1. CALL TO ORDER
Speaker Pro-Tem, Steven Beer: “Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to call to order the February 2013 meeting of the University Faculty Senate. I’d first like to offer a personal thank you to Dean Charlie Walcott for standing in for me at the December meeting. Charlie, you had an exciting meeting to coordinate, according to the minutes. Thanks.

“Now I’d like to remind the body to please turn off or silence all cell phones, beepers and so on, and remind you that there will be no photos taken or recordings made of the proceedings, except for those made by the authorities.

“When you speak, please be recognized by the speaker, wait for a microphone to be brought to you, then rise, state your name and affiliation, and then make the points that you wish to make or pose the questions you wish.

“I would like to suggest also that speakers -- and we do have a lengthy discussion coming up today -- limit your discussion points to no more than two minutes. There are no Good and Welfare speakers, so we’ll fill in the extra time allocated for Good and Welfare as we go along.

“It’s now my pleasure to ask Dean of the Faculty Joe Burns to make comments, introductions and so forth.”

2. REMARKS BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, JOSEPH BURNS
Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: “Thank you very much, Steve. To start, we decided that you probably didn’t need food after the holidays, but you probably needed food for the spirit, so we got some flowers to get you through this cold winter day. They’re from the Hortus Club, the undergraduate horticulture club at Cornell.

“We are still in our tradition of introducing ourselves to one another. If you don’t know anyone, somebody in your neighborhood, please turn around and say hi.

“So I should have gone through the agenda, but I think you all know what’s on it. After the usual formalities at the beginning of the agenda, we will have a
presentation by President Skorton on his report about the Ho Plaza incidents, and then we'll have the floor open for about 20 minutes, perhaps a little more, given that we've got Good and Welfare freedom, for further discussion of that topic.

“Let me go through a few announcements, some of them good, some of them not so good. Among the good, the Faculty Soup has restarted over in the Regent's Lounge. We had our first faculty forum just last Thursday. It was on the future of the research library and what it means for Cornell. It was run by Mike Fontaine and we had about 125 participants, so that was excellent.

“We have nominations due at the dean of the faculty office March 8th. The Weiss presidential fellows will be looking for nominations at that time. And then at the beginning of April, we're looking for nominations for the lectures. And then there will also be elections coming up, and Mike will mention this in his report to come.

“Notice, the whole purpose of these announcements is that the operation of the senate is supposed to be a back and forth, where you bring information back to your departments and then come forward with their feelings about various things. We have not been operating that especially well. Communications in both directions could be improved, and I encourage you to do that as much as possible.

“There were actions that we took at the last meeting, again, requesting the president to come and present his report on the Ho Plaza incident. The UFC and myself were asked to form a senate investigation committee. We've done that. It is Rick Allmendinger from Engineering, Bill Fry from CALS, and Margaret Washington from the Arts College. As I'll mention later, that group has started to meet and is progressing forward, and they are looking forward to getting some discussion here later in the afternoon.

“So that's the good or neutral news. The bad news is on the next slide. We've had two deaths of very notable faculty over the last month, right at the beginning of the term. Jerry Hass passed on. At the time of his death he was chair of AFPS, Academic Freedoms and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee and had been chair for five years.

“He was just an incredible individual and larger than life. To those who know him, he had a joy about life, but effectiveness in his personal dealings that was
truly remarkable. So he was accomplished as an academic, but also accomplished as a person, and will be sorely missed.

“He was instrumental in getting our Faculty Soup, so go over and have an extra bowl on his behalf the next time you are in the Statler. There will be a memorial service on March 1st over in Sage Chapel to commemorate his life.

“And then just yesterday, another person passed on. Bob Richardson -- that was a person that -- I'm Irish, so you can overlook the tears -- I was stunned by his death, although he hadn't been in good health. He died yesterday morning. He is a Nobel Laureate in physics, so somebody that will not be easily replaced, but also an incredible administrative leader; the first senior vice provost for research starting about 15 years ago.

“And he was not only accomplished in research, obviously, as shown by his Nobel Prize, but he was also an administrative leader here, a close colleague and a friend of many of us, and very important in the national scene; he sat on the National Science. It issued one of its most influential documents, a document calling on the federal government to do a better job of supporting research and the sciences and science education. So, both of them, will be very definitely missed.

“If I could have the next slide, which just gives the particulars of Jerry's service, 3:00 on Friday over at Sage Chapel, then there will be a reception in Sage Hall. We can move on to the rest of the agenda.”

Speaker Beer: “Okay, the next item is the approval of the minutes of the December 2012 meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes of that meeting? Seeing none, we'll declare those minutes accepted as distributed by the dean of the faculty's office.

“We'll now move on to the Associate Dean of the Faculty Mike Fontaine for a report of the Nominations and Elections Committee. Mike?”

3. **REMARKS** BY THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL FONTAINE

Associate Dean Fontaine: “Good afternoon. We have a few new appointments that we've made to various committees. Two people to University Assembly, these are all on the first slide, Ellis Lowe from the College of Veterinary Medicine and Ronald Booker from Arts and Sciences. To University Assembly for Campus
Welfare, Marianella Casasola, College of Human Ecology; and then for the University Assembly Planning Committee, Abraham Stroock from the College of Engineering. Finally, for the University Hearing Board, Ross Brann from Arts and Sciences.

“The other thing I’d like to mention right now is the two upcoming elections. It’s going to be at the same time, but these are quite important. We have one open spot for the Nominations and Elections Committee. That’s the committee that picks everybody for all the other committees. So it’s actually really an important thing, because you need to know people, and the committee needs to know a lot of people that the rest of us don’t know. We’re trying to get wide representation and not just keep picking the same people over and over and over. So this is actually quite an important committee. You don’t have to be a senator, and we have one open spot there.

“The other is for the University Faculty Committee, which is probably the most senior committee of all. This is the one that deals directly with the administration, and then with the rest of us here. We have five open spots for that. As you can see, we need both senators and non-senators for that.

“The only catch is that you cannot serve on both these committees simultaneously. That’s the legislation that’s already in place. And I’ve heard a number of people say in here that shared governance is quite important to us as individuals or as faculty, so this is the kind of the flip side, the responsibility, the shared responsibility of trying to make sure we can ensure governance and have our say in all the various things that matter.

“So please consider running yourself, or please consider tapping a colleague that you think would do a nice job at that, especially for those non-senator spots. Anyone who’s interested or wants to nominate a name can contact the dean of faculty office. The deadline should be about March 8th for all these different names. You can also ask me questions afterwards, if you have any. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Thank you very much, Mike. Dean Burns, you have further announcements?”

