal is my thought. And also on how the university should be organized, if there is a proposal to reorganize then we ought to look at it. There are infinite possibilities. As to a committee, it seems to me that our educational policy committee is always asking what we should be teaching our students. So I guess my reaction is I think we should have some senate sponsored workshops for some of these questions. Obviously we'll disagree about what those are, but that most of it we should play a reactive role when there is something concrete for us to look at."

Dean Walcott: "Other comments?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "For almost half my life I've heard people do things like this and I've almost never heard anything positive coming out of them. People stand with an easel and they say, 'we're having brainstorming, I'll write down everything that comes up.' People write them down and somebody summarizes and comes back to a meeting. I can't remember a time when I really heard something new or good come out of that. That being said, I really do applaud this."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Stein: "Well, in general I'm an eternal optimist and I think that it ought to be possible for this faculty of 1400 of us to somehow engage in very deep questions about the way the university is organized and what it ought to be doing and where it ought to be going. It's conceivable that the answer to that is well, just what it is doing now more or less with a little bit of changes here and there, but maybe it isn't. Maybe this is a time when people could converge on something different and constructive.

"I actually went through this, as one of your two faculty trustees, at the last Board of Trustees meeting where the president did in fact give this list to the trustees. Only it wasn't eight questions; it was only the last two, namely what ought we be doing and how ought we be organized. The trustees got into small groups of people and they talked about this for an hour. Surprisingly enough, I found that the answers that people gave to number seven were rather more thoughtful than I would have thought it was going to be. The answers to number eight, how ought we to be organized, didn't produce anything that I haven't heard many, many times before. In course of an hour I could really watch people react to what other people were saying. It was really quite a focused discussion and came out with a couple of things that were not trivial and weren't obvious before going in. So I was rather pleased with that, and I would sort of like to see something like that tried with the faculty.

"I kind of agree with Steve that the best way to do it is a forum. The problem is that the list has ballooned to so many items that I'm not sure that if you put them all together, if you had a faculty forum with an hour and asked people to say anything they wanted about any of the eight items, I don't know that that would yield anything. Maybe you could have eight different forums with eight items or four forums with two items a piece or something like that. I think there ought to be some kind a way for individual faculty members to throw out an idea and see if people respond to it, if that kind of thing does resonate with what other people are thinking. The only way to do this I would think is in an unstructured environment like a forum. Somehow I think that's a good idea, and it would be nice to try and figure out some mechanism for doing it."

Professor Anton: "I recall that when Hunter Rawlings started as president he called for a similar soul-searching endeavor, and there was a series of—what were they called—leadership conferences, and they generated a whole bunch of books with red covers that were copied and sent around to everyone. Whatever we did then, we have to make sure we don't do that again, because nobody can remember exactly what happened and nothing ever came of the results."

Professor Schuler: "I think Brad raises an excellent point, because in my modest 30 odd years here, I can remember going through this exercise at least three times. One of the earliest efforts under President Corson, which I recall Professor Stein was deeply involved in, was led by a professor in the Law School, and it led to a pile of documents this deep that were then tossed off into the dustbin of history I suspect. Then we went

through it again under President Rhodes under the label of strategic planning endeavor, and what I do think might be a worthwhile effort is to dispatch some graduate student to at least dig out these documents . . ."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Schuler: ". . . do a brief summary of what the key suggestions, findings and recommendations were. See how they changed by the documents and see which if any of them have ever been implemented at least partially. I just think that would be an interesting exercise in humility if nothing else."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Richard Tallman, Physics: "I would like to propose a kind of divide and conquer procedure. This is a thoughtful list, but it is just a list. I guess they could call it a laundry list, but it is just a list. It seems likely that some of them are promising and some are not promising, but I don't know which is which. If there is a procedure for selecting the three or four items which we thought (not that we know what the answer is) were promising, then we would immediately reduce the problem by the factor of two."

Dean Walcott: "Good suggestion."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "I share people's reservations about this exercise and recognize that we have been through this a number of times without a lot of results, however we do have a new president who really does seem to be interested in what the faculty and the community think about the future. I think it would be a bad mistake to say, 'well, we'll wait until you make a proposal and then we'll critique it.' I think we would be wise to engage at least to some extent if we want to be taken seriously as a faculty body concerned about the future."

