The Speaker, Professor John Pollak, Animal Science, called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and called on Dean Cooke for opening comments.

1. REMARKS BY DEAN COOKE

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "The April 1st issue of the Cornell Daily Sun may have touched a nerve on campus, but it was also close enough to reality that at least one commercial news service called to get an interview to explain what is happening with the salary issue. So, as fact and fiction get closer and closer together, funny things start to happen. There are four things coming up today that relate to this issue. We have invited the Provost for extended comments to share the administration's view on faculty salaries and there was time allocated for questions at the end. The chair of the Financial Policies Committee will give a brief update on what is happening on that front and we have two resolutions coming before us. I have a few general observations on this. The first is that I believe our advice to the administration is far more valuable and effective to them and to us in communicating our intentions when we give advice in some context. We have a long history of saying to the administration that we want to save need-blind admissions, increased contributions to the libraries, increased faculty salaries, and decreased tuition, which require different kinds of priorities if they are to be accomplished. If we can give advice that is couched in some framework so that we have some common ground on what is being said, I think that we can increase our effectiveness.

"I also want to say that I think that the administration is dealing with the salary issue in good faith and that is something to which we should also respond. I do not believe that the administration has anything to gain by denying appropriate salary raises that the faculty call for. The metaphor I would use for this is that imagine you were travelling down a freeway and the car in front of you is stalled. You have a choice of either making loud noises with your horn or getting out and helping start the car so that traffic can start again. I think that this is the kind of predicament that we're in. I think that the administration needs our help to get this thing moving again.

"I've appointed a Task Force on Long-Range Financial Planning that consists of the living members of the faculty-elected Trustees. There are 14 of them and all 14 have agreed to participate in this. The Provost agreed to serve as an ex officio member of that group and will participate regularly in the conversations. The chair of the Financial Policies Committee is a non-voting ex officio member who will serve as a link between the Task Force and the Senate. This group is not a Senate organization; it is a more informal group out of the Dean's office.

"One more thing I wanted to say before I introduce Don Holcomb is on the Dissection Resolution. I wish to thank both the students and the faculty who have labored on bringing this issue before us. It is something of a miracle that we have a resolution signed by both parties and I think that it is truly an historic occurrence that shows what good faculty governance can do. Now let me end my remarks and give my remaining two minutes to Professor Holcomb, who has agreed to chair this Task Force, to talk about it's charge."

2. TASK FORCE ON LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLANNING

Professor Emeritus Donald F. Holcomb, Physics: "This will, indeed, be very brief. The committee that Bob has asked us to participate in has the goal of long-range financial planning. Its responsibilities are to the University as a whole and to be wise. Let me just comment on what one can mean by 'long-range planning.' For about thirty-five years, Cornell's as well as other institutions' costs per student have risen at somewhere between one and a half to two percent each year about equal with inflation. If those numbers were to continue for all of the components of expenses for another thirty-five years, not a long period in the life of a university, the nominal sticker price for a university would be $45,000 a year in present dollars. Many people think that's a problem, not only at Cornell, but at many other institutions. So, that's what we mean by long-range planning.

"I've been thinking about this problem for twenty-years plus, ever since I was a faculty-elected Trustee. I believe that conventional ways of getting at it, by biting at this piece or that piece, are unlikely to succeed. So our challenge is to
find new ways of looking at the problem. We are just getting underway and so the new ways are not yet evident. We will, as Bob suggested, maintain liaison with the Financial Policies Committee and the Senate although, as I say, we have no formal responsibilities to the Senate or anyone except the University. We'll do our best. Needless to say, as we get going and you begin to see whether the committee has an activity that seems to make some sense, we will obviously invite input from all forces. Please wish us good luck."

Someone from the Senate called out "Good Luck."

Dean Cooke: "The charge is on the website and over the next seven days or so, if you would, please send comments to Professor Holcomb or to me on any changes you would like to have made. They are going to be looking at issues that have, perhaps, a ten-year horizon. We may start on something and this group may not make the decision; it may be made by someone else. They will generate alternatives, but they are looking at issues that might happen and be of value ten-years down the road rather than two or three, such as the Financial Policies Committee typically works on."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we'll now go to the third item on the agenda, which is a conversation with the Provost."

3. REMARKS/QUESTIONS ABOUT FACULTY SALARIES

Provost Don Randel: "Let me begin by saying just a couple of words about the remarks that were made at the end of the last meeting by Peter Stein, without there having been an opportunity for me or anyone else to pursue them. This bears on the degree to which I and the administration have or have not cooperated with the Financial Policies Committee. I would like to insist that we have cooperated with that committee as we have cooperated with every other faculty committee. The difference of opinion between that committee and myself, as it is pointed out in the resolution that is before you today, really revolves around one thing. It does not revolve around whether the administration is committed to doing something about faculty and staff compensation. I'll talk a little bit more about that later, but there is certainly no question of our commitment to improving faculty and staff compensation. The difference of opinion and the reason I am charged with being uncooperative is because I declined to agree to picking a number in the rankings of competing universities that we would achieve in terms of average compensation for the faculty. That is to say that if you look at the numbers for average compensation that are published in various public places, we get ranked. The Financial Policies Committee wanted me to say that by the end of the year I commit to rank $P$. I would be lying to you if I said that I could achieve such a thing. It would not be hard to say, 'Sure we can do it,' but nobody who thought about it carefully would want to believe it.

"That being the case, it seemed more honest and straightforward to say, 'We are now engaged in an unprecedented effort to improve staff and faculty compensation and we are going to stick with it for at least five years and hope to see gains. If we don't make gains we'll see what else we can do about it.' There are many things that bear on this and it is not as simple as saying that we're going to reach this point by some particular year. Why should that be the case? For one thing, there are many things that we need to bear down on within the institution, those we are working on and those we plan on working on harder. The meeting of the Financial Policies Committee, which is the object of complaint, was one in which we answered questions to the best of our abilities, committed ourselves to meet as often as was useful to all, and to continue to work with that committee. Some people were said to have complained that that meeting was absorbed completely with Vice President Rogers talking about the University's Financial Plan. Well, in point of fact, we arrived at that meeting expecting not to devote more than 15 to 20 minutes to that discussion, with this pile of overheads ready to discuss more specific things including the rate of growth of faculty and staff compensation. But, people continued to ask questions about the Financial Plan book. The character of those questions suggested that we should not shut them off, but rather continue to discuss them, which we did. Anybody was free to ask any question and if members of the committee felt that they were being stonewalled and wanted to talk about other things, they were free to say so then and there and we could have done something about it. In any case, we reached the end of that meeting by reassuring that committee that we would be glad to continue to work with them and that in order for us to make progress on this together it does entail doing our homework and understanding a number of basic things about the University's finances and we would be willing to engage in other discussions to get that homework done.