Dean Burns: “Yes. Another announcement which I meant to make originally is that president said he would be a few moments late, and that’s okay. I want to encourage you again to come up and take some flowers, take them home. They
are going to be hard for us to bring home. So that's your gift to your partner or your spouse. Kent may have something to say.”

4. **REMARKS BY THE PROVOST, KENT FUCHS**
Provost Fuchs: “I just wanted to add to the sad news that Joe shared. Joe mentioned the death of Jerry Hass and Bob Richardson, but there's been another death, and that's Kevin Pratt in Architecture Art and Planning, just in the last 24 hours. So let me read to you the e-mail. I'm not Irish, but I get emotional too.

“This is from Dean Kent Kleinman to his faculty, students and staff. He says, ‘I write with very sad news that architecture professor Kevin Pratt passed away last night. The news will be unfathomable for those of you who worked with Kevin and knew him as a source of boundless energy. There are no words to ease this terrible loss, and I know I represent the AAP community in sending our deepest sympathy to Kevin's wife, Dana, their three children and Kevin's family and loved ones.’”

Speaker Beer: “Well, it seems we're in the mode to await the president. Perhaps it would be appropriate to ask any members of the faculty present if they have any comments to make on the operations of the faculty or particularly the University Faculty Senate.

“We do have a comment. Would you kindly await the arrival of a microphone, Risa.”

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, ILR: “I wouldn't want to let any dead air go by here, and so I do have a question. We used to have the UFC report at meetings. That was one of the outcomes of the governance review report. And then for a while, the UFC did make a report of what was happening in the meetings with the provost and the president. And so I wondered if that was something that perhaps could get started again, because I was on the committee that made the recommendation, so obviously I thought it was a good recommendation and seemed to me a good way to create that communication.”

Dean Burns: “I think that's an excellent suggestion. I apologize for having screwed up. That's something we should be doing. Communication in both directions is real important. So while we await the president, we have a couple of options. We could -- maybe we start off with a moment of silence for our colleagues. That would be worthwhile.”
STEVE BEER: “Would you care for this microphone? Or this one is live.”

5. **REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT, DAVID SKORTON**
President Skorton: “Can I assume that everyone in the senate has gotten the report? I sent it out some time ago. So I’m just going to quickly review it, and I hope that’s not redundant. I just want to make sure if anybody got it, but didn’t have a chance to read it, that all have a summary of findings and recommendations. I first found out about the issues which we investigated and which the senate is going to investigate through correspondence I got from three faculty members, and I took the correspondence very seriously.

“I started by looking into the information that I could gather myself about what happened that day, and then spoke with Joe Burns after the senate had passed two resolutions. I’d already decided to investigate the matter on my own and shared that with Joe and with the UFC.

“So what I did was carry forward and spoke with the general counsel and with my most senior staff colleagues, and my executive assistant Jane Miller. The reason that I asked the general counsel to lead the investigation was three-fold.

“The two most important reasons: one was the fact that one of the bases of the concerns was apparently conflicting information, intentions of two pieces of writing to which the university community turns for direction, one the campus code and one, a description of a requested procedure to be executed before a planned rally. And since the general counsel is the person ultimately responsible for keeping track of all this information at the university, keeping it updated, I thought that was appropriate.

“Secondly, the general counsel is someone trained in investigation. And thirdly, one of the three faculty complaints had a concern about my own activities related to our partnership with the Technion, and it was my decision, right or wrong, that because of that complaint, that it was very important that I personally not make a judgment on this set of issues.

“The investigation involved talking with the three concerned faculty members, talking with the police officer on the scene, talking with the event managers on the scene, looking at video of the scene and looking at some other written commentary by people at the scene.
“As you saw in the report, the general counsel and Ms. Miller offered a series of findings and observations. I know you have had a chance to look at them. I want to go over a few of them that I think are particularly pertinent to a very emotionally charged situation that day and an emotionally charged situation in follow-up to the circumstance.

“First, everyone recognizes and accepts that there’s a lack of clarity governing outdoor rallies and demonstrations on university premises. I want to remind you that the campus code in one area sets forth the general right of free expression, of course. The code in another area sets forth a permitting of the university to, quote, ‘Impose reasonable time, place and manner restrictions on expressive conduct.’ You may ask why that would be. Why would this and every other organization of this type of which I am aware have something allowing imposition of time, place and manner restrictions; and it has to do with managing situations that can become volatile and difficult as part of the general campus safety environment.

“However, even though I think those are both reasonable things -- obviously, free expression is reasonable, it's the bulwark of the university. But it is also reasonable to have time, place and manner restrictions. I think it is important to look back at what other circumstances occurred when there were demonstrations. And the space-sharing of one space during counter-expressions, counter-demonstrations have often been worked out through the process of getting permission before protesting.

“Besides the apparent contradiction between these two pieces of writing, I thought it was also important to note the somewhat long lead time that is requested in the UUP area, because obviously things can come up in which people’s feelings that they would like to express will not wait that length of time.

“The material that I saw and the material that was gathered and analyzed by the general counsel and by Ms. Miller suggested -- and I believe this, based on the evidence that I saw -- that all the different people who were interacting that day did so in good faith, based on their reading of rules governing the situation. And I want to review that a little bit, because I think it's the core result of the investigation.

“Number one: each of the countering demonstration groups obviously had their point of view, a very emotional subject, a very emotional time, given the then very difficult hostilities in Gaza. Both of the groups that were protesting
believed, based on the way they read the campus rules, that they had a right to be where they were, and I think it’s very reasonable they both felt that way.

“The faculty members felt that they had a right to free expression, and they felt that there were things impeding their free expression. The campus police believe that the job they had to do there was to prevent an unsafe environment, and they were caught in the middle of a very difficult and emotionally charged situation. And then finally, the event managers tried, on the spot that day, to manage a way that everyone could have shared the space together, which was difficult to do because of the emotions expressed that day.

“The recommendations for forward action that I’ve accepted started out by the need to reconcile the apparent and real contradictions inherent in those two statements. Because the custodian of these procedures is the Executive Committee of the University Assembly, I have already gone ahead on February 13, a few days after reviewing the report carefully, and sent this to the executive committee of the UA, and Joy Cai, the chair of the UA, has already responded and is working on this and asked that recommendations come back to the university community by April 1.

“I chose that day, in part, to allow some more time to go by for the subsequent investigation that I know the faculty senate has commissioned or is commissioning, and obviously to give time for the UA to do a careful review of both pieces of writing.

“Secondly, we ask that the University Assembly, in reviewing it, think about us relaxing the length of time, the lead time between asking permission to have a rally in a public place on campus and the actual occurrence of the rally. We asked to cut it back from two weeks to two business days.

