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

THE SPEAKER: Okay, we are going to start the meeting. If I could just have everyone's attention. We have a lot to accomplish, and so starting on time is kind of key to getting it all done. My name is Sam Nelson. I'm the speaker from ILR. I would call to approve the minutes at this time, but it doesn't look like we have quorum, so I'm just going to maybe do that at the end. Hopefully more people will show up.

So I call the meeting to order. I would like to remind the body that senators have priority in speaking and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote.

I also want to ask the senators to identify themselves and their department when they speak and wait for the microphone, please. And finally, I'd like to suggest a maximum speaking time of two minutes. Of course, we're very lenient in enforcing this, but Michael Gold from ILR is our parliamentarian, and he will have -- he has a large timer up there that he will hold up that you can look to sort of self-monitor yourself in terms of your speaking length.

Without further ado, I'd like to call Charlie Van Loan, dean of faculty, to make announcements.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Sam. Just really very brief, so we have some upcoming elections. These are university-wide elections, and one is for the associate dean -- these are all three-year appointments. We have two seats on the University Faculty Committee, two on the Nominations and Election Committee, and two of the nine senator-at-large seats are vacant. That last item might be adjusted, depending on how things play out, but there are two seats there.

You will hear more about this officially via Chris and the Nominations and Election Committee, who oversees this, but if you can think of people, maybe yourself, who would be interested in these positions, let us know.

After Martha speaks, we'll return to this topic for like the fifth time, which is good. It's been highly vetted, and I think a model process of getting -- proposing things, getting feedback and modifying what you have to say, so we're going to try to push this to the next level, if possible, but let's be clear on a couple of things.

Again, we'll step through the revised proposal. There's a hand out-that has it written down explicitly. We'll step through very carefully, asking at every step if the people would like to propose an amendment or just general questions, make sure everybody understands what we are proposing.

If we get through all this with no approved amendments or motions to postpone, then we'll launch a vote like we did last week or last month, where you can vote right here. There will be paper ballots, we'll distribute them and we'll go into a one-week e-ballot sort of thing.

Again, don't hesitate -- if you feel rushed or that you need more time -- and remember, there would be a week where you could talk to your colleagues and the department about this, but that's sort of what the process will look like.

Having said that, Mary will talk about sort of the core value initiative. Mary is the Vice President for Human Resources.

MARY OPPERMAN: Thank you, everyone, for having me. I appreciate this time with you today. I wanted to go through the core values process that we are in the midst of right now, and the purpose of my being here is to collect your thoughts and comments about the values of Cornell University.

So once I go through this very briefly, I'm going to ask you to think of and share with me key words or phrases that you feel should be considered in the core values of the university, but just very quickly, most of us have an idea of core values, and I should stop here and say we are doing this because both the Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate and the Provost's Committee on Faculty Diversity recommended that the university develop a set of core values.

And you have seen these. Right? Have they seen these? Okay, so I'm going to go through these rather quickly; but basically, the foundation, the core values are foundational. They don't tend to change, they deal a lot with how we govern our relationships, what's important to the institution. They clarify who we are.

Most importantly, they actually help us make decisions, so you turn to your core values oftentimes when you're faced with a difficult decision, and these help guide your choices. I have a few of these up. I think this may be an older version of this, but I have a few of these I will just show you very briefly.

These are the core values of the University of Texas at Austin. You can see that they have six values and then short descriptions underneath them. The Harvard University has four: Respect for the rights, differences and dignity of others; honesty and integrity in all dealings; conscientious pursuit of excellence in one's work; accountability for actions and conduct in the workplace. So they have those four.

And yeah, I'm sorry. I know, I know. I just need to apologize. My computer crashed yesterday, and so I -- it's amazing I found the room, so there was a different set of them. I apologize. Southwest Airlines, I realize that this is not a university, but the value of these is that one of the things that we hear often is that core values, if you're not careful, could be anybody's core values. You'll hear excellence and breadth of knowledge or discovery, engagement, things like that; very, very good, but sometimes feel like they could kind of be anybody's.

So as I've gone around to the different assemblies and talked to students, faculty and staff, one of the things that has come through is if we're going to do core values, make them Cornell's. And so I show this only because these are very much Southwest's values. And if you've ever flown on them, you'll see aspects of these values in the way they treat you as a customer.

The next steps I wanted to quickly explain, we're having discussions with all of the assemblies. I've met with the UFC, and now I'm here to talk with all of you. I already met with all the other assemblies and also some student groups, additional student groups, and Martha's had some comments with small groups of faculty as well.

We're taking all that we get from all of you and creating theme areas from which we will create a draft set of core values. Those values will -- those drafts will be posted on the university website, and everyone will be made aware they are there for public comment. We'll also hold a couple of listening sessions for people who would rather give their comments in person. We'll take all those comments and, hopefully from there, create the final draft of the values, and we intend to be done this semester.

That's all I had. And now I'd really like to turn it over to all of you. And I don't know how you do this, but I need to take the notes, so if someone could call on people, I'm just going to write down what you say, so I'm sure I capture your discussions here. And here we're looking for key words and phrases that you feel are representative of Cornell's core values.

KEN BIRMAN: I would very much like to see academic freedom in the spirit of the Cornell motto identified as one of our core values. I could say more, but hopefully that's enough for everyone in this room.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Integrity and freedom, those two words. David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering.

MARY OPPERMAN: Just to clarify for my notes, are those two different ones, or do you want --

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Two different ones.

TIM DEVOOGD: Tim DeVoogd, Psychology. I'd like to see this elaborated as consciously and explicitly following from any person, any study.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski in English. What about freedom with responsibility? What is that phrase? It's a good one.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. I'd really like to see something about the sort of the immense -- this is the privilege of the position that we're in as faculty and as researchers here at Cornell, and the responsibility to use it to do something meaningful. I don't know quite how to phrase that articulately. I hope you can do that.

I'd also like, coming to this issue of sort of stuff that's unique to Cornell, I'd really like to see some recognition of the sort of commitment to excellence and craftsmanship that many of the -- especially the support staff have. You think people at CHESS, machinists; you might see, say, in physics, chemistry, things like that.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I want to second the academic freedom suggestion and raise a couple other things. One is following what we just heard. I think the value of the public mission of the university captures what was stated in terms of doing things that contribute to the public good, so we got public mission, public good, public interest, all of which capture that.

I'd also identify shared governance and inclusivity in many ways, including through shared governance. And as Ken said, there's a lot more that can be said about those terms, but I think most people are familiar with that, so I won't go into it any more.

The other thing I would just recommend as well is that through the Codes and Judicial Committee, we had a working group on hate speech and harassment, and one of the things in our report that we addressed was this issue of working on the kind of mission statement that's already in the campus code, so I hope that you all are looking at that working group report.

MARY OPPERMAN: Is that now, or was that before?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: We completed it last year. So I can send it to you, but it should be on the website. Yes.

And then also, just a question, Mary, and this might be something you provided already, but could you identify who's on the committee that's drafting this?