"We have a similar stance with Professor Holcomb's committee. I met with him yesterday at their very first meeting."
I think that this is a remarkably dedicated group of people who have served the University long and hard. In my book, Don Holcomb could be the Provost any day that he wants to be. I certainly am glad to work with that committee as well. We need to be prepared for both sides of the discussion, and I like not to refer to them as two sides. Everybody has to be prepared to do the homework and everybody has to take seriously the things with which faculty and staff compensation are in competition. Those are not issues that are not close to the faculty itself. That is, the things that we have to choose amongst in the deploying of resources are, like compensation, near and dear to the faculty's hearts -- many of them are, at any rate. It comes down to desire for increased staff, richer technology programs, more financial aid programs, and so forth and so on.

"That said, let me simply repeat that there is no question as to my willingness or the willingness of anybody else in the administration to continuing discussions with the Financial Policies Committee or with the committee that Professor Holcomb is now willing to lead. We will do that in perfectly good faith and there are no numbers to be hidden from anybody in the course of that. In the end, we'll all have to recognize the responsibilities we have for the deployment of University resources and that trade-offs will have to be made that are not simple.

"Let me just say a couple of words about the question of faculty and staff compensation, some of what we're going to do, and some of the landscape for this. If we take the endowed side of the university first, and return to statutory later, the single greatest source of revenue for paying bills like faculty and staff salaries is undergraduate tuition. The numbers are more or less comparable. The amount that we take in for undergraduate tuition is not dissimilar to what is the personnel budget. So the rate at which one can increase compensation is, in fact, closely related to the rate in which one can increase tuition. That is affected profoundly by the financial aid budget, which is also near and dear to the hearts of many of us, and it is also, in part, a function of other costs associated with personnel, for example, fringe benefits. Those of you who have grants and contracts are, at moments, unhappy that you have to put in a big number, on order of thirty percent, for fringe benefits. But fringe benefits include things that are forms of compensation to the faculty and staff. One of the most important of them is the cost of healthcare. Even in all of those years when faculty salaries were not going up faster than about 3% on the endowed side, healthcare was going up in double-digit rates. In recent years, you will have observed if you read the New York Times and other newspapers that the cost of healthcare declined for a bit. Its rate of increase got down to 7% or less in certain metropolitan areas. If you continue to read the newspapers, you'll notice that it is now starting to go back up again. The fact of the matter is that Cornell exists in a very different kind of environment from lots of other places and we never benefited from the downturn in the rate of increase of healthcare. For us, healthcare has gone up fairly steadily through that period. Even if we didn't benefit from the deceleration, we will certainly benefit from the acceleration of the rate of increase that is now resuming again. We're in a community that has only one hospital and a fairly small group of physicians who are fairly well-organized and who don't need to negotiate the sorts of deals with managed care purveyors that other physicians in other cities do. So, at a minimum, one would have to take into account something about total compensation for faculty and staff if one were to get a complete picture. That's my way of saying that there are some forces on us that we simply do not control.

"Other aspects of the environment under which we operate are not just competition for faculty and the rates at which other institutions can increase their salaries, but also the competition around the rates at which other institutions do and do not increase tuition and financial aid. So, for example, in the last year very substantial pressure has been put on us by Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, who have announced major changes in their financial aid programs. We are simply not able to keep up with those folks, but we have been obliged to respond to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars so far. That is, the government announces Hope Scholarships and right away a fair number of institutions announced that they would not deduct from their own grant aid the value of any Hope Scholarship and other kinds of external grants. Well, we have felt more or less obliged to go along with that. Indeed, it is something that one would be glad to subscribe to, but it does cost money. So it has cost a few hundred thousand dollars to do that alone. We are certainly, because of the cost alone, not able to do what Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale have elected to do by saying that anyone with family income lower than $40,000 will not have to borrow a nickel and give them all grant aid. The range of things like that in a competitive environment that press upon us cannot be ignored entirely. They require resources of precisely the unrestricted kind that we use to pay faculty salaries but we have to keep up with some of these institutions in order to attract the kind of students that got most of us into this business in the first place.

"Let me then say a little bit about the statutory side. Here we are, perfectly clearly, not the masters of our own fates
entirely. That is to say that we are reliant upon the State and SUNY for the provision of salary improvement programs. Even SUNY is not in charge of this, because all state employees negotiate their contracts with the Executive Branch directly. Their faculty is unionized as are the staff in SUNY. We have traditionally gone in the wake of what the UUP, that is the faculty union, got, which itself has usually gone in the wake of what the civil service union has gotten. Now, even when those contracts are negotiated, if the Governor vetoes or declines to put into his budget in the first place, we are bound to have to live with the consequences to some degree. We have steadily worked this year in Albany with the Executive and Legislative branches and SUNY administration, pursuing as our first priority, increased compensation for our statutory faculty and staff. There are simply some limits to what we can achieve if the Governor's sole policy, and pardon my saying so, regarding the State is tax-reduction.

"Now, there are some options to be pursued even in that discouraging environment, short of moving to Georgia, where they are increasing expenditure for higher education at the rate of 9% a year because there is a state that understands that a healthy economy is fundamentally bound up with strong higher education. We have been actively pursuing with SUNY and friends in the legislature and with the Executive branch a more flexible arrangement in which we would be at greater liberty to generate our own resources which in some ways would insulate us from the problems that affect SUNY. This is to recast arrangements that have been in place for fifty years. One has to proceed somewhat carefully with this and one would not wish to go in and try to drive some hard bargain and then lose and be punished ever after for having sought to achieve a standing in this context that other branches of the state university do not have. I can assure you that the work with SUNY and the state is being pursued at the highest possible levels and as rigorously as we know how to pursue it. If there are ideas about how to bring about such ideas at the state level that we have not tried, I would certainly be glad to hear them as would the President and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, who have been very energetic in pursuit of this. There are things that we can do locally, and we are beginning to do them in the statutory colleges. They are not easy to do and the faculty is not of one mind about them. The statutory colleges have lost on order of 100 faculty lines in the cuts of recent years. There is a steady wish to add back some of those positions and in fact, in CALS for example, some number of positions are being filled. Well, if the faculty rose up in one voice and said, 'Don't hire anybody else', that would be a help. But we can't simply do just that. There are places where we need to add back strength. There is a point at which faculties wish to have more staff people, more colleagues, and more of a good many other things, and it comes into conflict especially in the statutory colleges where the resources are so strained with the ability to grow compensation. There is no doubt that we recognize the seriousness of this on the statutory side as well as the endowed side.