“I feel very strongly that it’s important to have the possibility of time, place and manner restrictions; and this, I think, would allow a much shorter lead time for free expression and still allow the campus police and administrators to have a heads up about demonstrations, most particularly demonstrations of the type that occurred that day.

“And then finally, the last thing I wanted to mention is that when the subsequent investigation occurs, by the committee commissioned by the faculty senate, I’m requesting that you share that with the UA, and, knowing the deadline that I’ve asked them to work on, any interim information that could be shared with them I
think would be good, so that we can get this thing tied up yet this semester and be able to operate under less confusing countervailing portions of the code and the UUP.

“That’s it. I’m glad to answer some questions. Then I have one area I want to talk about later, if I can, but let me answer questions about this first.”

The Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters, Eric Cheyfitz: ‘I’m one of the three faculty who wrote you, as you know, and I was also at Ho Plaza on that day, and I also spoke with Jim and Ms. Miller. I read the report thoroughly, as did the group that put forth the resolution for separate faculty investigation, because we feel we need an independent investigation.

“I have to say that the report did not accord with my experience at Ho Plaza, and I think the people that worked with me on the resolution are in general agreement about this. My feeling was I never felt threatened by either of the two groups out there. There certainly was loud volume and loud speaker systems, but I didn’t feel there was any disruption until the police began to interact in various ways. I was physically pushed aside, and I know that there was a student who was pushed down, although that student, I guess, hasn’t come forward or wasn’t asked to testify. So I feel that the police essentially contributed to the volatile situation -- not contributed to it, but provoked the volatile situation. So that’s the first thing. The report does not accord with my understanding of the situation.

“The other thing is that the conclusion of the report, I think, really jeopardized free expression on the campus. I was asking around about the history of spontaneous expression on campus, and no one could come up with any time when students coming out to demonstrate about something they felt was important provoked situations that needed police control.

“And finally, I would just point out that the time, place and manner restrictions in the campus code are qualified by this phrase: ‘To preserve other important values and interests of the university community.’ So it’s not clear to me what those other important values and interests are that would stop students from coming out, demonstrating peacefully, as was going on in both cases, volume aside, that’s not unpeaceful.

“So all in all, I think we do need an independent investigation. It is extremely important and questions need to be put forward about this report. With all due
respectedly interpretation of events. Certainly I wasn't represented, and I spoke to Ms. Miller and Mr. Mingle. The
other two faculty members can speak to this as well, but I feel that my voice was
not heard in that.

“And I would also like to know who was spoken to. Were any of the students
spoken to who were involved in this? The students that I know that I have
spoken to were not called forward to give their contributions, and they are
certainly central to all of this.”

President Skorton: “Thanks, Eric. I appreciate the fact you wrote me. With all
due respect to you, I must say the material I looked at and the material that Jim
and Jane looked at did not line up with your description of what happened there
that day. And that's the reason for having an investigation. Obviously, I'm very
supportive, and I think Joe will confirm that I was very supportive from the
beginning of you doing your own independent investigation.

“In terms of your comment about what other interests might be preserved by a
process like that, you and I have talked about this already. Obviously, safety on
the campus is an important part. Now, you may feel that safety on the campus
was not an issue that day, but you're asking about a general statement in the
code. You're not asking about something written about that day.

“Thirdly, this was not a new procedure of the UUP; so, even if it is correct, which
I very much believe it would be, that you don't remember any other situation
where there were event managers or police on campus, there were. And finally,
what I would say is the way that Jane and Jim decided to do this was to talk to
the complainant and to talk to other people who were on that scene who were
subjects of concern. And they spoke with, as you know, with each faculty
member, and they spoke with the police and event managers, who don't work
for the police department, and reviewed videos.

“So I'm not arguing with your right to disagree with the conclusions in there, but
I stand behind the methods that they used. I look forward to the additional
faculty assessment bringing more information to the scene, and I look forward to
seeing it. And I'm very happy to stay involved in this, which of course I'm going
to do, all the way through hopefully to reconciling those two pieces of writing
and to making sure we shorten the period of the UUP. I'm not going to be in
favor of eliminating the UUP, and we can talk about that today or later.”
Assistant Professor Joanie Mackowski, English: “Thank you so much for coming. We’ve talked about aggression on campus, and I’m really grateful for all you do, but I wasn’t at the demonstration. I don’t know about it, but these recommendations, I think the recommendation to square the code with UUP is counter-productive, that free expression on campus has a purpose, so that our students learn to share ideas, and achieve mutual understandings so that they are part of the mission of the university.

“Expression is governed by a permitting process. We are defining expression as an inherently dangerous activity, and we are subverting our students’ abilities actually to use expression in a way in which they can learn from the process. If expression is defined as dangerous, then as a teacher, professor here, I can’t teach them to enjoy it, to use it responsibly so much. So I want to teach our students how to interact with respect. And having a leash on them doesn’t help that.”

President Skorton: “Sure. Joanie, of course the basic underlying premise of what you’re saying I agree with completely. I hope you know me well enough to know that. The UUP has been on board a long time. It would be very, very hard to make a cogent argument that expression on this campus has not occurred because of the UUP.

“I have been president almost seven years. I can’t even count the number of protests, demonstrations, partial sit-ins, discussions that I’ve had right in Day Hall. So, if the argument is that the UUP procedure is somehow quashing free expression on campus, that just doesn’t square with the history here. That is, the UUP process has been here a very long time and many demonstrations have occurred.

“Also, I have to say, respecting you and being honest with my response to you, that it’s obvious that there are situations in which counter-demonstrations could turn into a situation in which either side or both sides are not safe. And so again, I’m going to be strongly against totally eliminating the UUP. I think, however, that it’s not going to be me who figures out a way to square it. It’s going to be the UA. And I respect the shared governance process enough that I’ve asked the UA to do it.

“My point of view is that we do need a heads-up procedure, as we have had for - - I don’t know the exact date the UUP thing was passed, but I think the last four presidents. And I’ll check that and get back to Joe with the exact date. It was somewhere in the early to mid-’90s where that was set up, but the squaring
should not imply that free expression is going to be curtailed in order to make it fit with the UUP.

“I’ve already told you that I think it’s appropriate to reduce the lead time on that from weeks to two business days. And I’m not asking you to agree with me, but I think that a lot of cogent argument can be made, and I’m making it today; but it’s reasonable to have the university know when there is going to be a demonstration not to stop the demonstration.