Professor John Forester, City and Regional Planning: "I guess I'm thinking about working backwards, thinking about what would count as the answers here. We would have a debate about various alternatives, various responses, but I think if we are going to have a debate, we need some proposals about each one. If we are going to have proposals, proposals should presumably come out of groups of faculty and maybe staff and students that would need to discuss each of these questions. In order to have groups convened to discuss this, we have to have some incentives for people to take leadership in areas. I would suggest for a very little bit of investment on the administration's part, there could be some kind of small seed money for people who would be willing to step up and convene some groups over the course of six months or a year in each of these areas. The purpose of the groups would be then to provide and generate proposals answering what are the most interesting ways of answering these,

with the charge then of groups to write it up not in the big red books but to write them up in some way that they can be floated and debated in the community. Then we are all smarter, not dumber."

Professor Lieberwitz: "I wanted to follow-up on some of the things and what John was just saying. For one thing the group ideas make sense to me, and we have the Faculty Senate committee structure where we have categories of subjects that are carried out and directed by the Faculty Senate committees. So that would seem to be an appropriate place to start to think about where some of these questions can be addressed.

"The other issue that I started really thinking about with regard to our discussion about the strategic alliances and other issues that we have looked at like eCornell, like the Doha program with the medical college, is that one of our frustrations as a senate has always been this question of being presented with a fait accompli from the administration saying this is what we want to do, and now you can talk about it, and then we'll go ahead and do what we want to do. That's a constant frustration. So it seems to me that in terms of the faculty governance issue that what we can think about is how to structure this so that it's not simply, OK here is input to the president, so that the president can just go ahead and do what he wants to do, but here is a discussion that will in fact be part of the continuing back-and-forth, so that if there are proposals created by us that those are responded to. If the university administration creates proposals, then we can respond to them as well, but that this is the beginning of a back-and-forth rather than here are ideas, now the administration will do what they want to do. I think we should really structure it so that it strengthens faculty governance."

Professor Gregory Page, Art: "One of the things that I've noticed in the paper a couple of weeks ago is that there was a meeting with President Lehman and the Superintendent of the Board of Education. Whatever happens, whatever we decide, we [should] also make sure that we include the faculty, the staff and the students, undergraduate and graduate, but also the community to take part in this."

Professor Farina: "I wanted to follow-up on what Lisa said and suggest in a sense we look at this binocularly. To some extent we don't want to put time into something that will be unproductive, but we also have to recognize maybe that, if we looked at it more anthropologically, this is an initiation ritual. Isn't that what somebody looking at this from outside would make of Brad's comment that it happens every time? This is a dance; this is something that new presidents do. It has some value. The value is not necessarily where you get as a policy matter. Now we are all busy, and we don't want to waste our time. But whether you think of this in economic terms as just part of the cost of turning over a new president - we all have to go through this for a year - or whether you think of it in more cultural terms, this really is engagement - that's why it's called engagement - with the president. It's a way for him to see how we respond to

something he says is important. The doing it may be more important than where we get from it, or it's at least as important as where we get from it. So I agree with Lisa; we can't take the chance that we render ourselves as a body looking either useless, or uncooperative, or unwilling to dance by not participating. So the question is how do we do it in a way that doesn't feel constantly like a waste of time."

Dean Walcott: "The chair has just told me that we are out of time for this item, but I will be around afterwards if anybody has ideas they would like to communicate, I will try and pull things together."

Speaker Norton: "We are actually trying to adjourn a little early this evening, so that's why I am sticking with the agenda time. It is now time for Good and Welfare, and I will call on Hal Craft to speak for five minutes about United Way."

