

A MEETING  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019

(Technical difficulties.)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: -- is now our call who can vote for faculty trustee. And it is unambiguously our business to decide who we engage in any kind of votes. The trustees approved this a few weeks ago.

We just started a review of the tenure track and everything that hangs off it. The goal here is basically to clean up the faculty handbook, or rather put more details and guidelines in there, so that we can proceed with these things unambiguously. So it's a big project. It's going to go on for some time.

Here's sort of how it is structured: We have a committee, whose charge includes the tenure process, and that's the Academic Freedom Professional Status of the Faculty Committee, and we are going through meeting several times this semester to look at certain topics.

If you click on more details, you'll see we have a website on all this stuff with all the different things that do hang off the tenure track, and we want to step through those and see if we can make some improvements. Dual to that are the deans, the chairs, the provost's office. No one owns this, so the idea here is a general discussion and to emerge with a better prose in the faculty handbook.

We've had a couple of non-snow days. They always provoke things, so this was the first one that involved wind chill. There's a web page for that; put lots of facts there from the Climate Center, from Disability Services, from Cornell Health. There are about 80 comments in there from mostly students, but also faculty.

The group that makes these decisions will have a meeting in a couple weeks. I will bring all this to the table and, hopefully, some guidance will emerge from that. It's not going to be if it's minus 20 wind chill, classes are canceled. It's much more nuanced and so on. Anyway, that's in the cards.

There is a realignment of two departments. This has been a discussion amongst those in those departments and the associated deans, and it has to do with the Department of Statistical Science, which sits in CIS, and the Department of Biological Statistics and Computational Biology that sits in CALS. And the idea now is to move basically the statisticians in BSCB over to DSS and to rename the two units. These units now will be classical shared departments.

If you look around campus, there are about five of them: Nutritional Sciences, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, and so on, and that will be the model for these two units. They will have a lead dean, they will have a core faculty, but then part of their growth and strength and research and teaching enterprise will involve joint appointments. Anyway, like all these things, it's up for comments and thoughts about this.

That's the end of my announcements. We have time for questions on any of those things. Ken?

Let's skip the microphones. And the next one, I guess, Risa.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off mic.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't see Marty, but the only people moving really are the ones that are moving from BSCB, Biological Statistics, to that statistics unit. And really, within BSCB, the sort of rules for tenure are up to the faculty that are closest to those people.

So Marty, are you here?

So I'm not sure if there's any more detail to give, other than we're not particularly worried about it. Those junior faculty are talking a lot to Marty about what the standards would be, and I don't anticipate there would be problems. Within computational biology, there are a couple junior people and, if anything, they were in better condition because they're just surrounded by peers now. And they'll stay within the same college as well. The only change, really, is for the CALS people.

Marty, do you want to add to that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off mic.)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There are no new academic programs here, so it went through CAPP, and we are bringing it up here. If there are more concerns, we could have further discussion next month; but unless someone wants to have a resolution with a yes/no, all this is informational, if you feel it should be some kind of vote on this.

Yeah, in general, it did seem a little ambiguous to me, because there were no academic programs, but I ran it by CAPP.

Is Mike Tomlan here? You want to speak to this, perhaps?

MIKE TOMLAN: (Off mic.)

RISA LIEBERWITZ: (Off mic.) And in particular, I'm interested in hearing about your anticipation with regard to the appeals process.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right, so a lot of parts to your question there. Here's a sample topic: Should a department vote be by secret ballot? I have looked at all ten college things, and some do, some don't, so there's an example where maybe you put up guidelines about how to think about that. Some topics might lead to actually a strong recommendation, perhaps, by the faculty that this should be the rule across the colleges.

As things unfold, as you sort of said, as you begin to look into things, you discover, perhaps, more controversial things that have to be written down, and we will bring these to the senate, as we go along, because this is immense. The AFPS is going to meet three or four times this semester. My guess is that by April or May, we'll certainly bring stuff up here, where we can weigh in on that.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So that would be a vote? When you say weigh in, you're talking about a vote?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It might be a sense of the senate thing. If it's something that really goes in the faculty handbook, then a vote -- let's just discover that, as we get to that point.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Because this would seem to be something we'd also want to go back to our departments about.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Absolutely, absolutely.

Okay, we have a pretty tight agenda. Middle States accreditation.

SPEAKER NELSON: Mike Fontaine and Marin Clarkberg, come up and talk about Middle States accreditation.

MICHAEL FONTAINE: Hi, folks. Accreditation is here and accreditation is happening, it's already started, so I'm here simply to announce it, take questions and let you know what's happening.

You'll see on the first slide here at the top is our website that we just started, accreditation.cornell.edu. Everything is up there. What you are looking at is a screen shot from the website itself and, as you can see, in the spring, that is to say this semester right now, we have started on a university-wide self-study, which I like to think of as saying we're writing a dissertation on what happened at Cornell University in compliance with policies, what the policies are over the past eight or nine years, with a view on what's happening right now and to the future.

You'll want to notice this. Of course, some of you know accreditation from your own colleges; but for people like me in the humanities, it's not as obvious exactly what's happening. So accreditation is the process of peer review for colleges. We volunteer to join Middle States, which is a peer review organization. If we don't do this, then the federal government would do it directly.

So we have similar institutions in our region that will come and take a look at everything. This is going to be a two-year process. It will culminate with accreditation, we hope, but we assume, in spring of 2021. The capping event will be a visit to campus in the fall of 2020.

Why do we do this? If we don't get accredited, you will see from the red line, we would not be -- our students would not be eligible for financial aid funds. That would change the institution quite a bit, so we are getting under way.

There are seven standards that need to be met for accreditation. This is a nice change from the last time Cornell did accreditation ten years ago. It used to be 15 standards that had to be met.

They have now cut it down to seven and, as you can see, these are the different standards that we now need to meet: Mission and goals of the university; ethics and integrity; design and delivery of the student learning experience; support of the student experience; educational effectiveness assessment; planning, resources and institutional improvement; and last is governance, leadership and administration.

For each of these seven standards, we've established seven working groups, each one of them chaired by a faculty member on the committee. If you look below the red line, you will see Caroline Levine is the chair of our first working group. And then in the right column, it's working groups 2 through 7.

So each of these working groups is chaired by a faculty member, each is staffed with faculty, with staff, with deans in some cases, a vice provost, students, and we're seeking increasing student representation. Everyone in yellow is a faculty member here at Cornell, so the point I want to impress on you is that we have heavy faculty involvement and leadership in the whole process.

So what happens next? We're going to be -- the working groups are meeting right now, they are gathering information, seeking information and they are going to be analyzing it. They'll be drafting the report, we'll put the report together over the summer and in the fall. And we will be submitting this to Middle States toward the end of the year.

It might be of interest we're doing the whole thing through Canvas. The university switched over. I don't know if you found it yet. We are finding it extremely easy to use, very intuitive, very, very nice, so everything is collaborative in there.

And I want to draw -- if you go to our web site, you will see we have a full timeline of everything that's happening; but what's in red here is the important part for us. The Middle States representative, a gentleman named Steve Pugliese, will be here March 21, from 11:00 to noon. He'll have a public forum, where he can answer any questions or you can give any feedback or thoughts you may have to him at that time.

And that's all I have to say. I'm happy to take questions, if there are any. Please wait for the microphone.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Department of Government. I actually went to the Middle States meeting eight or nine years ago, whenever the last one was, and I remember the session, which was dreadful. It mean, it was really simple, it was aimed at community colleges and weak institutions that generally needed their accreditation in order to have -- with their state legislators and so forth, and we sort of went through the motions.

Princeton almost said no. They did say no, and then they backed off, if I remember correctly. So are there any issues in this process that you see that might be problematic?

MICHAEL FONTAINE: Thanks very much. Marin and I and a couple other colleagues went to the Middle States meeting in Philly about five or six months ago, and the very first thing they said was we're trying to reduce the standards, to make it less onerous, precisely for institutions like Cornell, where we don't necessarily need to show that of these 15 standards, a lot of them are not an issue for us. So they actually have received that feedback and have taken it into account in redesigning this.

That said, I believe Cornell was asked -- as a result of the last cycle, was asked to contribute additional reporting on assessment, which is Standard 5 this time around. And so we need to show if, in fact, it's true, we would like to show that we have done a better job and are now doing a better job of measuring assessment in the way that assessment professionals regard as best practices.

MARIN CLARKBERG: I could say a few things. Hi, I'm Marin Clarkberg from Institutional Research and Planning. It's true that the standards for accreditation apply to all institutions of higher education in our region, so community colleges and Cornell University all have to do things like have a mission and serve that mission. We don't have to have the same mission, but we have to do what we say we're going to do.

There was a big kerfuffle a decade or so ago around Princeton. Princeton spent a lot of time and energy trying to say that the process took too much time and energy. Our approach last time and this time is to -- I think it probably spends less time and energy to follow the process and to be good citizens and that there is things that we can reap out of this process.

It's an invitation to do a genuine self-study. That's something we ask of our academic programs. So there is utility to be found in it, and we can treat the process with the expectation there is something to be gained with it, and I think we can find some value from that.

SPEAKER NELSON: All right. We have a lot to cover, so unless there's any more pressing questions, we'll move on. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

MICHAEL FONTAINE: I did not expect that.

SPEAKER NELSON: The next thing we are going to talk about, Chris Schaffer is going to come up and talk about the sense of the senate resolution.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi. Chris Schaffer. And I do think that Mike Fontaine deserved that applause for agreeing to chair this whole process.

So I just wanted to give some updates on some of the sense of senate resolutions that we voted on in the past few meetings. First, we had one on food insecurity, where we agreed that faculty should do things to help with food insecurity among students on campus.

Charlie and I explored a few possible options. Adding \$1 to all the faculty soup tickets would have generated a few thousand dollars a year, but it seemed complicated to make that an opt-in kind of thing, and we were uncomfortable with just requiring it. The idea of donating to the campus store at a checkout was also complicated.

There were some things, though, that look like they are coming online. In part and independent of us, there is now a program in place where students can donate leftover meals that they have on swipe cards to a central pool, which then students who have food insecurity issues can draw from. There's also the Cornell access fund, which can be used by students to solve a variety of sort of emergent problems, including insecurity, and we strongly encourage faculty to contribute to this.

We also had in December a sense of senate resolution asking President Pollack to outline the conditions under which the university would consider declining entering into or

withdraw from an institutional-level collaboration with another university institution, due to concerns about violation of human rights, economic freedom or things like that in the other country.

I think you should have seen on the agenda President Pollack responded to that with a very thoughtful response. I just wanted to give a few key take-aways from her response.

She came out, I would say, very strongly in favor of an academic freedom perspective on this issue, emphasizing that international collaborations are essential to our mission, that any decisions about whether to enter into or not enter into an international collaboration should be focused on the academic partners and programs, not on the actions necessarily and policies of the national government that hosts those partners and programs.

The most important criteria would be that the partners uphold academic freedom. She did acknowledge that in direct partnerships with governments, that their policies could be worth considering. Obviously, safety concerns for students or other Cornell community members would also be important. And she described that situations like this are very unique, and each would require individual consideration when being decided upon and whether to decline or withdraw from a partnership.

So I think this is a good example of how an issue that came up at a faculty senate meeting was sort of distilled to a resolution that we voted on, that was communicated to the president, who has then provided a response. She's going to be back here at the faculty senate in March, so if there were additional follow-ups that any members of the senate or faculty have, that would be a good time to bring them forward.

We are going to have a lot of sense of the senate stuff on the change of the makeup of the senate. Maybe before that, if there's any quick questions. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. First, I want to thank you for doing that sense of the senate resolution. I think it was really important, and I compliment you on that.

Secondly, I also just wanted to give a quick update. I took a look -- I think the sense of the senate resolution came out of faculty raising issues about the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and in particular the Cornell College of Business relationship with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Global Business College, which was raised in the senate, as well as by faculty in a letter.

So a quick update to people. I just today went to the Global Business College's website, and I saw that Cornell's no longer listed as a, "collaboration partner" -- that's been removed -- and that Cornell faculty are no longer listed in the faculty listing on that website. And so I wanted to say that I think that's a very good thing that the university did, that Cornell clearly took steps to remove those statements of those relationships.

And I often times criticize the unit, but I also want to say when it's appropriate, like now, I think the university administration did the right thing in doing that, given, just as a reminder, that the Global Business College in Saudi Arabia has as its clients the royal court of Saudi Arabia and the Saudi Arabian defense forces. So I'm glad the university did that.

And I also want to point out how important it is when we raise issues, because I think it's quite clear that the university was acting in a way that was responsive to the senate and faculty governance issues, so that when we raise these, sometimes we think these issues go into the ether somewhere, but I think this is an example of how important it is for us to do this.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you. I agree completely. Comment.

MICHAEL TOMLAN: Michael Tomlan again, chair of CAPP, CRP. I agree with all those comments, Chris. And as chair of CAPP, because we are reviewing the international associations of the university, I'd like a copy of this to be distributed to CAPP.

I also want the faculty, as a whole, to be aware of the fact that those of us in CAPP have been aware of failed efforts, international collaborations in the past and, as we've collected data

over the years, there have been as many failed initiatives -- in fact, more failed initiatives than there have been successes.

The reasons for this are many and varied, but they have a lot to do with the fact that the faculty who have become involved and, in many cases, have been impressed to duty by the deans at the time for whatever initiative, and that has led to failed experiments any number of times. So to second what it is that's just been said, I think is important. And going forward, if you have concerns about this issue, to make sure that we hear more about them.

Thank you.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you. And a copy of President Pollack's statement is available on the faculty website, as part of the agenda for today's meeting.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you. All right. Charles Van Loan, Dean of Faculty, would like to come up and talk about faculty representation of RTE folks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So where are we? This all started a little more than a year ago. Recall in the early fall, we had a committee, and they submitted a proposal. The UFC adopted it. It was a resolution, it was presented in November. Then there were concerns that were talked about last month. We have to end up with a final single plan that's going to be crystallized in the resolution. The idea is to get the best possible one, and that's what today is about. We are going to step through ten issues that sort of came up last -- in December and get a sense of how we feel about them.

A quick review of the original proposal. First of all, it defines the notion of university voting rights. It says who gets them, and it figures out who can come to the senate. University voting rights basically means you can come to the senate and you can participate in all usual elections. So that's the definition of having university voting rights, as opposed to college voting rights and department voting rights.

Here are all the academic title-holders. There are about 4,000. Those are the university faculty members; that is to say, the 1,600 tenure track faculty and the 600 emeriti. This is what we are calling the RTE faculty, research, teaching and extension. That number is about 2,100. When you subtract off visitors, adjuncts and things like that, you are left to a core group of about 1,100. And in the proposal that came out through the UFC, it is that group that we feel should receive university voting rights.

A key component of that proposal is a new notion, the notion of a college RTE senator. You visit each college and say how many voting RTE are there. There's an apportionment rule. That college gets that many senators to elect at large within the college, and you can see the numbers there. It's about 20.

This is what the senate would look like in the original proposal. A department can send anybody they want to the senate, university faculty member or an RTE faculty member. You have those 20 college seats, and then you also have a designated seat for the library, and an ex officio seat for the postdocs.

These are the concerns we talked about in December: First, the voice concern. Well, if we expand the senate, then university faculty have a diminished voice. There's the identity thing. RTE faculty, are you okay with the acronym? Are you okay with using faculty in that title?

Then the question of who amongst the RTE faculty receive university voting rights. And finally, the ratio concern, because theoretically, in the original proposal, five years from now, we could have nothing but, say, senior lecturers in the senate, so that's a concern. It's a theoretical possibility.

There are some nonconcerns. Everyone's okay with the library having a voting seat, everyone's okay with having postdocs a voting seat. So when we step through these issues and do these sense of the senate resolutions, there are some details that aren't going to show up,

and it's because they didn't seem to rise to the level of having to spend more time on that. But you can bring up anything, and let's talk about how we're going to do this.

So we're going to stage ten sense of the senate votes, and they come in clusters there. And let's talk about how we're going to do the voting. First of all, it's yes, no, abstain. Yes, if you think it's a good idea; no, if you think it's not a good idea; abstain, if you're neutral. You have a paper ballot here.

So we're going to step through these one by one. I'll tell you what the resolution is, the kind of thinking that says it's a good idea, the kind of thinking that says it's not a good idea, we'll discuss it, and then not vote in the sense, but we're going to sit here and count, because that would take too long. You can, over the course of this meeting, fill out that ballot.

And some of the questions are coupled. You may -- SOS 9 is coupled to SOS 5. You may want to wait and so on, but we'll just do a show of hands, just to see -- because we are all curious about how we feel about these things.

SPEAKER NELSON: Charlie, can we see who needs a ballot, just by a raise of hands.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. If you either feel you can't vote today because you want to go back and talk to your department or maybe your department isn't even here, you can submit this ballot online to me and just do it by the end of Friday. The ballot is online. You can download it. It's a Word document. Fill it in and send it here.

There's also room on there for comments. These will all be duly considered. The transcript in the next hour will be duly considered. The idea is to walk out of this with enough understanding, so that we can package up the best possible recommendation.

SOS 1, the acronym RTE. The thesis is that that is an inclusive acronym: Research, teaching and extension. If you look at the job descriptions of all those academic title-holders, you'll see that every one of them involves some mix of those responsibilities.

Also, it's an acronym that sort of tells you what the person does. If you say non-tenure track or academic associate, it doesn't give a clue what that person does. RTE, when I talk to an RTE faculty member, I'm talking to someone who does teaching and/or research and/or extension, so it's a reminder of these colleagues.

A reason to oppose it is that, you know, I think a faculty -- the tenure track faculty, we have to do all these things; whereas the RTE job descriptions are much more focused on either R or T or E.

Anyone want to talk about this SOS resolution?

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I just want to comment that I find RTE to be particularly unintuitive and would be far happier to see it simply spell out non-tenure track, and I don't find that confusing in the least.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a job description based on a negative definition, right.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto from Biological and Environmental Engineering. I'm going to have to disagree. I really quite like the RTE faculty designation, because it denotes it as being something different, but by not defining it by what it's not. It doesn't connote any lack of respect to that group of people. I think that's, for me, a pretty big deal.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any more discussion? So what we are assuming here now, people have enough information to weigh in on this. So why don't we have a show of hands.

MAUREEN HANSON: One more. I just wanted to add -- Maureen Hanson, Molecular Biology, and Genetics. Last time you challenged me to come up with a different name than RTE faculty, and the one that I just wanted to suggest, and it also pertains to Number 2, is rather than quibbling over whether we have clinical or librarian or non-tenure, why don't we just call these people academic members?

We have faculty members. We could have academic members. That's just my suggestion, as a possible name that is a little more intuitive perhaps than RTE and doesn't make us argue about these other aspects.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. So again, please, if you have comments, you can put those on your ballot or email them to us. Let's just have an approximate show of hands. How many are in favor of this SOS resolution?

And those who question it.

And those who are neutral about it.

Okay, so pretty clear majority is in favor of RTE, but there are five or six or seven in the other categories. So again, these show of hands is just, we are all curious. We'll see precisely how we feel after all the votes are collected. This is really a package thing, RTE faculty, but the focus is on the use of the word faculty.

So one possible definition -- these things are always kind of dangerous to do, but teaching and research on and off campus is what faculty do; and therefore, RTE faculty is the proper way to reference this group of colleagues.

One reason for favoring this is it stresses the common denominator between what the university faculty do and what the RTE faculty do. It does not distinguish between them in that regard.

A reason to -- Maureen brought up this other point; there are reasons for opposing it. Again, when I think of the Cornell faculty member, I think of this -- a person who has a breadth, works in all these sorts of different areas and whatever. These are highly coupled, SOS 1 and 2. Anyone want to add comments or comment on this particular choice of words?

Okay, so how about a show of hands. How many are okay in using the word faculty when talking about our RTE colleagues?

And how many are -- have an issue with -- or hesitate in using the word faculty?

And how many feel either way, it's okay, or neutral?

Again, a similar kind of ratio.

SOS 3. This group should be represented through the senate, instead of the Employee Assembly, which is currently the case. When we talked about this last December, the alternative is sort of have a separate senate. That would solve a lot of these tensions.

Reasons to support aligning RTE faculty with us is the idea that we solve hard problems or we address hard problems. You want everyone in the room. And also, when you think about what's the difference between RTE and university faculty, we now will have an occasion to exercise leadership outside of our own circle, which is important, so there's the advantage of that.

The separate RTE senate is appealing, because then you just have two groups and whatever. You can coordinate. There would be a little bit of an overhead there, but there's no worry, going back to the reason to support this is out of sight, out of mind; that there will always be these two senates. There's this one and that one. And yeah, sure, you can collaborate on joint ventures, but is that really going to happen.

Anyone want to further discuss the idea of aligning the RTE faculty with the senate? Incidentally, the Employee Assembly passed a resolution saying they think this is a good idea.

Okay, so again, show of hands. Everyone in favor of aligning the RTE faculty with this body. Good.

And anyone think it's a bad idea or want to do the two senate thing?

Okay, anyone neutral?

Okay, so again, pretty much the vast majority in favor of aligning. Two or three no's, two or three abstains.

Now, there's a triplet to consider now, and this has to do with who among the RTE faculty get voting rights, and it drops down to the three dominant tracks in this group. There's the research associate track, there's the extension associate track, and there's the lecturer track. Those are all two-tiered tracks.

Everyone, by default, seems okay with professor of the practice, research professor, clinical professor being part of the group. This discussion about do we draw a line somewhere through the middle of the RTE faculty focuses on these three tracks, and there are three possibilities.

The original one. The original proposal, the one that has been out there for a while that came through the UFC says yes to all six of these ranks. Lecturers, senior lecturers all have a place, all should receive university voting rights. Let's go to the other one, the senior-only version, when it says only the senior rank in these three tracks should have university voting rights.

Now, there's an in-between that I looked into because, simply, the discussion about how long have you been here and all that kind of thing came up, so I checked out with the people in Workday and whatever, because this is about staging elections. Can we pull it off?

And the answer is yes, you could draw the line this way: For example, a lecturer who's been in that position for three or more years should have university voting rights. So there are three options, and you could play with the three years and whatever, but that's the issue before us.

Here are the numbers, before we get to the pros and cons. So for an example, there are 140 lecturers, and 55 of them have been here in that position for three or more years, so you can see the totals there. Useful information.

Now let us step through these three options and talk about what we think about them. This is the original one. This is the option that says whether you're a lecturer or senior lecturer, you have university voting rights, and ditto for the extension and the research tracks.

Here's how you can sort of think about it. It's simple, it's fully inclusive, you can trust the units to pick the right individuals. So for example, it's probably pretty unlikely that a research associate who's been here for one year wants to do this or would even think about doing it in a pool where there might be, say, researchers who have -- senior researchers and so on. It's an unnecessary -- it's a natural filter out there, the natural selection or whatever you want to say, that we don't have to worry about this.

The reasons against that have to do with this, and there's tremendous variation across campus. So don't draw wrong conclusions, but in general, the level of vetting for those titles is much less than for the senior titles, so that's kind of a concern. And also, all right, I'm the senior lecturer, I worked hard to get that. You should have a fringe benefit, such as being able to serve in the faculty senate. That's the kind of stuff we talk about.

Now, let's pause and discuss this.

THOMAS BJÖRKMAN: Thomas Björkman, Horticulture. I'm in a department that has all six of those ranks in it, so I polled the department, thinking it would be an interesting case, example. And we're also a department where the people at the senior level are hired by the department after a search, and we pretty much treat them as regular faculty anyway, where the lower ranks are hired by individual faculty to work in their programs. So a research associate is sort of a super-postdoc, and everybody thinks the senior people should be in -- every constituency thought that's a good idea.

When it comes to the lower rank, the people in that rank didn't respond, which kind of fits with the idea that they're not really engaged enough to care about it. And the senior people

thought that that deluded their constituents, and they preferred that the junior ranks not be in it, for that reason.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. We already rely on the units to filter the faculty members of the faculty senate in some fashion, and I don't see any reason not to rely on the units to filter the RTE members the same way.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. So by analogy, how we deal with the assistant, associate and full professors, we don't legislate. It just sort of happens in the best way. Maureen.

MAUREEN HANSON: Maureen Hanson, Molecular Biology and Genetics. I'd actually like to respond to that. I can hire any research associate that I want, without any input from my department. So the lower levels, as we just heard about, are very different than the higher levels. So just to represent my own department's comments from the people who did comment is that they also are fine with the senior titles having voting rights.

And I would like to clarify; we are now talking about voting rights, not service in the senate --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's correct.

MAUREEN HANSON: So we're talking about voting rights. And everyone felt that was fine. But to have a postdoc who's now been promoted to research associate or even just been hired from somewhere else, arriving here in their first month, being able to vote on the dean of the faculty and the trustees, et cetera, people who spoke to me about it felt that was inappropriate.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. Maureen, we had exactly the same conversation in my department as well, and we felt that the people who do have voting rights should have some level of commitment to the university. And we, again, thought that those junior levels at the research associates just don't have that. But thinking back along -- on my own history at Cornell, the people who were senior research associates were often truly outstanding people academically, and we think that we should afford them the respect of giving them voting rights too.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering, again. I take back my comment, based on what you said; because seriously, I was thinking serving in the senate. I wasn't thinking university voting rights. So the filtering wouldn't take place that I was thinking about for voting rights, so I take back my earlier comment. I know it will appear in the minutes, nonetheless.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Because these are so coupled, let me go to the other one, which is the senior-only option. You might say, well, what do we need this here for, because we just vote no on the other one, but you could be in favor of both of them or okay with both of them or not okay with either of them.

But something to bring up here is that -- again, just as a reminder, and it's not entirely a hollow promise, but years from now, it will be wired into the resolution that we look at things again, and we can very easily go from the senior version to the full version at that time. So I think we want to have a little bit of reticence about rolling this out, see how it plays.

And also, we must remember that if you are a lecturer, you have a channel to the senate in two ways: First of all, small print, everyone will be welcome here. Right now, it's all faculty. Now it will be all RTE faculty as well, so there's a channel here. And also, in your unit, there are going to be your senior colleagues in your track, and you have a real communication channel there, so that's an important point to bring up.

Anyway, continuing the discussion on these -- the extreme of these three options.

JUDITH PERAINO: Judith Peraino, in Music. I wanted to point out the senior-only option doesn't appear on the paper ballot.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's 6.

JUDITH PERAINO: No. 6 has research associates, lecturer and extension associates should not have university voting rights.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right, it's a negative way of saying this, right?

JUDITH PERAINO: But it doesn't specify seniors, which is according to what I understand in my department, what we would favor as the senior-only option. We also have a patchwork of lecturers hired in various ways and various types of contracts, many extending over three years, but not necessarily engaged in the same types of academic investments that the senior lecturers are.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So your first point is SAS 6, it isn't stated clearly there. That is the senior-only option.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, since senior is absent from it, I guess I'm --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: SOS 6 means you are in favor of the senior option. Another way of saying that is you are not in favor of lecturers and the bottom rung of the tracks.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. As I listen to the argument for senior-only, I'm more and more troubled by what I'm hearing as a slightly condescending tone towards the ability of junior people to make a judgment about whether they're stakeholders and a presumption they would vote randomly.

And I want to argue that respect for this group would suggest that we trust them to vote intelligently. They're colleagues, teaching the students here. There may be situations where there are stakeholders in a question that arises, as an academic issue, would come before the senate and their vote would be highly relevant and they are impacted by the outcome. And I'm less and less convinced this senior-only argument holds water.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So we can continue the discussion, let me just go to the mixed option. So although it's possible, I checked with Workday. The assembly office runs elections, it would be possible to do this, but it's a little bit complicated. And I can sort of sense that there might be more fuzzy cases, more how come I'm -- I started in January or June, but attempts to address this. So let's continue the discussion of these three options more, just more comments on these.

CARL FRANCK: Carl Franck, Physics. This is a personal expression, because I haven't done due diligence for my department, but I do abide by the comment that was just made. And I'm very concerned about lack of representation and voting rights, so I favor the "all" option.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just a note, not that we've canvassed every single university, but I don't think anybody would have the "all" option. It's almost always -- if this all goes through, we'll be pretty much out there, in terms of representing this group.

Questions back up there?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I want to agree with the last two comments. I think that if we're going to be democratic, we should be democratic and not assume that people without the senior rank are not committed to their jobs.

I hope that all colleges vote, that they have elections for people who are in the senate, as opposed to appointing them. And it seems to me that taking an election seriously can take that into account as well; that is somebody that really does have enough experience and somebody that people view as individuals who belong in the senate. So I totally agree with that.

And I just have one other question, and I may have missed this at some other meeting, but I did want to just confirm -- well, you've got the professor of the practice and research professor in there. Is that something we're voting on as part of this process, or are people with

those titles already covered as university faculty? Because I'm looking at the bylaws, and the bylaws just say titles.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: First of all, professor of the practice, three of those professor titles were approved in the mid-2000s. They are not university faculty members. My reading and talking to people in the last half year and the December meeting is that everyone is comfortable with those first three titleholders being given university voting rights. Does that answer your question?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: No, not exactly. Is the reason we're -- we're not voting on those titles because of the perception that people are in favor of it, and that's why --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The number of permutations, the number of different possibilities could get out of hand pretty quickly, so in common to all three of these -- those five ranks at the top are common to all the proposals. My reading is that the controversy or the debate focuses on these three tracks at the bottom.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So ultimately, though, the final vote, when we finally get there, will be for all of --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. If you feel that no lecturer --

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I don't. I'm just trying to figure out what we're voting on.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have to cut down on the search space. There's so many possibilities. If you feel that none of these options is okay and you want to exclude all lecturers, for example, you could just write that on the back as a comment and it will be considered; but my assessment, and I think you probably agree, based on what we talked about in December, this didn't even come up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: All I'm saying is that ultimately it seems like we are moving toward a final vote on something. Not today, so that I wanted to be clear on what that final vote --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: No. The idea here -- what's the collective wisdom of the senate. We are going to gauge that through these ten votes. We are then -- UFC, which is the sponsor of the resolution, will then put forth in their best way of thinking the strongest proposal, the one that captures how we think.

That's in March.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Right. That's what I'm saying.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: How about the back up there, Hakim.

HAKIM WEATHERSPOON: Hakim Weatherspoon, Computer Science. I just want to clarify this Number 6. So should we correct this on paper to say senior-only option?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. I guess I'm sorry -- it is confusing, but it is the senior-only version. And a way of saying it is that you're excluding lecturers, extension associates and research associates, the bottom rung of these three tracks. It's a synonym, but I think it would have been better to say this is the senior-only option.

Remember, in this category, there are three options. There's no need to gain theoretic thing here. We are just trying to figure out how you think. Maybe you're neutral in all regards, saying they're all okay, or maybe you don't like any of them. So the three options are, again, 4, 5 and 6. Everybody, the three-year thing, and the senior thing. That's 4, 5 and 6.

Continued discussion. Over here. Doug?

DOUG ANTCZAK: Doug Antczak, Microbiology and Immunology. If we vote -- if we approve of SOS 6, will the junior RTE individuals have any representation? Will they go back to the assembly or will they be not represented?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You might think well, we should -- the whole group would come over here regardless, but think about what does representation in the EA mean? Well, it means

two things. It is an assembly that never, ever considers academic matters. Oh, you can vote for the employee trustee.

I can tell you right now, that trustee, in the history of Cornell, has never brought up an academic issue with the board. There are 8,000 employees with zillions of important concerns, so yeah, looks like we're subtracting some stuff; but again, I would maintain that there's a channel -- a lecturer can come and speak up at any of these meetings.

And also, you have to assume there's a culture in a department, where they talk to RTE faculty members who may be here, so that's the positive side, but will not vote, yeah.

MAUREEN HANSON: Maureen Hanson, Molecular Biology, Genetics. What Doug was saying is what I wanted to clarify. I think people are getting confused as to what 4, 5 and 6 means. We're not saying you're not represented by the senate if you vote for the senior option, that we're not representing the research associates, the lecturers. I think that's what the confusion is. We're now only voting on the university voting rights, not whether they're represented in the senate.

And I'd also like to say that people in my department and I don't have any lack of respect for the intelligence of the research associates, the lecturers, et cetera. What we're commenting about is their experience of Cornell and how long they've been here.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, so let's -- maybe one or two more questions, and then move on to the last.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman again. I'll just observe that we don't impose such a restriction on a first-year faculty member. They get a voting right immediately. I wanted to pop way back to Risa, who asked for clarification. I actually was involved in drafting three of the four of the first titles, and the situation was that we authorized individual units, colleges, to allow voting in the college, but we didn't consider this question of voting in the faculty -- in the unit faculty, so that's the answer to your question.

CARL FRANCK: This is Carl Franck again. I should have said enfranchisement, not representation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any new angle to this -- and remember, this is sense of the senate. It's not like we're locked in this forever. The idea is to figure out what's most likely to pass, that kind of thing.

LINDA NICHOLSON: Linda Nicholson, Molecular Biology and Genetics. You showed a table that had some numbers in it, in terms of how many senior -- there we go. So you're saying there's no senior-only research associates? Am I misreading that?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: If we do the senior-only option, third column, there will be no research associates. That's why this is zero.

LINDA NICHOLSON: Okay, and the same; there are no senior lecturers?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: No. If we do the senior-only option, then there are 122 senior lecturers out there who have university voting rights.

Incidentally, whatever option's picked, it won't change the college RTE thing. It goes from 20 to 18, if you go in small number. That's not going to be a -- so to repeat, and when I go back, I will clarify the ballot to clear up this confusion.

So again, we'll talk about 4, 5 and 6, and it's all about whether or not lecturers, extension associates and research associates have university voting rights. They are in the original option, everybody. In the mixed option, you have to be in your slot for at least three years. In the senior-only, we only consider the senior ranks. We only give university voting rights to those in the senior ranks of those tracks.

And now we go on to 7, 8 and 9. And this has to do with who can come to the senate.

SPEAKER NELSON: Can we vote, while it's in our --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Sorry. This is the show of hands thing. Everybody can come; how many are in favor of that?

This is everybody can come. Sorry. Everybody can vote, sorry.

Abstain? Or against?

So slightly more are against.

The mixed, anyone in favor?

Against? Neutral?

Kind of split all the ways.

And now this is senior-only. You think this is a good idea. In favor.

Not in favor.

It's pretty even.

And then abstain.

We're sort of at quorum, maybe around 50 people or so, so we'll see what happens there.

Now we go on to this triplet, and this has to do with you're in a department, you have voting rights -- sorry. You're in the department. What can the department do. So in the original one, we basically said let's pretend we're talking to the chair, although these should be by secret ballot elections. It's in the bylaws. And when we walk out of this, that's going to be stressed. It's very important that these selection procedures in the departments are done properly.

Anyway, in the original thing, anybody can come. In what we call modified 1 -- so anybody can come, and we also have the college RTE scene. And I'm nervous, because we could have a solid RTE senate, so now let's look at some options that control that ratio.

Modified 1, you can only send university faculty to the senate. So it's just like now, sort of like now, only we are going to add these 20 college RTE slots. So that would keep the ratio 7-3, whatever, depends on some of the numbers, but that enforces a ratio. And that was one of the concerns talked about in December. So modified 1 does it this way.

Modified 2 was suggested by Chris Schaffer. When I first told it to him, I said whoa, but it actually has some strong merits that we'll talk about. Here's how it works, and we'll elaborate. Every department gets one more senator. That's A. And B, at most, one of those senators can be RTE, so that enforces a ratio. It obviously grows the senate.

In a nutshell, those are the three options to look at. In that last one, no college RTE. Everything sits in the department. Let's go through them, pros and cons. The idea here, then -- well, the basic rule is if you have more than 25 TT in your department, you get a second senator, and the senator can be either a university faculty member or an RTE faculty member. And then, there in the bottom are the rules about the college RTEs.

This is total freedom to the departments. You can send either an RTE or TT. That's why there's no control on the ratio. There was discussion last time about natural forces, and I think it was kind of a buy-in, but what are those natural forces 20 years from now or ten years from now.

You're trusting the units to make the right decision. There's no reason to expect a decline in tenure track interest in shared governance; but then, you might be nervous about future trends. And also, there's a forum thing that was brought up about the expanded senate. We have a hard enough time now getting the 50. What if we do this, and so on. So those are the pros and cons for the original proposal.

The second one is just like now, only we have those college RTE slots. So you're a senior lecturer in a department, you can't be that department's senator, but you can throw your hat in the ring. And your college will stage an election, and you could get into the senate that way. Pros and cons. So it addresses the ratio thing.

Here's some negatives. The department is your home, and you want to affect that culture, if you want to affect that culture. This kind of removes that whole issue, puts it off on the colleges, so there's not going to be an opportunity in a department to talk about this. There will be less of an opportunity to intermingle RTE and tenure track faculty, so that's a reason for hesitating.

Let me step through the discussion and go back. Here's the modified 2 option. Every department gets two senators, and you get three, if that inequality holds. And then this rule, you could state it a couple of ways, at least half of your senators have to be tenure track or, at most, one of your senators is RTE. There are no college RTE seats.

And because the senate will grow from about 100 to 170, new quorum rule, based on how many departments are here. 72 departments. If 36 are represented, you are in business, and that has a lot of fringe benefits.

So for example, think about how we use alternates now. Most departments don't bother doing alternates. But hey, I'm busy this week, now the alternate comes. Now you have this pool of two or three senators, same mechanism. You can all vote and you'll all come, if we are going to vote on consensual relationship policy; but if it's a general chitchat setting, you say hey, I'm busy, you go.

So in a way, in a curious way, I think you might decrease the workload of serving in a senate. The key thing is a channel, a channel from the senate to the department, and you don't necessarily need three people or two people there to do that.

What about the chair? Oh, now I got to find three senators. Okay, well, a couple of things: That extra seat could go to an RTE faculty member, so that's kind of a nice little forcing function in there that would encourage RTE involvement at the department level.

Anyway, so those are some of the positives there. But again, you sort of do a double take. Wow, the senate size 170, so takes a while to get your head around that, but maybe it isn't something to worry about. You always worry about the expansion of bureaucracy and all that kind of stuff, but I listed out some positives of this approach.

The negative is just that. It's going to be a bigger body, harder to get consensus, more whatever, but if you want to force a debate, maybe it's a good thing.

Anyway, there are the three options for who a department can send to the senate or how you can serve in the senate. Let's talk about them.

Yeah.

BOB KARPMAN: Bob Karpman, member-at-large. Just a clarification. Can you vote on an RTE who is not a voting RTE, or do you have to include voting RTE representative?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: All the RTEs you see here should be prefaced by voting RTE members.

BOB KARPMAN: Okay, so that would change, depending on the decision --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Associate Dean of the Faculty. One comment I have is with the idea of college-wide elections of RTE faculty to the senate. My impression, certainly, from my own units and from RTE faculty that I know is that their affinity is typically much more tied to a department than it is to their college, and so asking them to be representatives of the college is a bit unfair.

They really should be representatives of their department. And so schemes that try to bring them in at the college level, I don't think, are going to produce as useful a body as schemes that aim to bring them in at the department level, whether it be this final one that we've proposed here or something else.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I should mention the committee, when we talked about this, the idea was as you go across campus, each college has a different view of the RTE group; and therefore, it would be nice to have a cohesive representation of that. But clearly, if we go this route, all the arts RTE faculty can certainly get together and talk about issues peculiar to their college.

RHONDA GILMORE: Rhonda Gilmore, Design and Environmental Analysis. My sense is that this body has a goal of representing a diverse group, because that's what the faculty is; and so if you don't allow the RTE to be -- if you don't allow SOS 7, then you're shutting the door to diversity, I feel, and that the opinions that the RTE will bring are very different than someone on the tenure track or who has had tenure for 20 years. They're very different opinions, and I think both of those need to come to the floor of the senate.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: To be clear, you like the existence of the college RTE thing, because independent of your department's culture, you have a path here; whereas -- like we have three senators and maybe the culture is that we'll send three tenure track faculty, so you like the idea of the college RTEs for that reason?

RHONDA GILMORE: Yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Neil.

NEIL SACCAMANO: Neil Saccamano, English. I'm also interested in how the RTE will be represented if you have a department like the English Department, where we only have two or three, and so I'm not sure if a department-only selection of RTEs would work in our case.

Again, I agree that I think there's probably commitment and familiarity with the departmental culture than there is with college-wide culture; but on the other hand, under -- the English department made a decision many, many years ago to try to not hire lecturers. We try to do as much as we could to have ladder faculty and only keep faculty lecturers who we could give senior lecturer status to, so we don't have a pool of lecturers to choose from in order to send them to the faculty senate. I'm curious about what happens in departments like ours.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think what you are saying is if a department has very few voting RTE faculty members, what happens. That's a very valid concern.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. I really hear those points that were just raised. I think at the end of the day, this exercise is all about increasing respect and representation of sort of a broader body of the university -- of the tenure track and RTE faculty, and I think for that reason, I'm very much in favor of SOS 9.

I think this concern that you raised about SOS 7, about the forcing functions on the time availability of the tenure track faculty, if we look at the trajectory of those right now, it seems that their time to participate in bodies like this will only decrease. And 20 years from now, I could quite easily imagine a body that was composed largely of RTE faculty, because the tenure track faculty said we haven't got the time for this, and it would cease to be a representative body in that sense.

I really agree with Chris that I think most people have an affinity for their department and not their college. I could not tell you the culture of my college. I could tell you the culture of my department, so I very much -- I really like option 9, because of that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Other comments? No one says -- I mean, you could leave your seat vacant. There are a handful of departments now that leave their seat vacant, so if you go from two to three, like in English, and if there's no interest in filling that seat, nothing says you have to. That's another -- I think this long-term trend thing is kind of important, because we are talking about the profession and what's best for it.

Yeah, Tracy.

TRACY STOKOL: Tracy Stokol from Pop Med and Diagnostic Sciences. One of the faculty in my department actually said to me, which I thought was insightful, let's do the middle of the road right now, because changing things in the senate, it's very hard to unchange them.

I know you said there was a way to do it, Charlie, but it's next to impossible and you really have to have a will to do it. So for that reason, that person preferred option 8, because it's a step in the right direction, but it's not going whole hog and increasing the quorum in the senate and it's not raising the chance that there would be minimal tenure track representation in the senate, which is not true of any other university at this point.

So that's why that person advocated for that as the middle of the road option. So let's not blow things up was the comment, and I thought that was a pretty insightful comment.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: In terms of let's try something and then maybe kick it up a notch, if you started with 1, and then you could go to the original after that, or to the model -- you could go to the original and, if this big trend happened, then you could switch to modified 2. So there is a path here, if you want to think about being a more steady ratcheting up of the representation.

JUDITH PERAINO: Judith Peraino, Music. I think one reason I like the modified 1 is that I'm a little worried about if we go to modified 2, that lecturers wouldn't feel that they could say no to a chair who's asked them to do a specific service.

And there's an increased burden of effort on these, especially if we are going with the senior lecturer option or people who are engaged quite heavily in the department, but aren't paid at the level of a tenure track professor, where service is expected at a certain higher proportion of time. So I wouldn't want to see this become kind of coercive or a point of anxiety for lecturers who are having to come up for contracts every three years, every five years.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: A good point; but for example, if I was a senior lecturer and my five-year thing is ending next year, I have -- I could say I can't serve in the senate, because I don't know what's going to happen, but it's a good point.

SPEAKER NELSON: I just would like to ask -- Charlie signaled me he would like to extend this conversation a few more minutes. Does anybody move to extend the length of the meeting? Would anyone be willing to do that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion to extend by ten minutes.

SPEAKER NELSON: Does anybody second the motion?

Let's all just have a quick vote. All in favor of extending the meeting for ten minutes.

(Ayes.)

SPEAKER NELSON: All those opposed?

All right, thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Are we ready to do -- again, you can send -- if you want to think about it, talk to your colleagues about it, that's fine. You have a couple of days to do that; but right now, why don't we do our show of hands thing on these three.

So how many are supportive of the original plan? This means you can send anybody to the senate, if you're in the department, and we have the college RTE scene. How many support that?

How many do not support that?

And how many are neutral about it?

So it's pretty split.

Modified 1, it's just like today, only we add in the college RTE dynamic. How many support this idea?

How many are opposed to that idea?

And how many are neutral?

Fair majority for it, and so on.

Modified 2. This is everybody gets an extra senator. You can send at most one RTE, and there are no college senators. How many support this idea?

How many do not support this idea?

And how many are neutral?

So the center of gravity for that is more on the opposed side.

The last one -- all these are coupled, but the last one has to do with something we already have now. We have nine university at-large senate seats. The small print says three of them are reserved for assistant professors. Now, we are going to still have these nine seats, but here's another option. We designate them -- three for tenure track, three for assistant professors and three for RTE faculty with voting rights.

So this does give you a channel, if you are in a department and it doesn't seem that you are going to be able to be in the senate, but you want to be, that would be an option. So we have these elections and they are in the spring and, roughly, every year three of them would be up for grabs, so that would be a plan here for the university at-large seats. And the reason for it, well, it gives an opportunity for different types of faculty to serve in the senate, independent of their department.

The other one here is don't designate to the seats. Have the nine, but let anyone run for them. So the hesitation with that is that you have a professor well-known across campus, and the senior lecturer maybe known more locally wouldn't, quote, stand a chance.

So the thing here, then, is do you feel -- well, there's the options. Talk about this option. Again, designating some seats for the RTE faculty versus just making it up for grabs. There are obviously other options, but you could bring them up in your comments now or on your ballot.

CARL FRANCK: Carl Franck, Physics. This was the one issue that really meant something to us, and it was this issue over the representation from centers, because we have Wilson Lab and other things. So for Physics, that mattered. And for that reason, I feel it's a good idea in the first place, but I also feel obliged to express that strong favor for representation of people who are in centers.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. There are 100 researchers out in the centers who are not affiliated with departments in a formal sense, and this would give them a channel.

Buz.

BUZ BARSTO: Carl, I'm going to have to second you there. Like Wilson Lab is truly a center of excellence, of research, and I think those people really need -- deserve representation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So we can end on time with this. So the question now, just do a show of hands, how many are in favor of this three-three-three rule for the at-large seats, at-large at the university level? How many support this?

How many don't support it, a/k/a, anyone can vote kind of thing, anyone can run.

Then neutral. You are okay either way.

Substantial number are in favor of the three-three-three.

My wrap-up slide. Oops. Just a reminder -- well, just a reminder that you can leave your ballot now. You can email it to our office, as long as you do it by Friday. And remember, this is just a sense of the senate, taking all this information and then producing something that most of us will be happy with. Thanks.

SPEAKER NELSON: The meeting is now adjourned.