MARY OPPERMAN: So the way we are doing this, not through a committee, so it's through exactly this: I've gone through and I'm taking notes every place we go. And then the goal is to -- I'll probably work -- the president will pull together a draft.

The best way to create values that live in the community's actually to have the whole community get an opportunity to opine on them. So once we get that draft up, it's really the conversation that occurs after that occurred to get to the draft, and then occurs after the draft that helps us create a community buy-in.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Right, I understand. I would just suggest that -- I mean, somebody's got to draft it, right, and so it seems to me that it's great you are doing the broad community participation, but that you also have representatives from all parts of the community also working on the actual drafting. I think that's a good approach.

MARY OPPERMAN: I think it's a great idea. I'm not sure we have time, but thank you.

CARL FRANCK: Carl Franck, Physics. Something that is uniquely Cornell would somehow mention the public-private hybrid that we are.

THOMAS BJÖRKMAN: Thomas Björkman, Horticulture. This is sort of a corollary of the any person, any study, is that the resulting diversity is really a source of a lot of our strength and competitive advantage, producing value.

BOB KARPMAN: Bob Karpman, member-at-large. I would consider adding community engagement and also global sustainability.

DENNIS MILLER: Dennis Miller, Food Science. This has been articulated a number of times already, but I think we should explicitly state that we are a land grant institution.

RHONDA GILMORE: Rhonda Gilmore, Design and Environmental Analysis. Thank you for doing this, by the way. Hi, Mary. Thank you for doing this, number one.

Number two, very simply, a commitment to the human condition.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Chelsea Specht, School of Integrated Plant Sciences and Plant Biology. I also want to third, I think now, the any person, any study kind of working off of that. On the any person side, I think we need to include accessibility, diversity and inclusion. Inclusion's already been mentioned, and also engagement. Somehow the word engagement seems to be Cornell. I know there's also Cornell Engage, but whatever, engagement. And activism is another one that I'd like to sort of play around with too.

MARY OPPERMAN: Can you just say a little more about activism?

CHELSEA SPECHT: Just activism seems like something that could be played around with as well, and maybe even on the lines of any study, as we broaden the types of studies that we're engaged with.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you. Joanie Mackowski in English. Activism, any person, any study, say physical study. I mean, we've got PE here. Not all schools do. And I'm thinking the wine tasting classes. The study is not just cerebration, but kind of the physical immersion, whole being kind of thing.

CHARLIE WALCOTT: Charlie Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior. I would suggest, and it's been partly commented on, but integrity and honesty. I think of the most recent difficulties at some other universities. It seems to me it's important to have those basic virtues.

MARY OPPERMAN: Thank you all very much. Oh, sorry.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I wonder if we could make some allusion to the impact through external engagement mission of Cornell New York Tech. And here on campus, we don't think about that as much, but it's a very big thing for them. And it's becoming an issue here in Ithaca as well that we do work that has impact. And it's impactful because we actually work with the stakeholders in different forms, not always entrepreneurial.

MARY OPPERMAN: Thank you all very much.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Martha.

MARTHA POLLACK: It seems like such a solemn feel, you should come up here and tell a joke, but you guys don't want to hear my jokes. I do want to start with a few updates, and then as always, go to questions. One thing I certainly want to mention, because I know it's on everybody's mind, and Charlie just eluded to it, is all the scandals that we've seen over the past 24 hours.

As far as I know, it is our belief that we have good guardrails in place to prevent this kind of thing at Cornell. We are nonetheless doing what I think is the responsible thing to do, which is look at every aspect of our admissions procedure to make sure that those guardrails are in place.

I will say one I don't think ever could have anticipated that I would have a coach that would say you have a player on the team and they are not actually on the team. I mean, in an institution the size of this institution, there are many, many, many employees and many faculty and many students. And so if you have a bad actor, you have a bad actor, but it is my belief at

this point that we do have guardrails in place, and I don't -- we will do a very careful review, but I don't see a problem at this point.

So here's the thing. I want to give you a very quick update of what I've been up to. I want to give you an update on the situation in Washington, real mini-update on some initiatives, and then respond to some of the questions that you sent in in advance and open to further questions.

So all I really want to say about what I've been up to, because I get this -- every time I come here, I'm spending a lot of time trying to stay in touch with all of our stakeholders and students, just a variety of ways. I spoke at Keeton House, and actually going tonight to Flora Rose House, have these wonderful conversations in this living room setting about the future of higher education. And our students have really interesting views on that.

Regular meetings with student leaders, with the student leaders in the diversity and inclusion areas, with the "Daily Sun" editorial board. I gave a lecture in computer science last semester that would have been a lot of fun, except for those -- where's Ken? Ken's in the back somewhere. There were like -- it was in the Statler Auditorium. It wasn't really like teaching. I could have videotaped it, so that was unfortunate, but that's the life of computer science.

I'm sorry?

I have been making a number of departmental visits. Late in the fall, I visited with the Humanities faculty and the Biological and Chemical Biology Department. The provost and I literally just came from meeting with the faculty in Material Science and Engineering.

I enjoy these department visits, so -- scheduling is a bit of a challenge, because I'm on the road a lot, trying to raise money, but if your department would like to invite me, I'd love to come and do a departmental visit with all of you. And I'm continuing to have dinners at my house. There's a lot of faculty, so it's going to be a long time before I get through everybody, but with random groups of ten to twelve faculty, really just have a heart-to-heart about what's on people's minds.

And then in terms of alumni out on the road with campaign consultation, we are in the quiet face of our campaign. I'll come back to that in a minute. Regional meetings, I am about to go out to California for CSV Cornell and Silicon Valley. I was in China meeting with our really wonderful engaged Chinese alumni at the end of the last year, and assembly meetings, so a lot of attempt to stay in touch with constituents.

Washington, D.C., there are real challenges for us, including the continued slow pace of appointments, although I have to say continuity in the NIAS, NIH leadership has been very helpful to us. You all probably saw President Trump's proposed budget. It is terrible for higher education. It's terrible in a lot of ways, but it's terrible for higher education. Please remember the president's budget is just a first step. There will be lots of negotiation.

We, at Cornell, have a strong Washington staff. We stay in close touch with the New York congressional delegation, including Representative Nita Lowey, who is the head of the Appropriations Committee. It was very heartening, if you paid attention to the budget process last year, that at the end of the day, one of the few places where bipartisanship prevailed was in the research budget. So all the gridlock actually fell apart when it came to supporting research.

There was bipartisan support for the idea that if we were going to be competitive, we had to have a strong research budget, and my hope is that that will prevail this year as well. Of course, we do need to keep a close eye on the financial aid budgets out of D.C., which is also extremely important to us.

And finally, we've become more proactive, even more proactive, I would say, on immigration issues, which is so important to us. And some of you may have seen my CNN op-ed

piece on it. I would encourage all faculty who are interested in these kinds of issues to write op-ed pieces. They do get noticed. I got lots of email back out of it.

Okay, key initiatives. So I always want to bring back where we are on the diversity and inclusion initiatives. It is a continued priority for me. As I hope people know, if you go to the website, Cornell web site, you type in "diversity," you will get to the page where we are constant -- once a semester, we are updating the list of recommendations that were made out of the presidential task force and elsewhere, so you can keep track of what's getting done.