6. GOOD AND WELFARE

Harold Craft, Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer: "I appreciate being given the opportunity to say a few words today. I'm here in a different role. I'm here in the role of chairman of this year's Cornell United Way program. My purpose today really is just to remind you that the United Way campaign for both Cornell and the county is now in full swing. Cornell's, in fact, is off to quite a good start. In the first three weeks we have reached more than half of our goal. Our goal is currently $585,000 out of a total county goal of $1.7 million, but those are really just numbers. What I find interesting is that the Cornell goal is one-third of the country goal. Cornell is an enormous participant in United Way, and we have discovered that in those years that Cornell doesn't meet its goal, the county does not meet its goal either. The implications of that are a number of human service organizations within the community suffer real pain. The United Way is just really a mechanism by which we members of the community can support many of the human services within our community. There are forty-one different organizations, over 100 programs, supported by the United Way. So that really is my message and my pitch for the day. The university has always taken a laissez-faire attitude on this, and I will not attempt to change that, not that I could even if I chose to.

I do, on the other hand, want to make two observations in closing. The first is that I have always personally contributed to United Way, more on a conceptual basis than really understanding what was behind it. It just seemed like a way to support the community but I really didn't have a good feeling for what it was like on the other side of the pipeline. Then, I was asked to serve on the board of Challenge Industries, which is one of those organizations that are supported by United Way, and on the finance committee of Challenge Industries. I have had an opportunity over the last three years to see first-hand exactly what goes on in an organization like that and how much service they provide to really disadvantaged folks within our community, how dedicated these people are and how much they work with very little financial reward; it's all personal reward that they get, and from my experience on the finance committee how close to the bone those folks run that organization so that the contribution from United Way is absolutely critical to keeping Challenge Industries running the way it is. They of course get revenue from elsewhere as well.

"The other observation is one that I made just recently when I took over, as chairman of the campaign and that has to do with the participation rate of Cornell. I will say that I was really disappointed to discover that the overall participation rate of Cornell is about 12%. That is 12% of the cards that go out come back with some sort of contribution, whether it's twenty-five cents a paycheck or more. I guess I was just a little bit embarrassed to feel that that was a statement that the university about which I care so much and at which I have been so long is making to the community in our sense of commitment to that community. That participation rate is, by the way, one third of

Ithaca College's and roughly one-third or less of Yale's, and I could go on and on. It's not a standout participation rate to say the least. So my encouragement to all of us, not just to you or to your faculty colleagues but to the staff as well, (and I'll be speaking to them in various forms) is to think seriously about how it is that you want to support the community in which we are immersed and upon which we depend so heavily. If this is one way, please consider filling out your pledge card and sending it in. As you might expect, just in case you might need a pledge card, I do have a few here with me. Thanks very much."

Speaker Norton: "The chair now calls on Professor Kenneth Kennedy to talk about the University and Messenger Lectures."

Professor Kenneth Kennedy, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology: "Thank you, but that is scheduled for the agenda at the next meeting."

Speaker Norton: "Oh, it is? All right."

Professor Stein: "Madam Chair?"

Speaker Norton: "Yes, sir. Mr. Stein."

Professor Stein: "Might it be possible to move to have more discussion of the previous item. I sensed there were more people who wanted to talk about it."

Speaker Norton: "The previous item—you mean the discussion of President Lehman's questions?"

Professor Stein: "Yes."

Speaker Norton: "It's certainly possible. Is there unanimous consent for an additional ten minutes of discussion on that item? Seeing no objection, the floor is yours again Dean Walcott."

Dean Walcott: "Well, since you moved it Peter, the opportunity is yours to say something."

Professor Stein: "I could use up ten minutes easy."

LAUGHTER.

Professor Stein: "I just wanted to respond to what Brad said about the previous versions of this, and I do remember them. I remember the red books, and I remember

John Wiesenfeld's brown colored books. Then there was Corson's (I forget what color those were; that was too long ago)."

Dean Walcott: "They were grey."

Professor Stein; "It seems to me that there is something fundamentally different about this. The red books and Wiesenfeld's books were highly structured items that were brought down by the administration, and they purported to be an institution-wide examination of fundamental issues, but in fact the agenda was set, and when we went to those (I forget what they were called, over in North Campus) there were speakers that were selected to talk about action items, and we all were told to debate various items. It was more in the reactive mode, except there were no votes taken. It was more or less the same thing with the strategic planning that went on under President Rhodes. There was a very crafted agenda, and it really was not open to anyone that wanted to participate; the committees were selected, and in fact there were never votes on things, and people would look at the comments and they would write the answers to what the consensus of the group was. It was very hard or rather impossible in all of those settings for someone to bring up a new idea, an idea that was different than the prevailing tide of ideas that came down from on high. This thing may suffer from the other sin that there is no structure to it and anything goes, but I think it's an attempt to try something different, and I think we ought to take it very seriously and figure out how to participate in a meaningful way. I don't really have an answer, but I think we can't treat it lightly and it's a honest attempt to engage the whole community like I've never seen before while I've been here. I think we really ought to try hard to figure out the best way to meet the challenge."