“I want to say again, at the risk of being redundant, that even in the seven years I have been here and been president, multiple expressions of protest have occurred in various ways involving me and involving many others, and so I think that’s a priori evidence that having a UUP process is not stopping people from expressing themselves.

“I do think if something about it really put a leash on people, of course we have to change that, and I urge the faculty senate, urge you to communicate with the UA about your points of view, minority points of view and majority points of view about this, so that they can understand not just the feelings -- my feelings, Jim Mingle’s feelings, Jane Miller’s feelings and the faculty complainants’, but the broader view of the faculty senate in this regard.

“Obviously, you are represented on the UA, as all the other groups on the campus, but we’re going to see what they come up with. And any interim information I get, I’ll share with the senate and I hope you share your interim and final information on the other investigation, as well as your individual points of view, on that. If you want to do that, I’d appreciate if you’d also send me a copy and keep track of the dialogue, but it’s up to you.”

Speaker Beer: “Excuse me. We do have an agenda, and the next item on the agenda has to do with a senate discussion that will be introduced by Dean Burns, and I think we should move to that now. Hopefully President Skorton can remain and partake in that discussion.

President Skorton: “I can stay for 15 more minutes. Thank you.”

6. **SENATE DISCUSSION OF THE SECOND HO PLAZA RESOLUTION**

Dean Burns: “Thank you very much, David, for that presentation. It may be appropriate for me to describe the UFC’s goals and scheduling the senate session, sort of an open discussion. We are three months after the events on Ho Plaza,
two months after we sat here and made a resolution to investigate this just a few
weeks after the president's report came out. And we are now at a point where
our investigators -- and I should acknowledge them, Rick Allmendinger again,
“Bill Fry and Margaret Washington, and thank them -- they have started serious
work. They are scheduling interviews with the faculty who were at the incident.
They had not heard of the president's moving already to the UA and saying look
at the campus code and see how they can be rationalized.

“We agree with that going to the UA. I had spoken to the UA myself about a
month ago; but anyway, we feel this is a good opportunity for the senate now to
suggest how the faculty, not the president, not the central staff, how the faculty
might contribute to this debate.

“We have 20 minutes only, but we think it will be most valuable to the
committee, the three members who are here, if the discussion is forward-looking;
we don't see going back and saying oh, these guys did it wrong. We want to do
it right, so it's up to us to decide what right is. What else really needs to be done?

“We're hoping in this short period of time to obtain as many ideas and thoughts
as possible, so we're going to urge all speakers to spend no more than two
minutes speaking, and I'll clock that. I can't do anything to stop you, except
stand up and make funny faces.

“So there may not be enough time for everybody out there to say something and,
if that's the case, then I urge you to write to the dean of the faculty office with a
subject line which says Ho Plaza incident, and we will make sure that your e-
mails get pushed on to the committee.

“And you've seen already opinions differ on the quality of the president's report;
but after all, it is their report. It's not our report. Our report starts now. So we
need to move on and make sure that our report adds to improving the climate
for dissent on campus. That's our job. Let's get on with it.”

Professor Yuval Grossman, Physics: “If I can start by saying something to the
president. I think it's very important when the president come up, you should
present things mutually. And I know it may sound like a small point, but if you
say that the problem was in Gaza, I don't know how many of you understand
why it upset me so much. We were there not because of Gaza. We were there
because of Israel.
“So I think it would be just fair to say because of the situation in Israel and in Gaza, okay. And you should be very careful using these kinds of words in your report and now when you are standing here, okay. There are people who see things differently, and if some people think only one side, but I want you to think on both sides, okay. So thank you on this.

“So the other thing that I want to say is how to move forward. And I was thinking quite a lot about those things and was thinking like what’s happened to me, why I kind of felt bad about this event. And I think the thing that really bothers me is the difference between freedom of speech and not letting someone else talk, okay.

“And it was, I think, two things that really bothered me. The one thing that bothered me is the fact — three things. One thing is when someone set the demonstration, it’s very easy to go a little bit to the side and let someone else do it. I said it last time also, but not the first time those people come to our event, okay.

“And I think it’s very important to set very clearly what is your right, how close someone can come. Definitely, I cannot come very close to you and shout in your ear, right. So we have to be very clear what is our right and what is their right and everybody else right.”

Dean Burns: “There are 30 seconds remaining.”

Professor Grossman: “The other thing was the issue of the dogs. I really felt very -- when they bring dogs to -- it was clear the dogs -- nobody used the dogs against me, but this kind of thing should be stressed. They should not bring dogs to the demonstrations. The dogs, oh, they were puppies.”

Dean Burns: “Is there another comment in the back?”

Assistant Professor Sahara Byrne, Communication: “Some ideas from my department: One is a potentially rapid permitting process for either counter-demonstrations, so if something’s going on campus and someone wants to counter, they could have a rapid permitting process to have another opinion on the matter.

“This might have helped with what seemed to be a lot of confusion on the part of the police, thinking that one didn’t have an actual permit. And if they had
maybe called in -- I mean, we don't know all of the facts, but maybe if that police officer knew that, in fact, there was a rapid permit that the other group was given, that there may not have been the altercations that occurred there. And there could be more than just counter-demonstrations that were given rapid permitting or there could be an event going on in the world that requires rapid permitting and that there are some opportunities for that.

“Also, along the line of the police, there was some concern about how the police and campus security are actually being treated in this manner, and if they are -- and the concern that they are, in fact, being treated fairly. I know our job is to look out for faculty here, but was there retaliation or were they put on leave or anything that could suggest that maybe in the future, if a situation like this comes up, that our campus police would be afraid to interfere in a situation that maybe could become dangerous because of an event like this. That was another concern that was brought up by my particular department.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “Thank you. Couple of things. One is, it seems to me in order to look forward, we need to know what happened and, in fact, that's why the resolution is worded the way it is; to find out what happened, for the committee to do that, and then for the committee to look forward to make recommendations.

“So I would really emphasize that I, for one, appreciate the fact that President Skorton said that he supports our having this independent committee and that interviews with students and experts on academic freedom who were or were not there, as well as other people who were there, very important to find out the details, including the order of what happened, which is in dispute.

“The other thing that I would say is in terms of the permitting issue, that I think this should be an open question. It seems to me that the way it's been presented by President Skorton is that he's already decided there will be a mandatory permitting period and it's simply a mandatory permit requirement and that it's simply up to the UA to decide how to do it and with what time.

“Seems to me that it should be an open question based on what happened, based on our understanding of academic freedom and freedom of speech and the effect of permitting, and then we should decide what happens. And in light of that, I would ask the president to consider asking the UA to suspend its work until we do our full investigation.
“Seems to me that the UA starts with a very heavy thumb on the scales here, if all they have is basically an instruction from the president to create a mandatory permit procedure. And I think we need a full investigation of the facts and recommendations from our independent faculty committee to make that meaningful to us, to the community and to the UA.”