A lot of what needs to get done is the responsibility of central administration, but some of it is the responsibility of faculty, some of it is the responsibility of students. I won't go through everything, because you can look there. Just a few highlights.

First of all, many of you know of the old TND, Towards New Destinations program. It had gotten a little stale. I see confused faces. It was the way to push diversity initiatives out throughout the campus and bring accountability back in. That is being replaced with a new framework, new accountability metrics, and they call themselves presidential advisors on diversity and equity.

It's Avery August, faculty member and Vice Provost, Vijay Pendakur, Dean of Students, and Angela Winfield, who is Associate Vice President in Human Resources, roughly speaking, representing the faculty, the students and the staff. In place of a CDO model, Chief Diversity Officer model, which is quite a flawed model, they are active.

They have real responsibility, but they also serve as an advisory group to me, to my leadership team, and they are also revamping in important ways and putting in place new accountability metrics. They're coming up with a new name. It won't be called -- I think a lot of people didn't know what Toward New Destinations, they didn't realize that had something to do with diversity.

I've mentioned before that we rolled out an IDP program for over 3,000 incoming freshmen this fall. It was a new short program. IDP is the Intergroup Dialog Project. It was a new short program. We are tweaking it. We took feedback from it, we're making changes for next year; but I have to say, we don't yet have a measure of success in terms of did it change hearts and minds. That will take time to understand. What we do know is it has led to a dramatic increase in the number of students who are interested in taking the full semester IDP program. So that, I think, is a good thing.

We've announced new LGBTQ housing for students starting this fall, fall of '19. That's already completely booked. There's an alternative dispute resolution process up. It's still being developed, but it's really being used. A new first generation and low-income student center, with a director named Shakima Clency, who's doing an amazing job -- we get just great feedback for her from the students.

The course teaching and learning in the diverse classroom is up. Maybe right after revisions to our definition of harassment, the number two request I got from students and from faculty was more education for faculty about how to be more effective in multicultural classrooms and about how to deal more effectively with the classroom when there are difficult circumstances in the community.

This is an online program, although if you take it, you can take it as a cohort, so you can interact with other people who are taking it at the same time. I took it myself. I didn't do it in the cohort, because I did it over the winter break, but it's very good. And it's not just, you know, this is what we think might work. It's evidence-based. It's based on what we know is effective, and I would strongly encourage people to sign up for it.

A bunch of new programs for staff, Mary Opperman's done an amazing job there. For example, a mentorship program for staff who are in the colleague networks program, where if a

staff member wants to find a path by which he or she can advance, they are hooked up with a mentor who's in the field that they want to move into, and they get guidance. Lots more, but again, go and see the website.

Cornell and New York City. There was a faculty-led group. They developed a set of recommendations, basically a vision, what would Cornell look like in New York City, what should we look like in one year, in five years, in ten years. It was led by Noliwe Rooks from English and Africana. If you haven't seen the report, it's up on the website, and we are working towards those goals. We're basically building the bridge, as we cross it.

Last month, they conducted a faculty visioning meeting. There were participants from all three of our campuses, they developed an astonishing range of ideas. I was really delighted to see how much they aligned with university priorities, things like they build on our breadth of presentation and our collaborative nature, they collect theory and practice. They're very purposeful.

When Mary was doing her collection of phrases for core values, what we often hear people say is purposefulness. They of course exploit the unique strengths of being urban and rural, and what we are beginning to see over and over are some research emphases, some areas of research emphasis that seems to bind us together, even beyond this New York City initiative.

So in particular, really broad research in the areas of inequality, sustainability, health and the intersection of technology and humanity. So I have committed $250,000 in presidential discretionary funds for some pilot projects to get these new New York City initiatives up and running. These are grassroots kind of projects. There is going to be an RFA going out soon. You're all invited to participate.

And then finally, the questions that I received through Charlie or Chris -- I can't remember -- in advance from you. So one is student mental health. This is the number one issue for our students, it's the number one thing students ask me about. This is absolutely not unique to Cornell. This is true around the world -- around the country. I actually don't know about around the world.

I saw a statistic yesterday, couple days ago that said by age 24, three-quarters of young people will say that they've had a mental health crisis, so that's quite dramatic. Up until now, we've tried a number of things, but the main thing we've been doing is just investing hand over fist hiring more and more and more CAFPS staff. That's obviously not going to be sustainable. That's not working, it's not enough.

So Ryan Lombardi, our Vice President for Student Life, is in the process of undertaking a comprehensive review, not just of CAFPS, but really of the whole environment. How can we foster a healthier educational environment? How can we promote social connectedness?

There's real evidence that technology is driving undergrad -- this was one of the saddest conversations I've had in the past year. I was talking with a group of students, and they were asking for education and training, so when one of their friends comes to them and they're upset about something, how do I talk to them.

And I thought: How do you talk to them? You're their friend, you listen to them. But there is a real disconnect these days. There isn't this kind of social connection and resilience. So there's this question of whether we can do something to foster that and to educate them.

There's also interest in things like improved sleep habits. Can we engage students in developing better sleep habits. There's very strong evidence of the connection between sleep and depression, and there's very strong evidence that the increased use of technology, phones that ring in the middle of the night, blue lights that you look at until you go to bed is disturbing sleep. So are there ways -- would that be helpful.

It's going to be a very broad look at things. There will be an internal group, a committee of students, faculty and staff starting their work this semester. And then there will be an external group coming in probably starting in the fall, to give us an outside perspective. When those reports are done, they will be made fully public.

Maybe I'll pause and ask if there's questions on mental health, before I go on to the other questions that were submitted.

Okay, there was a really interesting question about CTE amongst our alumni and do we know anything about CTE rates amongst former Cornell football players. Unfortunately, we don't. The data is extraordinarily hard to get, in part because you can only diagnose CTE postmortem.

We are aware of two cases of former Cornell football players who had CTE, but one played in the NFL for nine years and one participated in American Gladiator, so it's really hard to know how to attribute the cause of the CTE. I will say that CTE and concussions more broadly are of deep concern throughout the Ivy League.

The Ivy League has been pairing with the Big Ten to study this, which is interesting, because Big Ten football, I can tell you, is very, very different from Ivy League football, but concussion is a risk in both. It's almost certainly a bigger risk in Big Ten football.

There have been changes, so we've eliminated full contact hits from football practice -- sorry, I'm not a football fan, so I have to read this, because I would get it wrong -- moving the kickoff and touchback lines by five yards. So kickoff goes forward and touchback goes -- well, those of you who know football will understand.

The point is, it's during kickoffs and punt returns that people are coming at each other full speed from a far distance. That's when you get the real -- it's not the short plays. It's these big running plays where you lead to concussions. That has reduced concussions from 11 per 1,000 kickoffs to 2 per 1,000, so half an order of magnitude reduction.

It's also not just football. It's not football at all. It's important to notice concussions are an issue in almost all the sports that have been played, so there have been similar kind of tweakings to the rules in soccer, hockey, wrestling and lacrosse.