"It cannot honestly be said that the situation in which we find ourselves right now can be characterized by an unwillingness of the central administration to cooperate. I hope that this body understands that the faculty presence in the central administration is at an all-time high. The voice of the academic side of the institution is now very thoroughly engaged here. The number of people who have been recruited directly from the faculty who come in to the central administration is at an all-time high. So it's not as if there is a bunch of people, centrally conspiring not to cooperate with the faculty. Finally, I must say that in the past four years, I would challenge anyone to say that there has ever been a time when the Office of the Provost worked as closely with the Faculty Senate as it has in the past four years. I call to your attention things like the Faculty Review of Promotions to Tenure and Academic Program Review, in which I personally took the lead in making the Dean of the Faculty an important figure in the academic life of the institution and in making decisions that had previously been made centrally.

"Let me now provide a little bit of context. This can't be an extended discussion of the ins and outs of the budget. We had a little bit of a discussion at the last meeting of this body about the money that comes from the federal government. One has to understand that we have many different kinds of money and the fact that we do $300 million of business in sponsored research per annum simply does not help faculty salaries; it only adds costs. I'll give you but one example. LNS - Laboratory of Nuclear Studies - the Synchrotron, was recently renewed to the tune of $88 million over 50-some months. We should be extraordinarily proud of a Physics Department that has been able to sustain that level of achievement. That is very good for us all, including those of us in fields like medieval music because some of what comes to the University out of this is the ability to pay for infrastructure for research, which produces libraries and lots of other things that benefit people other than physicists. In order to grease the skids for this renewal, however, NSF said 'Well, gee, what can we look forward to here by way of institutional contribution and don't you think you ought to up that a little more?' That is a very familiar story. So, another few hundred thousand bucks as bait for the really big fish. Now that $88 million dollar fish is a pretty good size and we ought to proud, but it takes bait to get it. We could not afford not to pursue that renewal, but somewhere, we had to find
unrestricted money to put in as bait. The same could be said for all of our major scientific enterprises and a good many other things that we do in the area of sponsored research.

"Suppose that we just took some key indicators -- a set of dials made up of some you get to turn and some you don't get to turn -- let's say that inflation remained at 2 1/2 percent, we don't know but who's to say what it will be in 2002. For tuition this year, we came up about in the middle of the pack, which is what we wanted to do. Some of our competitors institutions for two years in a row have raised tuition less than we have. Only one or two of our competitors increased their tuition at the rate of the endowed side. The statutory increase is higher, but the absolute dollars are lower. So there is a pressure on us to reduce the rate of growth of tuition that is partly purely competitive -- I don't think Cornell can afford to be the most expensive college in the Ivy League. So let's recognize that there is downward pressure on tuition, some is purely political and some is quite simply competitive. So let's say we did 4 1/2 last year, next year we're going to do 4.3. Let's suppose that it has to come down to 4, which is still a point and a half above inflation, but we set ourselves to getting it down within two points above inflation and we've managed to do that. However, none among us a year from now could promise that we wouldn't be in a situation in which some of our leading competitors said they were going to raise their tuition by 2% or 0%. Consider the magnitude of what they did on financial aid. Suppose they come out and say that they're going to increase tuition by 0% and we say we're going to increase by 4% and all of a sudden, we cost more than Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. That would not be a good position for us to be in, in terms of public relations and in terms of competition. We can't get out of this by taking in more undergraduates. I think we all understand that. The basic ingredient in the economics of the University is the student-faculty ratio. My own belief is that we cannot reduce the size of the faculty in relation to the number of students. We need to work on how to deploy that faculty effort. We are competing with institutions where the student-faculty ratio is 8 to 10 and we're at something like 14 to 16.

"Suppose that because of infrastructure, costs, and lots of other things, we're going to have to keep the number of students constant. The indirect cost rate is certainly going to come down. Part of the theory is that the government will simply insist on a number whose first digit is five, never mind what the costs actually are. One cannot shed those costs. That is to say that the federal government will tell us that they are going to give us less indirect cost recovery and unless we're prepared to shut down buildings or not heat and light them, we must shed those costs or every time the rate comes down, more unrestricted money has to go to pay for them. The long-term investment pool payout is essentially the endowment. In 1997-98 we increased the amount of payout per share by 12.7. It works like a mutual fund, so every time someone gives a gift to the endowment, it is like buying shares to the mutual fund. Then because of the way the market was performing, we judged it prudent to increase the payout again by 34.5% and still keep within a range that would ensure against a repetition of 1987. That produced a fairly substantial surge of income to the hundreds and thousands of people on campus that own shares of that mutual fund. With a very substantial amount of effort, we were able to recover that income and convert it to the benefit of compensation. One of the chief methods by which we have achieved the increase in competition that we are providing is by squeezing out what we could from the payout of the endowment. Now you ask me, why should that be hard? What it meant was that we had to go to the colleges and say, 'Next year, you are going to have n hundred thousands of dollars, sometimes in order of a million, coming from the endowment, that you weren't planning to have. We're going to take that back from you in the form of unrestricted money so that we can put it into compensation.' That is a tough sell and who was against it? A lot of departments, faculty members, and so on. My favorite case is the Martha Jane Dale Voice Scholarship. It produces, maybe, three thousand bucks a year so its income goes up by a few hundred bucks. How are you going to get that back so as to turn it into faculty compensation? You have to go to the department and say, 'Look, you have to find a way to put some expenses on that account.' We've got to have back the unrestricted money. So, we're out mopping up little bits and pieces everywhere for the sake of compensation.

"The short-term investment pool is essentially a money market account and doesn't fluctuate very much. We actually managed to push the benefit rate down by a point, which is a big achievement in light of recent years. One of my predecessors, two predecessors ago, is said to have declared nobly that the Fringe Benefit Rate must never exceed its current level of 23%. And here we are now, with health care going back up and partly because we were able to push this down thanks to an over-recovery in a prior year (sounds like something you hear about when leveraged buyouts take place), that fringe benefit rate is likely to start back. We saved some money there and that, too, was turned into compensation.

"Then we put up 4%, centrally, for faculty salaries, obliging the colleges to mop up 1% from savings. This is
relatively easy to do and means that you can't blow the money that you save when a senior person retires and you hire a junior person. You have to plow that back into compensation. In undergraduate financial aid, the target was to bring it down to within two points of where the rate of tuition increase was, and thanks to very successful fundraising, and this year's increase in the endowment payout which produced dividends for a lot of scholarships, we have been able to moderate the growth of financial aid, which in very recent years was growing at double-digit rates. So all of that looks like we're making some progress and we have all of the ingredients going the way we want them to go -- there's not as much compensation as we would like, but there you have it.

