Announcements
The Faculty Handbook Project

The Problems

Broken links, inconsistencies, illogical structure, hard to maintain

Proposed Solution

Visit this restructured, rough draft version of the Handbook obtained via cut-and-pasting and greater reliance upon links that work.

Would like to form a small group that will step through the tenure track promotion part and produce cleaner, consistent procedures.

All changes carefully reviewed by the Senate, the academic Deans, the Department Chairs, and the Provost.
2016 Work-Life Survey Results

The **preliminary report** gives “all-respondent” results to questions like

All things considered, if you had to do it all over again would you choose to be a faculty member/academic at Cornell?

To what extent do you have confidence in the decisions made by the central administration?
All things considered, if you had to do it all over again, would you choose to be a faculty member/academic at Cornell?

- TTT faculty: 6% Definitely not, 14% Probably not, 31% Maybe, 47% Probably would, 47% Definitely would
- Academic professionals: 4% Definitely not, 15% Probably not, 34% Maybe, 45% Probably would, 45% Definitely would
- Academic short term: 3% Definitely not, 8% Probably not, 19% Maybe, 30% Probably would, 40% Definitely would

If a candidate for a position similar to yours asked you about your department or unit as a place to work, would you:

- TTT faculty: 7% Not recommend, 39% Recommend, 54% Strongly recommend
- Academic professionals: 6% Not recommend, 46% Recommend, 49% Strongly recommend
- Academic short term: 8% Not recommend, 42% Recommend, 49% Strongly recommend
Faculty need to see what the responses look like by age, race, gender, rank, discipline, and college.

BUT, dashboards must be carefully designed to preserve anonymity.

See earlier survey reports.

Q. How do we interpret the results and elevate the campus discussion so that we make progress on the problems that are exposed?
Provost’s Review of the Social Sciences

So Far:

1. Internal committee report
2. External committee report
3. Input from faculty in the social sciences.

Next, three committees will work on:

1. **Organizational structure of the social sciences**
2. **Identifying areas for Radical Collaboration**
3. **Administrative Issues**
Provost’s Review of the Social Sciences: Timeline

Organization structure of the social sciences
Committee develops options followed by campus discussion

Identifying areas for Radical Collaboration
“Idea Panels” spark public discussion followed by radical collaboration committee work

Administrative Issues
Address administrative concerns raised by reports and feedback.
Provost’s Review of the Social Sciences

For details and continued updates, see the Provost’s website:

http://provost.cornell.edu/academic-initiatives/provosts-review-social-sciences/

Questions, comments, or concerns email ssreview@cornell.edu
Modifying the Campus Code

This webpage has the Code and the rules associated with the modification process. The process looks like this:

Codes and Judicial Committee

The University Assembly

President

Trustees

R. Bensel  
M. Hatch  
R. Howarth  
E. Loew  
C. Van Loan

R. Bensel  
M. Hatch  
R. Howarth  
E. Loew  
C. Van Loan

Only for Title 4 Changes (Public Order)
## Need to Hold a Pro Forma Election

### UFC
- **Rosemary Avery** (Human Ecology)
- **Cynthia Bowman** (Law)
- **Harry de Gorter** (Dyson)
- **Shannon Gleeson** (ILR)
- **Kimberly O'Brien** (Nutritional Sciences)

### Nominations & Elections
- **Julia Finkelstein** (Human Ecology)
- **Ruth Richardson** (Engineering)

### Senator-at-Large
- **Rosemary Avery** (Human Ecology)
- **Michael Mazourek** (CALS)
- **Rob Thorne** (A&S)
- **Suman Seth** (A&S)

---

**Bad math all over the Place:** $\#\text{vacancies} \geq \#\text{candidates}$.

This is a serious problem that needs to be addressed.