Professor Nicholas Calderone, Entomology: "I think it's very nice of the president to send us this list. This is a fairly broad list, and certainly you could read into it a lot of important issues, but I think it's basically his agenda. Isn't it really more appropriate for the senate to be giving consideration to what we think are the truly important issues and putting those into some framework for discussion and seeing how well they match up with what has been presented to us by the president? In these dialogs and exchanges shouldn't we really be generating the ideas from our perspective of what we think are the issues that need to be discussed?"

Professor Schuler: "I really applaud the last observation. I think it's very useful to try and construct something independently on our own just as a point of comparison, and I also wanted to actually qualify, because I sensed a misinterpretation of my earlier observation that adds a note of cynicism. In fact, what I was really proposing is that we exercise that in which we try and encourage everyone to do that is to engage in some serious scholarship. That is to look at—have our hopes and aspirations remained relatively constant through these various programs—and if they have and the outcomes have not been fulfilled, to begin to focus in and zero in on what is it that is inhibiting the

successful outcome that we desire. While speaking tongue in check, I was dead serious about the proposal that we actually look at these previous studies and try and understand what are the common themes. What are the common threads, and what are the impediments? And can we do something constructively about dealing with that?"

Professor Anton: "I think it's important that we respond to this. I agree with Peter. What I said before should not have been taken as cynicism either. I think we need to look at the procedure that we used before and analyze that procedure and how effective the procedure was and use that to guide us as to what would be a productive procedure to use in this opportunity. I think we have to do something much more significant than just sending e-mails to the president. Because if we send e-mails to the president, we could get in a situation that I think I've seen before where the president announces that he has reached some great new decision based on oodles of faculty input that was given to him through e-mails. Then everybody looks at one another and says, 'that wasn't my input; that wasn't our committee; that didn't come from us.' But it is declared to be supported by faculty input, so it's important for us to organize something and come to some collective (not that we all have to agree on all of the topics) but something that comes from us that is public and is our statement so that it's out there."

Professor John Forester: "There is more than one model. As Dean Walcott said one size doesn't fit all. One model from the mid-80's, as I remember, was some funds that I guess President Rhodes had put together for a program called Innovations in Undergraduate Education. What little that I know about it, I saw some parts of that have enormous effect for very small amounts of funding, and that would be a strategy the administration might think about to explore this."

Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I'm hearing a lot of very good ideas. I like Dick Schuler's modification of his earlier comments, which we all misinterpreted. What it does suggest is a place to begin, and I think that is one of our problems. We need a place to begin. His suggestion is a very good place to begin, because many of us have been there two or three times, and if we can come out with some themes from that, I think it would be very useful. I see another place to begin and that goes back to what Peter Stein said. He has met with the trustees on item seven. The trustees came up with thoughtful suggestions about item seven. I think he ought to write those up and have that as another beginning point. I've heard another good suggestion. The senate has formal committees, and it makes sense to feed back to them and if there are some things that are not covered by a formal committee structure, we would create new committees. But we have to have some place to start, and I've heard some very good suggestions about places to start."

Professor William Arms, Computer Science: "Let me add one other place to begin, that [for]many of these topics a sensible discussion should begin with gathering some facts. For many of the topics, the worry is that we express opinions first rather than get the

facts and information for expressing an opinion."