"Now, one last comment and then I'm out of here. (Laughter). If you operate with all of those indicators that I sketched, we come out in 99-00 even and the net turns negative and grows steadily in the out years. Obviously, we can't have that. It will take more bearing down on all of those dials on the preceding page to achieve a result that keeps us on an even keel. This can certainly be done with hard work and dedication on the part of lots of people. I'm optimistic that it will be done. This is a sensational university that is doing an incredible number of neat things, neater than ever, despite shrinking resources. But we have our work cut out for us and there are many complicated trades that will need to be made to rectify this problem and to turn up the dial on some other things. We are now raising compensation faster than we are raising tuition. That's never been done before in the history of the institution and that requires real discipline on everyone's part to sustain. If 5% doesn't prove to be enough to make some progress, we'll have to find some other ways to make some progress as well. In this kind of environment, given that we don't control many of the numbers on that preceding page, I would be lying to you and anybody else if I said, 'Sure I can guarantee that we'll be ranked 6th in the nation, on average, by the year 2000.' We'll have to work on this every year.

"I regret to say that I must catch an airplane, but I would be glad to answer questions if -- I'm out of here, I guess. The upshot of this is that I'm perfectly prepared, as is the staff of the Budget Office, to continue to work with the Financial Policies Committee. We have met relatively recently and are prepared to get out all of the numbers and talk about it if people are willing to do it in a serious exchange, which means that when we can't agree, we'll have to agree to disagree on some things. Thank you and sorry to have taken so much time."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 1999

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, you've all had the opportunity to read the minutes on the web from March 10th. Are there any questions or comments on that? Seeing none, we'll pass a unanimous ballot to accept those and we'll move on to Kathleen's report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

5. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences, and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I also have a fairly long report but I'll try to make it as fast as possible.

"Every three years, we are obliged to reappoint the Senate by the legislation that established the Senate. This is done by the official count of the faculty in each department. As a result of this, Computer Science has gained one seat and Architecture and SCAS (Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences) have each lost one seat.

"Next, we are able to bring you the slate of candidates for the elections that will take place very soon. You will receive your ballot in the next few days and they will be due back very early in May. Each year we elect At-Large members of the Faculty Senate, tenured and non-tenured; members to the Nominations and Elections Committee and members to the University Faculty Committee, which serves as the Executive body for the Senate.

**AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE, TENURED** - 2 vacancies, 3-year terms

Theodore L. Hullar, Professor, Natural Resources; Director, Center for the Environment

Bruce V. Lewenstein, Associate Professor, Communication

Henry Shue, Wyn & William Y. Hutchinson Professor in Ethics and Public Life
Tom Davis, Professor, Economics

**AT-LARGE MEMBER, FACULTY SENATE, NON-TENURED** - 1 vacancy, 3-year term

Beth A. Ahner, Assistant Professor, Agricultural and Biological Engineering

John R. Elliott, Assistant Professor, Design and Environmental Analysis

**NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE** - 3 vacancies, 3-year terms

Judith Bernstock, Associate Professor, History of Art

David L. Brown, Professor and Chair, Rural Sociology

Jennie T. Farley, Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

Harold F. Hintz, Professor, Animal Science

Christine A. Shoemaker, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering

John F. Wootton, Professor and Co-chair, Biomedical Sciences

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE** - 3 vacancies, 3-year terms

R. Keith Dennis, Professor, Mathematics

Locksley G.E. Edmondson, Professor, Africana Studies and Research Center

Richard S. Galik, Professor, Physics

Stephen F. Hamilton, Professor, Human Development

D. Peter Loucks, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering

Charles Walcott, Professor, Neurobiology & Behavior; Director, Division of Biological Sciences

"The Nominations and Elections Committee has, indeed, been very busy this year. The individuals shown below are all replacements to these committees of folks who had resigned or were unable to be available.

**Academic Freedom & Professional Status of the Faculty**

Katherine Houpt, Vet.

**Academic Programs and Policies Committee**

Terrence Fine, Engr.

**Affirmative Action Committee**

Douglas Haith, CALS

**Financial Policies Committee**

Peter Harriott, Engr., Chair

John Muckstadt, Engr.

"We have also finally been able to complete the Minority Education Committee which will select a chair and move
"Last time I mentioned that we have established a Task Force on Computer and Information Science with half the members appointed by the Senate and half by the Provost. We gave the Provost four names and he took three of them.

**Task Force on Information Sciences**

*K Kerry Cook, CALS

Geraldine Gay, CALS

*Marcia Lyons, AAP

*Saul Teukolsky, A&S

*appointed by Senate

"There also will be a search for a new Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development and Clare Fewtrell will speak to you more about this particular search at the end of the meeting. It will be a search committee for this particular Vice Provost and, again, we split appointments with the Provost.*

Ronald Booker, A&S

Raymond Dalton, Executive Director, Office of Minority Educational Affairs

*Clare Fewtrell, Vet.

*Porus Olpadwala, AAP

Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources

Terry Plater, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Don Randel, Provost, Chair, 300 Day Hall

*Vilma Santiago-Irizarry, A&S

*appointed by Senate

"Are there any questions?"

Unknown: "Just one question. What is the composition of the University Faculty Committee?"

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "That depends on who you elect. We tried to pick those who would compliment those already on the committee."

Speaker Pollak: "Remember to state your name and department."

Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "Without seeing the whole committee, it's difficult to tell
but it seems that some of those lists are 100% male."

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "Minority Education Committee is 100% male, I concede the point."

Professor Reppy: "So that's a new committee and it's going to be 100% male?"

Associate Dean Rasmussen: "That is correct, at the moment. That is not the case for any of the slates except Tenured At-Large. Let me just say in my defense, if anything, I am criticized for bringing in too many women. But it all depends on what people tell me when I call, so please encourage your colleagues to say 'yes'."

Dean Cooke: "I would say that, if anything, it is on minority representation on the committees that we're not doing as well as we should be."

Speaker Pollak: "Any other comments? Seeing none, we'll accept the committee report and call on Peter Harriott."

6. REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE FINANCIAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Professor Peter Harriott, Chemical Engineering and Chair, Financial Policies Committee: "We had a very cordial meeting of the Financial Policies Committee with the Provost and the Chief Financial Officers, Fred Rogers and Carolyn Ainslie. They answered all of our questions. They reviewed some of the budget and they explained the meaning of the five percent five-year plan. The Financial Policies Committee plans to continue to work on faculty salaries. We've asked the administration to provide some more detailed data, such as the median and average salaries by school and college, not just by endowed or statutory college, and the average percent increase that faculty members have received in these different schools and colleges for the last year or two, which we will compare with the 5% increase. I hope that the Financial Policies Committee can continue to work on the salary question with the administration but I hope that we can also look at some of the aspects of financial policy, including looking at some of the expense items that have grown more rapidly than inflation and some ways of enhancing revenue. To give one example, we recently got figures from the Development Office that show that 25% of alumni with a first degree from Cornell give to the fund-drive, but only 15% of alumni with a graduate degree from Cornell give. I know that there are some schools that have a higher percentage. We would also like to get some data from the Development Office about how different departments in different colleges or schools do in alumni fund-raising and maybe consider different suggestions that would help improve those figures. The overriding concern that I have in reducing expenses and increasing revenue is the rise in tuition. Even though this is projected to come down in the near future I think that it's intolerable to project a continuing rise in tuition of endowed colleges, which is 1 1/2 or 2% higher than inflation. Another thing that we would like to be able to do is to look at enrollment statistics from the Financial Aid Department to see how we might be changing the population of students at Cornell because of this policy. I feel that now we are somewhat underrepresented of children from families of middle income and as tuition rises towards the $40,000 figure, there's a danger that we will have a university that is diverse in student body by gender, race, and ethnicity, but would be underrepresented of children from middle-income families."

7. RESOLUTION ON FINANCIAL POLICIES

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, we now have a resolution but before we take it up there has been a request to get unanimous agreement for a change. It's written on both sides of the board. This is the Resolution Reaffirming the Resolution of December 1998 and if you look at the bottom down where it says, 'Be it finally resolved,' the word 'its' is a bit confusing and so we would like to replace it with 'salaries the highest priority of that committee.' Does anybody have a dissenting vote? Seeing none, we'll move forward with that change of the resolution. I call on Keith Dennis."

A. RESOLUTION ON REAFFIRMING DECEMBER 1998 RESOLUTION

Professor Keith Dennis, Mathematics: "I'm sorry that the Provost isn't still here. I was very pleased to hear that things are going along much better than I had hoped originally and that people are actually talking about it. Unfortunately, Bob Cooke got a little ahead of me, but just in case anyone missed the April 1st edition of the Cornell Daily Sun, I wanted to make sure you saw it. A colleague of mine was visiting last week to see his daughter play softball and he mentioned to me that he had seen this and he told me he didn't realize that it was this bad here and I assured him that this is just one part of a multi-year plan. (Laughter). The main thing I would like to say, and
according to this article Bob Cooke has already said it, that we should have some fears of hiring difficulties and retention. There were some slides presented last time by Peter Stein and I do not want to go through them again but I would like to stick them on the projector just to remind you of the general tendencies. The endowed side seems to be going up now but the statutory doesn't have a peak to show that things are going up. So I think that it's something we should keep in mind.

"Okay, there are two resolutions today to be presented and, no doubt, there will be various substitutions that people will want to make and I think that's all very good. I would like to say a little bit about what I would hope would be in any resolution that we pass today. I would like to say a few things that are anecdotal in nature but, nevertheless, relevant. A colleague of mine recently wrote a letter to his department chair and made a number of interesting comments and I asked him if I could repeat some of those comments and he said that it was okay as long as I didn't use his name. One of the sentences was the following: 'I believe now that my salary is significantly below comparison data for my peers at similar institutions.' Then he quoted a survey of what comparison salaries were but I don't want to give you any specific numbers. His next comment was 'My salary is hardly above the mean.' And this is a person whose salary should be way above the mean given his achievements. In regards to Cornell's plan, he goes on to say, 'This leads me to believe that relatively little has been accomplished.' And then the part that I find most worrisome because he's really a nice guy to have around, 'I have received a couple of inquiries recently in my interest in moving elsewhere, but I don't want to move and I detest the game of fishing for offers.' Okay, now the reason people leave Cornell is quite complicated and it doesn't always hinge on salary, but people tend to look at other places if their salaries are low and people elsewhere find it easier to make offers to people at Cornell if their salaries are low.

"Again, I'd like to present some anecdotal evidence but these things are really complicated and you can't pinpoint why these people left Cornell, but I'm going to concentrate on the Mathematical Sciences. Cornell has lost two really good people and salaries were definitely a part of it, not the whole thing, Phil Holtman and Sy Levine, for example. I'm sure that down the road, and in every department that you can envision you know of people who have left Cornell for reasons related to salaries. I hope you will keep that in mind. One of the other things we need to do is to reiterate the importance of salaries at Cornell and how they should be competitive. I'm presenting one particular motion. You might wish to modify it or accept two different motions. Let me just say a couple of things that I find perfectly reasonable in any resolution that is passed. I personally do not find it unreasonable for Cornell to establish some sort of goals. It doesn't necessarily have to be some particular position in some package of salary ranges of universities. I don't believe that it's unreasonable to make it a bit more specific than the Provost made in his earlier statement. I'm sure he's trying hard and I think what we want to say to him is to try a little bit harder. I don't see why we can't have goals and timetables and strategies for achieving them. And in regards to having one motion for endowed salaries and one for statutory salaries, there's no particular reason to have that. We're all in the same boat. It's sort of slowly sinking and I hope that we'll all paddle. I don't think we need to get into an argument about whose is smaller. And there's no particular reason why a motion should have anything in it about methods or budgetary details. That can be worked out by the committee. We really want the faculty to have some early input in the budgeting process in some significant way. Again, my hope is that there has been good faith negotiation between the committee and Provost Randel and, I must admit, back when I was department chair I had some rather difficult dealings with Provost Randel but somehow we always came to a resolution and made it all work and I hope that will be done here. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any questions? Yes?"

Associate Professor Penny Becker, Sociology: "I actually agree with you that we shouldn't argue about whose salary is smaller, but I think that in light of recent disclosure at peer institutions, like Stanford, I want to ask whether this committee has in the past or will in the future ask the administration for data that breaks down salary data at all faculty levels. Also, the examples we've seen are on the full professor level, but when it says here to break down by rank, I want to know how specific those requests have been and if the information has been forthcoming."

Professor Dennis: "Let me say that I have been away from Cornell for several years and I am not on this committee. I hear all sorts of things from different people and I would like to know what's going on. You would have to ask someone on the committee, like Peter Stein."
Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I think I can answer your question quickly. All the data that the Financial Policies Committee has presented from the time that I began to work with it, six years, is public data that did not come from the administration; it came from the AAUP surveys. Whatever they have is what they give and they don't break down the salaries by gender and so we don't know that. In my experience, unless I'm wrong, I can't think of any data that we ever got from the administration on any subject. (Laughter) Excuse me, I meant on financial numbers."

Speaker Pollak: "Do you have a response to that?"

Professor Danuta Shanzer, Classics: "A few years ago, a group of women professors met with Ron Ehrenberg for such a study that would isolate the salaries according to sex, male and female salaries separately. At that time, we were told that many years ago they did do such a study but they took out the chairs. In other words, anyone who had an endowed chair was left out. It showed that there was a gap but the gap didn't look so bad for that particular reason. I don't think that Professor Ehrenberg came up with the study, but that's all I know."