Dean Burns: “Thank you. Any other comments? Professor Stein.”

Professor Emeritus, Peter Stein, Physics: “Hi. I just had a question that perhaps I’m not understanding properly, but if you put a window of time, say even as short as two days -- today is the 20th. I want to have a meeting on the 22nd, and then you grant me that, that precludes any counter-demonstration. Is that not correct?

“Because once the people that want to counter hear about it, then they no longer can have a counter-demonstration, because the time is too short. The counter-demonstration could only take place the day afterwards. Am I missing something? Or is what I’m saying correct?

Dean Burns: “You’re asking me?”

Professor Stein: “I’m asking somebody, okay, an expert.”

Dean Burns: “You are the parliamentarian. I think you would know things like this.”

Associate Professor, Thomas Björkman, Horticulture: “Remembering my own youth with a lot of demonstrations, it was a great learning opportunity, and we shouldn't forget -- in fact, emphasize that participating in demonstrations is one of the big learning opportunities.

“So I ask particularly the senate committee to think about not just the freedom of expression and the security issues, but also what are the learning outcomes that should come from participating in a demonstration, particularly the dangerous ones with counter-demonstrations. What should they take home from that?”

Dean Burns: “Thank you very much. Anything else?”

Associate Professor, Ronald Booker, Neurobiology: “My view is that really the idea is that any interaction should be constructive, and I think the real issue that
needs to be discussed or at least reviewed by the committee that's been appointed is whether or not the outcome was constructive. So if it's just that two people are screaming at each other at the greatest degree of amplification possible, then that's not constructive. Obviously, there will be counter-demonstrations without permits, but you do have to consider the possibility if there's a limited amount of space in any given area, you could actually have occasions where two or three demonstrations permitted are occurring, and it may not even be physically possible to have groups interact. The permitting process is just a regulatory process. It's not an exclusionary process, and that needs to be expressed, and people need to be aware of it; but I think probably when the UA looks at it, it should be also looking at how do you actually go through the process of helping students learn how to engage constructively. If both groups have megaphones and they are screaming at each other, that's not constructive. You may disagree with the other group, but you will probably not convince them or anyone else present that your view is the correct one if everyone's just screaming as loud as they can. So becoming effective communicators and getting your argument or point to the masses in general is really important. And we will be more effective as a university if we can somehow figure out a way to get our students to understand that.”

Dean Burns: “Thank you very much. Another comment?”

Senior Lecturer, Darlene Evans, The Knight Institute: “I was one of the faculty members on Ho Plaza. I'm with the Knight Institute, and I deal in rhetoric. I don't mind narratives, but I think if there are competing narratives, they should both be represented. And my narrative is not represented in this university report in very specific ways, things the report says that I said, things that were said to me actually did not occur.

“Beyond that, it also disturbs me that, according to campus code, as the report says, police have the right to solicit my aid in helping to control students who are engaged in these kinds of demonstrations. And I wasn't, but even if I had been, I would think that is not appropriate.

“And I go along with others who have said this notion of competing rallies, police came to the plaza to keep order because something was unsafe also is in dispute with Kathy Zoner, the police chief's comments in "The Sun" the day after the rally, in which she said they came to move one group off because the other group had secured a permit.
“So the police reasons for being on the plaza that day are also not represented in this report, and I hope the faculty report actually does do some investigation on when the permit was granted and if, in fact, it may have been to preempt the other group’s expression.”

Associate Professor, Cark Franck, Physics: “I’m particularly interested in the role of the event manager, who is an event manager, what authority and what qualifications do they have and how they have functioned in the past and such a thing. Seems like that kind of person could be an absolutely key person in such a situation.”

Dean Burns: “The president would like to respond.”

President Skorton: “Just a couple things before I have to leave. I take Risa’s point about the UA, and I will contact Joy Cai and make sure she understands another report will be coming. I didn’t have a date by which the report was going to come in, and that’s the reason I wanted them to look at the report and begin to think about the issues.

“I also need to just correct something you said. I never said that I told them to create a permitting process. It’s a very important thing you said that’s incorrect. This permitting process was here long before I was here. What I’ve asked them to do is look at the report and consider what they want to do. That’s a very important thing that you don’t misrepresent that.

“So I think one comment that I would like to make as a faculty member, because this report also represents me in that way, is I think it would be good to go back and find out when the UUP process was set up, what the discussion was at that time, because the shared governance system must have agreed to this at the time; or at least been aware of it, if they didn’t agree with it at the time, because the impression that all of a sudden this was just dreamed up lately is not correct, and I would like to know what you might find out in that regard.

“And I apologize; I have to go to another thing, but I appreciate this and I will contact Joy Cai tomorrow about that.”

Dean Burns: “We have time for one last comment.”

The George Reed Professor of Writing and Rhetoric, Paul Sawyer, The Knight Institute and English: “I was the third person that wrote to President Skorton,
and I am in agreement with my colleagues’ sense of dissonance from our experience and with what the report states; but what I want to ask the next investigating committee to look at is -- and I’m going to repeat one of the items in the code, because outdoor picketing, marches, rallies and other demonstrations generally pose no threat to long-lasting exclusive use of university grounds or property, there appears to be no need for a mandatory permit procedure for such outdoor activities.

“That statement has been in effect for a long time. I think it’s one reason why Cornell has enjoyed such freedom of expression, and the bombshell in that report is a suggestion that be modified. And I would just hope the second investigating committee puts the bar very, very high indeed and try to understand what happened on December 19 or any time recently that should warrant a modification to that principle. I see nothing in this report. Thanks.”

Dean Burns: “Let’s move on to the next speaker. Bob Buhrman will tell us something about the research university.”

Speaker Beer: “Very good, thank you. So we're turning to an entirely different subject, and you can now have a roving microphone. And you may advance your slides, or I could do it, if you like.”

7. **STATE OF SPONSORED RESEARCH REPORT, SENIOR VICE PROVOST, ROBERT BUHRMAN**

The John Edson Sweet Professor of Engineering, and Senior Vice Provost for Research, Robert Buhrman: “Thanks. This is certainly a different subject. I appreciate the opportunity, the invitation by Dean Burns to come here and talk to you about Cornell Research, as seen from my office. And I also want to say how saddened I am by my predecessor's untimely passing. It's a great loss.

“So Cornell Research and Scholarship, I would like to say that we support all sorts of research and scholarships on the campus, but I have to worry about one a lot more than the other, and there are really two ways, as organized from the outside looking in.