Professor Michael Lynn, Hotel Administration: "What I am hearing is ideas about how to give him more thoughtful not just brainstorming ideas but edited ideas, and if his interest is genuinely brainstorming, I'm not sure for us to form committees and have committees produce documents is the way to give him the plethora of ideas he is looking for. My guess is he may be coming here and saying that this is a large university; there are a lot of ideas currently out there. There are people who already have ideas as to how their work intersects with the work of other people. There are ideas about whom we should have partnerships with and this would be an opportunity on his part simply to try and surface those things. In which case our goal should not be to produce these kinds of formal documents you are talking about, but perhaps we could serve in an advisory role in instructing him about ways to motivate the faculty and encourage the faculty to surface the ideas that they already have. That advisory role and how to get the process going on a more individual level may be a more appropriate thing for us to do."

Professor Steven Beer, Plant Pathology: "As I look at these eight questions, the first three or four strike me as sort of resource neutral. Whatever recommendations or suggestions we come up with for possible change or maintenance perhaps could be done with the same resources. The other five or so seem to depend in part on acquiring other resources to perhaps change the university operations relative to the subjects at hand. For those who have more experience in analyzing questions of this sort, is it considered that we can really think with a blank sheet and should we come up suggestions on how to collaborate that involves considerable more resources than are now being expended for collaboration or the different places where we perform or how the university is organized? Is that within the realm of what the president is asking?"

Dean Walcott: "Yes, it is, because they are planning, as you may or may not have heard, a very substantial capital campaign, and I think part of this process is to get ideas to form what additional things they might wish to ask for in a capital campaign. So I think that we should not necessarily be concerned about the finances. It's not necessarily as zero sum gain. That's my sense of it."

Speaker Norton: "We have reached the end of the ten minutes. The speaker adjourns the meeting."

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia R. Farina
Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

STRATEGIC CORPORATE ALLIANCES –
PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

No coercion to participate
- identifiable indirect forms of pressure?
- Faculty v. graduate students

Permissible scope of right to limit work sponsored by competitors
current plan: "same investigator and similar work"
- what constitutes "sponsorship"?

No right to censor content of presentations or publications beyond proprietary data

Permissible scope of pre-clearance requirements ("first look" rights)
- What?
Publications
Presentations
Dissertations
Other sorts of scholarly interchange
- Which?
Funded work vs. all work
- For how long?

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No restriction on revelation of sponsorship
Fraud and individual/institutional conflict of interest - adequacy of existing regulation?
"Desk drawer effect" antidotes?

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Licensing rights
- Scope
- Funded work vs. all work
- % limitations

- Terms
>> Exclusive license vs. more limited forms (e.g., retention of humanitarian use rights; 5-year cap)

GOVERNANCE

Process for allocating funds to projects
> direct donor participation?

Involvement in other aspects of lab/department functioning
> jurisdiction and powers of "Joint Steering Committee"?

Nature and extent of
- "facilitated access to [department] facilities, faculty and students"
- "opportunities for company employees' training"

OTHER TERMS

Requirement of accompanying unrestricted gift – combating the "crowding out" problem

Other desirable requirements or prohibitions?

....

FACULTY REVIEW AND OPEN ACCESS

Review by LAC (?) and Dean of Faculty before finalization
- extent of power – veto vs. advisory
- composition of LAC – addition of neutral members?
ethicists? others?

Publication of full agreement once finalized
> alt: Publication of essential terms – what are these?
- when and how does LAC report to faculty?

OVERSIGHT

Process for registering complaints

Special needs of grad students?

Ensuring periodic assessment of performance and reevaluation of principles/practices

JURISDICTION

What qualifies as a SCA?

Cornell SCA Plan (7/30/03): "A strategic alliance is a comprehensive, formally managed company-university agreement centered around a major, multi-year financial commitment involving research, programmatic interactions, intellectual property licensing, and other services."

CALL TO ENGAGEMENT
FROM JEFFREY S. LEHMAN TO THE CORNELL COMMUNITY

In my inaugural address, I asked the Cornell community to consider how our university should evolve during the years leading up to our sesquicentennial in 2015. I believe that Cornell, with its unique set of animating principles, history, and contemporary structure, can make contributions to humanity that no other university in the world can make. We have a shared responsibility to reflect carefully on how to pursue that goal.

I hope that during this academic year the broad community of Cornellians – faculty, students, staff, alumni, and other neighbors and friends near and far – will engage a set of important questions and will share the fruits of that engagement. Before enumerating those questions, however, I want to offer some of my thoughts and hopes about the process.

I am not asking you to consider all the important issues that face Cornell. Rather, I am asking you to approach a subset of those issues, a subset that touches the core of our identity. In challenging us to think about Cornell's fundamentals, I anticipate that much of the discussion will reaffirm what we find good about our university. I nonetheless encourage us to reflect on all of Cornell, even the aspects that are its greatest strengths.

To be sure, it is not my intent to revisit or second-guess major commitments that Cornell has made; I am fully dedicated to their successful realization. This exercise is about the future – the new commitments we should be making to ourselves and to others, so as to ensure that Cornell is the university we want it to be when we celebrate our 150th birthday.

These are not matters that lend themselves to easy, consensus to-do lists, or to simple, one-sentence answers. They are complex, difficult subjects about which reasonable people will disagree. Accordingly, responses will be most helpful if they convey people's approaches to the questions and the ways they think about them, rather than simply generating a list of agenda items. When a group considers a topic, I hope that they will produce a response that conveys the broad heterogeneity of reaction within the group rather than stating a simple "bottom line."

I am asking our community to begin this discussion over the coming weeks. The opportunities for thought and conversation are varied and numerous. Members of the senior administration will help develop and organize discussion among all of our stakeholders, but many of you will want to engage, instead, in smaller group discussions or in individual reflection. I encourage you to take whatever opportunity arises to give consideration to these questions. We invite you to share the results of your deliberations by sending an e-mail to calltoengagement@cornell.edu or simply sending a note to the President's Office at 300 Day Hall. My colleagues and I will be reading the ideas you write down and mixing in our own views. By next fall, I expect to have framed an initial set of goals for myself and for our university that will reflect the dreams and aspirations of Cornellians everywhere.

Thank you, in advance, for participating in this exercise. I look forward to joining with you in the conversations that these questions stimulate. It is a great privilege for me to serve as Cornell's president and to lead what I trust will be an extraordinarily stimulating conversation.

QUESTIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT
JEFFREY S. LEHMAN
Fall 2003

1. What should we be teaching our students? What intellectual dispositions, character traits, and essential knowledge should we be nurturing? How can we inspire our undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to become intellectual and moral leaders of their communities? How can we prepare them for well-rounded lives that incorporate artistic, athletic, cultural, humanitarian, political, and social dimensions?

2. How should we be teaching? Have new technologies and research on how students learn created possibilities for better pedagogy, or are they mere distractions? What kind of mentorship, inside and outside the classroom, should we providing our students at the different stages of their educations?

3. Whom should we be teaching? What mix of undergraduates, graduate students, professional students, and non-degree students will best help Cornell achieve its educational mission?

4. Where should we be present? As our world has changed, we have added new places where we teach those who would earn Cornell degrees. How much should we be extending ourselves, our resources, and our reputation around the globe?

5. What does our land grant mission mean today? What forms of extension and public service are the best modern expression of Senator Morrill's program for having outstanding universities contribute to the practical education of society? Should we do more to ensure that the fruits of our research become part of the fabric of the larger society?

6. How should we collaborate? We already collaborate with other great universities in the United States and around the world, on projects large and small. What other institutional partnerships, international and domestic, might permit a scale of endeavor that would allow us to accomplish things we cannot do alone? With whom might we collaborate, closer to home, to enhance the upstate New York economy and/or strengthen our ties to New York City?

7. Should we be identifying special domains of research emphasis where Cornell is unusually well situated to make enduring and significant contributions? Can such an identification be reconciled with the highly adaptive decentralization that has been one of the hallmarks of research innovation at Cornell? We have already identified some candidates for special emphasis: information science and computing technology, post-genomic life sciences, and nanotechnology. Additional themes which have the potential to draw on multiple disciplines where Cornell has great strength might include: technology and society; race and religion; globalization's consequences; humanity's relationship to the natural and built environment; peace, liberty, and security; and global health.

8. How should the University be organized? Our complex web of institutional structures and processes has, for the most part, provided a healthy mix of stability and flexibility. But are some features anachronisms? Do new forms of knowledge production and dissemination require different structures? Might organizational changes better enable faculty, students, and staff to achieve their individual and institutional ambitions?