Speaker Pollak: "Terry?"

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I wonder if I could somehow change the nature of the debate. We are sensitive to two kinds of things. We are sensitive to having our intellect engaged and we are sensitive to having our egos stroked. Frank Rhodes was a charmer. He told us Cornell was great and therefore we were great. He was so proud of everything. We learned from Peter that while his one arm was around our shoulders, his other arm was in our pockets. Look at the curve, those are his years. We felt good, I felt good. I was at Cornell, I must be good. We didn't even know what was happening until we looked at the numbers. Now we have a different strategy. The charm isn't going to work and we don't have the same level of charm available. So we had a very nice discussion with the Provost, a very elegant, intellectual discussion. And in some sense we're being invited to participate. We have a new committee of nobles who have met with the Trustees and are looking at a time frame of 10 years. This is about budgeting, priorities, and choices. The choice is going to be made to put the money elsewhere. You can turn this into a complicated problem, but in the end, it comes down to more than trying -- it requires actually doing something. So here we're being dragged along. Let me just close with the words of Yoda, the Jedi master: 'There is no try, there is either do or not do.' The evidence is very clear as to which of the two we've been seeing." (Applause)

Speaker Pollak: "Is there anyone else who would like to comment? Okay, Peter."

Professor Stein: "Gee, the opportunity to agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Electrical Engineering I can't pass by. I agree with everything that Terry said. I want to make a couple of points. I want to tell you why this resolution is so important. I really wish the Provost were here; I'm sorry he's not. The question is not a question of faith, good faith or bad faith, or having a good time at a meeting. In fact, I have been involved in discussions of this matter for five long years. And those discussions have gone back and forth and they never converge on anything. The reason they never converge on anything is that we never have a number that we are supposed to agree to. We sit and we hear that faculty salaries are too low and that it is a high priority on the part of the administration to raise them. I believe that. But then, when it comes to how low are they and is the program that we are involved with sufficient to accomplish the goal, then all of a sudden the conversation ceases. We talk about these very large scale numbers. I've sat through discussions like this year after year about numbers that are in the millions and percentages going up 2% and so on. Now the reason we need numbers is because we don't even agree on what's been going on in the past three years. We are now in the third year of the five-year program and if you look at Paul Sherman's analysis, in this third year of a five-year program with a deficit on the endowed side, which is something of the order of 20% on full professor salaries, we have gained in this three years two-tenths of a percent. The Provost says that they're trying as hard as they can and that they are making Herculean efforts but, nonetheless, there is only one thing. It's not how you play the game, it's whether you win. Two-tenths of a percent over three years is losing the game. The Provost looks at the numbers and says that we are not losing; that we are gaining 3 to 4%. We cannot even discuss how it is that we're doing the methodology. That makes for a very different conclusion. I mean, maybe even 3% isn't so great when you're behind by 20%. The Provost also doesn't think that we're behind by 20%, he'll say we're behind by 10%. The discussions that we have had always go off in a vague manner. It's like talking to a student, in a certain sense. They're off in this vague kind of discussion where you don't have anything to grab onto because we don't deal with firm numbers where we can say, 'No, that's wrong because of...' and he could say, 'No that's wrong because of...'. That's the kind of a discussion we're trying to have. It is my experience that until we
have it, all of the good will in the world and all of the pleasant meetings in the world won't mean a thing. What is so terrible about benchmarks, goals, timetables, and strategies? They're a common part of all administrative procedures. We demand that of our students. We say, 'Here are your goals, the benchmarks are the prelims and the strategy is to read the books, your goal is to pass the course.' We do that to ourselves when we write down research. We say, 'Well, in a year we want to accomplish this and that and we're going to try to build this.' We hope to accomplish something. We often don't meet our benchmarks and then we have to sit and re-evaluate. Without benchmarks, you don't know how you're doing. It all slips by year to year in terms of good intentions. That's really all we're trying to do for this: to bring sound managerial practice to this terrible problem that confronts us in both the statutory and endowed parts of the university. That we are desperately behind the competition in faculty salaries is very unhealthy for this university."

Speaker Pollak: "Are you ready? All those in favor of the resolution signify by raising your hand? All of those opposed. Let the record show that the vote was unanimous."

**BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate reaffirms the resolution (attached below) it passed at its December 1998 meeting, and asks the Provost to reconsider his decision not to abide by that resolution,**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate asks the Dean of the Faculty and the UFC to make every effort to achieve the goals of the December 1998 resolution, and**

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Senate supports the Financial Policies Committee's decision to make the improvement of faculty salaries the highest priority.**

Resolution submitted by: Donald Barr, Robert Kay, Keith Dennis, William Lesser, Clifford Earle, Peter Loucks, Locksley Edmondson, Mary Beth Norton, Stephen Hamilton, Judith Reppy, Mary Jacobus, Gordon Teskey

---

**FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION PARTNERSHIP:**

**IMPROVEMENT OF FACULTY SALARIES**

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, December 9, 1998.

The Senate believes that it is both appropriate and in Cornell's best interests for the Faculty to be fully involved in a partnership with the administration on all major fronts as priorities are chosen and a vision of the future is crafted.

One critical area that could benefit immediately from a renewed partnership is faculty salaries. The Senate believes that progress is not proceeding rapidly enough toward average salaries in both the statutory and endowed units that are competitive with those at peer institutions whose faculty are ranked similarly in quality.

To attack this problem in a spirit of cooperation and partnership, the Senate asks the Administration to develop, together with the Financial Policies Committee, faculty salary targets for all ranks in both units, as well as a schedule and financial strategy for meeting these targets. The Senate instructs the Financial Policies Committee to report on the status of this joint effort no later than the April 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The Senate believes that it must be not only consulted, but also substantively involved in the formulation of major policy and selection of major priorities involving Cornell's faculty, academic programs, curricula, and students. The Senate is increasingly concerned that the partnership is withering rather than flourishing.

---

**B. RESOLUTION ON FACULTY SALARIES IN THE STATUTORY COLLEGES**
Professor Peter Schwartz, Textiles and Apparel: "I admit I was pleased at the first time at these meetings that I hear people use the word 'statutory' when talking about salaries. I’d like to present to you the graph (Appendix A) that was included with the call for the meeting and the motion. One of the things that we’ve been talking about and one of the things that is constantly done is that we talk about salaries between peer institutions and that masks a much larger problem, even though the data are present.