Athletics do play a very different role. I think they are much more properly in scope at the Ivy League than, say, in the Big Ten, and we are really open to changes that will make it safer. There is a health benefit to being active as well. We could just say no more sports, but that doesn't seem like the right response either, so the goal is to find the right balance.

Questions on that one? So quiet. You won't be quiet when I'm done.

Code of conduct. Risa mentioned the CJC. One of the main things, right after mental health, I would say the second issue that students come to me about is the code of conduct. And they keep asking me, why don't you fix the code of conduct. You need to fix the code of conduct.

They have two major concerns. One is the updating of the harassment definitions, and the other is the fact that the code as currently written is just horribly legalistic, horribly complicated, not aspirational and educational. Students, frankly, just can't read it.

And what I keep telling them is that the University Assembly has the responsibility for making the changes. They are working on it, specifically their CJC -- help me, acronym is CJC. Code and Judicial Committee. They have promised me that we will have a draft by the end of this semester. It's really important that that happens. Our students are demanding it and our board is demanding it, and I really want to thank them for all the very hard work they are doing on that.

Questions on that?

Okay, then finally, there was a question about the financial state of the university. Now, I could talk about that for an hour, so I'm just going to give a very high-level response. And if you have more specific questions, I can answer, or the provost, who really runs the budget here, can answer.

If you want the full financial report of the university, it's online. It's on DFA, divisionoffinancialaffairs.cornell.edu. It's right out there. In my view, our finances are very healthy. We have a ten-year model, a ten-year budget. It covers our major goals, it certainly does not cover all of our aspirations.

Cornell is filled with really smart, really ambitious faculty who want to do lots of things, and we're going to try and figure out how to find the -- not just like this is a new thing. One always has to try and figure out how to find the resources for that. We are in the quiet phase of a capital campaign.

I mentioned I was doing the campaign consultation dinners. We are going out and beginning to develop a message about the needs of our faculty and our students and the resources it will take to meet those needs. We are always working to do three things: To support faculty ambitions, to enable access by students, keeping tuition down, adding to financial aid; and maintaining the long-term institutional stability of the university.

And that's important because there are risks we have to be concerned with. At some point, the stock market is going to drop. And when the stock market drops, our endowment, which we rely on very, very heavily, will pay out less. Its value will be less and the payout will be less. At some point, there's going to be a recession, and that will lead to a decline in the gifts coming in.

And then there's things you can't anticipate, like government shutdowns. If the government shuts down again for any lengthy period of time -- you know, the first six or eight weeks, we muddle by; but after that, it can cost us on the order of $10 million or $11 million a month. So we need not only to worry about faculty doing what they should be doing and students being able to afford an education, but also we need to worry about, just like anyone in their personal budget, having some stability.

It's important to note that we have a modified RCM model. That's responsibility-centered model. That means that a lot of the responsibility for the budget sits in the schools and colleges. In fact, the bulk of the discretion reinvestments are made at the school or college level. We do invest centrally in some core priorities.

Just about every time I talk, I mention that my core priorities are academic distinction, educational verve, civic responsibility; but notably in there affordability, and then One Cornell, building on our collaborative strengths.

So we will invest in things like the academic learning initiative, which is a great example of educational verve. It's had remarkable results that feed into our diversity goals. We see students from under-resourced high schools thriving, and we close the performance gap for them. Actually, that came from a gift that we got, a $5 million gift. We made nine new departmental grants, which is supporting the development of 40 courses across four colleges.

Another key investment, of course, is financial aid. $466 million this year in financial aid. It's really important, to my mind -- I don't need to say this to this group, but I say it to external groups. People ask me all the time, if you were a business, you wouldn't raise your tuition, things like that.

First of all, that's false. Businesses do raise their prices; but if we were a business, we would have no financial concerns at all. The demand for our education is so huge that we would just raise tuition through the roof, right. That's what an economist would tell you to do.

We wouldn't worry about who came, we wouldn't worry about students who couldn't afford to come and we would have no -- but that's not who we are. That's not who we want to be. So business models don't work for us, they don't make sense.

Our biggest expense, by far, is labor. 64% of our expense is our compensation and benefits. The rest are services, supplies, maintenance, facilities, debt payment and so on. We are a very labor-intensive industry.

And when you have an industry that's labor-intensive -- where are the economists in the room? They can throw bananas at me when I get this wrong, but when you have an industry that's labor-intensive, where you can't drive down costs through the use of technology, you're going to end up having super-inflationary prices, because the places where you're not labor-intensive, where you relied on technology, it's cheaper.

If it's not cheaper -- I mean, inflation is just the average of all this, so we're going to be above that. And labor is particularly expensive when it's scarce, when it's very highly educated, and that's what faculty are.

So I think we know -- are we wasteful? I don't think we're wasteful. Are there places where we could do cost containment? Sure. But for the most part, I think we actually use our resources incredibly well. We're just hiring people for whom we have to pay good wages.

So what do we do? If there isn't a lot of cost containment, what are our options? Well, one option, the one bright spot really is philanthropy. We have incredibly loyal alumni and donors, and we rely on them. That's why I'm on the road a lot, meeting with them and trying to raise money.

The other is to look to new revenue sources. And I do think -- let me be clear. We're not going to offer online -- unless faculty want to, not talking about we are going online, but I do think we have to be open to new alternative forms of education, when faculty want to do it, to professional education, to certificates, to badges and so on.

This is a growing area. It's an area in which we can contribute. We can build on our land grant ethos and reach out into the world. So one of the things we're working on, and I will come back -- we are not sort of ready to do anything about it, but I will come back and talk to the faculty senate about is a realignment of eCornell to be a little bit broader and to allow more flexibility.

I'm sorry. I had a lot to tell you guys, but the last few were your questions anyway, so I will stop there. And is there still time for questions?

Okay. Questions?

MARIA FITZPATRICK: Maria Fitzpatrick, Policy Analysis and Management. I wondered if you could talk at little bit about the social science review process and what you think next steps might be or --

MARTHA POLLACK: I would be happy to do that; but actually, if it's okay, can I invite the provost to do that, because he's really leading the charge. You okay with doing that, Mike?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: We've gotten the summary report back to faculty that have met with many, many faculty in the social sciences departments, et cetera. That summary, we're just now analyzing. It will be reported out, I hope, to the full faculty within, I would say, two weeks at the most. And with that, there will be some suggestions about next steps associated with those findings?

ROBERT TRAVERS: Thanks. I'm Robert Travers, in History. Thanks so much for your presentation. I wanted to ask about the corruption scandal. One of the things that struck me in the press reporting is a kind of widespread sense of agreement on the opinion pages that their illegal form of rigging the admissions system is actually the tip of the iceberg of a much wider

problem of, as it were, legalized corruption, in which an increasingly powerful moneyed elite is managing to capture this valuable sector of education for itself.

And you know the things that are mentioned, legacies, donations, SAT tutors, pay to play, all of the above. And I would be super-interested to know how you would respond to that, both in terms of maybe statistics you have or evidence you have that this is not the case, that a narrow elite is not capturing this market, or in terms of measures, concrete measures in the short and medium term that the elite universities are doing to address it.

MARTHA POLLACK: Perfect question. And the answer is not it is happening or it isn't happening. Clearly, the fact that we have such a skewed socioeconomic diversity amongst our students means that wealthier students are capturing this resource disproportionately, and we need to address that.

And one of the key priorities for me for this campaign is to raise more money for financial aid, so that we can increase socioeconomic diversity. But along with that, you need the kinds of programs like the first generation and low-income student program that I talked about, so when they get here, when students get here, they can succeed. So that's one small piece of the answer.

The other extreme, then I'll go to the middle, what I am comfortable about at Cornell -- although I always have to caveat this. We have many, many staff, and I'm not going to tell you I know what every single staff member does; but as far as I know, we have a very clean separation. For example, we will not do a solicitation of a major gift from a potential donor during the period in which their son or daughter is being considered.

Now, as an example of what we can do to make that more concrete -- there's also standard wording, by the way. I have standard wording, when someone sends me a recommendation, I have a standard letter I send out that says, basically, thank you for your recommendation for such-and-such. I have no input to the admissions process. However, I will send this on to them and I'm sure your student will get full consideration. And we send that to the trustees, and they use it as well.

We don't have a tightly written down policy that says that. That's one of the things we just uncovered. It's been the practice, the best practice, and so we're going to tighten that up.

The athletic stuff, honestly, until yesterday, I don't think anyone ever imagined that kind of a situation, and so we will -- who would have thought to look to say that the lacrosse coach said this person was going to play and -- I have no reason to believe that's happening, but we'll put in mechanisms.

The tricky part is this tutors and essay writing, so let me throw out to this body one idea -- I would actually love your feedback on this -- one idea that we were kicking around, the provost and I, and the vice provost for undergraduate affairs and some others this morning. I don't think we can at this point require students not to use paid SAT tutors. I just don't think that's feasible; and even if they weren't using them, if you are in a private school.

I do think if the faculty were comfortable with it, that we could, for next year's cycle, say you must sign something that says I wrote this essay myself, and no one has helped me edit it. How would people feel? Seriously, show of hands. Would people -- if you would be supportive.

Okay, so I mean, literally, we're just talking about these things today. I think, even if that didn't make a difference in -- by the way, I was talking to the chair of the board, and he's on the Rhodes Fellowship Board, and he said they do that for the Rhodes fellowships. They require students to do that. Those are the kinds of things we're talking about. Does that help a little?

NEIL SACCAMANO: Neil Saccamano, in the English Department. Thank you for the presentation. I wanted to piggyback on what my colleague in history just said -- health that you

brought up, because I was wondering, it's very disturbing to hear that 75% of former students say they've had some kind of mental health crisis.

MARTHA POLLACK: Let me be careful. That's not 75% of Cornell students. That's 75% of young people in this country.

NEIL SACCAMANO: Right, I understand that. Mental health crisis. Any specification about how many of those people, students, former students are related to Ivy League schools or other kind of institutions?

MARTHA POLLACK: First of all, when you are at 75%, you're talking --

NEIL SACCAMANO: The entire population, yeah.

MARTHA POLLACK: I think there's a few ways to think about that number. First of all, it is shocking and it's dramatic. I think -- I want to be careful saying this. I don't mean to minimize that at all; but look, if I said to you by the time someone is 24, 75% of them will have had the flu, you wouldn't think twice about it.

So I do think there is a slight difference in the definition of mental health crisis than you or I might think about it. But that said, there is no question but that -- whether we would call it mental health crisis when we were teens, there's no question but that there's a spike. So the question is what's causing it. Like why are we seeing this? And I'm not an expert. I'm just going to tell you the theories that I've heard.

So one theory is a dramatic change in parenting styles. This helicopter parenting, this idea that you tell students from a very young age how wonderful they are and, suddenly, when something goes wrong, they're not equipped to deal with it.

A second thing I've heard is technology, this idea -- I mean, you walk around campus early in the morning, and everyone has big headphones on, or the story I conveyed about students really not knowing how to just listen to a friend. There is also some evidence that this is worse for young women than young men, and it has to do with comparing pictures, you know, the sort of social pressures to look a certain way.

And the third thing, I just heard this theory the other day -- again, I'm not purporting to say these are true. These are just theories I have heard. A third thing I heard has to do with the instantaneousness of our culture. So students -- anything you want. You know, used to be if you wanted to go to the movies, you had to get the schedule, you saw when the movie was, you went and waited. You wanted a book, wait till you go to the store and buy the book. Now you download it on Amazon. You want a date, you swipe -- I mean, there's a certain impatience, and when you have to wait for things, it's frustrating.

Now, let's say those are true. I don't know whether they are. None of those are the fault of our students or young people today. It's the environment that they've grown up in, and so we need to work on ways to help them develop resilience and patience and social connections and so on. At least that's the theory.

NEIL SACCAMANO: May I have a follow-up? The reason why I'm thinking about this is only because when we talk about what we at Cornell can do for our students who are experiencing mental health difficulties, I'm wondering to what extent -- and this is related to the scandal that's been happening with the Ivy League schools, whether or not the pressure on students to get into universities like Cornell is actually part of the problem for producing those events.

MARTHA POLLACK: It could be.

NEIL SACCAMANO: And I was wondering to what extent actually there's something we can do as a university, not for the students once they get here, but change how we think about admitting students, so we don't necessarily put them under that kind of pressure to get here, because I've seen too many documentaries about how they already are in crisis in high school

and trying to get into college, and then they sort of collapse once they're here. So I was just wondering what your thoughts are on that.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah. First of all, I do want to make one point, because I do think it's important. This current scandal is not just Ivy League schools, so far, anyway. Yale was the only one. I think it's a great question, but to be completely honest, I don't have a good answer. It mean, we can't go to sort of random admissions. Parents are going to be what they -- it's a really good question, and I will certainly think about it. And if people have ideas -- but I just don't have a good answer for you.

Hi, Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, Martha. And very nice. I love to see you work a room. You do it so well. It's really, really nice.

No, I didn't. This is a narrow question. On admissions, does Cornell, in considering applicants from abroad for admission into the college, is that a need-blind process?

MARTHA POLLACK: No. So it was around the time that I got here that there was a change made in admissions for international students to make it need-aware. And let me explain what happened and why it happened. There's two aspects of admissions. There's need-blind and there's whether you meet full need. And for our domestic students, we have been and, bar some major, major catastrophe, we will always be for our undergraduates need-blind and meet full need.

What used to be the case for our international students was we were need-blind, but we couldn't guarantee that we would meet full need, because international students don't qualify for federal loans. We just simply didn't have the money to cover it. We would admit need-blind students, and then they would get here and they couldn't afford to be here, so the decision was made to be need-blind, up until the point -- we didn't reduce the amount of aid for them.

Need-blind, up until the point in which you had no more money to meet full need. And then after that -- we also didn't want to reduce the number of international students. We would only admit international students who could afford to pay. Now, we maybe want to reconsider that; I don't know. But I want to explain. That was the rationale behind it, so that we didn't get students here from abroad who simply couldn't afford to be here.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. My children both went to Cornell as undergrads, and this is a question that really they expect for a period five years ago. I don't know if it's an issue now.

MARTHA POLLACK: I wasn't here then.

KEN BIRMAN: I know. So on this issue of mental health, my response especially pointed out that Cornell for undergrads, he said, had a culture of study, drugs and amphetamines around the end of the semester. And it was a coincidence at the time, but there was actually a "Daily Sun" editorial five years ago from someone in the law school asking when would Cornell engage with the culture of Adderall, which is one of those amphetamines, and there wasn't really a response.

And I don't know that the problem persists, but I will say that as a professor in computer science, you go into the bottom floor of Gates Hall at the end of the semester when students are working on their projects, and they're trying to stay awake. You were talking about sleep. Well, they're trying to stay up for 72 hours at a time. They think they're healthy, and I wonder how much of a trigger for problems we're seeing in that culture. And that's something we could educate students about, if it's still an issue.

MARTHA POLLACK: So I don't know. I would have to ask -- Ryan Lombardi would probably know the answer to the Adderall culture. I don't know that. As I say, I do think -- I'll

tell you, when I talk to students about the importance of sleep and how we'd like to do sleep education, sometimes they find it kind of patronizing. I don't mean it to be patronizing.

The fact is, all of us know how important sleep is. I always want to be real careful, because students should work hard. This is Cornell. They should work hard, but if we're putting them in a position where they have to stay up for 72 hours, I think we need to ask ourselves, too, whether we might need to rethink our expectations, you know.

KEN BIRMAN: I agree. Skorton Center probably has indirect indicators of whether that's a problem on campus, because now and then someone would end up over there --

MARTHA POLLACK: That's right. All of us have written a conference paper and stayed up for it, but I'm saying if routinely at the end of every semester, all the CIS students are staying up for 72 hours, something needs to give.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thanks for coming and spending this amount of time with us. So I wanted to go back to two things that you had talked about in your updates. One is about the labor-intensive nature of the university. And certainly, I know you were referring to faculty in terms of high-paid labor, but this is another issue that's a constant one, which is staff, where the labor market is different, and so you see a difference in income. And I wondered if you could perhaps update us on what's being done to increase staff salaries. So that's one question.

The other one is you said something about considering realigning eCornell, and I thought of that in relation to what you had said, which I was happy to hear when you said business models don't work for Cornell, and they shouldn't work for any university. I know you didn't say that. I'm saying that, but they certainly shouldn't work. And we had a huge discussion and a lot of conflict over eCornell when it was first adopted -- and I know you weren't here -- and as a for-profit business, and so perhaps you could say something more about realignment there.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah, so first of all, is Mary still here? Can you say something about staff? I know Mary does an incredible job of surveying staff salaries, making sure that they are appropriate to market. Would you mind answering that question?

MARY OPPERMAN: So as you know, we have literally thousands of positions in different job families, so is that a general question or specific one to a particular group of staff?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: It's general in the sense that we have a -- it's always been kind of frustrating to say if you pay market rates, when you set a market, you know, as kind of a big business in town. I worry about that issue of how are we keeping up. Maybe you could --

MARY OPPERMAN: Yeah, so look, there are different rates of pay for different jobs, and I don't think you're suggesting that we would pay all of them the same, but we don't set our market by a local market because we are an influencer of that market. So we set all of our rates at minimum by a regional northeast market or by the national market. Looking here in the local area would just be looking at ourselves, and then we set -- we aim our pay to the 50th percentile of that regional or national market after a period of time.

So depending on what they come in with, they may go right to the 50th percentile, they may be below it, if they're new in the role, and then they extend past that with years of service and performance. I really don't know that I answered your question, but that is -- we've done that that way since ILR helped us, when I first came, set up our compensation strategy, and they helped us choose our surveys and the like, and that's how we've been doing it.

Yeah, so we have an appreciation portal. So when you go on to either the HR site or onto the Workday site, you'll see an actual click. And the reason that we're prompting it is because anybody on the campus can send a private thank you to anyone else on the campus. We've had about 600 of them since we went up about two weeks ago, but they are an

opportunity for us to just acknowledge staff who have done a good job. And so if you haven't used it, it would be a great opportunity to do so, as you all well know, the staff probably more than anything, appreciate a thank you from the faculty, so just something to keep in mind.

MARTHA POLLACK: As to your other question, so eCornell is a stand-alone for-profit organization right now. It, however, is beginning to do -- it's being asked by the colleges to take on not just professional education, but in a few cases, online master's programs, certificate programs and so on. So that's one problem, and it seems to me that if that's the case, it ought to be under the auspices of the provost, with faculty control, so that we assure that it's up to our standards. That's number one.

Number two, we have very robust professional education programs in the Business School, in ILR, in Engineering. We have some all over, but they are completely uncoordinated. If you google Cornell executive education or professional education, it's a complete mismatch. We're going -- so those need to be coordinated.

Number three, it's incredibly difficult right now, if you look at places with well-run -- I don't mean online degrees. I just mean use of online education, what you see is a really rich flow of ideas and resources and materials back and forth between uses for our on-campus students and these other programs, and that's very hard to work.

And number four, because it's for profit, for many years it was just losing money. It's now starting to make money, and so we're paying all these taxes that could be put back into the core mission. So what we are looking to, and I'm just not ready to say more, because we are working on it, what we're looking to is a realignment that would address all those issues.

All right, I'm told I'm out of time. Thank you all very much.

(APPLAUSE)

SPEAKER NELSON: I will suggest that -- we have limited amount of time and there's a lot we want to try to do, and there was a suggestion from the parliamentarian that perhaps we just discuss sort of generally the ideas, and then at the end, if we get pressed for time, we table it, so that we can have a vote at a later meeting, but we try to get as much as we possibly can during the short time that we have left. Yes, sir.

Right, exactly, but maybe there will be, is my suggestion. But perhaps someone will make a motion. Yeah, exactly. Maybe it will be you, so we'll see what happens, once we have the discussion.

Yeah, exactly, but I'm suggesting this, just generally as a way we can get a lot done in a short period of time. Without any further waste of time, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Yeah, let me slowly step through the aspects of the proposal, and we'll pause at each point. And if people have questions, we'll certainly entertain them. This is driven off of our SOS voting last time and other feedback. So the proposal recommends the use of the term RTE faculty, and it supports the alignment of the RTE group with the faculty senate.

Any comments or questions?

With respect to university voting rights, remember, again, that means you can serve on the senate and vote on all the university-level elections. There were three options out there and, in looking at the results and considering a more conservative approach to see how things go and other reasons, we opted for what was called the senior-only approach, which is to say that if you're, say, a lecturer, you do not have university voting rights, but if you are a senior lecturer, yes.

The library actually, and the archivists are four-tiered systems and, to be consistent and fair in consultation with the library, a line was drawn through the middle of those. This one was by no means a landslide kind of thing, but if you look at the three results that I hope you had a

chance to look at the results of the SOS voting, as you move down the list, it became a -- interest in those options increased a little bit.

Anyway, let's pause, because there was a lot of discussion about this. Remember, these titles are used in very different ways across campus. Nevertheless, let's pause right here and entertain any kind of question or follow-up on this.

Carl.

CARL FRANCK: This is kind of embarrassing, but I realized in reviewing the various descriptions, there are careful definitions of positions like research associate, senior research associate, and I'm thinking back to Wilson Lab and I suddenly realize there's CHESS, staff, scientist, and that's it.

So I was wondering if somehow I dropped the ball in the sense of I never realized that the people that I was thinking about were never -- they never really appeared in that list. And as I think of this, I don't even think there's a distinction of senior versus unsenior.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right, so how lecturers and whether people expect or departments exercise promotion, it varies a lot. We've heard things like so-and-so's been a great lecturer for 20 years or whatever, so you might say, well, why wasn't that person promoted to senior lecturer.

But there are different stories all over. This is obviously a judgment call, it's a conservative call, but I should also say, this is -- people work in environments. And I think you want to ask yourself, this doesn't make things any worse for that group, but it does open up context.

People work in groups, there are senior lecturers working with lecturers. The avenue for people to contribute to discussions is open, even for that group. A small detail, which I think is the next one, is that -- like right now, any faculty member can come here and speak. And in the new world order, if we get to it, any lecturer, anybody of the 1,000 RTE faculty out there can come here and speak. They can do everything except propose motions and vote and so on.

It isn't driven to zero. It's not ideal. There are long faces out there. I have heard pushback on this, but in the end, this is a good first step, in my opinion.

Okay, just to be clear, that is the list of titles, we call it RTE star, that people will have UVR, university voting rights. Then again, a couple of things that seemed to not be controversial, a seat for the library, an ex officio seat for postdocs. We already have a seat for the emeriti and so on.

And then we have currently the nine university-at-large seats, which are split 6-3. Three are supposed to be for untenured university faculty members. Consensus seemed to be pretty strong for doing this 3-3-3 thing. And again, the electorate for this is all the people with UVR.

Okay, let me just pause right here, because we are about to go into the harder stuff. Any questions about what's been the purple up to this point? Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I realize you are explaining this as kind of a compromise position about senior versus other people with regard to voting rights. So I just want to express unhappiness with this. I mean, it seems to me if what we're trying to do is to become open and democratic, that this compromise is inconsistent with it.

I recognize if you are looking at votes and who voted for what, that it's difficult to know if you don't have a landslide one way or the other, but it just feels so -- it's like it's simply kind of a level of elitism that's simply undemocratic, and I'm just really unhappy with it. And I think it would be useful if you could maybe just step through just what it is that has been decided in terms of people without the senior in front of their name. What are the rights that they have and don't have?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's UVR, either you have it or you don't, just to be blunt about it. That's the official channel. But I guess, as I mentioned, it doesn't mean that this group, that we think less of them or that we aren't going to listen to them. There are avenues for them to express themselves. If you look at how the colleges have their own voting rights, and if you look at that, they almost always split this way.

In fact, I think we're more -- well, not every college has extension and pays attention to research, whatever, but again, I urge you to think about now and what we're proposing and whether it's a step forward. It's not ideal, okay, but there's a rationale, and it was laid out in the more extensive overview slides I provided you for the reason. So you could say it's elitist, but if this goes through, in terms of all our peers and our outreach, we will be way out there in comparison, which is something I think you should keep in mind.

Okay, any more?

Okay, the harder stuff is this, which is these two components. Two avenues to the senate. One is through your department and one is through your college, and it's important to have both of these components. So we voted on some things in February. One option had no RTE faculty coming from the departments. Another option didn't have any college RTE component. Another option, do whatever you want kind of thing.

It's very important to have the departmental RTE senators, because it's in the department where the chemistry exists, where you really want to make things happen, so to speak. The college thing is very important, because the number two unfairness thing I've heard after the senior-only option is this: I'm in a small department. RTE's very important, but I'm not over the threshold and I can't serve as a department senator.

So having the college avenue is not a perfect step, but something of a way for such individuals to participate in the senate. So the compromise, the proposed thing has both of these components. And let me tell you now what it is.

So we have the definition of let's call it a big department. The current definition of a big department is you have 25 tenure track faculty. That means you get two senators. We're liberalizing the definition of big, where it's now a summation between tenure track and RTE. If it's over 25, you are a two-senator department. The result of that is that the number of two-senate departments goes up from 18 right now to 31. So there's 72 departments, so a good fraction of departments with a lot of RTE will have this avenue open to them.

The college rule, again, is based on 25, okay. And there are ten colleges out there. Right now, six of them would have two college seats and four of them would have one. These are the recipes, the allocation formulas and the rules associated with faculty serving in the senate.

Let's pause right here, because I think this is probably the heart of a lot of this, so comments about this? Any kind of questions about the rationale, the numbers, the parameters? Tracy.

TRACY STOKOL: So I'm interested how you came up with the 25 for the college-at-large seat rules for more than two because departments are much smaller than the college, as a whole. And so there would be quite a few departments or units or colleges that would have two senators, based on that greater than 25, so you're applying a department-level criteria to an entire college.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. We provided a table of all the stats. And if you changed the 25 to 30 or 50, it probably wouldn't change things that much. My recollection is that Human Ecology's the only one that's very close to that number, so there's no rhyme or reason. I just think that reverse engineering might be an explanation, but you want to have, in the larger colleges especially, the chance for more than just one.

And the one is the floor. Some colleges, smaller units may not even want to exercise that option, so that's up for grabs. If you think the 25 is wrong or that the two is wrong, that's certainly something that can be considered; but again, this is a start, okay, a way of initializing this.

In the future, if down the road it turns out colleges aren't filling these, that's the signal that hey, we don't need this particular option, and you can dial it back. We don't know a lot right now, and we have to -- what will be the reaction to this? Are people going to -- we don't know, but this is a careful, reasonable proposal. We'll learn a lot from it, and then see what happens.

Yeah.

TRACY STOKOL: So for my college, we have five departments, of which three would already have two positions, of which I'm pretty sure that one of each position will get filled by an RTE star faculty, and then we would have potentially have another two College level positions.

And then, if the other two departments continue to grow in RTE faculty, which we have been told is the only way our college will grow, because we aren't going to increase the number of UF in our college, then we're going to be at a situation where we could have more RTE representation on the senate than less, and that is a big concern for me with this proposal, so I think that needs to be addressed.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So we took steps to -- this is called the ratio issue, which you talked about. We took steps so that the university level, the ratio issue is controlled and sensible. Now, you visit certain colleges like yours, and you can do a worst-case analysis and say if it all goes this way, we're going to have a majority of RTE faculty, but I think we can only set guidelines at this level.

Colleges have their own scene. If the vet faculty decide on how to choose their -- that's their issue, and you can visit some of the other colleges, and we have examples on the website of three other colleges which have sort of ratios that Tracy is sort of pointing out. Again, I would sort of say those colleges know best. They can decide for themselves how to choose their representatives.

And again, at the university level, we took steps in this compromise to ensure that the university faculty feels the responsibility to show up. Every department has to have a university faculty member senator. How you spend that second seat is your business. No one is telling you to do it this way or that way. It's just an option that's out there.

So I would, again, say I appreciate each college has their own scene. Vet relies on clinical professors. Other units, visit Arts College, there's a lot of lecturers doing the language instruction and so on. Every college has their own scene, but you have to trust them to work it out.

Again, we set the parameters, and the parameters are set so that overall here, there will be a nice mix of the two faculties, and it won't get out of control, which brings me to the next slide, which is it's more than just hey, let's take a look at things three years. We have to institutionalize this.

First of all, we need to publicize these numbers. Takes a lot to dig up the data that you have. This will be out there. We'll see what the issue is. As we go forward, the balance between RTE and university faculty is very important. This gives us a chance to pay attention. The alternative is where to let things drift, let the colleges solve their problems without any overall university or senate-level guidance.

Anyway, so it's not like we'll do this, and just sort of coast. This will be an active thing that the UFC looks at every year or whatever, making sure that we have good and sensible representation strategies out there.

Yeah, Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Hi. Joanie Mackowski, in English. This is, say, a question dovetailing off of Risa's, what you said about the democratic. And yes, I think we should do the right thing, what helps us to be a vibrant community of engaged professionals working together. But then I also wonder, say, about the history of RTE faculty at Cornell and what the numbers have been over time.

And I also wonder, say, is it -- could it be almost analogous to a union. If tenure is akin to union, what is the value of tenure? What is specific about the professional contribution of RTE members? Would not the appropriate enfranchisement be to expand the numbers of tenured faculty?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have data on there someplace from 2000, the number of university faculty members has been pretty much 1,550, 1,600 constant. The numbers of RTE that we're talking about here is about 1,000. 550, if you do the senior-only thing. So that number has been constant. It dipped during the recession. Was like 1,100; now it's 1,000.

So those statistics, you can't look at those and conclude from that that there's some bad trend down the road. You can't conclude that. What I think you should be nervous about is that the student population has gone up -- undergrad population has gone up 11% there and grad population's gone up like 30%. So that's what we have to pay attention to. Again, you want me to comment more on the elite --

Well, again, having tenure gives you a chance to, in a room that has mixed company with RTE faculty, gives you a chance to learn from people who have other points of view and also to exercise leadership. We have that guarantee that protects us with academic -- the academic freedom thing, and I think it's an occasion for us to exercise more leadership and to be -- it strengthens the tenure system.

How can we continue like this, and then tell -- people are looking at the tenure system from the outside and being critical of it. Why don't we show that we use it, that we pay attention, and so -- I'm rambling here. So it's a judgment call, but it's rationale, and I don't look at it as elitism or not. This is a step forward. Keep in mind, you can look at what it really could be, but look in the other direction, what we have right now, and ask yourself, are we advancing the cause here.

Yeah.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I want to follow up on what I think Joanie is expressing, what I'm hearing, is there is a bit of a tension in the discussion. And so the way I think of it is in two ways. One is the job security of tenure is created -- was created historically and should still work to protect academic freedom. It wasn't created to simply reward people for a certain level of productivity. Its function is to protect us with strong job security for academic freedom.

There have been trends over the years, particularly since -- into the 1980s and on, generally nationally with the increase in non-tenured track faculty, and undermining the tenure system, which protects academic freedom, so that's a reality. So I think we can have a project, we being kind of, you know, our departments, our university, we can have a project to increase job security for everybody and to increase tenure track and tenured positions, because we think that's good for the university.

At the same time, it seems that what we're doing here with this project is to say for non-tenure track faculty, now we have the title of RTE, we are saying people are here, and if we want

a democratic participatory faculty as a whole, that everybody should be included, which is not inconsistent. In fact, I think it could be consistent with saying and we should work more broadly to increase the job security of the rights and the job conditions that all faculty should have, so that's how I view it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I don't want a show of hands, but ask yourself, in your department, have you ever, in a poll, a vote or should we hire this person, how many have you actually involved lecturers, extension and research associates? I reckon the number is fairly small. Just sort of conjecturing.

The number for the senior levels is higher, but is by no means perfect. I'm not afraid to use the word compromise here and to get something done, with the chance of perhaps moving more in these directions, as we discover how this plays out. And I don't think there's any risk, and I don't think it degrades what it means to have tenure. I think it's the opposite, and so on.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Just to follow up briefly, Charlie. I think you think I'm disagreeing with you, and I'm not. I'm agreeing with you, okay, and so I don't think we have to have a conflict over something we're agreeing on. And what I'm saying is I think we can have those two projects at once, so I think we're agreeing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Again, under the heading of things we can do, for example -- we have to deal with time here. We're not going to vote today.

SPEAKER NELSON: Why not? Let's vote.

And I would make a motion we vote now.

We have one motion by Chris to extend the meeting by ten minutes. All in agreement, raise your hand. Raise your hand if you are in agreement to extend the meeting by ten minutes.

All in disagreement?

Okay, it looks like the disagreements clearly win, okay. Then I heard another motion about let's just vote. Let's just put a motion out on the floor and vote. Is there a motion? Is someone making a motion?

BOB KARPMAN: Bob Karpman, member-at-large. I make a motion that we vote on all the proposals, as presented, in one single up or down vote.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, it is going to be a package deal. There's a referendum after this, incidentally, and the referendum is exactly the same as what we're going to vote on.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, so Charlie, can you just articulate specifically what we're voting on?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, you have the sheet, which has been -- it's been all the purple slides, is another way of looking at it. You have the sheet there. It's called UFC revised proposal. That's it. Everything on that sheet, if we approve it, goes into the senate bylaws. There's a follow-up referendum.

SPEAKER NELSON: All right, great. Do we have a second for that motion? You have a question?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There were these sign-up sheets.

SPEAKER NELSON: Yeah, we have to have 54 for quorum.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Voting without a quorum is not a good thing to do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do not.

SPEAKER NELSON: If everybody signed in, I think we are close to --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: If you are eligible to vote, please stand. We'll get the count right now. We need 50.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I saw 52.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So 52, we have a quorum.

SPEAKER NELSON: You seconded the vote, so we could do it, a simple -- first of all, we have to decide if we're going to vote now or not. All in favor of voting now, raise your hand.

All those opposed?

Okay, it's clear that those that are for voting now outnumber the number that are against the vote, so we'll now have the vote.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What I would prefer is that we do a show of hands thing, but I did in the advertisement of this meeting say that if we vote, there will be e-voting afterwards for a period of a week. So what I would like to do is pass out -- we'll do a show of hands, but pass out the pink thing, so you sign them, so that we know that you voted, and then we'll do the one week of --

SPEAKER NELSON: Yeah, that's a good point. So the meeting is now over. We are going to have to contact you in some way to deal with this in the future. The meeting is adjourned.