“We don't necessarily see it this way, but there's a thing called departmental research, which we do as part of our function, and you do it without federal funds or without some sponsor. You do it as part of your work. And that is a large part of what Cornell is all about.
“However, there’s another part, which is organized research, and it is separately budgeted. This is now an accounting and federal agency point of view, and it includes all our work that is done from external sponsors. It includes all the work we do with state and explicit federal appropriations, and it’s also done as work in research that’s done on Cornell funds principally in the contract colleges, which is specifically stated as a research project.

“Our primary concern within the division that I have the pleasure and privilege of trying to lead is supporting and overseeing our research here at Ithaca, also at Geneva and, while as yet to be started, eventually in the New York City Tech Campuses.

“So what is the scope of our work? Just to give you a little bit of an idea how big it is and what it encompasses, it’s basically half a billion a year in annual research expenditures in the university as a whole, on the Ithaca campus. That includes the sponsor, the federal and state appropriations, and the internal support.

“That represents 26% of the Cornell Ithaca budget, so it’s a big part, the second biggest source of revenue to the campus; the first being tuition, third being endowment. That involves about 1,900 graduate students that are supported on graduate research.

“It does not include the fellowship students and other students that are heavily involved in sponsored research, but are not being directly supported. It involves about a little less than 4,000 individuals on this campus who are supported in whole or in part by sponsored funds and external funds, federal appropriations, so forth, and involves about 1,100 principal investigators.

“You do not have to be a faculty member to be a principal investigator, but all faculty members are eligible by that title, and it’s about 225 departmental and college research administrators, your financial administrator and your individual departments and other units around the campus.

“What is the trend? I tend to look at history a little bit. What are the trends in research over the years? It’s basically upwards, so this is not in constant dollars. This is in current dollars, so it overstates the growth, but there’s a substantial growth in research over the last decade, and then stops, and then growth again.

“And I might say a word about where we are going in the future on that. And this is broken out by our major units, the endowed colleges, the statutory or
contract colleges, and the medical colleges down in New York City. This year, we had a decline after several years of substantial growth. Ithaca was down about 4.5%.

“What does that mean? That means we are supporting 4.5% fewer graduate students. Some staff may have lost their positions, things like that, not good news. The med school was up by 6.6% from last year, so they have outperformed us this year. Overall, it’s a half a percent decline, so from the institution point of view, we have been pretty flat on research expenditures and organized research; however, that does not take in account the inflation we have. This is how it’s distributed around the different disciplines at the university: Medical sciences is substantially the biggest component of our research portfolio from sponsored research, 43%. Most of that is from the medical college, but not all. A lot of our research which is classified by federal agencies, the National Science Foundation as medical research is done here in the veterinary college and also in the life sciences elsewhere on campus.

“I should just comment that for our peer institutions, typically the medical sciences, size is bigger than it is in Ithaca or for Cornell as a whole, and that is because our medical college has not been as large as some schools, and because of the robust nature of the physical science and engineering and biological, nonmedical biological sciences and the Cornell portfolio; but biology is the next largest, large research centers that don’t necessarily fall in a particular category, agriculture, physics, astronomy and so forth. This represents our distribution.

“If you look at it from an Ithaca campus point of view, about a quarter of our research from sponsored programs is in the Arts and Sciences colleges, including the research centers, the space sciences, laboratory of atomic physics, things of that nature.

“Ag and Life Sciences is about a third of the campus in sponsored research. This is direct expenditures, not including what we refer to as overhead or facility and administration costs. Vet medicine, human ecology, so forth, you can see the breakdown there.

“Who pays for all this? We rely on the kindness of strangers to do our role, which is to fund our work, and this is either the federal taxpayers, its foundations, it’s corporations, or other entities. And the biggest entity, of course, as you would expect, is the federal taxpayer, which in this case went up nicely in the early part of the last decade, then dropped and then had this almost certainly
unsustainable, unfortunately, uptick here. You can see the foundations have
grown substantially. I’ll comment on that in a moment. The next largest is
corporations, industrial funders, and then state and local; and other, which
means whatever we couldn’t put in another category.

“Federally funded expenditures: you can see how it breaks down here separately
and how it breaks down by the major units; and again, you know when that
happened. This was the Stimulus Act which occurred in 2009, and we were
allowed to spend for the next couple years with that fund. I’ll come back to that
in a moment.

“One of the remarkable developments of the last couple years, principally for
Ithaca has been robust growth in foundation funding. Foundation funding is
now over $70 million a year. Biggest component of that is one entity, which is
the Qatar National Research Foundation, which has a partnership due to our
medical college in Qatar with New York City, so there’s a lot of funding that
flows to that. Some flows to Ithaca, but not a lot.

“Another one here, very noticeable in the contract colleges is the Gates
Foundation, which is very generous supporting a lot of work; however, they are
not generous enough, because they only pay 10% of the 60% or 54% of the
normal overhead that they should be paying. So someone else is covering those
costs, but they are doing very good work, particularly in the areas of
international agriculture; very important.

“If you just draw a straight line, corporate research funding has been roughly
pretty much flat over the years. The med school again has seen a substantial
increase this year. I don’t know whether it will be sustained or not. It may well
be.

“There’s more emphasis on drug discovery work at the medical college and also
in clinical trials where the drug companies and other pharmaceutical entities will
engage with a number of medical colleges to do clinical trials -- prove the efficacy
of drugs, so there’s a drop here, which was actually just a re-categorization of
how funding is.

“Until then, if you have funding from a third party, which ultimately came from
the federal government, it was attributed to the third party. Now it’s attributed
to the federal government. So there’s just a re-categorization of who’s ultimately
the sponsor.
“And then where does it come from? Well, if it’s medical college, medical research is number one. You would expect the Department of Health and Human Services would be our primary sponsor of research, which is correct. And again, most other universities, the Ivy Plus and the Big Ten, which have a medical school, you would expect this number to be over 50%. We are only a little less than 40%.

“The National Science Foundation: We are one of the biggest recipients of National Science Foundation funding, which is good for us. We are number three last year in research funding to academic institutions. There are a couple other entities that get large funding from the NSF: Foundations, 12%; corporations 5%. We are low in that regard, compared to our peers, particularly in urban areas. Some people think that’s good. Some people think it’s bad, but that’s just where we are.

“We are dependent heavily on the federal funds, so how are the federal budgets looking? We have all heard about sequestration. I will say a word about that in a minute; but basically, this is now in constant dollars, so this is normalized by some view of the cost of research or cost of living.