"This graph says pretty much all that I want to say, which is that there has been since 1978 or 1979 an increasing disparity between the salaries of the endowed faculty and the salaries of the statutory faculty, partly because of the state constraints that the Provost talked about. Regardless, they are real and they exist. If these particular graphs are normalized, brought to nine-month long appointments, and scaled by 9/11ths so that we’re all working on a level playing field, at the present time for equal amount of work, the statutory are compensated at 82% of the rate that the endowed faculty are compensated. This graph is a bit confounding because it shows average salary for all ranks.

"I wanted to use some data that the junior senator from physics used when he was the Dean of the Faculty, presented at the March 1998 Faculty Senate meeting. These data were for 1997 and were based on AAUP data. As you can see though, they’re pretty good at showing what the trend is. This (Appendix B) is a comparison of salaries at all ranks among the assistant, associate, and full professors. The statutory is the darker bar and the endowed is the hatched bar. Being an engineer I like to normalize things, so these (Appendix C) are those data normalized by the endowed faculty salaries showing that the assistant and associate statutory professors are compensated at approximately 9/10 of their endowed colleagues and the full statutory professors at approximately 8/10 of their endowed colleagues. These jibe pretty well with this graph because it shows how full professor salaries are driving down. One other thing I wanted to mention is that when we look at salary data and we look at raises, there’s one other confounding issue that we don’t always note, which is that when the endowed side gets a raise, they get a raise. But when the statutory side gets a raise, we get 40% up front and then six months later we get another 30% and then July 1st, at the end of the year, we finally get the raise. So that the numbers that you see, if we get a five percent raise, we don’t see those numbers in the beginning, we see them at the end of the year. Within any given year, the raise is not 5%. I didn’t know if you knew that, but I wanted to tell you. So based on that, I’m not going to read it, but you have the resolution. Now, here’s Bill Lesser."

Professor William Lesser, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics: "Thank you, Peter. I’m Bill Lesser, one of the two senators from the Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. I find that often when you speak later, many of the things that you had planned to say were already said better than you had intended to. In terms of justifying my endorsement of both of these resolutions, I would have to say that’s so. I don’t see either of these resolutions as saying that the administration at the central level have not been attempting to make efforts to improve the salaries only that they have not produced adequate results to date and something more needs to be done. The second thing that I don’t read either of these resolutions as saying is that specific purchase ought to be taken. Clearly, that needs to be worked out and also very clearly, the faculty needs to be involved when talking about explicit trade-offs. I do want to say that, in particular, the resolution that gives higher attention to the salaries of the statutory faculty needs to get additional attention at the University and lead to more effective results.

"I was asked to make these comments because last year I was part of a CALS ad hoc committee where we were asked to look at various sources of money that might be used to achieve these goals. Let me indicate that we were not asked nor did we think it important to collect more data to justify such a thing. What Professor Schwartz is showing you is sufficient and clear, and shows who is more substantially behind. What this committee did discuss is that basic justification can be characterized at counterpoint from what the Provost was saying to us. My interpretation of what he was saying is that we basically cannot afford to provide better salaries primarily for statutory units, which is what his conversation centered around. My point is basically saying that there are costs to proceeding as we are; they may be hidden and become evident but at what time, we’re not sure. Basically, the real problem is that we’re in a very unstable situation where we’re paying so much below our peer institutions. When I say peer institutions, I mean that pretty loosely, because I learned recently that, in my field, both the University of Delaware and the University of Connecticut are earning on average over $100,000 a year. I don’t know what the average is here, but I know that I’m earning substantially less than that. Perhaps they’re not peer institutions at least in the sense of salary. It’s also very clear, at least in my college, that the administration is willing to pay at competitive levels when there are threats such
as new hires or to meet outside offers. But as Professor Dennis indicated, this really creates stresses in the system, such as phantom job searches and feeling that the University is not interested in recognizing those who want to do the job but rather those who will create opportunities in that area.

"It’s also been pointed out that the faculty in the Biological Sciences are going to be compensated very differently, not in terms of what they do or contribute but by what college they are affiliated with. There’s a definite possibility here that faculty be given the incentive to look for other opportunities to generate outside income such as using their consulting time. In CALS, we are allowed 2 days a month for consulting. I haven’t seen any surveys, but my guess is that a lot of the faculty do not use those days for consulting but those are part of our compensation package. I think if we don’t do something about salaries, people are going to see their own solutions in that way which will mean a loss to the University in that regard. We’re also starting to see, at least in my department, that faculty are not particularly interested in taking on committee work. I’m sure that Kathy sees this. We’re asked to do a lot of things and if we’re not paid for it; we’re going to take our additional compensation in terms of free time.

"I think it’s also important to recognize, especially for those of us who are paid out of the public sector, that we must take some step while the economy remains strong before it turns down as it inevitably will. If we can’t get any increases in the years when the state has record surpluses in the budget, what’s going to happen to us in a time when we’re running a deficit. I think we’re also at the point now where we’re recognizing that if there is going to be some improvement in that area that we’re going to have to do something ourselves. We can’t simply wait for our governor or our lobbying power to do something. We’re going to have to do something and I’ve indicated that one thing might be done is to identify a pool of money of at least a million dollars to make any substantial improvements in faculty salaries that are lagging behind. The first thing to recognize is that the money will not come from one single source and we’re going to have to look at several places. The CALS ad hoc committee identified cashing in faculty lines. Provost Randel indicated that the faculty is always requesting additional faculty and so on, but we’ve never been given the choice. Either we turn them in or we don’t get any increases. If we look at it as a net benefit of something with no cost to us if we realize that this is a source of possible increase for ourselves and our colleagues, we might think of it differently. We also looked at the possibility of accessory instruction, these dollars that supposedly bounce back and forth between colleges, recognizing that in each of the colleges we could offer courses that would attract students from other colleges and enhance the flow of dollars. However, the flow of accessory dollars is so opaque in terms of how it’s transferred, when it’s done and how it would be shared, led us to believe that there’s really no incentive to offer additional courses. Another thing that I noticed that was missing from Provost Randel’s overhead is to reduce the rate of increase of fees paid to central administration. Here I’m talking about Lake Source Cooling, and all those other things. Individually, there’s possible merit, but as explained to us, our entire salary increase in CALS almost exactly offsets our increase in central administration fees. So those extra salary dollars that Provost Randel indicated were the only sure source of income that we have on an annual basis essentially fly over the college to roost there in Day Hall. So as long as we have such increases in those areas, it’s going to be very difficult to increase our salaries. Another possibility is to switch to nine months. Most of us in statutory are on a twelve-month calendar. That could involve a 22% increase and something that some of our peer institutions have done such as Penn State University. A colleague there indicates that when they did that, the faculty finally had incentive to generate research grants to get themselves a summer salary. We should use incentives to change the system that we have which we're saying is inadequate. Finally, and nominally, the University could give us free parking. It's a bit of money, but it could be a pre-tax benefit. One thing we realized would not work was joining the SUNY unions because we found we're in a different operational unit and not even eligible. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Okay, are there any comments or questions on the resolution? Seeing none, all those in favor of the resolution signify by raising your hands. All of those opposed. The motion carries and the resolution carries."