“And as you can see from most of my career, there’s been some plateaus and then some growths and then some plateaus, and then this wonderful thing that happened. We thought it should go on forever, but that which cannot go on forever doesn’t, as they say.

“So this was the doubling of the NIH -- the real doubling of the NIH funding for medical research, which started under President Clinton, which continued under President Bush II, and then stopped. Then it went down, and now we have been flat with this singular event known as the stimulus funding, and it’s broken down by agencies. I will look at that a little more carefully in the next slide.

“Here is the National Science Foundation budget, the biggest single entity for the Ithaca campus. It was also trying to go up. It never reached the goal, the American Competitors Act, (which Bob Richardson had something to do with), was the double if’s budget, which should have been up to there by now, it peaked out because of the recession after the 2001 events and so forth. Again, now we have the Stimulus Act, which played out over the next couple of years, and now we are flat again.
“And this is the Institutes of Health, which is on a real decline by constant dollars, so it's becoming more and more difficult, more and more competitive for researchers to write proposals that win. And it's not going to get any better, so we have to focus on supporting our research the best we can.

“Turning quickly to some things about what the research administration activities are on campus, as I've already said, we have about slightly less than 2,000 proposals a year that go through our Office of Sponsored Programs. Now I only speak about the Ithaca campus. There are about 3,700 different awards that have to be monitored, tracked, reported.

“Each of you who have sponsored research are writing reports, we have to track all that. It's actually a major task. This is what OSP does. We have 600 sub-awards that we have to monitor and be legally responsible for. We report back to the Feds that we are doing the right thing, which is a substantial burden.

“The Office of Research Integrity and Assurance has faculty compliance committees. We are very, very dependent upon faculty committees to provide the oversight, approval and review of protocols for research that is required by federal regulation and law; and without the faculty doing their job, the work of the other faculty would come to a halt.

“One of the things I would like you to take back to your department is that it is important that faculty agree to serve on these committees. These are a significant thing for us. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee has to review annually 500 protocols for the use of animals in research or in education.

“The Institutional Review Board has 1,400 protocols annually they have to review and approve for research that involves human participants and human data. Fortunately, most of these are done pretty automatically, because on this campus, we do not do substantial -- we do some clinical and physically invasive studies, such as drawing blood or things of that nature. Most of it is human data, and only a few hundred require detailed review; but they all have to be logged in, examined and approved by the committee.

“There's an Institutional Biosafety Committee, 240 active protocols to make sure we are doing the right thing. 15 years ago, it was just for DNA. Now it's anything that involves biosafety or biohazards, this is very important work that needs to be done.
“Now we have a new Campus Committee on Financial Conflict of Interest.

“Each of you, I hope and I assume, have filled out the annual online report and complained about it or thought bad thoughts about it. We’re trying to get it better, but it’s required to fulfill our obligations to the public and to the national funding agencies that make sure any outside relationships that relate to your Cornell duties are properly understood and properly managed; not to stop them, but to properly manage them.

“And then the other office that reports in this area is the Cornell Center for Technology, Enterprise and Commercialization, or what we call CC Tech. Last year they had 390 invention disclosures from Cornell investigators that resulted - or previous ones resulted in 158 patents last year, seven start-up companies were started based on Cornell inventions, there were 184 licenses, where Cornell intellectual property of some sort, including new plants, were licensed to commercial entities.

“And as a result of that, Cornell received $12.6 million of gross revenue, which one-third of the net revenues attributed to the inventor, one-third is retained to operate this operation, and one-third goes to the campus to support research.

“The other thing I mentioned, research division components. One thing Cornell is really good at is maintaining shared resources that allow people to do work in a way that is efficient and also stimulates interactions and stimulates new ideas.

“The first one I mention is the entity we call CARE: the Cornell Center for Animal Resources and Education. Last year, 930 different Cornell staff, grad students, and faculty used the facilities of CARE to do their research. The Institute of Biotechnology has life science facilities, DNA sequencing, things of that nature. Over 1,000 unique Cornell users paid fees, did research.

“The Cornell Center for Materials Research, 800-plus users; the Center for Advanced Computing over in Rhoades Hall, 600-plus users. The Cornell NanoScale facility, 400 unique users, very intense users, usually; the Cornell High Energy Synchrotron Source, users from around the world, and over 200 from Cornell doing major research projects here.

“Two other entities that are very important, but are not managed currently through my office: CISER Center, Cornell Institute for Socioeconomic Research, and the SRI: Survey Research Institute, which play seminal roles in the social
sciences. Those are Cornell-added advantage, they allow us to do things that other places that don't play nicely with each other don't do as well. So this is very important to us, in my opinion.

“I’ll close with a couple more comments. Cornell Research and Scholarship. The academic reputation of Cornell, I assume you know this, but we don’t like rankings unless it says something good about us, right? So rankings say that Cornell, as a research university or -- for an undergraduate university, major university, we are Number 15th in the country. But there’s one ranking that stands out, and that’s the one that says academically our reputation is Number 6. That, of course, is a low score. We should be higher than that, but Number 6.

“Why are we 15 in research? Because our resources are below average of the other 14 above us. Number 6, because our faculty outperform our resources. And there are various ways to do it; one of which, in my opinion, the facilities, the interactions, the nature of our culture here.

“The other thing is there’s a thing some of you may know about, there’s an entity called Academic Analytics that produces a thing called a Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index, which certainly doesn’t apply well to humanities and other areas, but in the sciences and engineering fields, what it measures is papers, patents, research funding, citations, awards, things of that nature, which an analytical number-oriented person could put together.

“And how do we do on that? Well, we are Number 3 in the country -- we have more programs rated in the top 10 than any other university. We are doing quite well in that. We need to do better. We always need to do better, but it’s a pretty good thing.

“Why do we do that? Again, in my view, is because we have excellence first in the disciplines. You can’t do well unless you have good fundamental basic units that are really outperforming; but the other thing we do is we sum up those parts very well. I’m a product of, and remain very proud of, our graduate field system, which I think is very effective in getting people to work together and interacting.

“We also share these resources, and we have mechanisms which have lots of interactions and lots of collaborations across the disciplines, where people are not forced to work together, but I think quite often do, to bring success.
“From my point of view, in the research division, we spend a lot of time supporting these interdisciplinary research centers – as I just mentioned the accelerator lab, the material science lab, the NIH funded center that involves folks from at least three different colleges, the Energy Material Center, also the Space Science Center, the CALS Center, the Weill Institute for Cellular, Molecular Biology, Center for Vertebrate Genomics, Comparative and Population Genomics.

“I should allow some time for talking, so I would just say that doesn’t apply solely to the sciences and engineering. And one of the things that I have learned about over the years that I think is very important is the society for humanities, because that is something that spans the humanities, and we have similar things in the sciences also. So it really depends upon the attitude. I think Cornell is really good at this. This is the Cadley Institute. It was funded with an endowment of a few years ago, started out with six faculty in two different colleges, five different departments, and now involves 16 faculty members from three different colleges, about eight different departments, and it’s sharing post-docs, sharing people, and this has resulted in 23 "Science" and "Nature" journal papers in the last two and a half years.

“That’s a very high level of productivity, and that productivity involves faculty who would never have worked together without these kinds of mechanisms, getting together, getting ideas and doing things, and I think that really, really speaks to one of the major strengths of Cornell.

“So wrapping up, just giving my current views, externally based federal prospects are not particularly bright at the moment, as you have heard all about sequestering until you’re sick of it. We also have an increasing regulatory burden which is not getting any better. Any time there’s a new announcement of reduced burden, it turns out to be higher. I’m very cynical about that.

“What’s the federal funding prospect? It’s going to be flat or it’s going to go down by about 5%. The sequestration now indicated a 5% reduction in funding, if it happens. Is that bad? That’s bad, because if you are the person losing your graduate stipend, if you are the person that has to be laid off from the research lab, that’s bad.

“Can we survive it as an institution? Yes, we will and we will compete, but it’s not a good thing for the Country. Internal prospects are quite positive. We have
a very strong foundation, a lot of new faculty appointments, I think are going great.

“We have a research enterprise that’s really oriented to what I consider to be today’s challenges, which is multidisciplinary research arising from disciplines, we have shared facilities that are at work and we have students and centers that really support interaction and creativity. And I thank you for enduring my lecture. Thank you.”

Speaker Beer: “Vice President Buhrman, please don't leave. You have left seven minutes for questions, if there are any. Any questions? Professor Lieberwitz, the lady in the middle in the red.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “First, thank you very much for that. I think these kinds of reports are extremely important for us to get a sense of where all the money is and et cetera.”

Professor Buhrman: “Or isn’t.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “I have a couple questions. One is pertaining to the large growth in corporate funding at the medical school that you pointed out with regard to pharmaceutical companies, and I have a question first about whether your office has dealt with the faculty senate report on strategic corporate alliances that I think was created in 2005.”

Professor Buhrman: “Yes, I'm familiar with the report.”

Professor Lieberwitz: “And the other one, the AAUP at the national level just recently published a very extensive report on industry relations and best practices, as well as a lot of description of issues that are in the forefront, and one of the areas that the report focuses on is the concern with the conflicts of interest that come out of pharmaceutical funding.

“And reporting and disclosing is one step, but it seems to me that there are other things to think about. So I thought you might comment on whether you’re considering the AAUP report.

“And then just a follow-up question is whether you anticipate changes in those bar graphs that you showed us with regard to the New York City Tech Campus.”
Do you think that’s going to be significant with regard to funding from industry?”

Professor Buhrman: “Well, I'll answer the last one first. I think the plan for New York City -- the goal for New York City is to do a lot of corporation/industrial engagement and to work with them, so that's the goal.

“Back to the current situation, I have certainly read the senate report from here and I've read, but not recently, the AAUP report you refer to. And then the other thing that I am well aware of and I mentioned, conflict of interest process we have here is that the Public Health Service, which is the lead for the National Institutes of Health and FDA and others put in a rather robust or greatly enhanced conflict of interest policy.

“That was a two-year process that all the universities were engaged in, and it did mandate about what is a publicly appropriate management of malleable relationships. That’s heavily on the individual side; that is, if you’re a PI, you have a drug that you discovered and how to handle -- if there’s going to be a chemical trial where you may be involved.

“The medical college has their own separate conflict of interest -- we developed our enhanced policy, but they implement their rules and we implement them here. We are simply too far away. I think they’re in pretty good shape as far as protecting against poor performance. Well, that’s my opinion.

“It's heavily on disclosure, it's -- in some cases, it's focused on separation; that is, you cannot be conflicted when it involves a human subject in a drug trial, that you have to have someone else who looks at the data and makes sure all is okay. That’s a matter of opinion.

“Then there's a question “Should medical colleges be involved in that?” That's the debate that I'm not taking a personal opinion on. I think the university as a whole currently does, and medical schools all around the country do it. Whether they should or not is a political debate and a societal debate that I'm happy to have engaged, but I'm not going to lead that.

“I'm going to enforce the rules and the regulations that I have to in order to enable Cornell researchers to do whatever they want to do within the scope allowed by regulations and by Cornell principles, which are no restraints on publication.
“I presented here many years ago when we started on that. I think the university should allow anything that's okay that's part of academic freedom as far as research is concerned, but there are many other motives for people to do things, I'm sure you are aware of.”

Professor Carole Boyce Davies, English and African Studies: “I noticed you jumped quickly over humanities. I once had a student having a hard time squeezing in a paper in between her obligations to all the sciences. It seems to me there's a general perception that the humanities are not counting anymore. What is happening from your office to advance that particular -- besides just indicating the society? It seems to me there's a lack -- and then you mentioned, when you talked about faculty scholarly productivity using academic analytics, you mentioned it's more amenable to sciences.”

Professor Buhrman: “That's my opinion.”

Professor Davies: “Right, but it seems to leave out, again, a portion of the university.”

Professor Buhrman: “Okay. So I am a great fan of the humanities, but my office plays very little role in it, simply because my office is charged with enforcing things or making sure that we do right things with human participants, with animal research, with conflict of interest related to outside entities, so my office is not engaged in a way that either can support nor harm humanities.

“Cornell is an amazingly diverse institution. I can't speak about what the academic side is, whether the faculty who are having science homework or demanding too much for the students who don't have time to do anything else, I really can't speak to that. It's not what I'm here to support. That's all I can say.

“What was your -- oh, the analytics, I agree. Again, I don't think any set of metrics should apply to the diverse university. I think we have to have metrics for different fields. I am not competent and would not presume to say how we should evaluate the humanities. I assume they are evaluated and properly, so forth.

“I can more readily do it in the sciences and engineering fields where the metrics that are -- at least most of our peer universities use similar metrics. I assume they exist in the humanities. I just don't do them. I think you should have someone
talking about humanities here. I wanted to bring it up. I mentioned the humanities when I presented something similar to the trustees’ meeting, because I think it's very important; but it's not something I'm really responsible for, nor competent to talk about.”

Speaker Beer: “Thanks so much, Dr. Buhrman. I must remind you there are many flowers in the front of the room awaiting adoption. Brighten your life.”

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)