Whereas, the average salaries in the statutory colleges are much lower than at comparable peer institutions, especially at the full professor level and especially in the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Human Ecology, and

Whereas, the long-standing inequity between statutory and endowed faculty salaries has become an institution fracturing gap during the past decade, (At present the average monthly salary for statutory faculty has dropped to approximately 82% of the endowed level. In other words, the average statutory faculty salary for eleven (11) months service for all ranks in 1998-99 equaled the average salary for
Therefore Be It Resolved, that a much higher priority be given to improving faculty salaries by both the college and by university administrators.

Such efforts should include:

Expanding lobbying and political efforts in Albany and with SUNY.

Creating an emergency funding source for more robust salary improvement programs. (For example, consider leaving unfilled some faculty positions that have been or may be authorized - except to meet truly urgent needs such as sustaining required courses or pursuing truly high priority research needs.)

Faculty compensation comes in many forms. In this emergency, consider encouraging retention of high productivity faculty using non-salary perks such as dedicated support for graduate students and special parking benefits to encourage institutional loyalty.

Be It Further Resolved, that we request the University administration to seek both Trustee and expanded Faculty assistance in finding remedies for this crisis and to make a formal report no later than the Senate's September meeting.

8. RESOLUTION ON THE PROFESSIONAL MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM IN ARCHITECTURE

Professor Kenneth C. Hover, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I'm here this afternoon as a representative of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, which just as of last week, received a proposal from the Department of Architecture to develop their new professional degree program at the graduate level. My job here for the next couple of minutes is to give you a thumbnail sketch of that proposal which we approved for bringing forth to this body. This proposal is for a First Professional Master's Degree program and has been in the works for over a year. It has had the approval of the Department of Architecture for about a year and has also been approved by the Graduate School with changes, which the Department of Architecture has made. The most recent version of the proposal is dated March 5 and was approved just last week by CAPP. The wishes of the Department of Architecture would be to bring this to the Trustees at the May meeting, which is the reason for my appearance here this evening.

"The current graduate program in the Department of Architecture is a Master of Architecture at the second level. It is a post-professional degree. In other words, to take the current graduate program, the student will come into that already with a Bachelor's degree in Architecture. The proposed program would be for students who do not necessarily have prior study in architecture. The proposed program would normally be of a duration of seven semesters and a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or Bachelor of Fine Arts would be a prerequisite. Evidently, the program of study that we are discussing here is accredited on the national level. It is a recognized professional degree within the profession of architecture. The proposal that came to our committee a week ago did include a study of peer institutions. Since the theme of this evening's discussion seems to be about resources, I thought I would copy out some key statements that the Department of Architecture included in their proposal.

"Architecture tells us that the most effective way to leverage their existing undergraduate program is to add this particular degree program. They see this as an effective way to magnify their capability. They go on to say that they believe that the addition of this program could take place without significantly increasing the faculty teaching load, without requiring new facilities, and without disrupting existing programs. They also see a trade-off that if they are not to increase the teaching load and facilities, and they are to admit 10-15 graduate students a year, they would reduce the number of their undergraduate enrollment by 10-12 students per year.

"On the basis of the proposal that came before CAPP, we approved it to come forward to this body."

Speaker Pollak: "Questions or comments? Yes?"

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "What fraction of the undergraduates would that affect?"
Professor Hover: "I understand that a representative from Architecture is here tonight to help us deal with these questions."

Associate Professor Jonathan Ochshorn, Architecture: "We have an entering class of between 60-70 per year, so it would be a 20% decrease in class number."

Professor Hover: "Are there any other questions?"

Associate Professor Michael Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering: "Is your committee endorsing that we approve this proposal?"

Professor Hover: "Our committee approved this proposal to come forward to this body."

Unknown from Physiology: "Does this program take three and a half years to complete a Master's Program? If so, isn't that a bit much for a Master's Degree?"

Professor Ochshorn: "This is a professional Master's degree, quite comparable to those in peer institutions such as Columbia, Princeton, and Harvard. It's a professional Master's degree program leading to a professional degree, which enables a student to get licensed as a professional architect. It's similar to a law degree. It shouldn't be compared to a 1 or 2 year Master's program."

Speaker Pollak: "One more quick comment?"

Professor Stein: "I don't know quite how to interpret your answer to the question asked from here. You were asked if the committee endorses it and you carefully said that the committee brought it forward."

Professor Hover: "No, what I generally said was to repeat what we did a week ago. We received the proposal and the question was, 'Can this proposal be approved to go forward to the Senate?' So we did so. My current recollection doesn't include that it came forth with an endorsement nor do I believe that we were asked to endorse it. We were asked to approve it to bring forward to the Senate. Please don't try to read too much into what I said. What we did was approve it to bring it forth to the Senate. We did turn others down because we believed that they were not ready to come before this group. We did believe that this one was ready to come before the group."

Professor Thompson: "What is the impact of the Senate's endorsement? Is this required to taking it forward to the Trustees? Are we an advisory board?"

Dean Cooke: "Yes. Yes, we are required to approve it before it goes to the Trustees. That's been delegated to the faculty."

Speaker Pollak: "Are we ready for the question? Yes?"

Professor Fine: "Your committee had this proposal for how long? How long was it discussed? Tell me something more, because right now I'm looking at a 3 1/2 year program which I'm informed is a traditional length for a professional degree but which doesn't match with the length of professional degrees from the Engineering College. I'm not getting a very clear sense that CAPP has considered, studied, recommended it. Give me something."

Professor Hover: "As I have pointed out, the current proposal has a date of March 5th. Sometime after that date, it went to our committee and was distributed to our committee. We were asked to read it and then we met for the first and only time on the issue, last week. We reviewed the proposal before us and approved it to come to the Senate."

Speaker Pollak: "Wait a moment. We're at the point here where we're going to have to adjourn without a vote. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of calling the question, raise your hand. All of those opposed? Okay, I'll take another question or comment."

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "What constitutes acceptable or not acceptable to this body? I'm completely confused and so are a lot of people here. What's going on?"
Speaker Pollak: "Before you answer that, may I have unanimous consent to extend the meeting? (A few people called out 'No.') Okay, this meeting stands adjourned."

Dean Cooke: "Let me add that we've already reserved the room for next week, according to standard procedure. I will get together with the UFC and we will call a meeting."

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty