The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:17 p.m.
The minutes of the meeting of May 28 were read and approved.
The President announced the deaths of the following members of the Faculty:

John Baptiste Pastore, Assistant Professor of Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, on August 18, 1951;

Foster Kennedy, Professor of Clinical Medicine (Neurology), on January 7, 1952;

William Cyrus Ballard, Jr., Professor of Electrical Engineering, on June 11, 1952;

Leroy Pearl Burnham, Professor of Architecture, Emeritus, on June 17, 1952;

William James Elser, Professor of Applied Pathology, Emeritus, on July 6, 1952;

Thomas Roland Briggs, Professor of Physical Chemistry, on August 9, 1952.

The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleagues.

The President welcomed the new Dean of the Faculty, Dean William Hursh Farnham.

The Dean read the following communication from the President:

In view of the potentially growing importance of television and radio as educational devices both for students in the University and for adult education throughout the area, I should like to have the Faculty, through the recently constituted Committee on University Broadcasting, advise with the administrative officers of the University, including those in charge of its radio operation and of its possible television operation, in order that we may make the most effective educational use of these facilities.

It is understood, of course, that to the extent that our operations in these fields are commercial, responsibility and discretion must be left in the hands of the financially responsible officer. The work of the Faculty's Committee would,
therefore, be confined to giving advice and making recommenda-
tions concerning the programs to be offered as having educational value.

Specifically, I am conferring upon the University Fac-
ulty the following powers to be exercised on its behalf by its Committee on University Broadcasting:

1. The power to make recommendations concerning the appropriate use of radio and television as educational activities of the University.

2. The power to recommend possible educational or research programs.

3. The power to advise during the planning of the production of such educational programs.

4. The power to advise concerning the educational value of programs arising outside the University and pur-
porting to be educational.

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the following appointments to committees to prepare memorial articles for the Necrology:

Concerning William Cyrus Ballard
R. F. Chamberlain
True McLean
B. K. Northrop, Chairman

Concerning Leroy Pearl Burnham
G. I. Dale
J. A. Hartell
H. E. Baxter, Chairman

Concerning Thomas Roland Briggs
Lewis Knudson
A. W. Laubengayer
M. L. Nichols, Chairman

The Dean read communications from the President, which announced the following appointments to standing committees of the Faculty, the appointees to serve four-year terms from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1956, unless otherwise specified:

To the Committee on University Lectures
W. R. Keast, to serve from September 1, 1952 through October 31, 1956
To the Committee on Music

R. B. Schlesinger
J. B. Rosser, to serve from October 6, 1952 through October 31, 1954
George Winter, to be Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1955

To the Committee on Student Conduct

E. C. Showacre
J. J. Vanderstock
J. W. McConnell, to serve from September 1, 1952 through August 31, 1953
during the absence on leave of C. K. Beach
E. N. Warren, to serve from September 22 through October 31, 1952
H. D. Albright, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1955
E. P. Leonard, to be Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1954

To the Committee on Student Activities

James Campbell
G. E. Peabody, Chairman

To the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships

L. J. Daniel
A. T. Blomquist, to serve as Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953
James Hutton, to serve as Acting Chairman during the shorter of the following periods:
until A. T. Blomquist is able to assume the chairmanship or until October 31, 1954.

To the Committee on Entrance Credentials

C. A. Hanson

To the Committee on Requirements for Graduation

Rollin Perry, without term, to succeed Donald English

To the Committee on Military Curricula

Peter Ward

To the Committee on Calendar

Gordon Danks
R. I. Fricke
To the Committee on Registration and Schedules

D. H. Bateman
James Campbell
A. H. Detweiler
H. M. Gift
G. R. Hanselman
J. P. Hertel
M. L. Hulse
C. W. Jones
W. L. Nelson
H. G. Smith
R. H. Smith
E. H. Stocks

W. D. Curtiss, to serve from September 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953
G. C. Snyder, to serve from September 1, 1952 through July 31, 1953

To the Committee on Scheduling of Public Events

R. E. Cushman
A. W. Gibson, to serve during the shorter of the following periods: until T. N. Hurd returns from leave or until October 31, 1953.
D. V. N. Brooks, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.
T. A. Ryan, to serve as Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.

To the Committee on Prizes

Maurice Neufeld
F. B. Agard, to serve from September 1, 1952 through August 31, 1953.
H. P. Banks, to serve as Chairman from September 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.

To the Committee of Award of the Moses Coit Tyler Prize

C. F. Cronkhite, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1955.
Curtis Nettels, to serve as Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.

To the Committee on University Broadcasting

J. J. Gibson and W. H. Stainton, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.
M. P. Catherwood and C. E. F. Outerman, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953.
E. S. Phillips and H. G. Smith, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1955.
H. E. Guerlac
J. W. MacDonald, Chairman
L. P. Smith, designated by the Dean - and announced by him at this juncture - to serve in his stead on this committee from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1956.
To the Committee on University Policy

M. G. Fincher, to serve from September 1 through December 31, 1952 to fill the vacancy created by the appointment of a member of the committee as Dean of the Faculty

H. B. Adelmann, to serve from November 1, 1952 through June 30, 1953 during the absence on leave of H. W. Briggs

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the following appointments:

To the Orientation Advisory Board

Whitson Powell, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1956

B. K. Northrop, to serve as Chairman from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1954

The Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty

H. F. DeGraff - The Dean announced his designation of Professor DeGraff to serve in his stead on this committee from September 24 to December 31, 1952.

Under the Special Order of the day, the election of the Nominating Committee for 1952-53, the Dean presented the following statement:

As Faculty legislation of November 14, 1951 requires that the nominations for membership on the Nominating Committee prepared by the Nominating Committee be published in the call for the meeting at which it is proposed that the elections be held, and

As the Dean of the Faculty, through inadvertence, failed to publish the Nominating Committee's slate in the call for this meeting,

The Faculty is faced with the question as to whether to vote to waive the publication requirement in this instance, or to postpone the election to the regular November meeting, or to set election for a special meeting to be held later this month.

The Professor of Hotel Accounting, Professor Silk, then moved:

That the Faculty waive the requirement for publication of the nominations for membership on the Nominating Committee in the call for the meeting at which it is proposed that the elections be held, as prescribed by Faculty legislation.

The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.
On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, the Professor of Pomology, Professor Boynton, reported that, in accordance with the legislation of the Faculty, last year's Committee had designated one of its number, Damon Boynton, to serve as Chairman of this year's Committee. He then reported the following list of nominees for election to the Committee for the ensuing year:

- H. E. Guerlac
- J. A. Hartell
- Maurice Neufeld
- W. R. Sears

Four new members were to be chosen.

There being no response to the invitation for nominations from the floor, the Professor of Horticulture, Professor MacDaniels, moved:

That the report be accepted, that the nominations be closed, and that the Secretary be directed to cast a unanimous ballot for the slate.

The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on War Alumnus Certificates, the Dean reported upon the application of Colonel Carroll K. Moffatt as follows:

Colonel Moffatt was in residence at the University for upwards of four years and completed substantially three years of scholastic work in the School of Civil Engineering during that period of residence. He has been on active duty with the Army of the United States from October 7, 1910 to the present and now holds the rank of Colonel. His service with the Army has been not only honorable but distinguished. The only unusual feature in his case is that a considerable period of time elapsed between his last attendance at Cornell and his call to active duty. The Committee sees no reason why this fact should render Colonel Moffatt ineligible for a War Alumnus Certificate and, in fact, is of the opinion that he has more than fulfilled the requirements for such a certificate.

The Dean, therefore, moved on behalf of the Committee:

That the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that a War Alumnus Certificate be awarded to Colonel Carroll K. Moffatt.
The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean reported that, at the suggestion of the President, the Committee considered the advisability of having the Director of Public Information serve as a member of the newly constituted standing Faculty Committee on University Broadcasting and concluded that the suggestion should be adopted. He, consequently, moved:

That the first paragraph of the Faculty legislation of April 9, 1952 establishing the Faculty Committee on University Broadcasting be amended to read as follows:

There shall be a standing committee of the University Faculty to be known as the Committee on University Broadcasting. The Committee shall consist of eight members appointed by the President for terms of not more than four years each; the Dean of the University Faculty or, at his discretion, some member of the Committee on University Policy designated by him; and the Director of Public Information, ex officio. The President shall name the Chairman of the Committee. (The material shall name the Chairman of the Committee.)

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Professor of Structural Engineering, Professor Winter, after discussing the inconveniences and inadequacies of room number 122, Boardman Hall, moved:

That the Committee on Registration and Schedules be requested to search for an auditorium more appropriate than 122 Boardman for holding the meetings of the University Faculty, and to report on this matter to the Faculty at an early date.

The motion was seconded.

After some discussion, the Professor of Electrical Engineering, Professor Credle, moved to amend the motion by the addition of the following sentence:

That not only the place of meeting but also the hour of meeting of the Faculty be reviewed by the Committee.
The motion to amend was seconded and passed.

The amended motion was then passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Festival of Contemporary Arts, the Professor of Architecture, Professor Hartell, after discussing briefly the history, purpose, and present status of the Committee, moved:

1. That this Faculty request the Committee on University Policy to consider whether the Committee on the Festival of Contemporary Arts should become a standing Committee of the Faculty, and to report its finding back to the Faculty.

2. That the report, if affirmative, include recommendations on the composition of the Committee and on the procedures under which it should act.

The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 4:52 p. m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:15 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of October 8 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Dexter Simpson Kimball, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Emeritus, on November 1, 1952. The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the following appointments to the standing Faculty Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships:

Harold Feldman, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1953 to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of M. S. McIlroy.

J. N. Tilton, to serve from November 1, 1952 through October 31, 1956.

On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, the Professor of Architecture, Professor Hartell, presented the following list of candidates:

For Member of the Committee on University Policy
A. H. Detweiler
W. A. Wimsatt

For Member of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty
Arthur Kantrowitz
N. A. Tolles

For Member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics
H. F. Newhall
M. V. Sampson

For Member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene
Temple Burling
J. K. Loosli
In response to the invitation for nominations from the floor, the following additional candidates were proposed:

For Member of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty
B. J. Conta, by the Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Erdman
C. O. Mackey, by the Professor of Electrical Engineering, Professor Malti

There being no further nominations from the floor, the Provost referred the amended slate to the Committee on Elections.

On behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Division of Unclassified Students, its Director, Professor Rideout, presented a progress report in which he summarized the activities of the Division since its establishment at the beginning of the spring term of 1951-52. A copy of this report is appended to these minutes.

On behalf of the Committee on Military Curricula, its Chairman, Professor Stainton, presented the following report:

At the meeting of this Faculty held on May 28 last, the Professor of Geology, Professor Cole, proposed the following resolution:

"That the Committee on Military Curricula be requested to study the scheduling of the annual military reviews which occur in the spring semester to ascertain whether these reviews cannot be given without disrupting the laboratory schedules of particularly the large elementary courses. A report of this analysis is to be presented to this Faculty during the coming fall semester."

This resolution was passed by a voice vote.

In accordance with instructions, the Committee on Military Curricula discussed the matter of combining the military reviews at a meeting on October 22. Several other meetings of individuals and groups concerned have been held.

The Committee reports that a single review is practicable.

The Committee reports, further, that arrangements have been made by the President and the Commandants of the three
services to combine the Presidential Review and the review held during the annual inspection. This review will be held at 4:30 p.m. on a day, yet to be determined, late in May.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, the Professor of Chemical Engineering, Professor Winding, presented the following report:

As instructed by the University Faculty at its October meeting, the Committee on Registration and Schedules has considered possible places of meeting other than Boardman 122.

The Committee took into account such factors as seating capacity, seating arrangement, lighting, ventilation, distance from the center of the campus, convenience of parking, and the seating of the President, the Dean, and the Secretary.

The Committee moves that the Faculty give trial for the remainder of the academic year to Room M, Olin Hall, and that hereafter the Faculty convene, when called for its regular meetings, at 4:30 in the afternoon.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean, after discussing at some length the considerations that prompted the Committee, moved:

That W. R. Brossman be invited to attend meetings of the University Faculty as an auditor.

The motion was seconded and, after some discussion regarding whether the invitation should be made by name or by position, was passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
Dear Mr. Malott,

Although no formal report was requested from the new Division of Unclassified Students, I believe you will be interested in some of the facts and figures I am able to present at this time.

The Division had been a subject of discussion for some time, and was finally created by a vote of the University Faculty on September 26, 1951. The first group of students was admitted at the beginning of the Spring Term 1952.

From a field of forty-four candidates, the Administrative Committee selected twenty-two to constitute the "pilot group". Following is a table showing the source of the applicants and the actions taken by the Division of Unclassified Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 23, 1952
After a term or two under our auspices, the students in the "pilot group" hoped to qualify for transfer as follows:

13 Arts and Sciences  
2 Agriculture  
2 Architecture  
1 Hotel Administration  
1 Industrial and Labor Relations  
1 Home Economics  
1 Civil Engineering  
1 Engineering Physics

The above figures represent interesting cross currents and trends. It is however, very apparent that the source of a large number of the applicants is the College of Engineering. The Administrative Committee feels that this situation will not change in the near future.

OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

In a large university like Cornell where the freshman is obliged to start in one of eleven different undergraduate schools, and where there is no General College or a common freshman year for engineering students, it is inevitable that many persons will embark upon the wrong program. Some explanations for these errors are: parental pressure, poor advice from a guidance counselor, and a notion gathered from reading or a hobby. To penalize an able student for making the wrong choice of course is short-sighted and narrow-minded, not to mention the harm it does to good public relations.

The Administrative Committee has interpreted the legislation passed by the Faculty to mean that a candidate must be first of all a misplaced student. In addition he may be a "bustee". The Committee's principal problem is to differentiate between the bona fide misfit who should have started in a different course, and the "bustee"
who did not entertain the idea of attempting to transfer until he was dropped. In order to make as accurate a diagnosis as possible, opinions and recommendations have been sought from the candidate's Dean or Director. Moreover, before action has been taken by the Administrative Committee, each case has been submitted to the admissions authorities of the school or college where the applicant hopes to take his degree. In general, if the candidate's previous record in school and college reveals evidence of reasonably good prospects in another course, and if the authorities of the new school are willing to provide an adviser, the student has been admitted to the Division.

Some reasons for our inability to admit certain applicants are:

1. Lack of evidence pointing to success in another course.
2. Advisability of working for a term in order to crystallize his thinking and develop maturity.
3. Lack of an objective, hence the recommendation that he do his military service at once.
4. Admission by the student that he wishes to return to the college that "busted" him.

(The Administrative Committee follows the principle that the Division was established primarily to assist the potentially good undergraduate to transfer from one school to another.)

**RECORD OF THE PILOT GROUP**

Of the 347 academic hours carried by the twenty-two students during the Spring Term 1952, 344 hours or 99.13% of the total load were passed satisfactorily. 287 hours, or 80% of the total, were graded at 70% or better.
Of the twenty-two students, nineteen achieved records entitling them to good standing in June. Only one was placed on probation. The other two had satisfactory records, but were not permitted to reregister for the reason that in Case A, the course in Industrial Design was not to be offered, and in Case B, it appeared extremely doubtful that he would gain admission to any school on the campus after one more term.

Considering the fact that fifteen members of the group were "bustees" or had been placed on probation by their original college, this is an astonishing record of accomplishment.

Schools admitting our students are:

- Arts and Sciences: 5
- Home Economics: 1
- Hotel Administration: 1
- Agriculture: 1
- Civil Engineering: 1
- Engineering Physics: 1

The present status of the "pilot group" may be summarized as follows:

- Approved for transfer to other schools: 10
- Continued in D. U. S. for Fall Term: 8
- Leave of Absence (Naval Reserve): 1
- Withdrew voluntarily: 1
- "May not reregister": 2

GROUP ENROLLED FOR FALL TERM 1952

The present group numbers thirty and is made up of

- 8 old students
- 22 new students

Whereas the "pilot group" had representation from seven different colleges, the current group comes from eight out of the eleven under
graduate divisions, and they hope to be admitted to nine different schools (not represented: Home Economics and Chemical Engineering).

In February the Administrative Committee approved exactly 50% of the applicants; for the current term 38% of the candidates were successful. Following is the table showing the demand for admission for the Fall Term as well as the actions taken by the Division:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Labor Rel.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Withdrawn

The most interesting feature about the candidates for the Fall Term is that all undergraduate schools and colleges on the campus are represented except two - Home Economics and Hotel Administration. It is obvious that this is a campus-wide operation and is not limited to two or three schools.

The volume of business handled by the Division is considerably greater than might be inferred by the application figure. It has been our policy to advise each candidate to try to gain admission to one of the degree-granting colleges first of all. Many interviews, therefore, do not result in an application and still others (twenty-two for the Fall Term) are filled but lapse for one reason or another.
Much time was spent during the summer months "calming the troubled waters", interviewing the parents of "busted" students who probably should not have been admitted to Cornell. Office callers, long distance 'phone calls, and mail during July, August, and September kept the Director rather busy. It is clear that the office must operate on a twelve months basis.

CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. From our point of view it appears that the Division has already achieved a good reputation for setting and maintaining good standards. It has stature and dignity. The Administrative Committee realizes that it is expected to admit some "risks", yet its actions are governed to a large extent by the principle that the new unit must not become a soft spot for the incompetent, a haven for the draft dodger, or a refuge for the shiftless undergraduate.

2. It is apparent that the Division has not only been accepted by the campus as a whole, but it has been heartily welcomed by the majority of individuals who have expressed themselves. Several schools are using the Division to try out borderline candidates, and express great satisfaction in the new service. The Administrative Committee is very much gratified by the good will shown by the offices of the Deans and Directors of the several schools.

3. The experience of less than a year has supplied evidence that this new organization is not narrow in scope; on the contrary in its operations thus far, every undergraduate school on the campus has been involved.

4. The expressions of gratitude received from students and their families are indicative of the value and importance of this new
service. To salvage a few misplaced students each year can contribute tremendously to good public relations. And those who may not make the grade will at least have been given the satisfaction of another try.

5. The Administrative Committee foresees no need of building up a large organization; indeed the present members of the board are determined to avoid the creation of another hierarchy and want the Division to continue to operate on a minimum budget.

NEEDS OF THE DIVISION

The principal need of the Division is a new name which will be dignified and will adequately describe the purpose and nature of the program.

SUMMARY

In brief, the state of health of the Division is excellent. It has made a good start thanks to the splendid record of the "pilot group" and the fine spirit of cooperation shown by the Faculty and the Administration.

B. L. Rideout
Director
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p. m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 12 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Gilbert Dennison Harris, Professor of Paleontology and Stratigraphic Geology, Emeritus, on December 4, 1952. The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleague.

The President announced that the Board of Trustees has voted to increase the maximum amount of salary on which retirement contributions will be made by the University from $6,000 to $12,000, the amount contributed by the University to equal the amount contributed by the member. This increase, which becomes effective on July 1, 1953, is optional for those who are now members of the Contributory Retirement Income Plan and may be obtained upon request, but is mandatory for all Faculty members and employees eligible for the plan who enter the employment of the University after the effective date.

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the following appointments to committees:

To the Committee on Student Activities
   Kenneth McEntee, to serve from November 11, 1952 through September 20, 1953 to fill the vacancy created by the absence on leave of C. G. Rickard.

To the Committee to Prepare a Memorial Article for the Necrology concerning Dexter Simpson Kimball
   C. D. Albert
   W. F. Willcox
   Romeyn Berry, Chairman
The Dean read the following report on behalf of the Committee on Elections:

481 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on University Policy, of which 252, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Zoology, Professor Wimsatt.

475 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics, of which 245, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Industrial and Engineering Administration, Professor Sampson.

471 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene, of which 319, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Animal Nutrition, Professor Loosli.

470 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty, of which 195 were cast for the Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Tolles, a plurality of 27 over those cast for the Professor of Heat-Power Engineering, Professor Conta, and a plurality of 88 over those cast for the Professor of Aeronautical Engineering, Professor Kantrowitz.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, the Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Erdman, in the absence of the Chairman, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved that the University Faculty, the Board of Trustees concurring, designate Saturday, May 15, 1953, as Spring Day, a University holiday, and instruct the Committee on Registration and Schedules to schedule evening hours which members of the Faculty may use for classes and laboratory periods which are normally scheduled on that day.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, its Chairman, Professor Long, after expressing his satisfaction with the action of the Board of Trustees on the Contributory Retirement Income Plan and after referring to the report that was distributed with the call for this meeting, a copy of which is appended to these minutes, moved the adoption of the
following resolution:

Resolved that the President be asked to forward copies of the Report on Cornell Faculty Salaries dated December 5, 1952 to the Trustees of the University; that the Board of Trustees be urged to consider the serious educational implications of the present state of faculty salaries and to take prompt action to restore a salary scale which will permit Cornell to maintain a first class faculty.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Professor of Economics, Professor Adams, reminded the Faculty that, at its meeting of October 8, 1952, it had requested this Committee to consider whether or not the Committee on the Festival of Contemporary Arts, at present an informal and unofficial committee, should become a standing committee of this Faculty and, if affirmative, to recommend its composition and procedures. The Committee on University Policy had appointed a subcommittee, which, in studying the matter, had ascertained that there are many areas of interest in the creative arts, but what these areas are and how they may contribute to the Festival had never been determined. If the Faculty is to assume responsibility for the Festival, it should know the resources at its disposal. The subcommittee had, consequently, recommended that the Policy Committee be granted authority to broaden its field of investigation. Professor Adams, therefore, moved:

That the Faculty request the Committee on University Policy to examine all the resources which might contribute to the Festival of Contemporary Arts, report its findings to the Faculty, and bring to the Faculty any recommendations which might emerge in the course of its discussions.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.
On behalf of the Faculty of the College of Engineering, its 
Dean, Professor Hollister, after explaining the need and de-
scribing briefly the program, read the following resolution and 
moved its adoption:

Resolved that the University Faculty recommends that 
the Board of Trustees authorize the granting of the degree, 
Bachelor of Agricultural Engineering, to persons who have 
satisfied the University requirements for graduation and 
who have satisfactorily completed the undergraduate pro-
gram in Agricultural Engineering and are recommended for 
such degree by the Faculty of the College of Engineering.

The motion was seconded and, after the statement of the support 
of the College of Agriculture, expressed by its Director of Resident 
Instruction, Professor Gibson, and the assurance that the increase 
in cost to the University will be negligible, if any, in view of 
the possibility of an increase in revenue, was passed unanimously 
by voice vote.

The Dean, after describing the status of the J. G. White 
Spanish Prize Fund and tracing the background of his proposal 
from the Committee on Prizes through the Executive Committee and 
the Law Committee of the Board of Trustees, moved:

That the Committee on Prizes be requested to consider 
the advisability of utilizing the excess income from the 
J. G. White Spanish Prize Fund for a scholarship; and to 
report its findings to the Faculty.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Dean reminded the Faculty of the resolution which it adopted 
on November 12, 1947 in regard to absences from classes immediately 
before and after University vacations.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr. 
Secretary
This report on faculty salaries discusses the financial status of college teachers in general as well as the long-time trends and present status of salaries at Cornell. It also compares the salary position of the Cornell faculties with those of some other institutions of higher learning. Trends in salaries and comparisons with other professions are of interest since they reflect on the overall position of higher education in the United States. However, the important comparison for immediate consideration is that of Cornell salaries with those of its competitors. The reason is simply that Cornell cannot expect to be a first class University unless it pays salaries which are large enough to attract and keep a first class staff.

Trends in Faculty Salaries

As every college teacher knows, in recent years faculty salaries have not kept up with increases in cost of living. This is true for all institutions, public and private, large and small. An excellent discussion of the general trends in faculty salaries as well as comparisons with the incomes of other professional groups is given in a recent article by C. D. Long (Page 8, Johns Hopkins Magazine, June 1952). The conclusion is that the real income of college teachers has dropped considerably from 1940 to the present whereas for most other groups the real income has increased considerably during this same period. Some of the actual figures are interesting: From 1940 to 1949 the real income of physicians increased 50%, that of lawyers 18% and that of factory workers 30%; from 1940 to 1952 the real income of college professors decreased 27%.

This same general trend of faculty salaries is illustrated for Cornell in Figures 1 and 2. Figure 1 compares the trends of the real salary of the average Cornell professor in the endowed colleges in Ithaca with trends for the average citizen, based on the BLS cost-of-living index. The period covered is from 1914 to the present. Quite evidently the lot of the average citizen has improved markedly over this 40 year period whereas the real salary of the Cornell professor has actually decreased somewhat from 1914 to 1952. Incidentally none of these figures takes into account the recent increase in the tax burden which of course results in a smaller spendable income than implied by this graph.

Figure 2 shows trends of real salaries at Cornell, i.e. in 1934-39 dollars, over the last 40 years for the four teaching ranks separately. (These figures are for average salaries in the endowed colleges at Ithaca; the trends in the state colleges are similar as may be seen from the detailed figures of Appendix I.) The period of most interest is that from the immediate pre-war years to the present. During this period only one rank, that of instructor, has maintained or increased its buying power. For all other ranks the real salary has declined appreciably.

These trends, which are shown by salaries in almost all institutions of higher learning, are partly a reflection of the normally unfavorable status of salaried groups in times of inflation. However, the deteriorating economic status of college teachers does suggest that unless corrective measures are taken the quality of higher education in this country will decline.

Comparisons between Endowed and State Colleges at Ithaca

A striking change in faculty salaries at Cornell and the one most apparent to the local faculties is the marked disparity that has recently built up between
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salaries in the state and endowed colleges. Table I gives the figures. From 1914 through 1939 the average salary in the endowed colleges was larger than in the state colleges. For instructors and assistant professors during this period the figures are very similar but professors in the endowed colleges tended to receive higher salaries than in the state colleges. This situation has changed markedly until now average salaries in the state colleges are larger than for the endowed in all categories. In fact the average salary of an instructor in the state colleges is now almost the same as for assistant professors in the endowed. A corresponding situation holds for assistant professors in the state compared with associate professors in the endowed.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professors Endowed</th>
<th>Professors State</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof. Endowed</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof. State</th>
<th>Asst. Prof. Endowed</th>
<th>Asst. Prof. State</th>
<th>Prof. Endowed</th>
<th>Prof. State</th>
<th>Instructors Endowed</th>
<th>Instructors State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914-15</td>
<td>3264</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-24</td>
<td>4432</td>
<td>4039</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>4935</td>
<td>4385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3073</td>
<td>3103</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3978</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>5655</td>
<td>5620</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>4321</td>
<td>3226</td>
<td>3703</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>7209</td>
<td>7101</td>
<td>5273</td>
<td>5438</td>
<td>4329</td>
<td>4631</td>
<td>3062</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>7631</td>
<td>7862</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>6053</td>
<td>4528</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>7752</td>
<td>8359</td>
<td>5698</td>
<td>6394</td>
<td>4645</td>
<td>5584</td>
<td>3575</td>
<td>4606</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Salaries of Deans and Directors are excluded.

(b) Large majority of salaries in both state and endowed colleges are on 9 months basis, but appointments in the state colleges imply service for 11 months. Even though terms of employment differ, this table is valid for comparisons over a period of time.

Cornell Salaries Compared with Those of Other Institutions

The most important salary comparison to be made is that of Cornell salaries with those of other large universities. The reason is that in the long run any institution will get the quality of staff it pays for. And there can be no doubt that the overwhelmingly important determinant of the stature of a university is the quality of its faculty.

A comparison of Cornell with other institutions for the year 1951-52 is simplified by the excellent report of the Committee on Economic Status of the American Association of University Professors (A.A.U.P. Bulletin 37, 768, Winter 1951-52). Data from this report on mean salaries for various university groups are collected in Table II along with similar data for Cornell.
From Table II it is obvious that the Cornell Endowed Colleges are in a very unfavorable competitive position. Only at the instructor rank are the Cornell endowed salaries at all comparable with either "4 Large Eastern Universities" or "6 Large State Universities." For all three professorial ranks the Cornell averages are markedly lower than those for the groups with which Cornell would like to consider itself competitive.

Table II
Comparisons of Mean Salaries for 1951-52
(All salaries on 9-10 months basis except where noted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Group</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (Arts and Science)</td>
<td>7574</td>
<td>5813</td>
<td>4670</td>
<td>3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (Engineering)</td>
<td>7322</td>
<td>5275</td>
<td>4279</td>
<td>3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (State Colleges)</td>
<td>7862</td>
<td>6053</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Large Eastern Univ.</td>
<td>9897</td>
<td>6554</td>
<td>4827</td>
<td>3601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Large State Univ.</td>
<td>8266</td>
<td>6145</td>
<td>4947</td>
<td>3969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Institutes of Technology</td>
<td>9310(e)</td>
<td>6733(e)</td>
<td>5190(e)</td>
<td>3985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Large majority of salaries on 9 months basis but a few on 11-12 months basis.
(b) These are: Columbia; Cornell (Endowed); Harvard (Arts and Science); Yale (Arts and Science).
(c) These are: California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Washington, Wisconsin.
(d) These are: California Institute of Technology, Case Institute, M.I.T.
(e) Salaries on 10 1/2 or 11-12 months basis.

Benefits Other Than Salary

It can be asked whether the Cornell faculties obtain larger-than-normal "fringe benefits" in lieu of salary. The answer is quite definitely, no. First, in contrast to several universities the Cornell faculties have no access to the university medical clinic and infirmary. Second, although many universities permit their Purchasing Departments to buy items for their faculties on a very broad basis, at Cornell the regulations prohibit use of direct university purchase orders for items for faculty use and limit the purchasing department to an advisory role. Third, the university contributions to the retirement plan for the endowed colleges are well below the average for other universities. In fact the retirement plan for the faculties of the endowed colleges has been termed "pathetically inadequate" by one of the Cornell vice presidents.

Summary

A conceivable title for this report might be "The Financial Plight of College Teachers." A far more valid title is "The Educational Plight of Cornell University." Various reasons have been given for the need for increases in faculty salaries at Cornell: decline in standard of living of the staff, decrease in faculty morale, etc. These are good reasons why a financially secure university might wish to raise
faculty salaries but hardly compelling to a university which is already running a deficit. The compelling, the overwhelmingly important reason why Cornell must increase faculty salaries both promptly and substantially is that unless it restores a competitive salary scale, its decline as an educational institution seems certain. In the opinion of the committee there is no other problem at Cornell as urgent as this one.

Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

George Adams
Herrell DeGraff
Perry Gilbert
Slade Kendrick
Andrew Schultz, Jr.
F. A. Long, Chairman
## APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost of Living Index</th>
<th>Estim. per Capita Income $ (35-39 = 100)</th>
<th>CORNELL PROFESSORS</th>
<th>CORNELL ASSOC. PROF.</th>
<th>CORNELL ASST. PROF.</th>
<th>CORNELL INSTRUCTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE Ave. Median</td>
<td>STATE Ave. Median</td>
<td>STATE Ave. Median</td>
<td>STATE Ave. Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3284 3000</td>
<td>3082 3000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>4432 4500</td>
<td>4039 4000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>5236 5000</td>
<td>4469 4500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>4935 4500</td>
<td>4385 4185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>5051 4500</td>
<td>4708 4500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>5655 5100</td>
<td>5620 4950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>170.2</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>7209 6800</td>
<td>7101 6910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>7631 7250</td>
<td>7662 7647</td>
<td>5594 5500</td>
<td>6053 6035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>190.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7752 7500</td>
<td>8359 8152</td>
<td>5698 5500</td>
<td>6394 6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For academic data, year is that in which Fall Semester started. Chosen years based on data already available in Treasurer's Office from 1929 on.


(3) For 1929 to date computed from Dept. Commerce figures. Earlier years estimated by splicing preceding series with Total Realized National Income estimates adjusted by the Cost of Living (NICB).
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of December 10 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Grant Sherman Hopkins, Professor of Veterinary Anatomy, Emeritus, on December 21, 1952. The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the appointment of the following special committees to write memorial articles to be published in the Necrology of the Faculty:

**Concerning Gilbert Dennison Harris**
- G. W. Herrick
- A. H. Wright
- O. D. von Engeln, Chairman

**Concerning Grant Sherman Hopkins**
- A. G. Danks
- M. E. Miller
- Earl Sunderville, Chairman

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the following appointments to standing committees:

**To the Committee on Student Activities**
Arthur Mizener, to serve from December 20, 1952 through October 31, 1954, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of G. H. Healey.

**To the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty**
B. J. Conta, to serve during the second term of the academic year of 1952-53, to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of Andrew Schultz, Jr.

**To the Committee on Registration and Schedules**
G. W. Lattin, to serve during the academic year of 1952-53, to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of J. H. Barrett.
The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the establishment by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees on December 5, 1952, subject to the approval of the Faculty, of the degree of Bachelor of Agricultural Engineering. (The Faculty approved this degree at its last meeting.)

The Dean read a communication from the Chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, which announced that this Committee had elected Perry Gilbert as its chairman for the year 1953.

On behalf of the Committee on Prizes, its Chairman, Professor Banks, presented an interim report on the progress of its study of the advisability of utilizing the excess income from the J. G. White Spanish Prize Fund for a scholarship. This study was directed by the Faculty at its last meeting, as the result of a proposal of the Law Committee of the Board of Trustees.

On behalf of the Committee on Military Curricula, its Chairman, Professor Stainton, after discussing in some detail the Army's new Branch General R.O.T.C. curriculum, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the Commanding General of the First Army has requested the comments or recommendations of the University with respect to the Army's new Branch General ROTC curriculum,

Be It Resolved that the Army ROTC Commandant be authorized to inform the Commanding General of the First Army that it is the sense of this Faculty

1. That the curriculum in question is sound in principle;
2. That its effectiveness in actual operation should be carefully studied before its establishment at any college or university having a ROTC program be made compulsory;
3. That special study be given to ways and means for providing for the assignment of ROTC cadets upon graduation to the arm or service in which their interests and qualifications will be most fully utilized; and
1. That, if and when the Army requests the University to decide whether or not it wishes the curriculum to be instituted at Cornell, further consideration be given by this Faculty to the desirability of this curriculum, taking into account its effectiveness in operation at other institutions.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Dean, speaking on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, explained the background, the reasons, and the purposes of the Committee's proposal that the University By-Law fixing the academic rank of commissioned R.O.T.C. personnel be amended, as set forth in the appended memorandum. He then moved the adoption of the following recommendation:

That the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees

1. That the third and fourth sentences of section 3a of Article XIV be stricken from that article;

2. That section 2 of Article XX be re-numbered 2a;

and

3. That a new section to be numbered 2b and reading as follows be inserted in Article XX of the By-Laws:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XVI and the other provisions of this Article XX, the commanding officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC units shall be department heads with the ex officio rank of professor in the Department of Military Science and Tactics, the Department of Naval Science, and the Department of Air Science and Tactics respectively; and other members of the instruction staff in these departments shall have the academic rank below that of professor to which they may be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of their department heads. Unless sooner terminated by the University all appointments in these departments shall terminate upon relief from military duty at Cornell."

The motion was seconded and, after some discussion, was passed by voice vote.

The Professor of Electrical Engineering, Professor Malti, after stating reasons, read the following resolution and moved its adoption:
Whereas the policies of the University in adjusting faculty salaries in the endowed colleges are of concern to the members of the Faculty, and

Whereas the principles and methods of such adjustments in the endowed colleges are unknown to the faculties of these colleges, and

Whereas the aims of this resolution do not fall within the scope of any standing committee of this Faculty,

Be it, therefore, resolved that a special committee of this Faculty, consisting of two non-administrative faculty representatives from each of the endowed colleges, be appointed by the President to:

a. Ascertain what principles, methods and policies guide those who are charged with the responsibility of salary adjustments in the endowed colleges.

b. Propose a codification of fair principles, policies and methods of salary adjustments for the endowed colleges.

c. Report to the Faculty its findings and recommendations within a year from the passage of this resolution.

The motion was seconded.

After a brief discussion over jurisdiction in this matter, the Assistant Professor of German Literature, Professor Oechler, moved to amend the motion as follows:

That the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty be considered the appropriate committee to handle this matter and its name be inserted in the appropriate places in the motion.

The motion to amend was seconded and passed.

The original motion as amended was then passed by voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:17 p. m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
MEMORANDUM

RE: Proposal of Policy Committee to Amend University By-Laws
Governing Academic Appointments of Military Personnel

Section 3a of Article XIV of the University By-Laws lists the persons who are members of the University Faculty. The second sentence of this section provides that the professors, associate professors, and assistant professors whom the University may appoint in the military departments shall not be members of any separate college or school faculty but shall be members of the University Faculty.

The third and fourth sentences of section 3a read as follows:

"Except for the commandants of the Military and Naval ROTC units, who shall have the ex officio status of professors, officers in the Department of Military Science and Tactics and Air Science and Tactics with the title of Captain or above, and officers in the Department of Naval Science with the title of Lieutenant, Senior Grade, or above, who offer instruction in the advanced ROTC or NROTC, shall be members of the University Faculty with the rank and title of assistant professors. Commissioned officers below the rank of Captain in the Army and Air Forces and below the rank of Lieutenant, Senior Grade, in the Navy, shall have the academic status of instructor."

The Policy Committee recommends that the sentences just quoted be amended and transferred to Article XX of the By-Laws:

I. Because their present wording prevents the assignment of the rank of associate professor to an officer serving in a ROTC unit as executive officer or as a sub-department head;

II. Because the effect of these sentences in conjunction with the second sentence of section 3a of Article XIV of the University By-Laws providing that any officer appointed to one of the three professorial ranks shall be a member of the University Faculty and in conjunction with legislation of the Graduate Faculty of May 7, 1926 and section 3d of Article XIV of the University By-Laws prohibiting the registration of a member of the University Faculty as a candidate for a graduate degree, is to make it impossible for an Army or Air Force officer with the rank of Captain or above, or a Navy officer with the rank of Lieutenant, Senior Grade, or above, to receive credit for resident study in candidacy for an advanced degree while on ROTC duty at Cornell; and
III. Because a provision with respect to the academic ranks to be held by officers in the several military departments belongs in Article XX of the By-Laws which deals with faculty appointments, rather than in Article XIV which deals with membership in the several faculties.

The Dean will, therefore, move on behalf of the Committee on University Policy that the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees

1. That the third and fourth sentences of section 3a of Article XIV (quoted above) be stricken from that article;

2. That section 2 of Article XX be re-numbered 2a; and

3. That a new section to be numbered 2b and reading as follows be inserted in Article XX of the By-Laws:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XVI and the other provisions of this Article XX, the commanding officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC units shall be department heads with the ex officio rank of professor in the Department of Military Science and Tactics, the Department of Naval Science, and the Department of Air Science and Tactics respectively; and other members of the instruction staff in these departments shall have the academic rank below that of professor to which they may be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of their department heads, Unless sooner terminated by the University all appointments in these departments shall terminate upon relief from military duty at Cornell."

It will be noted that the new section 2b proposed for insertion in Article XX has been phrased

A. so as to add to the By-Laws the following provisions which, while not essential to the elimination of objections I, II, and III listed above, supply existing lacks in the By-Laws and constitute appropriate parts of the new section:

(1) A provision that the several military commandants are heads of their respective departments; and

(It will be remembered that the military departments are listed as independent departments in section 6 of Article I of the By-Laws which enumerates the colleges, schools, and independent departments comprised in Cornell University.)
(2) A provision that academic appointments of military personnel shall, unless sooner terminated by the University, terminate upon relief of the appointee from military duty at Cornell and

B. so as to make it clear that the provisions of section 1 of Article XVI and section 2 of Article XX of the By-Laws making Trustee action prerequisite to the appointment of department heads, professors, and associate professors, are not intended to apply to appointments to these ranks in the military departments.

William H. Farnham
Dean
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 14 were read and approved.

The President announced the deaths of William Ernest Blauvelt, Professor of Economic Entomology, on February 2, 1953 and of Wilder Dwight Bancroft, Professor of Physical Chemistry, Emeritus, on February 7, 1953. The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleagues.

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the appointment of the following committee to award the J. G. White Prizes in Spanish in 1953:

   G. I. Dale
   R. A. Hall, Jr.
   W. G. Moulton, Chairman

The Dean read a communication from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Meigs, which announced:

   1. The receipt by the Board of the report of December 1952 of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

   2. The approval by the Board of the designation by the Faculty of Saturday, May 16, 1953 as Spring Day and as a University holiday.

   3. The amendment by the Board of Articles XIV and XX of the University By-Laws in the respects recommended by the Faculty at its meeting of January 14, 1953.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, its Chairman, Doctor Bradford, stated that the Dean had referred to this committee a letter which he had received from a member of the Faculty informing him that some instructors, particularly
those in charge of multiple-section courses, had been holding preliminary examinations in the evening hours, thereby causing conflicts with (1) regularly scheduled evening classes, or (2) previously scheduled activities, or (3) previously arranged social commitments. Doctor Bradford then moved for the Committee:

That it is the sense of this Faculty that students may be required to attend class exercises, including prelims held in the evening, only when such exercises are regularly scheduled for the class and included, as so scheduled, in the printed announcement of courses.

The motion was seconded. Some discussion followed, in which it was emphasized that class exercises, to be authorized under the provisions of this legislation, must be regularly scheduled for the class and included in the printed announcement of courses and in which it was stated that the regulation would become effective in the academic year of 1953-54. The motion was then passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, its Chairman, Professor Blomquist, after describing the composition of the principal committees that are responsible for the administration of scholarships, made the following motion with the view of aiding in the correlation of the work of the several committees on scholarships and student aid:

That the University Faculty add to the membership of the Faculty Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships a representative of the Office of Admissions as an ex officio member.

The motion was seconded and, after some discussion, was passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean, after describing the sequence of events that led up to
its proposal, moved:

That the University Faculty request the President to appoint a special committee of the Faculty to study and report on the advisability of acceding to the request of Columbia University that Cornell University participate in the celebration in 1954 of Columbia University's 200th anniversary by arranging programs to be given on the Cornell campus during 1954 stressing the theme - "Man's Right to Knowledge and His Free Use Thereof".

The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

On behalf of the Faculty of the College of Engineering, its Dean, Professor Hollister, after tracing the history of the various degrees that have been awarded by the College, presenting the reasons for the proposal, and citing the procedures of several other leading engineering schools, moved:

That the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees of Cornell University the change in undergraduate degrees in the College of Engineering as follows:

Bachelor of Civil Engineering to Civil Engineer
Bachelor of Chemical Engineering to Chemical Engineer
Bachelor of Metallurgical Engineering to Metallurgical Engineer
Bachelor of Electrical Engineering to Electrical Engineer
Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering to Mechanical Engineer
Bachelor of Agricultural Engineering to Agricultural Engineer
Bachelor of Engineering Physics to Engineer Physicist

and that students presently enrolled in the College of Engineering in work leading to the above degrees be given the option at graduation of either the baccalaureate degree or the degree to which it is recommended that it be changed.

The motion was seconded, and, after a lengthy discussion concerning the requirements, the nature, the significance, the standing, and the desirability of the new degrees, was passed by voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:34 p. m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:33 p. m.
The minutes of the meeting of February 11 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Dwight Clark Carpenter, Professor of Chemistry, on January 14, 1953. The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean read a communication from the President, which announced the appointments of the following special committees to write memorial articles to be published in the Necrology of the Faculty:

**Concerning William Ernest Blauvelt**
- R. W. Leiby
- Kenneth Post
- H. H. Schwardt, Chairman

**Concerning Wilder Dwight Bancroft**
- J. R. Johnson
- L. A. Maynard
- C. C. Murdock, Chairman

The Dean read a communication from Doctor Frederick R. Hirsh, Jr., an alumnus of the University, in which Dr. Hirsh expressed his gratitude to the Faculty for their presenting the purse of money last May to former Dean Murdock, because this purse made it possible for Dean Murdock to travel to Southern California this winter and there visit many of his friends, colleagues, and former students. Doctor Hirsh praised Dean Murdock most highly, both as a teacher and as a man. He considers Dean Murdock, along with Professor O. D. von Engeln, about the best teacher he had as an undergraduate.

The Provost informed the Faculty that there would be a special
meeting next Wednesday in order that the Faculty might have the opportunity to comment upon the educational aspects of the dormitory question before a final decision is reached.

The Vice President for University Development, Mr. Emerson, reported on the progress that had been made on the Cornell Associates program. He discussed the membership and the dues, traced the history, outlined the policy, described the services, and stated the objectives of the plan. In discussing the promotional literature, he stated that, when the time came for its revision, he intended to consult the Faculty's Committee on University Policy. He added that he welcomed questions at any time.

The Dean read a communication to the Faculty from the Junior Class Council of 1954 appealing the decision of the Committee on Student Activities to deny the request of the Council to have scheduled a public eggnog party on Sunday, January 11, 1953. The Chairman of the Committee on Student Activities, Professor Peabody, presented a reply to this appeal from the Committee, commenting as he did so on the considerable number of persons who had registered with its members approval of the Committee's action. (Copies of these two documents and a verified summary of the events leading up to the appeal are appended to these minutes.)

The Professor of Botany, Professor Petry, then moved:

1. That the action of the Committee on Student Activities in denying the request of the Junior Class Council to schedule a public eggnog party on Sunday, January 11, 1953 is approved;

2. That the Committee on Student Activities is asked to continue its consideration of the problems of student activities in relation to the University as a whole, and to the public, with a view to formulating policies in this field, and to the assigning of further responsibility to students and student organizations as they show ability to accept them.
The motion was seconded.

Professor Petry supported his motion by saying that, although he approved the Committee's action, he, nevertheless, wanted to encourage the steady transfer of responsibility to the student that has been going on since the War. A lively discussion ensued on various aspects of the issue.

The two parts of the motion were acted upon separately. Part one was first passed with a substantial majority by voice vote. Part two was then passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Requirements for Graduation, its Chairman, the Dean, after reviewing the old legislation and its effects and explaining the basis and reasons for the new proposal, moved:

That section 3 of the Faculty legislation of April 11, 1945, governing exemption from the requirement in military training, be amended to read as follows:

Students who are unable to meet the minimum physical standards established by the armed forces for admission to the basic courses in military training or who are ineligible for such courses under other regulations of the armed forces shall be exempt. In the discretion of the Committee on Requirements for Graduation exemptions from the requirements may be granted to aliens and conscientious objectors. It is recognized moreover that some other conditions, such as those of age, residence, or unusual outside responsibilities, may be accepted by the Committee as bases for exemption.

and that the Faculty inform the Board of Trustees of its action.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean as its Chairman, reported the establishment of the Sub-Committee on Research Contracts with the following members:
The reason for the establishment of this sub-committee is to have a competent body to study and recommend basic policies to be followed when the University enters into research contracts with particular reference to contracts with industrial corporations.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:32 p.m.
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:33 p.m.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor Peabody, after remarking that certain members of the Staff Committee on Men's Dormitories were neither members of this Faculty nor authorized to attend its meetings, moved:

That Mark Barlow, Jr., Assistant to the Dean of Men, Foster W. Coffin, Director of Willard Straight Hall, Milton R. Shaw, Director of Residential Halls, Walter A. Snickenberger, Administrative Assistant to the President, and Edgar A. Whiting, Assistant Director of Willard Straight Hall, be invited to attend the meeting of this Faculty today and to contribute to its deliberations on the educational aspects of the construction plans of the men's dormitories which the University administration now has under consideration.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

The minutes of the meeting of March 11 were read.

Professor Peabody, on behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, discussed the number, size, accommodations, and use of the proposed new dormitories for men; and the Provost, for the administration, discussed the history of development of the dormitory plan, the methods of and problems involved in financing the construction of the new dormitories (see tabulation appended to these minutes), and the policies which have guided these considerations.

Professor Peabody then, after expressing concern over the housing conditions of our students, moved the adoption of the following recommendations of the Committee on Student Activities:

(1) That, if at all possible, the six dormitory units be constructed, provided compulsory contract dining be not resorted to as a means of raising revenue.

(2) The use of (b), (c), and (d) under the heading "Estimated additional income or savings from specified sources" of the appended tabulation entitled "Men's Dormitories", providing for -
(b) Possible non-compulsory dining revenue (Willard Straight Hall).

(c) Temporary conversion of social lounge and head resident's apartment to student rooms.

(d) Addition of an average of $10 per man per year to room rents in new dormitories.

The motion was seconded.

After much discussion, centered chiefly around financing and costs, accommodations and services, adequacy of planned facilities, contract dining, deferred pledging, and library needs, the motion was lost on a show of hands - 21 for, 33 against the proposal.

The Professor of Electrical Engineering, Professor Smith, in order to consider separately that portion of the motion just defeated dealing with compulsory contract dining, moved:

That the Faculty now consider separately the first portion of the motion just defeated.

The motion was seconded and lost by voice vote.

The Professor of Hotel Administration, Professor Meek, then moved:

That, if the Faculty makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding dormitories, it be that dormitory rooms be built only to the extent that they can be readily rented at rates that will permit the project to be self-liquidating.

The motion was seconded. During the discussion which ensued, Professor Meek, in response to questions, indicated that he referred to the combined operations of residential halls, including existing and proposed dormitories. The motion was then passed by a show of hands - 34 in favor of and 24 against the proposal.

After comment that the motion just passed does not imply transmittal to the Board of Trustees, the Professor of Economics, Professor O'Leary, moved:

That this Faculty make the recommendation to refer the motion to the Board of Trustees.
The motion was seconded.

There followed a series of statements for and against this proposal, after which Professor O'Leary withdrew the motion and offered in its stead:

That it is the sense of this Faculty that compulsory contract eating for men students is undesirable on educational grounds.

The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
### MEN'S DORMITORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of new dormitory units for men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six 1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated construction cost</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal construction loan</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee construction loan</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Residential Halls income available for interest and amortization from existing and proposed dormitories</td>
<td>295,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual interest and amortization charges on dormitory loans</td>
<td>294,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of estimated Residential Halls net income over total interest and amortization charges</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by which income exceeds total interest and amortization charges</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of additional income required to provide a margin over total interest and amortization charges of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 10%</td>
<td>28,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 15%</td>
<td>43,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 20%</td>
<td>58,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual cost of counseling and social programs in new men's dormitories</td>
<td>32,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of additional income required to provide (a) a 15% income margin over total interest and amortization charges and (b) the cost of counseling and social programs in the new men's dormitories</td>
<td>75,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated additional income or savings from specified sources:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Compulsory dining for Freshmen in Willard Straight Hall</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Possible non-compulsory dining revenue (Willard Straight Hall)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Temporary conversion of social lounge and head resident's apartment to student rooms</td>
<td>26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Add an average of $10 per man per year to room rents in new dormitories</td>
<td>13,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Events Preceding an Appeal by the Junior Class
from a Ruling of the Faculty Committee on Student Activities

(The accuracy of this statement is agreed to by the Committee on Student Activities and the President and Secretary of the Junior Class.)

On November 20, 1952 Mr. Barry Kolton, Chairman of the Junior Class Special Events Committee, came to the office of the Dean of Men and requested registration of a junior class eggnog party to be held in the Tau Delta Phi fraternity house from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. on Sunday, January 18, 1953. Registration was withheld pending Dean Baldwin's approval as Executive Secretary of the Faculty's Committee on Student Activities. Mr. Kolton sought registration for this event because it was hoped that coeds would attend, and because coeds are forbidden by WSGA rules to attend social events in fraternity houses unless they have been registered in the Office of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women.

Later on the same day Dean Baldwin, having some doubt as to whether the request for registration should be granted, had a conference with Mr. Kolton. During the conference it developed that while the party was being sponsored by the junior class as an event primarily for juniors, all University students were to be invited; that the event was to be advertised in the Cornell Daily Sun; that announcements advertising the event were to be posted in public places; that admission of $1.00 per person was to be charged; that eggnogs were to be served; and that music for dancing was to be furnished by a student professional dance band. In the light of this information and particularly in view of the fact that this was to be an all-University social event which Dean Baldwin deemed inappropriate to a Sunday, he declined to register it and suggested to Mr. Kolton that the affair be held on a Friday or Saturday. Thereupon Mr. Kolton asked whether Dean Baldwin's decision was conclusive or whether he could appeal to some higher authority. Dean Baldwin replied that an appeal could be taken to the Faculty Committee on Student Activities.

On December 15, 1952 Mr. Kolton conferred with Prof. Peabody, Chairman of the Committee on Student Activities. During this conference Prof. Peabody stated that in his judgment the Committee would probably uphold Dean Baldwin's decision and for the reasons which led Dean Baldwin to decline to register the event. Prof. Peabody seconded Dean Baldwin's suggestion that the party be scheduled for a Friday or a Saturday.

On December 18, 1952 Mr. Kolton appeared before the Committee on Student Activities and appealed from Dean Baldwin's decision. Mr. Kolton stressed three points: (1) that the junior class hoped to make money from the event to replenish the class treasury, or at least not to lose any; (2) that he believed the event would attract a larger attendance if held on Sunday rather than on another day; (3) that no student activity which would be objectionable on a week-day could be forbidden merely because it was scheduled for Sunday. After full discussion it was moved that the affair might be scheduled provided that no publicity by newspaper nor by radio nor by posters in public places or in University buildings be given to it. The motion was not seconded and was withdrawn by the mover after it had been pointed out that since the Cornell Sun would publish the Committee's decision, publicity could not be avoided. It was then moved and seconded that the request for approval of the event be denied. On a show of hands the motion was carried, five voting for the motion and none against.
The Committee's action was based on the belief that it was obligated to disapprove student activities which in its judgment would seriously jeopardize the University's public relations; and on the further belief that the public reaction to the official authorization of such an event on a Sunday would be definitely unfavorable. The Committee's recollection was that a senior class cocktail party previously held had aroused adverse comment. The Committee conceded that it would not have the power to curtail a student's freedom of speech or worship even if the exercise of such freedom jeopardized the University's public relations.

Mr. Farber, President of the Junior Class, and one of the four non-voting student representatives on the Committee on Student Activities, inquired as to whether an appeal from the decision could be carried to the University Faculty. His question was answered in the affirmative. The appeal will be presented to the Faculty at its meeting on March 11.
We, the Junior Class Council of 1953, appeal from the decision of the Faculty Committee on Student Activities to ban our Eggnog Party scheduled for January 11, 1953. Sunday was chosen for the date because such a party cannot compete with open and free parties on campus: 1) Friday and Saturday nights are filled with fraternity parties and athletic events. 2) The 1953 Junior Class Council found Sunday the most successful day for their party of a similar nature. Realizing that the Eggnog Party itself is a small affair, we make this appeal because we feel it marks a new trend at Cornell - the narrowing of student freedom. We present this brief not to challenge the authority of the Faculty or its committees, but as a case for clarification only. We question one criterion - that of judging an event on the basis of the day scheduled - as it affects public relations, and as it restricts student freedom.

I. Public Relations - We believe that the Faculty committee overestimated the extent of unfavorable publicity; therefore, there was no necessity for its subsequent action. We believe this because:

A. The committee, though questioned on the amount of bad publicity, presented barely any evidence.

1. The closest we came to any such evaluation was when a prominent member of the committee stated that three people had spoken to him of the affair.

2. We question if three, or six, or eight people are enough to warrant such action.

B. Various contacts among Ithacans and alumni have indicated a minimum of publicity (favorable or unfavorable) concerning the Senior Class Cocktail Party as well as our Junior Class Eggnog Party.

II. Regardless of any publicity we feel that the ban is an unwarranted infringement upon student privileges.

A. We believe that students at Cornell as individuals and as members of society have the right to think and act as they choose provided they show respect for order, morality, personal honor, and the rights of others. Our party would in no way violate the above principles. Moreover, the event was not compulsory and would not be harmful to any individual who chose not to attend.

B. In addition, we believe that the decision of the Faculty is inconsistent with Cornell's policy and tradition of freedom with responsibility. And in itself, the decision is an imposition of the standards of a few (the committee) upon the many (the student body).

(signed) John H. Eisele, Jr., Sec'y-Treas.
Junior Class Council
(signed) Colin Tait, James D. McDonald, Ben Farber
Members, Junior Class Council
In the appeal of the Junior Class Council, the assertion is made that the Committee, by its decision, had imposed the standards of a few (the Committee) upon the many (the student body). The implication attempted is that the Committee forbade the eggnog party because the Committee believed that it was contrary to good morals to hold such an affair on a Sunday.

This is far from an accurate description of the Committee's position. The Committee did not pretend to decide whether or not the holding of an eggnog party on a Sunday was morally acceptable. The Committee addressed itself rather to this question: What effect would the holding of such an affair on a Sunday have on the public relations of the University? That this was the viewpoint from which the Committee actually considered the matter is pointed out on page 2 of the statement of events preceding the appeal distributed with the notice of the meeting; a statement which was carefully checked and agreed to by Junior Class Council representatives before publication.

The Committee's belief that the authorization of a Sunday party of this kind would jeopardize the University's public relations was based primarily on two factors:

a. The adverse comments made upon a substantially similar affair held in the recent past.

b. The critical comment which greeted the news that the party under discussion had been planned.

The Committee has made no attempt to compile statistics as to the number of persons who made adverse comments; but in the judgment of the Committee the number is sufficient to warrant the inference that a substantial number of mature persons, including townspeople, alumni, faculty, and trustees would, if asked, have expressed objection to the project.

Assuming that the Committee drew the correct inference as to the public reaction, the Committee submits that it was justified in its refusal to approve the party. To be sure this refusal involved a curtailment of student freedom. But it is clear that no one - not even a student - is allowed complete freedom. The question involves a balancing of interests: the interest of the University in its public relations, and that of the students in their claim to the privilege of holding a Sunday eggnog party.

The Committee concedes, of course, as pointed out on page 2 of the statement of events, that it should not curtail a basic freedom, such as that of freedom of speech or of worship, even if the exercise of such freedom jeopardized the University's public relations. The Committee contends, however, that the freedom to hold an eggnog party on a Sunday fails by a large margin to achieve a place in the above category. The relative unimportance of this party even to the students is inferentially admitted in their brief when they point out that such an event could not
hope to compete, if held on a weekday, with the student activities normally carried on on weekdays. The Committee, therefore, believes that it was correct in concluding that the freedom of the students to hold a Sunday eggnog party was far less important than the protection of the University's public relations.

In conclusion, the Committee wishes to call special attention to the first contention made by the Junior Class Council in its appeal; viz, that the day on which an event is to be held has nothing to do with its permissibility. Since the acceptance of this contention by the Faculty would lead to the conclusion that events such as the Junior Prom, the Spring Week-end Dance, and intercollegiate athletic contests, could be held on a Sunday, the Committee believes that the Faculty should not accede to this contention.

G. E. Peabody, Chairman  
Committee on Student Activities
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:33 p. m.

The Dean reminded the Faculty that the minutes of the regular meeting of March 11 were read but not approved at the special meeting of March 18. Whereupon the Professor of Chemistry, Professor Long, moved:

That the minutes of the regular meeting of this Faculty of March 11 be approved without rereading.

The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

The minutes of the special meeting of March 18 were read and approved.

The Dean read communications from the President, which announced the appointments of the following two special committees:

A committee to prepare a memorial article for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty -

Concerning Dwight Clark Carpenter
G. J. Hucker
Richard Wellington
D. B. Hand, Chairman

A committee to award in the spring of 1953 -

The Sampson Fine Arts Prize
N. D. Daly
H. A. Myers
N. A. Patillo, Jr., Chairman

On behalf of the Committee on Prizes, its Chairman, Professor Banks, after tracing briefly the history of the development of the idea, presented a report, a copy of which is appended to these minutes, recommending that the surplus income from the J. G. White Spanish Prize Fund be devoted to an annual scholarship in Spanish. He then moved:
That the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that so much of the annual income from the J. G. White Spanish Prize Fund as is in excess of the amount required for the three annual $100.00 prizes in Spanish (the annual surplus being about $490.00) be devoted to the establishment and maintenance of a scholarship to be known as the J. G. White Scholarship in Spanish and to be awarded beginning in April 1954 in the manner and on the terms set forth in the report of the Committee on Prizes presented at this meeting.

The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, the Professor of Economics, Professor Adams, presented a report, which was submitted in compliance with the provisions of the resolution that was adopted by the Faculty at its meeting of January 14, 1953 dealing with adjustments of faculty salaries in the endowed colleges. (A copy of this report is appended to these minutes.) Professor Adams then moved:

That this report be accepted by the Faculty.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, its Chairman, Doctor Bradford, after relating background events, moved:

That, with the consent of the authorities in charge of Olin Hall, this Faculty continue to meet here until it decides to meet elsewhere.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

On behalf of the Faculty of the College of Engineering, its Dean, Professor Hollister, after stating his reasons, moved:

That the University Faculty reconsider its action of February 11, 1953 changing the forms of undergraduate degrees of the College of Engineering and refer this matter back to the Faculty of the College of Engineering for further consideration.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Faculty adjourned at 4:51 p. m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIZES

The prize committee presents for the consideration of the Faculty, the following recommendation concerning the use of the excess money in the J. G. White Spanish Prize Fund.

This committee recommends the creation of an annual scholarship, with a value of about $490, to be applied on the recipient's tuition or other University expense. The scholarship should be known as the J. G. White Scholarship in Spanish. It is to be supported by the income of the J. G. White fund that is in excess of the amount required for the three annual $100 prizes in Spanish.

The committee recommends further that the scholarship thus created be administered on the following basis:

1. The scholarship would be awarded in April of the candidate's sophomore or junior year, the proceeds to be enjoyed during the following year. Award of the first scholarship would be made in April 1954, to be used during the academic year 1954 - 55.

2. A given student may not at the same time both win the prize in a given year and receive the scholarship for the following year, nor may he be a candidate for the prize during the year he holds the scholarship.

3. Limitations on candidates' previous residence in a Spanish-speaking or English-speaking country (as the case may be) would be the same as those now in effect regarding the prizes. The same would be true of requirements regarding Cornell Spanish courses, in the case of English-speaking students.

4. The scholarship would be awarded mainly on the basis of linguistic attainments, including a general knowledge of the language, its structure and its literature. At the same time, the criteria would be broadened so as to weigh also the candidates' continuing use of the language in relation to his future career, his motivation for maintaining proficiency in that language, the orientation of his personality toward the other culture, his character and his economic needs. Any type of student eligible for any one of the J. G. White Prizes in Spanish would be eligible in any given year for the scholarship award.

5. The decision to award would be made by the Professors of Spanish Linguistics and of Spanish Literature in consultation with their respective staffs and also with other appropriate members of the University Faculty who had been in important contact with the candidate and his general record.
Report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

On January 14, 1953, the University Faculty directed the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to:

"(a) Ascertain what principles, methods and policies guide those who are charged with the responsibility of salary adjustments in the endowed colleges;

(b) Propose a codification of fair principles, policies and methods of salary adjustments for the endowed colleges."

To fulfill this assignment the Committee attempted to compile a set of questions for submission to the Deans and Directors of the endowed divisions of the University. This undertaking proved unexpectedly thorny, and after considerable deliberation and discussion with other members of the faculty, the Committee abandoned the idea of a questionnaire and arrived at the following conclusions with respect to this assignment.

1. **Ascertainment of Procedures by which Faculty Salaries are Determined.**

The Committee believes that the present procedures for determining salary raises are well known and that the main criterion which does and should enter is individual merit. We further think it proper that the initiative for salary determinations should remain in the hands of the Departments and their Chairmen, and that the Directors and Deans and ultimately the Provost should make the necessary modifications to give a consistent University pattern.

We are aware that mistakes are made, i.e., that there are cases either where merit is not adequately rewarded or where the rewards differ in different parts of the University. When there are significant differences in salary scales among the several colleges, the Committee believes it appropriate to call attention to such inequalities as it did in its Report on Faculty Salaries dated December 5, 1952. However, we do not believe it is in the province of this Committee to become involved in the detailed aspects of University administration. If the Faculty wishes clarification of the administrative procedures for salary raises, we respectfully suggest that the most direct procedure would be to ask the Administration to make a report on this subject. Furthermore, since the determination of salaries is initiated in the several Schools and Colleges the Committee feels that they are the centers where specific procedural questions should be raised.

2. **The Proposed Codification of Procedures by which Individual Salaries are Determined.**

It is consideration of this part of its assignment that most disquiets the Committee. Quite obviously the general level of faculty salaries is of direct interest to this Committee. However, the deter-
mination of individual salaries rests, ultimately, upon the appraisal of individual merit. The Faculty will recall that its Special Committee on Tenure and Efficiency, after prolonged consideration, was unable to suggest procedures for the appraisal of merit to which the Faculty could agree. In its turn the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty believes that it should not assume responsibility for telling the administration how merit should be evaluated, and doubts that the Faculty wishes it to do so.

For the foregoing reasons, and because the areas for which the Committee has assumed responsibility constitute in themselves a major assignment, the Committee does not believe that the codification of specific procedures for the appraisal of individual merit falls within its sphere.

George P. Adams
Bart J. Conta
Slade M. Kendrick
Frank A. Long
Arnold N. Tolles
Perry W. Gilbert, Chairman
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:31 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of April 15 were read and approved.

The Dean read a communication from the President which announced the appointments of the following special committees to award prizes during the spring of 1953:

**The Barnes Shakespeare Prize**: J. G. Linn, Edward Partridge, W. R. Keast, Chairman.

**The Corson French Prize**: Jean Collignon, R. C. Weingartner, W. M. Sale, Jr., Chairman.

**The George Harmon Coxe Award**: J. A. Sessions, W. H. Stainton, Baxter Hathaway, Chairman.

**The Goethe Prize**: Ephim Fogel, W. F. Oechler, H. W. V. Lange, Chairman.

**The Guilford Essay Prize**: Ephim Fogel, H. A. Michelns, Arthur Mizener, Chairman.

**The Luana L. Messenger Prize**: Harry Caplan, Fritz Stern, A. E. Murphy, Chairman.

**The Mary B. Knoblaugh Prize**: L. D. Rockwood, B. F. Willcox, J. T. McKelvey, Chairman.

**The Morrison Poetry Prize**: M. G. Bishop, J. B. Hall, R. M. Adams, Chairman.

**The Sherman-Bennett Prize**: H. A. Freeman, H. M. Roelofs, F. G. Marcham, Chairman.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Neufeld, a member of its Subcommittee on the Revision of Legislation Governing the Committee on Nominations, presented to the Faculty the following proposed legislation:

I. The Committee on Nominations shall consist of nine members of the University Faculty, each member to be elected for a three-year term. In the initial establishment of this procedure, three members shall be elected for three years, three members for two years, and...
three members for one year. In succeeding years, three new members shall be elected by the Faculty for three-year terms at the same time and in accordance with the procedure followed in elections to other committees of the University Faculty.

The term of office of the present Committee on Nominations shall be extended until December 1953 in order that it may submit a slate of candidates for the new nine-man committee to be elected by mail ballot between the November and December 1953 meetings in the same way that members of the other elected committees will be elected next fall.

The Committee on Nominations shall elect its own chairman each year choosing from its three senior members. No member of the Committee shall be eligible for reelection for a period of five years after the expiration of his term.

No more than two members of any of the separate college or school faculties, other than the Graduate Faculty, listed in Article XIV, Section 2 of the University By-Laws may serve on the Committee on Nominations simultaneously.

II. The Committee on Nominations shall use the following procedure in making nominations for all elected committees of the Faculty:

a. Before submitting nominations, the Committee shall canvass the Faculty for suggestions as to nominees.

b. There shall be two nominations (paired) for each vacancy to be filled. In making its nominations, the Committee shall take into account the advisability of providing for representation of the several schools and colleges.

c. A biographical sketch of each nominee and a table showing the previous members of each committee and their schools or colleges shall be included in the call for the meeting at which the nominations are to be presented to the Faculty. Additional nominations from the floor shall be permitted.

d. The mail ballot for final voting by the Faculty shall include a biographical sketch of each nominee.

After pointing out the principal features of the proposed legislation,

Professor Neufeld moved:

That the Faculty legislation of November 14, 1951, under which the Committee on Nominations had been operating, be
amended so as to conform to the proposals of the Committee on University Policy.

The motion was seconded.

In response to a question raised by the Professor of Law, Professor Thompson, and during the discussion of the motion, the Professor of Economics, Professor O'Leary, suggested that it would be advisable to amend the motion by revising paragraph a of section II of the proposed legislation so as to read as follows:

   a. Before submitting nominations, the Committee shall canvass the Faculty for suggestions as to nominees; and, when conducting this canvass, shall furnish the Faculty with a table showing the previous members of each committee and their schools or colleges.

This suggestion, having been accepted by the maker and the seconder of the motion, the motion as revised was passed by voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Military Curricula, its Chairman, Professor Stainton, after explaining that certain Marine Corps courses had been added to the curriculum of the Department of Naval Science subsequent to the enactment of the Faculty legislation of November 13, 1946 assigning hours of credit for courses offered by the several military departments, suggested the advisability of bringing the added Marine Corps courses within the scope of such legislation, and moved that it be amended so as to read as follows:

   That three hours of credit a term be assigned to Naval Science 101, 102, 201, 202, 301, 301M, 302, 302M, 401, 401M, 402, and 402M; and that the special faculties be asked to determine to what extent these credits may be included within the college requirements for graduation.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the special Faculty committee to consult with the special Trustee committee in regard to the Faculty's recommendation of December 12, 1951 that the Faculty Representatives in the Board be constituted Faculty Trustees with the right to vote, the Dean presented
and discussed a report, a copy of which is appended to these minutes.

The Dean thereupon moved on behalf of the special Faculty committee and of the Committee on University Policy:

That the Faculty, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the special committee's report, rescind the part of its resolution of December 12, 1951 containing the suggestion that it would be desirable to amend the By-Laws of the University to permit of a distribution of committee assignments so that a Faculty Representative may sit on each of the principal committees of the Board; and that the Faculty request the Dean to furnish a copy of the special committee's report to each member of the University Faculty, together with a ballot on which he may indicate whether or not he believes that the Faculty Representatives in the Board should be accorded full Trustee status including the power to vote.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean reported the passage by that committee on May 4, 1953 of the following resolution:

Resolved that it is the sense of this Committee that it is sound policy to allow undergraduate students to sit with a University Faculty committee as consultants, or to be members of such a committee, either with or without the power of voting, when in the judgment of the Faculty members of that committee and of the University Faculty such representation, membership, or voting power would tend to further the educational aims of the University.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor Peabody, after reading to the Faculty the legislation of May 12, 1948 prescribing the composition of the committee, presented to the Faculty the following proposed legislation:

The Committee on Student Activities shall consist of eleven members of the University Faculty and four undergraduate students.

The Faculty component of the Committee shall comprise eight members of the University Faculty appointed by the President for terms of not more than four years; and three ex officio members: viz., the Dean of the University Faculty, the Dean of Men, who shall serve as Executive Secretary, and the Registrar, who shall serve as Recording Secretary. In the absence of the Dean of Men or in the event of his inability to serve, his place on the Committee shall be filled by the Dean of Women.
The President shall designate one of the appointed members of the Committee as Chairman.

The student component of the Committee shall comprise two women appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Women's Self-Government Association and two men appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Student Council.

The student members shall serve one-year terms beginning on or about May 1 and ending on or about April 30, and shall be eligible for reappointment.

The student members shall have the right to vote except on academic matters. The power to determine what matters are academic shall lie with the Faculty component of the Committee. The presence of six Faculty members shall be necessary to a quorum.

Professor Peabody then pointed out that the principal feature of the proposed legislation was the addition of four voting undergraduate student members to the Committee in substitution for the four non-voting undergraduate student consultants who had been sitting with the Committee on its invitation for several years. He reported that it was the opinion of the Committee that the services of the student consultants had been of great value to it; that the good record made by these consultants entitled the students to voting membership, and warranted the belief that granting such membership would facilitate the satisfactory solution by Faculty and students of their common problems. He explained that the few academic matters which came before the Committee usually consisted of requests of students to be relieved of some of the restrictions incident to the status of academic probation; and that the provision in the proposed legislation depriving the student members of the Committee of a vote on such matters reflected the Committee's belief that jurisdiction over such matters should lie exclusively with the Faculty. Professor Peabody thereupon moved:

That the Faculty legislation of May 12, 1948 prescribing the composition of the Committee on Student Activities be amended so as to conform to the proposals of that Committee.
The motion was seconded.

During the discussion of the motion, it was pointed out that there were two reasons why no provision was made for representation of graduate students on the Committee: (1) questions concerning the activities of graduate students rarely come before the Committee; and (2) graduate students have shown no interest in representation on the Committee.

To the contention of the Professor of Economics, Professor O'Leary, that the resolution of the Committee on University Policy reported by the Dean earlier in the meeting had failed to make clear the committee's opinion on the question as to whether voting student members should be added to the Committee on Student Activities, and to Professor O'Leary's suggestion that the question should, therefore, be referred to the Committee on University Policy for consideration and report, the Dean replied that the resolution of the Committee on University Policy was intended to indicate that, while it believed that the question as to whether or not any particular Faculty committee should include student members ought to be decided upon the recommendation of the particular committee, the Committee on University Policy wanted the Faculty to know that it could discover no valid reason why a Faculty committee should not have student members, if the committee and the Faculty concluded that such an arrangement would be advisable in view of the nature of the committee and its work. The Dean added that the inclusion of students in the voting membership of the Boards on Physical Education and Athletics and Student Health and Hygiene seemed to afford ample precedent for the recommendation of the Committee on Student Activities.

Thereupon the motion was put to a vote and passed by a show of hands.
On behalf of the Committee on Scheduling of Public Events, its Chairman, Professor Ryan, called to the attention of the Faculty the existing legislation with reference to the composition of that committee, and presented the following proposed legislation:

The Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events shall consist of eleven members of the University Faculty and four undergraduate students.

The Faculty component of the Committee shall comprise the Dean of the University Faculty, the Dean of Women, the Chairman of the Committee on Student Activities, and the Director of Physical Education and Athletics, ex officio, and seven members of the University Faculty appointed by the President for terms not to exceed four years. In the absence of the Dean of Women, or in the event of her inability to serve, her place on the Committee shall be filled by the Dean of Men. Two of the seven appointed members shall be selected so as to give representation to the Department of Music, and the Department of Speech and Drama. These two members may be immediately reappointed after a four-year term. The other five appointed members are not eligible for immediate reappointment. The President shall name as Chairman one of these five appointed members. The presence of six Faculty members shall be necessary to a quorum.

The student component of the Committee shall comprise two women appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Women's Self-Government Association, and two men appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Student Council. The student members shall be voting members; shall serve one-year terms beginning on or about May 1 and ending on or about April 30, and shall be eligible for reappointment.

The President shall designate a member of the administrative staff of the University as the Executive Secretary of the Committee.

After pointing out that the Committee on Scheduling of Public Events had had a satisfactory experience with its two non-voting student members, had carefully considered the advisability of recommending that their number be increased and that they be given the vote, and had come to a conclusion consistent with that arrived at by the Committee on Student Activities; and after pointing out further that the proposed legislation omitted reference to the Secretary of the University because of the vacancy in that office and the committee's understanding that that vacancy was
not likely to be filled; and that the proposed legislation substituted "the Dean of Women" for "the office of the Dean of Men or the office of the Dean of Women" because by agreement between the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, it had become customary for the latter rather than the former to meet with the committee, Professor Ryan moved:

That the second paragraph of the Faculty legislation of November 13, 1946 concerning the Committee on Scheduling of Public Events as amended by the Faculty legislation of May 12, 1946 be further amended so as to conform to the proposals of that committee.

The motion was seconded.

To the President's question as to whether it was advisable to limit the student membership to undergraduates, Professor Ryan replied in the affirmative, pointing out that the only student organizations which appeared to have an interest in the questions normally coming before the committee were undergraduate organizations.

The motion was thereupon unanimously carried by a voice vote.

The President informed the Faculty that the organization known as Cornell United Religious Work has recommended to the Board of Trustees that it be taken into the corporate structure of the University. The President stated further that he would request the Board, before acting upon this proposal, to give the Faculty an opportunity to express its opinion upon it.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:36 p. m.

J. D. Burfoot, Jr.
Secretary
I. Historical Background

In 1916 the Board of Trustees, in response to a request of the Faculty for voting representation on the Board, which request was vigorously supported by President Schurman, authorized the Faculty to select delegates to represent it in the Board; these delegates to serve during a trial period of three years, to meet with the Board and its Committee on General Administration, and to have the usual powers of Trustees except the right to vote.

In April 1920 the Faculty voted in favor of continued representation, renewing its request that its Representatives be made Trustees with the right to vote. The Trustees, while approving continued Faculty representation, took no action with respect to the Faculty's request that its delegates be made Faculty Trustees.

In October 1921 the Faculty voted that its delegates should not assume to speak for the Faculty but should rather express their own independent judgment when sitting with the Board. At the same time the Faculty asked again that its Representatives be given the status of voting Trustees. In 1922 the Board appointed a special committee to draft amendments to the University Charter, including a provision for giving the Faculty Representatives the vote. In 1923 this committee reported that the time was not opportune for making changes in the Charter; and the Board approved this report.

In 1933 the Faculty extended the term of its Representatives from three to five years, enacted that they should henceforth be chosen from active members of the Faculty, and reiterated its request that they be given the vote.

In 1934 the Board of Trustees replied:

1. that it found itself in full agreement with the principle that the Representatives of the Faculty should, in addition to the other rights of Trustees, have the right to vote;

2. that provision for the right to vote could not be made without alteration of the University Charter;

3. that the Board did not regard the present as a favorable time to ask the Legislature for alterations in the Charter; and

4. that the Board was disposed, when a favorable occasion arose, to request an alteration in the Charter granting voting power to the Faculty Representatives.

II. Recent Developments

The Board having taken no further action in the premises, the Faculty on December 12, 1951, upon the recommendation of its Committee on University Policy, and after some discussion, adopted by a voice vote two resolutions:

1. That the Faculty recommend to the Board that the Faculty Representatives be constituted Faculty Trustees with full powers as Trustees of the University; and
2. That the Faculty suggest to the Board the desirability of an amendment to the By-Laws of the University to permit of a distribution of committee assignments so that a Faculty Representative may sit on each of the principal committees of the Board.

On February 13, 1952 the President reported to the Faculty that the Board, at its January meeting, had appointed a special committee of three to consider the Faculty's recommendation and request. The Faculty thereupon voted to authorize the President to appoint a special committee to consult with the Board's special committee. In April the President appointed R. E. Cushman and R. S. Stevens as members of the special Faculty committee. The third member of the Faculty committee is the Dean of the University Faculty, as provided in the University By-Laws. In June 1952 the two committees met and engaged in an exploratory discussion of the Faculty's recommendation and suggestion. After attempts to schedule meetings in October 1952 and in January and March 1953 failed because of the absences abroad, the conflicting engagements, or the illness of one or more of the committee members, the second meeting of the Faculty-Trustee conferees was finally set for April 23.

At this meeting, which was attended by all of the members of each committee, it was conceded that since no class of Trustees is now assured of seats on any particular committee, the giving of such assurance to Faculty Trustees would amount to preferential treatment; and that the Faculty could not in fairness simultaneously urge both of its points: (1) its request that its representatives be made full Trustees, and (2) its suggestion that they be assured of seats on all important committees. Believing that the full Trustee status was more important than a guaranty of representation on the several Trustee committees, the Faculty conferees voted to recommend to the Faculty that it withdraw its suggestion with respect to committee representation.

One of the Trustee conferees argued in favor of the substitution of Faculty Trustees with full powers for the present non-voting Faculty Representatives on the ground that the Faculty members now sitting with the Board of Trustees are in a position to exercise power by influencing the Board without being subject to the tempering responsibility which the duty to vote would impose upon them.

Two Trustee conferees expressed concern lest the addition to the Board of voting Faculty Trustees afford a precedent which could be relied upon by other special groups seeking representation on the Board. The Faculty conferees replied by suggesting that the relation of the Faculty to the University differed so markedly from the relation to the University of any other group which might seek representation that it would not be difficult to justify a decision to extend voting representation to the Faculty while withholding it from other groups.

Two Trustee conferees also expressed concern that the replacement of the present Faculty Representatives with voting Faculty Trustees might deprive the Board of Trustees of the benefit of part of the Faculty counsel which the Board now enjoys, and so might in the long run be prejudicial to the best interests of the University. More specifically they pointed out that much of the Board's important business goes to its Executive Committee for preliminary consideration before being handled by the full Board: that since the four Faculty Representatives are not now voting members of the Board, all four can sit with this committee as consultants: but that if and when they become voting Trustees, the Trustees would almost certainly repeal the By-Law pursuant to which they now sit with the Executive Committee, and would in all probability be unwilling, for the reasons pointed out above, to substitute a new By-Law guaranteeing even one place in the Executive Committee or any on other important committees to the Faculty Trustees.
The Faculty conferees, while admitting, as indicated above, that voting Faculty Trustees could not be guaranteed places on Trustee committees, do not believe that it follows that the Faculty Representatives should not be given full Trustee status. In the judgment of the Faculty Representatives now in office, the educator’s point of view could be more effectively presented by voting Faculty Trustees than by non-voting Faculty Representatives. They stress their reluctance as non-voting Faculty Representatives to speak in the Board unless their opinions are sought; and say that more than occasionally their views are not asked concerning questions with important educational aspects. They also point out that the loss of four non-voting consultants’ seats with the Executive Committee is not as serious a matter as it might appear (1) in view of the fact that some of the work formerly done by the Executive Committee is now handled by other committees of the Board; (2) in view of the reasonable probability that at least one voting Faculty Trustee would be appointed to the Executive Committee; and (3) in view of the possibility that a voting Faculty Trustee might be appointed to one or more of the other committees. Your Faculty conferees concur in these views of your present Faculty Representatives, and believe that this Faculty would usually elect Trustees capable of earning the confidence and respect of the Board, and that a sufficient number of them would, therefore, in the normal course of events, be appointed to the Board’s committees to enable them adequately to represent the interests of education. The Faculty conferees are also influenced by their agreement with the following statement made in 1912 by President Schuman in his annual report:

“What is needed in American Universities today is a new application of the principle of representative government. The faculty is essentially the university; yet in the governing boards of American universities the faculty is without representation. The only ultimately satisfactory solution of the problem of the government of American Universities is the concession to the professoriate of representation in the board of trustees or regents and these representatives of the intellectual which is the real life of the university, must not be mere ornamental figures; they should be granted an active share in the routine administration of the institution.

In response to a question put by the Trustee conferees as to the number of Faculty members present at the Faculty meeting of December 12, 1951, the Faculty conferees estimated the attendance at 75, and pointed out that a larger number might well have appeared had it not been assumed by most of the Faculty that the existence of its desire for voting Faculty Trustees had long previously been thoroughly established. Despite this explanation, the two Trustee conferees who had expressed doubt as to the advisability of creating voting Faculty Trustees stated that they didn’t consider that a Faculty vote at a small meeting afforded an adequate cross-section of Faculty opinion on the question; and the third Trustee conferee, who had already declared himself in favor of voting Faculty Trustees, also exhibited an interest in the extent of Faculty support for the proposal. Thereupon all the conferees expressed the opinion that it would be advisable to secure the opinions of larger number of the Faculty; and the Faculty conferees agreed to recommend to the Faculty that a mail ballot be taken on the question.

It will be noted that the Trustee conferees have not in any way challenged the validity of the action taken by the Faculty in December, 1951; but have merely indicated that in their judgment the number of members of the Faculty who
had recently and personally indicated their support of the Faculty's request for voting Faculty Trustees should be treated as a relevant factor.

Your conferees are authorized to state that the Faculty Committee on University Policy concurs in this report and in the recommendations contained in it.

R. E. Cushman  
W. H. Farnham  
R. S. Stevens  

May 13, 1953
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The President announced that in the absence of the Secretary of the Faculty, Professor Burfoot, the Professor of Psychology, Professor Ryan, would serve as Secretary of the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting of May 13 were read and approved.

The President welcomed the new members of the University Faculty, and introduced to the Faculty, Helen G. Canoyer, Dean of the College of Home Economics, and Dexter Perkins, the first John L. Senior University Professor of American Civilization.

The President announced the deaths of the following members of the University Faculty:

- Edgar Cooper Person, Jr., Associate Professor of Clinical Surgery, on September 5, 1952
- Oscar Menderson Schloss, Professor of Pediatrics, Emeritus, on October 1, 1952
- Meyer Rosensohn, Assistant Professor of Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, on April 26, 1953
- Leland Bernard Norton, Professor of Insecticidal Chemistry, on June 10, 1953
- Percival John Parrott, Professor of Entomology, Emeritus, on August 10, 1953.

The Faculty rose in respect for the memory of their former colleagues.

The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the appointment of six special committees to write memorial articles to be published in the Necrology of the Faculty.

Concerning William James Elser: E. F. Dubois
Concerning Edgar Cooper Person, Jr.: Frank Glenn, R. H. Melchionna
Concerning Oscar Menderson Schloss: S. Z. Levine
Concerning Meyer Rosensohn: R. G. Douglas
Concerning Leland Bernard Norton: J. L. Brann, Jr., T. C. Watkins, C. E. Palm, Chairman
Concerning Percival John Parrott: F. Z. Hartzell, Richard Wellington, J. D. Luckett, Chairman.
The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the substitution of J. R. Johnson for C. C. Murdock, as Chairman of the special committee to prepare an article for the Necrology concerning Wilder Dwight Bancroft; and the appointment of G. J. Thompson to the Committee on Nominations to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of H. E. Guerlac.

The Dean read communications from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees stating that on June 15, 1953 the President, pursuant to the Faculty's request, reported to the Board of Trustees the Faculty action of March 11, 1953 amending the Faculty legislation of April 11, 1945, governing exemption from the requirement in military training; and announcing the establishment by the Board of Trustees on June 10, 1953 of the J. G. White Scholarship in Spanish in accordance with the Faculty's recommendation of April 5, 1953.

The Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, Professor Boynton, announced that the Professor of Geology, Professor Burfoot, had asked to be relieved of his duties as Secretary of the University Faculty. After pointing out that Professor Burfoot's faithful services to the Faculty would be missed, but that his reasons for resignation were compelling, Professor Boynton moved:

That the University Faculty accept the resignation of Professor Burfoot as Secretary of the Faculty with regret, and that it record a vote of thanks to him for his services as its Secretary during the past three years.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Professor Boynton announced that the election of a new Secretary was scheduled for the regular Faculty meeting of October 14; that the Committee on Nominations would make two nominations for the position, the names to be sent to the Faculty in the call for the meeting; and
that there would be opportunity for nominations from the floor.

Professor Boynton then moved:

That the election of a Secretary of the Faculty be made a special order for the regular Faculty meeting of October 14.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Chairman of the Committee on University Lectures, Professor Kendrick, reported that Watermargin had tendered to the University a fund of about $1,100.00 to be administered by the Faculty Committee on University Lectures for the support of a series to be known as the Watermargin University Lectures; that the series was intended to bring to the campus personalities outstanding in the field of intergroup relations who have by their skill, knowledge, artistic ability, profession or position demonstrated the truth of Watermargin's motto - "All Men Are Brothers"; that the Committee on University Lectures had recommended to the President that Watermargin's offer be accepted; and that the President had acted in accordance with the Committee's recommendation.

At the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Student Conduct, Professor Leonard, and of the Chairman of the Committee on Student Activities, Professor Peabody, the Dean reported that at a joint meeting of these committees held on September 17, 1953, it was unanimously voted to recommend the establishment of an Undergraduate Men's Judiciary Board with limited, initial jurisdiction over male undergraduates. The Dean related the events which led up to the recommendation, and summarized the main provisions of the constitution of the proposed board, and the considerations which impelled the committees to make their recommendation. Thereupon the Dean, on behalf of the
Committees on Student Conduct and Student Activities moved:

That the Faculty authorize the establishment of a Men's Judiciary Board in conformity with the provisions of its proposed constitution dated September 17, 1953; the authorization to be effective if and when the Board of Trustees signifies its approval.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

A copy of the proposed constitution is filed with these minutes.

The Faculty adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

T. A. Ryan
Secretary pro tem
CONSTITUTION OF MEN'S JUDICIARY BOARD
(Draft of September 17, 1953)

I. MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTION

1. The Men's Judiciary Board shall consist of eight male undergraduate students, who shall elect one of their number as Chairman. The Chairman shall vote only in the event of a tie. The membership shall be elected in the following manner:

   a. Student Council will conduct signups from the campus-at-large, in the spring of each academic year.

   b. The Executive Committee of Student Council will interview all those who apply and will nominate a minimum of fifteen (first year), eight (each following year). These nominees will be further interviewed by Student Council for final selection. The eight members shall include:

   i. Four male undergraduate students who have two academic years remaining at the University, and who shall serve for two years. (Approval by Student Council will be required to seat the Board member for the second one-year term.)

   ii. Four male undergraduate students who have one academic year remaining at the University, and who shall serve during that year.

   c. After the year of initial establishment, Student Council will -- in the manner specified under b (i) -- choose four male undergraduate students annually, to be added to the Board.

   d. In the event a member of the Board is unable to continue, the Executive Committee of Student Council will appoint, subject to Student Council approval, a male undergraduate stu-
dent with a comparable number of academic years remaining at the University, to fill the unexpired term of office.

II. JURISDICTION

1. The MJB shall have initial jurisdiction in cases involving the conduct of male, undergraduate students on campus, including traffic violations, provided, however, that no case involving academic work or academic fraud, no case falling within the jurisdiction of the Interfraternity Council, and no case in which the civil authorities such as the Ithaca police or the Tompkins County Sheriff's Department shall have acted as complainant, shall be within the jurisdiction of the Board. Doubts as to jurisdiction in particular cases shall be resolved by the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct.

2. The penalties which the MJB may impose shall be chosen from those authorized by the FCSC.

III. ADVISOR TO THE BOARD

The Dean of Men shall serve as Advisor to the MJB. In the event of his inability to serve, he shall designate a substitute.

IV. QUORUM

The presence of five members of the MJB shall be necessary to a quorum. No case shall be tried unless a quorum and the Dean of Men or his designated substitute are present. No findings or recommendations shall be valid unless supported by three votes. Neither the Dean of Men nor his substitute shall have the power to vote.

V. BOARD PROCEEDINGS

Complaints involving student conduct falling within the MJB's jurisdiction will be filed with the Proctor, who will conduct an inves-
tigation, and furnish his report in writing to the Chairman of the MJB. The Chairman will thereupon notify the accused of his right to appear before the Board and present his defense. At the hearing, the Chairman will read the complaint and the Proctor's report. The accused will then be given an opportunity to speak and present evidence, and the MJB may interrogate the accused and the witnesses. At the close of the hearing, the MJB will meet in closed session to reach its findings and make its recommendation. The MJB shall report its findings and recommendation in each case to the FCSC, retaining a copy for its own files. If the recommendation is suspension or expulsion, or if the accused student appeals, or if the FCSC requests it, the MJB shall deliver its entire file on the case, including the Proctor's report, to the FCSC.

VI. REVIEW BY FCSC

1. In any case in which the MJB recommends suspension or expulsion, or in which the accused student appeals, the findings and recommendation of the MJB shall be reviewed by the FCSC.

2. Review of cases other than those specified in section 1 of this article shall be at the discretion of the FCSC.

3. The FCSC may summon the Chairman of the MJB to be present at the review of any case by the FCSC pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of this article; and the Chairman of the MJB shall have the privilege of appearing at any such review although not so summoned.

VII. STUDENT APPEALS

In all cases except those in which the MJB recommends suspension or expulsion, the accused student shall be deemed to have accepted the findings and recommendation of the MJB unless he shall file a
written appeal with the Chairman of the FCSC within five days of his receipt of written notification from the MJB of its findings and recommendation and of his right to appeal therefrom. Such notifications shall be sent by registered mail, with return receipt requested; and the MJB shall file the return receipt with the Secretary of the FCSC. The failure of a student to appeal does not, however, preclude a review of his case by the FCSC pursuant to section 2 of Article VI.

VIII. RECORDS

No MJB records shall be examined by any person other than the President, the Proctor, the University Medical Office, the members of the MJB, the Advisor to the MJB, and the members of the FCSC, or withdrawn from its files, except with the authority of the FCSC, or as elsewhere herein provided.

IX. PUBLICITY

The Board, through its Chairman, shall have the authority to release its findings and recommendation to the public. However, in no instance may the name of the individual be used or released.

X. INDOCTRINATION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS

First Year: A proper indoctrination will be conducted along both formal and informal lines, by the Chairman of the FCSC, the Advisor to the MJB, and other persons familiar with problems of student conduct.

Following Years: New members will sit in on meetings of the Board during the spring in which they are appointed. Proper indoctrination will be conducted by the old members of the MJB, the Chairman of the FCSC, and the Advisor
XI. ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION

Whenever the MJB believes its area of jurisdiction should be enlarged, it will request the Student Council to petition the University Faculty through the FCSC for such increase in jurisdiction.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p. m.
The minutes of the meeting of September 30 were read and approved.
The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the following committee and board appointments, the appointees to serve from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1957 unless otherwise specified:

To the Committee on University Lectures
R. H. Dalton

To the Committee on Music
M. H. Abrams
K. W. Evett from November 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954, during the absence on leave of J. B. Rosser.

To the Committee on Student Conduct
J. W. Reps
E. N. Warren
Duncan MacIntyre from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1954.

To the Committee on Student Activities
Theresa Humphreysville
J. R. Moyahan

To the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships
James Hutton, to be Chairman from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1954
Harold Feldman
W. M. Sale, Jr.
R. D. Sweet from November 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954, during the absence on leave of N. C. Brady.

To the Committee on Entrance Credentials
H. E. Baxter from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1955
J. P. Hertel

To the Committee on Requirements for Graduation
J. O Mahoney from October 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954, during the absence on leave of S. M. Barnette.

To the Committee on Military Curricula
H. M. Giffi
C. A. Hanson from November 1, 1953 to February 7, 1954, during the absence on leave of J. W. McConnell.
To the Committee on Calendar

James Campbell, to be Chairman from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1954
H. J. Cady
F. W. OcVirk
D. L. Finlayson from November 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954 during the absence on leave of S. M. Barnette.

To the Committee on Scheduling of Public Events

A. W. Gibson, to be Chairman from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1954.
H. D. Albright
Jean Warren
F. W. Wells from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1956
W. C. Heasley, Jr., to be Executive Secretary of the Committee without term.

To the Committee on Registration and Schedules

R. I. Fricke
V. DiGiambattista from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1955
J. H. Searle from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1954.

To the Committee on Prizes

F. B. Agard

To the Committee of Award of the Moses Coit Tyler Prize

P. W. Gates, to be Chairman from November 1, 1953 to October 31, 1956
Dexter Perkins from November 1, 1953 to June 1, 1954 during the absence on leave of C. L. Rossiter.

To the Committee on University Broadcasting

J. J. Gibson
G. A. McCulm
W. H. French from November 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954 during the absence on leave of H. E. Guerlac.

To the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

B. J. Conta from November 1, 1953 to February 7, 1954 during the absence on leave of N. A. Tolles.

To the Board on Student Health and Hygiene

Temple Burling from November 1, 1953 to September 15, 1954 during the absence on leave of J. K. Loosli.

On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, its Chairman, Professor Boynton, placed in nomination for the position of Secretary of the University Faculty the Professor of Food and Nutrition, Professor Hauck, and the Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Erdman. There
being no nominations from the floor, the President appointed the Pro-
fessor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Professor Rideout, and
the Professor of Mathematics, Professor Kac, to act as tellers. 84
votes were cast, of which 51 were for Professor Hauck and 33 for
Professor Erdman. The President thereupon declared Professor Hauck
to have been elected.

The President reported that he had received a request from the
Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools that it
be permitted to make an accrediting inspection of the University, and
asked the Registrar, Dr. Bradford, to comment upon the background of
the request.

Dr. Bradford stated that Cornell was one of the charter members
of the organization, which had originally been concerned with standardizing
admission requirements among its members, but which later took over
the function of accrediting new colleges and schools. He added that
the projected inspection of Cornell grows out of a new policy under
which the Association is giving attention to the larger universities
as well as to the smaller colleges. Dr. Bradford thereupon moved:

That this Faculty approve the proposed visit to Cornell
University by a Committee representing the Commission on Higher
Institutions of the Middle States Association of Colleges and
Secondary Schools at a time to be agreed upon by the President
of the University and the Secretary of the Commission.

The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The President expressed his appreciation to the Faculty for its
cooperation in welcoming to the campus numerous distinguished educators
who have been visiting the University under the sponsorship of several
foundations and agencies.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p. m.

T. A. Ryan
Secretary pro tem
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p. m.

The minutes of the meeting of October 14 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death, on October 25, 1953, of James Edward Rice, Professor of Poultry Husbandry, Emeritus. The Faculty rose in respect to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the appointment of the Professor of Zoology, Professor L. C. Cole, as Chairman of the Committee on University Lectures to serve until October 31, 1955, and of the Professor of Hotel Administration, Professor J. J. Vanderstock, as Chairman of the Committee on Student Conduct to serve until October 31, 1956.

The Dean read a communication from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees announcing that on October 17, 1953 the Trustees approved the University Faculty's recommendation that its Committee on Student Conduct be authorized to establish a Men's Judiciary Board which will have initial jurisdiction over the conduct and discipline of men students, subject to the President's approval of the detailed plan. The Dean announced that an oral communication had been received from the President approving the plan, which is embodied in a document entitled "Constitution of Men's Judiciary Board (Draft of September 17, 1953)". (A copy of this document is appended to the minutes of September 30, 1953.)
On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, its Chairman, Professor Damon Boynton, presented the following nominations for faculty positions on University committees and boards:

for Faculty Representative on the Board of Trustees
R. E. Cushman
K. L. Turk

for Committee on University Policy
M. G. de Chazeau
T. W. Mackesey

for Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty
B. J. Conta
A. E. Kahn

for Board on Physical Education and Athletics
A. M. Mizener
H. F. Newhall

for Board on Student Health and Hygiene
Temple Burling
Samuel Leonard

for Committee on Nominations
(1 year) L. H. MacDaniels and L. C. Petry
C. W. Jones and Lauriston Sharp
C. W. Mason and D. F. Gunder

(2 years) M. G. Fincher and F. H. Stutz
G. P. Adams, Jr. and Knight Biggerstaff
W. D. Curtiss and M. R. Konvitz

(3 years) A. H. Detweiler and J. G. B. Hutchins
W. H. Erickson and H. J. Loberg
Irene Patterson and Mabel Rollins

In discussing the nominations, Professor Boynton noted the number and scatter of suggestions received for the several positions to be filled, and outlined some of the procedures followed by the Committee in arriving at a slate of nominations. He pointed out that nominations for the Committee on University Policy and for the Committee on Nominations were arranged in such a way as to insure some representation for the smaller units within the University.
There being no response to the invitation for nominations from the floor, the Professor of International Law, Professor H. W. Briggs, moved that the nominations be closed, and that the Committee on Nominations be thanked for its work. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously by a voice vote.

The Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, Professor Boynton, then moved that the list of nominees be referred to the Committee on Elections. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean moved that a special committee be established to advise the President regarding the selection of a nominee for the John L. Senior University Professorship in American Civilization, and that the elective component of this special committee comprise four members of the Faculty.

The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean then reported that, after consulting with the Committee on Inter-Faculty Relations, the Committee on University Policy had chosen the following four nominees for places on the elective component of the special committee to advise the President with regard to the selection of a nominee for the John L. Senior Professorship in American Civilization:

M. G. Bishop
H. F. DeGraff
P. W. Gates
G. J. Thompson
Opportunity was then given for nominations from the floor. The Professor of English, Professor R. H. Elias, nominated the Professor of Philosophy, Professor S. M. Brown, Jr. The Professor of Mathematics, Professor Mark Kac, nominated the Professor of International Law, Professor H. W. Briggs. Professor Briggs, however, declined the nomination. The Professor of Economics, Professor G. F. Adams, Jr., then moved that the nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Provost asked the Professor of Psychology and of Child Development and Family Relationships, Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, and the Professor of Business Management, Professor G. W. Hedlund, to serve as tellers, and the Faculty proceeded to ballot. The tellers reported that the following persons had been elected: M. G. Bishop, P. W. Gates, G. J. Thompson and H. F. DeGraff.

For the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor G. E. Peabody, reported on a Statement on the Registration of Social Events which was approved by the Committee on Student Activities on October 26. He discussed its provisions and answered a question with respect to it. The statement, together with an account of the events which led to its adoption, is appended to these minutes.

For the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean, reported on the variety and range of suggestions which had been received from students, members of the Faculty, and from the President for changes in Commencement and Senior Week activities.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean then moved that the following legislation be adopted:
That there be established a special committee of this Faculty to be known as the Committee on Commencement Policy, the size of the committee to be determined by the President;

That the President be requested to appoint the members of the committee and to select its chairman;

That the function of the committee shall be to study problems of Commencement and Senior Week policy and to make recommendations concerning their solution to the President, to the Faculty or to the student body as may be appropriate in the particular instance;

That the committee shall have power to establish sub-committees to aid it in the discharge of its duties, and to appoint thereto members of the administrative staff of the University and of the student body; and

That the committee shall serve until the October 1956 meeting of this Faculty unless in the meantime the Faculty shall have taken action to the contrary.

The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
For some time prior to the academic year 1952-53 the members of WSGA had been of the opinion that the existing rules governing social events in student apartments were unnecessarily cumbersome and restrictive. About a year ago the President of WSGA called attention to this issue at a meeting of the SFA, a name given a group of student leaders, faculty and administrative representatives who meet, usually once a month, with the President to discuss current problems affecting students. At the suggestion of this group the Presidents of WSGA, Student Council, Independent Council, Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council met with the Deans of Men and Women to consider the problem. As a result a committee was set up by the Student Council and WSGA to study the question and if possible prepare some workable recommendations. The committee consisted of Miss Jane Atwood in charge of student activities from the Dean's office, Professor W. A. Wimsatt, a former Chairman of the Conduct Committee, and six student leaders from representative student organizations. This Committee had frequent meetings during the year and presented its report with recommendations to the Student Activities Committee at its last regular meeting of the school year.

In view of the fact that approval of the recommendations would provide additions to the existing regulations of WSGA governing social activities of women students and that violations of the proposed changes involving men students would become the problem of the Student Conduct Committee, the Chairman of the Activities Committee met with Dr. Leonard, Chairman of the Student Conduct Committee and Dean Farnham, at which time it was agreed that it would be advisable to hold a joint committee meeting just prior to the beginning of the fall term to which would be invited the presidents of student organizations already mentioned. With the student members of the two faculty committees it was felt that student opinion would be well represented.

The office of the Deans of Men and Women was requested to put the recommendations of the Apartment Party Committee into a suitable resolution which the Joint Committee was to consider. To the section devoted to Apartment Parties was added, as a related subject, a further request by WSGA, later approved by the IFC, to allow mixed party dinners in organized living units under certain conditions.

After three long meetings of the Joint Committee, it was voted on October 5 to tentatively approve the revised document known as a Statement on the Registration of Social Events.

The purpose of the tentative approval was to allow opportunity for discussion among the members of the various student organizations represented. It was recognized that if these additional privileges were to be respected, whole hearted support of the student body was necessary. Robert Landau, President of the Student Council, was given
the responsibility to handle the gathering of student opinion. With the able assistance of the other presidents of the major student organizations, this was done. At the meeting held on October 26, it was reported that all of these groups had approved the tentative statement. The Joint Committee then voted to give the statement final approval and recommended that the Committee on Student Activities consider the question. This committee did approve the resolution to take effect as soon as the Dean's office could work out a method to implement it. I understand that this has been done and the additions to WSGA rules are now in effect.
A Statement on the Registration of Social Events
approved by the Committee on Student Activities

(As tentatively approved October 5, 1953)

Social events shall be registered in the Office of Student Activities according to existing procedures with the following exceptions:

I. Apartments. Cornell men residing in apartments may entertain women only when the following conditions have been met:

A. Cornell men, except freshmen, may register their apartments for a period of one academic year for the purpose of entertaining women guests. Annual registration, through the Office of Student Activities, grants the privilege of mixed entertainment without individual registration of each party and without the presence of chaperones. Registration of an apartment carries with it certain obligations and responsibilities:

1. At least two women must be present.
2. At least one resident of the apartment must be present as host.
3. Women may be in the apartment between the hours of 12:00 noon and 12:00 midnight except Saturday when they may remain until 1:00 A.M. on Sunday.

4. Students will at all times uphold the University Code of Honor.

B. The registration forms, which will be signed by all members of the apartment and by the landlord or landlord's agent, will state that a registered apartment consists of at least two rooms, one of which is a living room, and includes private lavatory facilities. Three copies of this registration form will be completed, one to be filed in the Office of Student Activities, one to be kept by members of the apartment, and one to be given to the landlord.

C. Cornell women, except freshman women, may sign out directly to any party at an annually registered apartment. Lists of these registered apartments will be compiled in the Office of Student Activities to be distributed to the women's living units.

D. The already existing type of registration for individual parties in apartments, requiring the presence of chaperones, will be available for all Cornell men including freshmen; for apartments not registered annually; for all apartment parties at which freshman women will be present; and for other situations not specifically covered herein.

E. All Cornell women, including freshman women, may continue to sign out to apartment parties which are registered individually under the present requirement of the presence of chaperones.

II. Except as provided above it should be understood that, under the University Code of Honor, no male Cornell student may entertain a woman guest, whether Cornell student or not, in his private living quarters.

III. Organized living units for men.

A. Organized living units for men, including fraternities, shall be defined as those having dining rooms and dining service as a part of the physical facilities in the building.

B. Organized living units are not required to register with the Office of Student Activities or have chaperones for mixed dinners taking place between the hours of 12 noon and 3:00 P.M. on Sunday or 5:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M. on Wednesday provided:

1. That no alcoholic beverages are served.
2. That all activity shall be limited to the social areas of the unit which in no case shall include individual study rooms or bedrooms.
3. That such dinners will be open only to members of the organization and their women guests.

Special Note: The Chairman of the Committee on Student Conduct states that his committee holds the maintenance of these standards to be of paramount importance. Serious violations may lead to suspension or expulsion of the students involved.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 11 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Charlotte Brenan Robinson, Professor of Housing and Design, Emeritus, on November 16, 1953. The Faculty rose in respect to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean read communications from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

To the special committee to study and report on the advisability of acceding to the request of Columbia University that Cornell University participate in the celebration of Columbia's 200th anniversary: J. W. MacDonald, R. B. Schlesinger, R. E. Cushman, Chairman.

To the special committee to advise the President regarding the selection of a nominee for the John L. Senior University Professorship in American Civilization: H. C. Canoyer, C. W. Jones, C. P. Nettles; and as chairman, H. F. DeGraff, who was one of the four members elected to the committee by the Faculty at its November meeting.


To a special committee to write a memorial article for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty concerning Charlotte Brenan Robinson: V. B. Hart, L. D. Rockwood, R. E. Comstock, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty concerning James Edward Rice: G. O. Hall, G. E. Peabody, and J. H. Bruckner, Chairman.

On behalf of the Committee on Elections, its Chairman, the Dean, read the following report:

527 ballots were cast for a Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees, of which 341, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Government, Professor Cushman.
517 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on University Policy, of which 304, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Regional Planning, Professor Mackesey.

498 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty of which 255, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Economics, Professor Kahn.

530 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics, of which 321, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Physics, Professor Newhall.

503 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene, of which 321, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Zoology, Professor Leonard.

505 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a one-year term, of which 297, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Botany, Professor Petry.

497 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a one-year term, of which 347, a majority, were cast for the Professor of English, Professor Jones.

471 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a one-year term, of which 238, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Chemical Microscopy and Metallography, Professor Mason.

490 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a two-year term, of which 259, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Veterinary Medicine, Professor Fincher.

491 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a two-year term, of which 266, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Economics, Professor Adams.

494 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a two-year term, of which 319, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Law, Professor Curtiss.

489 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a three-year term, of which 269, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Architecture, Professor Detweiler.

465 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a three-year term, of which 244, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Loberg.

466 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations to serve a three-year term, of which 260, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Economics of the Household and Household Management, Professor Rollins.
On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, one of its members, Professor James Campbell, made the following motion:

Resolved that the University Faculty, the Board of Trustees concurring, designate Saturday, May 15, 1954, as Spring Day, a University holiday, and instruct the Committee on Registration and Schedules to schedule evening hours which members of the Faculty may use for classes and laboratory periods which are normally scheduled on that day.

The motion was seconded and passed without dissent, by voice vote.

For the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events, Professor A. W. Gibson, its Chairman, moved:

That the Faculty legislation of May 13, 1953, prescribing the membership of the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events be amended so that the first sentence of such legislation reads as follows:

The Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events shall consist of 11 members of the University Faculty, 4 undergraduate students, and a member of the Administrative staff of the University and so that the last sentence of the existing legislation reads:

The member of the Administrative staff of the University serving on the Committee shall be appointed by the President, shall be the Executive Secretary of the Committee, and shall have the power to vote.

The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

For the Committee on University Policy, Professor J. A. Hartell, Chairman of its sub-committee on the Festival of Contemporary Arts reviewed briefly the history of the Festival of Contemporary Arts, the first of which was held in 1945. Professor Hartell pointed out that the White Museum of Art, which was opened on November 22, 1953, and the Festival of Contemporary Arts, provide complementary, not overlapping, activities. Professor Hartell noted that the Festival has been a successful educational project which should be continued, and that the committee which organizes
it should be responsible to, and enjoy the support of some faculty. Since the membership of the committee, which has consisted largely of those interested in teaching the practice of the arts, represents six departments in three colleges, and a seventh, independent department, there is no college faculty to which the committee could logically be connected.

For the Committee on University Policy, Professor Hartell then moved:

1. That there be established a standing committee of the University Faculty to be known as the Committee on the Festival of Contemporary Arts charged with the responsibility of organizing annually, or at such regular intervals as may seem proper to it, a coordinated program of lectures, exhibitions, concerts, and other performances presenting the works of contemporary artists in all fields.

2. That the committee consist of the Director of the Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art, ex officio; and at least sixteen additional members appointed by the President.

3. That the appointed membership shall include two members representing each of the following departments: in the College of Arts and Sciences, English, Music, Speech and Drama; in the College of Architecture, Architectural Design, Painting and Sculpture; in the College of Home Economics, Housing and Design; also two members representing the independent Department of Physical Education for Women, and at least two members chosen from the Faculty at large.

4. That the President shall appoint the chairman.

5. That the terms of office be four years with members eligible for reappointment and that in so far as possible, the terms of office of two members in any given category be staggered to provide continuity.

6. That the committee be authorized to invite others to sit with it, in particular representatives of the office of Public Information, WHCU, and students studying in each of the arts.

The motion was seconded. During the discussion the Professor of Structural Engineering, Professor George Winter, Chairman of the Faculty Committee on
Music, asked if the Professor of Architecture, Professor Hartell, did not think that provision for a liaison member from the Faculty Committee on Music would be appropriate. Professor Hartell replied that the motion as presented offered opportunity for this liaison in the person of one of the two members from the Department of Music. To clarify the situation, however, with the consent of the second, Professor Hartell amended his motion so that paragraph 2 would read "That the committee consist of the Director of the Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art, and the Secretary of the Faculty Committee on Music, ex officio, and at least sixteen additional members appointed by the President."

The Dean asked if Professor Hartell would be willing to have the end of paragraph 2 amended to read "and at least fifteen additional members appointed by the President", and paragraph 3 to read "That the appointed membership shall include one member representing the Department of Music, and two members representing each of the following departments: in the College of Arts and Sciences, English, Music, Speech and Drama; in the College of Architecture, Architectural Design, Painting and Sculpture; in the College of Home Economics, Housing and Design; also two members representing the independent Department of Physical Education for Women, and at least two members chosen from the Faculty at large".

The Professor in Personnel Administration, Professor H. S. Tyler, suggested that the period of initial appointments should be such as to allow for staggering of terms of office of two members in a given category, as provided in paragraph 5.

Professor Hartell and the second having accepted the proposed amendments, the original motion as amended was put to a voice vote
and passed without dissent.

On behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, its Chairman, Professor P. W. Gilbert, moved

That its report on "Cornell Faculty Salaries" and its report on a "Retirement Plan for the Endowed Colleges" each dated December 4, 1953 be accepted, and that the President be asked to forward copies of both reports to the Trustees of the University.

This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Copies of these reports are appended to the minutes.

Under new business, the Professor of Psychology, Professor F. S. Freeman, made the following motion:

Resolved

1. That the President be requested to appoint a special faculty committee of five members to consider and report on the question of prohibiting Cornell undergraduate students from keeping or operating motor vehicles in Ithaca or its environment.

2. That this special committee be prepared to report to the Faculty of the University not later than at its meeting in March 1954.

Professor Freeman said that he had a communication from the Dean saying that the Committee on University Policy had considered the question, and voted to table it. Professor Freeman presented facts concerning the number of parking places on the campus, the number of staff members and students with parking privileges, and the extent of traffic and parking violations by students in the past year, as indicated by the fines collected.

The Professor of Mathematics, Professor Mark Kac, seconded the motion, and spoke in its favor. The President pointed out that two problems are involved: (1) speed of driving and (2) shortage of parking areas. He noted that only 400 undergraduate students have parking permits,
including those permitted to park on the periphery of the campus, and that some of these students have severe medical disabilities. Prohibiting students from operating cars on the campus would therefore do little toward solving the parking problem.

The Professor of Physical Education and Athletics, Emeritus, Professor C. V. P. Young, moved to amend the motion to limit the scope of the inquiry to the question of students driving cars on the campus. The motion to amend was seconded by the Professor of Chemical Microscopy and Metallography, Professor C. W. Mason. Professor Freeman spoke in opposition to the motion to amend, since the original motion merely provided for study and he believed that the committee should not be limited in its considerations. Professor Mason then spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that the responsibility of the student as a citizen should cover the situation off campus. The question being called for, it was put to a voice vote and lost.

The discussion on the original motion was then continued. The Vice President for Research, T. P. Wright, noted that the motion was not as broad as the discussion, which encompassed parking problems, driving hazards and the like. The President commented that a committee would be free to investigate all aspects of the problem.

The Professor of Architecture, Professor Hartell, then asked if the Dean would comment on the motion, since Professor Freeman had stated that it resulted from dissatisfaction with the action of the Committee on University Policy in tabling a motion on the question. The Dean said he knew of no reason why the Committee on University Policy would object to investigation of the question by another committee; and stated some of the considerations which led the Committee on University Policy to vote
as it did. After further discussion, the Professor of Philosophy, Professor Max Black, moved to amend paragraph 1 of the motion to read:

That the President be requested to appoint a special faculty committee of five members to study and report on questions arising from the operation of cars by Cornell students.

The motion to amend was seconded. Both Professor Freeman and his second having accepted the amendment, the motion was put to a voice vote and passed.

The President reminded the Faculty that its deliberations are confidential, and expressed the conviction that the committee should be able to study the problem without outside pressure.

As another item under new business, the Professor of Economics, Professor A. E. Kahn, asked for information concerning the complaints made recently by two freshman women in letters to the Cornell Sun. He inquired if students working for board were not exempted from payment for meals in the dormitories. The Dean of Women, Mrs. Dorothy V. N. Brooks, replied that students who work for their board or room and board are given full refunds, and that the statements which appeared in the Sun were inaccurate.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX INCREASE JANUARY 1, 1954

The present Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) law provides for a tax increase to take effect on January 1, 1954. Although considerable sentiment is developing in Washington to defer this increase as soon as Congress convenes in January, it is impossible at this time to predict what Congress will do.

Old Age and Survivors Insurance taxes on participating employers and employees are now 13/4% each on the first $3,600 of salary. The scheduled increase would bring the total rate to 2% on the employer and the same on the employee, thus making a maximum tax increase of $18 per year on each.

Indications are that most colleges plan to pay their additional tax out of current budget and deduct the individual's share from his salary, thus leaving the benefits of their funded retirement plans at their present levels. Others will deduct the additional tax from premiums now being paid to their funded retirement systems. The decision as to which course to take should rest upon prospective adequacy of the retirement plan as it now exists. The following patterns are designed to help the college choose appropriate benefit levels for their staff members.

Benefit Objective

A comprehensive study, entitled "Academic Retirement and Related Subjects," was conducted by a Joint Committee of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1949 and 1950. This AAUP-AAC Joint Committee concluded that retirement plans should provide as a normal goal an annuity of half-salary for faculty members and administrative officers.

The AAC confirmed this recommendation through action of its Committee on Insurance and Annuities in January 1953, stating that a retirement system should "be planned to provide under normal circumstances and insofar as possible for a retirement life annuity equivalent in purchasing power to approximately 50% of the average salary over the last ten years of service. . . ."

Assumptions

The examples given below are based on the following assumptions:

1. OASI taxes on participating employers and employees will increase to 2% (of salary up to $3,600) each on January 1, 1954; to 23/4% each in 1960, to 3% each in 1965, and to 31/4% each in 1970, as presently scheduled.
2. The present OASI benefit formula will continue, providing 55% of the first $100 of average monthly wage and 15% of the next $200 wage; thus the maximum monthly benefit for the worker is $85.

3. Two salary scales are used as illustrations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Age</th>
<th>Salary Scale A</th>
<th>Salary Scale B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64 (or 70)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. TIAA’s minimum deferred single life annuity rates for males will be used, thus assuming no dividends or rate changes.

**Effect of CREF**

The examples assume that all premiums will be paid to TIAA and OASI, and that the general price level in the United States will remain at its present level for the next 30 to 50 years. The purpose of CREF is to help the dollar amounts of actual retirement benefit adjust to changes in the purchasing power of the dollar. Thus if we have inflation, and at the same time CREF works out well by providing a higher-than-expected annuity, the one will merely have offset the other and they need not be taken into account in the present examples. The same conclusion is appropriate for deflation, assuming lower prices and lower annuity from the College Retirement Equities Fund.

**Patterns of Coordination**

Two main patterns of coordination between TIAA and OASI have developed in the colleges. The first calls for total annuity contributions of 15% of each participant’s salary. OASI taxes are deducted from this amount and the remainder is sent to TIAA to purchase an annuity for the participant. The second major pattern calls for annuity contributions of 10% of salary, in addition to the OASI tax.

15%–16% TIAA Plans. Thirty per cent of the participants at cooperating institutions are covered by this type of plan. One-fourth of the 15% plans do not deduct OASI taxes; that is, they add OASI benefits to those provided by a full 15% TIAA plan on all salary. This provides a superior arrangement which should aid these colleges in securing and holding able staff members and, of course, will enable retired professors to live in greater comfort.

Most of the institutions in this classification deduct Social Security taxes from the 15% total contributions.

15% TIAA Plan Less OASI Taxes on First $3,600 of Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Scales</th>
<th>TIAA</th>
<th>OASI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ($6,000)</td>
<td>$1,963 (32.7%)</td>
<td>$1,005 (16.8%)</td>
<td>$2,968 (49.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ($10,000)</td>
<td>$3,518 (35.2%)</td>
<td>$1,020 (10.2%)</td>
<td>$4,538 (45.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the 15% plan minus OASI taxes provides slightly less than half of final average salary, the continuation of TIAA’s current dividend rate would bring the total above 50%. Thus these 15% plans meet the half-salary minimum standard set by the AAUP-AAC Committee.

In most of the 15% plans the premiums are shared equally between the staff member and the college; a number of colleges, however, contribute 10% to the employees’ 5%, and a few use 8%-7% or 9%-6%.

10% TIAA Plans. Nearly half of the participants at cooperating educational institutions are covered by 10% TIAA plans with OASI added on top. The benefit pattern for these plans is as follows:

**10% TIAA Plan Plus OASI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Scales</th>
<th>TIAA</th>
<th>OASI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ($6,000)</td>
<td>$1,804 (30.1%)</td>
<td>$1,005 (16.8%)</td>
<td>$2,809 (46.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ($10,000)</td>
<td>$2,853 (28.5%)</td>
<td>$1,020 (10.2%)</td>
<td>$3,873 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the middle salary scales represented by the $6,000 final salary, these plans are a little under the Joint Committee’s half-salary recommendation; they would slightly exceed the recommendation assuming continuation of TIAA’s present dividends. Since the 10%-plus plan weights the benefits rather heavily in favor of participants with lower salaries, such plans miss the objective for the higher-salaried person by a substantial amount, providing less than 40% of final salary for the $10,000 man. Thus 10% plans plus OASI are only a minimum approach to the solution of the retirement problem. Relatively modest increases in contribution rates when budgetary conditions permit, will place these plans in good shape.

Since a 10% plan plus OASI is only a minimum plan, it follows that institutions which deduct the OASI taxes from a 10% plan have an inadequate arrangement. Such plans cover less than 7% of the total participants. The combined OASI-TIAA benefits will run only 34.5% of final pay for Salary Scale A and 31.1% for Salary Scale B.

12%-14% TIAA Plans. This is a middle group of good plans, covering 16% of the participants. When OASI taxes are added to 12%-14% TIAA contributions, the total program meets minimum objectives and provides more than half-salary as a retirement benefit for those in the low and medium salary ranges. If OASI taxes are deducted, the eventual amount contributed on the first $3,600 of salary to provide the regular annuity will be less than provided by a 10% plan on which no deductions are made. Therefore such a plan may be only barely adequate if based on 13%-14% total, and inadequate if based on 12% total.

Variations

Later Entrance Ages. The average age at which participants enter a retirement plan at a particular institution may be closer to age 35 than to age 30; this shortens the period of accumulation for all staff members who do not come to the
institutions already owning a TIAA contract. For each year’s delay in participation between ages 30 and 40 the TIAA annuity benefit is decreased by 2% to 3%. Assuming entrance age 35 and retirement at 65, a single male will receive from TIAA plus OASI the following per cent of final salary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Scales</th>
<th>10% TIAA Plan Plus OASI</th>
<th>15% TIAA Plan Minus OASI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ($6,000)</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ($10,000)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later Retirement Ages. As long as a person continues to earn over $75 a month in employment covered by OASI, between the ages of 65 and 75, he receives no OASI benefit and both he and the employer continue to pay taxes. When he does retire his OASI benefit will not normally be any larger than if he had retired at age 65.

Under his TIAA contract, however, delayed retirement has a sizable effect upon benefits. Each year’s postponement of retirement and continuation of premiums after age 65 increases the benefit about 8% for a person commencing contributions at age 30, or some 11% for one entering at age 50.

With retirement at age 70, the combined benefits from a 10% TIAA plan plus OASI provide more than 50% of final salary for persons entering at age 30. For entrance at age 35, such a plan provides more than 50% for the lower and middle-salaried persons and slightly less than 50% for the higher salaries. The 15% plan, whether OASI taxes are added on top or subtracted from the TIAA contribution, provides an arrangement with benefits well in excess of 50% of final salary for retirement at age 70 and entrance ages up to 36 or 37.

Income for Retired Couple. In the case of OASI, the staff member receives the primary benefit used in the previous tables and a wife or dependent husband receives a benefit of one-half of the primary amount after reaching age 65. If the worker dies first, the wife’s or dependent husband’s benefit increases to three-fourths of the primary. While there are several options under the TIAA annuity, the one that is usually most appropriate for a married couple provides an annuity throughout the contractholder’s lifetime and continuing in half to the widow. This provides a joint income of a little more than 80% of the single life annuity amount unless the second annuitant is a number of years younger than the first.

At lower salary ranges, the total income for the couple is a little larger than for the single person because the additional OASI benefit for the wife more than counterbalances the reduction in TIAA annuity to provide for the second annuitant. The total income for the couple from the two sources is a little smaller at the higher-salary ranges.

Other Patterns

The above material is based on objectives, salary scales, entrance ages and retirement ages which are illustrative of by far the majority of college retirement plans. TIAA will be happy, of course, to work individually with those institutions for which the illustrative computations are not appropriate or which, for other reasons, want additional information.
CORNELL FACULTY SALARIES - A PROGRESS REPORT

(Confidential. For Faculty, Administration and Trustee Use Only)

A year ago this committee called attention to the low level of faculty salaries in the endowed colleges at Cornell and pointed to the serious educational implications of the salary scale. It is gratifying to report that in the past year substantial progress has been made in raising the level of these salaries. Table I lists the changes in faculty salaries for both the endowed and state colleges and from this it is clear that salaries in the two divisions of the University are now very similar.

The important question still is, how do we stand in relation to our competitors? We do not have recent figures for other Universities but Table II compares Cornell 1953-54 salary averages with those of three groups of Universities for 1951-52. Since one can be fairly sure that these latter averages have increased in the last two years it is evident that all Cornell salaries must be further raised if we are to be in a satisfactory competitive position. We therefore strongly hope first that the increases made in 1953-54 will be considered only as an excellent start on a still pending problem and second that it will be recognized that salary increases are needed in both the endowed and state colleges.

Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

George P. Adams
Bart J. Conta
William H. Farnham
M. Slade Kendrick
Franklin A. Long
Andrew Schultz, Jr.
Perry W. Gilbert, Chairman
TABLE I
MEAN AND MEDIAN SALARIES BY RANK FOR STATE AND ENDOWED COLLEGES
AT ITHACA FOR 1952-53 AND 1953-54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>New York State Colleges</th>
<th>Endowed Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952-53 Average</td>
<td>1953-54 Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952-53 Median</td>
<td>1953-54 Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Average</td>
<td>4606</td>
<td>3575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Average</td>
<td>4461</td>
<td>3712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Median</td>
<td>4377</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Median</td>
<td>4384</td>
<td>3760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. Prof.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Average</td>
<td>5584</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Average</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>5176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Median</td>
<td>5627</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Median</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>5225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Average</td>
<td>6394</td>
<td>5698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Average</td>
<td>6411</td>
<td>6315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Median</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Median</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Average</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>7752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Average</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>8394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 Median</td>
<td>8152</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54 Median</td>
<td>8184</td>
<td>8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
CORNELL 1953-54 MEAN SALARIES COMPARED WITH THOSE
OF OTHER INSTITUTIONS PAID IN 1951-52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Group</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (Arts and Science)</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>6178</td>
<td>4921</td>
<td>3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (Engineering)</td>
<td>8138</td>
<td>6178</td>
<td>5217</td>
<td>3614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (State Colleges)</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>6411</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>4461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Large Eastern Univ.</td>
<td>9897</td>
<td>6554</td>
<td>4827</td>
<td>3601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Institutes of Technology</td>
<td>9310</td>
<td>6733</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>3985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Large State Univ.</td>
<td>8266</td>
<td>6145</td>
<td>4947</td>
<td>3969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retirement Plan for the Endowed Colleges

One of the most pressing problems for the faculties of the endowed colleges at Cornell is that of an adequate retirement plan. This report gives details of the present Cornell plan, compares it with plans of other colleges and universities, and suggests possible modifications.

The present Cornell plan was started in 1937. Initially it was possible to choose annuity plans of either Prudential Life Insurance Company or Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, but in recent years only TIAA annuities have been available. The original plan called for participation by all faculty members of the rank of assistant professor or higher and by certain members of the administrative staff. The contributions were set at 10% of salary, 5% each from individual and from Cornell, up to a maximum of $6000. Since 1937 there have been two major modifications of the plan: (a) entrance of Cornell endowed colleges into the Social Security (OASI) plan in 1951 and (b) an increase in 1953 of the maximum salary for joint contributions from $6000 to $12000. In spite of these two improvements the Cornell plan remains quite inadequate.

Many colleges, recognizing the deficiencies of the 10% plan, have shifted in recent years to 15% plans. Illustrations of such plans are given in the table below. These plans differ in the relative contributions from individual and institution and in their treatment of the OASI Tax but they all provide for more satisfactory annuities.
The enclosed TIAA bulletin quotes recent recommendations by the American Association of University Professors and by the Association of American Colleges to the effect that a realistic retirement plan is one which results in a life annuity paying 50% of the average salary of the ten years before retirement. The "15%-16% TIAA Plans" discussed on the second page of this bulletin come close to achieving this objective.

On the third page of the TIAA bulletin calculations are given for a "10% TIAA Plan Plus OASI" which is the type of plan now in effect at Cornell. Clearly such a plan fails to meet the 50% recommendation by a wide margin. This committee therefore believes it essential that Cornell change to a 15% retirement plan for the endowed colleges in the very near future and urges the administration to effect this change by July 1, 1954 if possible.
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### TIAA Plans of Neighboring or Competitive Institutions

**Contribution Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Univ.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate Univ.</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Univ.</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth Coll.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Univ.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan, Univ. of</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>Contributions scaled by age from 5% matched to 10% matched</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, Univ. of</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Univ.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells College</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

A. Social Security (OASI) is in addition to TIAA retirement plan.

B. TIAA premiums reduced by 1½% OASI tax from each source on first $3600 of salary.

C. Harvard also has a plan which is operated by the university itself.

D. State institution and so not eligible for OASI.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p. m.
The minutes of the meeting of December 9 were read and approved.
The Dean read communications from the President announcing the following appointments to committees:

To the Committee on The Festival of Contemporary Arts:
for terms expiring October 31, 1955: R. H. Elias, Romaldo Giurgola,
Judith Hodge, R. M. Palmer, W. H. Stainton, Clara Straight,
R. R. Wilson, J. A. Hartell, Chairman.
For terms expiring October 31, 1957: May Atherton, Joseph Carreiro,
Victor Colby, F. G. Marcham, G. A. McCalmon, H. A. Myers,
E. H. Quell.

To the special committee on questions arising from the operation of cars by students: D. L. Finlayson, F. S. Freeman,
W. H. French, R. I. Fricke, K. L. Turk, Chairman.

To the Committee on Registration and Schedules, for a term expiring October 31, 1956: H. P. Osborne.

To the Committee on University Lectures, during the second term leave of J. G. B. Hutchins: G. M. Kahin.

To the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty during the second term leave of N. A. Tolles: B. J. Conta.

The Dean announced the receipt of a communication from the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty stating that it has elected Andrew Schultz, Jr. as its Chairman for the year 1954.

The Dean announced the receipt of a communication from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees stating that on January 18, 1954 the Executive Committee of the Board approved the resolution adopted by the Faculty on December 9, 1954 designating Saturday, May 15, 1954, as Spring Day and a University Holiday.
There being no special order, and no unfinished business, reports of committees were called for.

For the Committee on Calendar, its Chairman, Professor James Campbell, moved that the calendar prepared by the committee for the period 1955-56 through 1959-60, and circulated to the Faculty in advance of the meeting, be adopted by the Faculty subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote. A copy of the calendar is appended to these minutes.

The Dean, as Chairman of the Committee on University Policy, noted the need for clarifying the legislation of April 17, 1914 and of November 11, 1936, governing the dates and omissions of regular Faculty meetings, and for bringing such legislation into conformity with existing practice. On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean then moved that the existing legislation be superseded by the following legislation:

Regular meetings of the University Faculty shall be held on the second session Wednesday of each month except July and August, unless the President and the Dean are agreed that a meeting is unnecessary. Except for the September meeting, no meeting shall be omitted by agreement of the President and the Dean unless a meeting, either regular or special, was held in the immediately preceding month.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

For the Committee on Commencement Policy, its Chairman, Professor B. L. Rideout, reported on the problems under consideration by the committee and the progress made to date. His report was greeted with spontaneous applause.
In order to provide for representation of the Committee on University Lectures on the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events, the Chairman of the latter committee, Professor A. V. Gibson, moved for the committee that the legislation of May 13, 1953 and December 9, 1953, prescribing the membership of the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events be amended so that its first and second sentences shall read as follows:

The Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events shall consist of twelve members of the University Faculty, four undergraduate students, and a member of the administrative staff of the University.

The Faculty component of the Committee shall comprise the Dean of the University Faculty, the Dean of Women, the Chairman of the Committee on Student Activities, the Chairman of the Committee on University Lectures, and the Director of Physical Education and Athletics, ex officio, and seven members of the University Faculty appointed by the President for terms not to exceed four years.

This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Under new business the Dean then moved that the legislation of April 19, 1933 prescribing the composition of the Committee on University Lectures be amended by deleting therefrom the provision that the Secretary of the University be an ex officio member. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The President described briefly the present organization and policies of the Office for University Development.

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Freshman Orientation Begins

Instruction begins at 1 pm.

Midterm grades due.

Thanksgiving Recess:
Instr. suspended, 12:50 pm
Instr. resumed, 8 am

Christmas Recess:
Instr. suspended 12:50 pm
Instr. resumed, 8 am

Instruction ends.

2nd term registration for students in residence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calendar of Cornell University Continued...

1955-56

Term Examinations begin...........
end..........
Jan 24 Tu
Feb 1 W

Midyear recess.............
Feb 2 Th
Feb 3 F

Registration for students not
in residence for Fall Term
Feb 4 Sa

Instruction begins...........
Feb 6 M

Midterm grades due...........
Mar 24 Sa

Spring Recess:
Instr. suspended, 12:50 pm.
Instr. resumed, 8 am
Mar 24 Sa
Apr 2 M

Instruction ends............
May 26 Sa

Final Examinations begin.....
end.....
May 28 M
Jun 5 Tu

Commencement Day.............
Jun 11 M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>Jan 22 Tu</td>
<td>Jan 30 W</td>
<td>Jan 31 Th</td>
<td>Feb 1 F</td>
<td>Feb 2 Sa</td>
<td>Feb 4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 28 Tu</td>
<td>Feb 5 W</td>
<td>Feb 6 Th</td>
<td>Feb 7 F</td>
<td>Feb 8 Sa</td>
<td>Feb 10 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 25 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 23 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 29 Sa</td>
<td>Apr 1 M</td>
<td>May 25 Sa</td>
<td>May 27 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 26 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 28 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 29 Sa</td>
<td>Apr 7 M</td>
<td>May 31 Sa</td>
<td>Jun 10 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>Jan 27 Tu</td>
<td>Feb 4 W</td>
<td>Feb 5 Th</td>
<td>Feb 6 F</td>
<td>May 30 Sa</td>
<td>Jun 16 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 26 Tu</td>
<td>Feb 3 W</td>
<td>Feb 4 Th</td>
<td>Feb 5 F</td>
<td>May 30 M</td>
<td>Jun 15 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 7 Sa</td>
<td>Feb 6 Sa</td>
<td>Feb 8 M</td>
<td>Mar 26 Sa</td>
<td>Jun 13 M</td>
<td>Jun 13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>Mar 28 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 26 Sa</td>
<td>May 28 Sa</td>
<td>Apr 4 M</td>
<td>Jun 9 Tu</td>
<td>Jun 7 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 28 Sa</td>
<td>May 30 Sa</td>
<td>May 28 Sa</td>
<td>Apr 6 M</td>
<td>Jun 1 M</td>
<td>Jun 15 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>Feb 25 Sa</td>
<td>Mar 26 Sa</td>
<td>May 30 M</td>
<td>Jun 10 Tu</td>
<td>May 30 M</td>
<td>Jun 13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 25 Sa</td>
<td>May 28 Sa</td>
<td>May 30 M</td>
<td>Jun 10 Tu</td>
<td>May 30 M</td>
<td>Jun 13 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of February 10 were read and approved.

The President announced the deaths of

Ralph Spencer Overman, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry in Medicine, on September 10, 1953;

Arthur Palmer, Professor of Clinical Surgery, on February 18, 1954;

Walter Roy Jones, Professor of Electrical Engineering, on March 8, 1954;

Laurence Pumpelly, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Emeritus, on March 14, 1954;

Howard Jay Milks, Professor of Veterinary Therapeutics and Small Animal Diseases, Emeritus, on March 30, 1954.

The Faculty rose and stood in respect to the memory of their dead colleagues.

The Dean read a communication from the President announcing the appointment of the following committees to prepare memorial articles for the Necrology of the Faculty:

Concerning Ralph Spencer Overman
I. S. Wright

Concerning Arthur Palmer
J. A. Moore

Concerning Walter Roy Jones
C. W. Gartlein
E. K. Northrup
True McLean, Chairman
Concerning Laurence Pumpelly
Harry Caplan
M. L. W. Laistner
M. G. Bishop, Chairman

Concerning Howard Jay Milks
M. G. Fincher
D. H. Udall
H. C. Stephenson, Chairman

The Dean also presented a communication from the President
announcing the establishment of a "Natural Areas Committee"
"to give general oversight to . . . the natural areas in the
various biological departments of the University", and the
appointment to the committee of the following: A. A. Allen,
R. T. Clausen, Richard Fisher, P. P. Kellogg, E. L. Palmer,
and C. E. Palm, Chairman; and the appointment of C. E. Palm
to the already existing Plantations Committee to facilitate
coordination.

There being no Special Order of Business and no Unfinished
Business, the Faculty passed to the consideration of a report
from a special committee on questions arising from the operation
of cars by Cornell students. On behalf of a majority of the
committee, recommendations were presented by the Chairman,
Professor K. L. Turk.

Professor Turk first moved that Mr. R. J. McCarthy, Super-
visor of the Safety Division, be invited to sit in the meeting,
and it was so voted. (A copy of the report as presented to
the Faculty is appended to these minutes.)

After preliminary remarks, Professor Turk moved (and the
motion was seconded) that sub-sections (a), (b), (c), and (d)
under section 1 of the "Recommendations" be approved by the
Faculty for transmittal to the Board of Trustees.
It was moved and seconded that (d) be deleted from the recommendations, as unfair to students not operating motor vehicles, and returned to the Committee for further consideration.

It was then moved and seconded that the previous motion be amended as follows: that item (d) be deleted from the recommendations and referred to the Administration for study, without prejudice to further action by this Faculty. The amendment was carried by voice vote.

Sub-sections (a), (b), and (c) were then approved by voice vote.

It was then moved and seconded that Section 2 of the "Recommendations" be considered as a separate piece of legislation. The motion was lost.

Section 2 was then put to a vote and approved.

Section 3, on motion duly seconded, was then amended so as to omit the second sentence (beginning "Every owner"...) in its entirety, and by deleting the clause, "and if need be subsidize," from the third sentence. Section 3 as amended was then approved.

Section 4 was amended by omitting the word "additional" and by substituting the word "provided" for "added". Section 4 as amended was then approved.

It was voted to amend Section 5 by deleting that part of the first sentence following the word "effectively" and to refer the remainder of the Section to the Committee for further study.
The result of a voice vote on Section 6 was doubtful. On a show of hands, Section 6 was declared approved.

A motion to approve Section 7 was lost.

Section 8 was withdrawn by the Chairman of the Committee.

On vote, Section 9 was approved.

It was agreed that no announcement should be made of the action of the University Faculty on the Committee's majority report until after consideration of a minority report to be presented at a subsequent meeting of the Faculty.

Adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

E. F. Bradford
Acting Secretary
Report to the Faculty of Committee to
Study and Report on the Questions Arising
from the Operation of Automobiles by
Cornell Students

History

According to the legislative records of the University Faculty, this is the third Faculty Committee appointed by the President to make a study and report on the problems arising from the use and operation of automobiles by students.

In 1930 a committee report was accepted and transmitted to the Board of Trustees with the resolution that the University Faculty approves in principle of the following: (1) licensing of student owned and operated automobiles, (2) licensing of all student drivers, (3) limitation of parking privileges on the campus, (4) regulation and control of commercial traffic upon the private roads and driveways of the campus, and (5) the establishment of a Motor Vehicle Bureau to put these recommendations into effect and administer them.

After a temporary period during World War II when student cars were banned, a second committee was appointed in 1945 to consider what, if any, changes should be made in the legislation governing the student use of automobiles. In May, 1946, the Faculty adopted the following recommendations:

1. That no fundamental change be made at the present time in the regulations governing student ownership and operation of cars, except that the parking fees be abolished and that the reasons for levying of a car registration fee be adequately publicized.

2. That in a limited number of cases blanket parking privileges be granted to disabled or other students to whom fixed parking is a real hardship.

3. That the speed limits on and adjacent to the campus be better publicized and posted.

4. That the traffic laws be enforced to the fullest extent and that all possible precautions be taken to avoid accident.

5. That fines for traffic violations which endanger life or property be raised within reasonable limits at the discretion of the traffic board.
6. That the sending of a letter from the President's office to parents of prospective new students discouraging the student operation of cars at Cornell be repeated as often as seems appropriate.

7. That the Board of Trustees be requested to designate a resident committee or board to survey the vehicular circulation and parking problems of the campus area with authority to make recommendations directly to the Board of Trustees on measures designed to alleviate congestion and danger.

8. That the Committee on the Student Use of Automobiles be continued to explore with other appropriate groups the possibilities of turning over to a student court certain cases of student traffic violations.

On July 8, 1949 the Board on Traffic Control recommended to the Board of Trustees that for a trial period of one year (1949-50) freshmen not be allowed to have cars in Ithaca. Subsequently, on April 12, 1950, the University Faculty voted to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the temporary regulations, prohibiting the use of cars by freshmen, be continued together with provisions similar to those now in effect under which exceptions are possible. The Board of Trustees adopted this legislation.

Present Situation

According to the records of the Safety Division Office, there were 6,671 automobiles registered as of November 30, 1953. The staff and employees had 3,882 of these vehicles. There were 2,789 student vehicles.

The percentage breakdown of student cars by classes is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the student cars registered with the University 1,164 have been issued parking permits for various reasons which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written requests approved by Board on Traffic Control Representative</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the commuters have been assigned spaces in the peripheral areas, such as Kite Hill, Clara Dickson, near Hoy Field, and near the Livestock Barns.

The total available parking spaces on campus, including the areas on the outskirts, amount to 2,538. Of this number of spaces, 657 are not utilized by the staff because of the distance from their offices. Therefore, 3,882 staff members are trying to park their vehicles in 1,881 spaces. Disabled students and those students using their cars in connection with University business (mostly graduate assistants) require approximately 400 of the same 1,881 spaces.

The parking problem is further aggravated by visitors to the Campus. This is true when large conferences are scheduled and when daytime athletic events are held.

Another factor contributing to congestion on the campus is the "shuttle" service operated by fraternities to bring students on campus for classes in cars having no parking permits.

Since accidents will always be a problem where automobiles are driven, some statistics are presented here on accidents in Ithaca and on the campus involving Cornell students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total passenger vehicles registration for City of Ithaca plus student vehicles*</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total drivers involved in accidents in City of Ithaca</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of drivers involved**</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles registered by students</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents in City of Ithaca involving students</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of student drivers involved in accidents</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated. Does not include commercial vehicles.
**Estimated because of unknown number of county cars driving in city.
***For full semester. (figure given on p. 2 is for the term up to November 30)
As one examines these data it is evident from the traffic accidents reported that Cornell students have a record which compares with any other similar area.

Included in the above statistics were five accidents in Ithaca in 1953 in which a fatality occurred. Of these five accidents, three vehicles were driven by Cornell students. Two of them were pedestrians hit and killed by student drivers. In the third case, a student lost control of his car and was thrown out and killed. There were no fatal accidents in the City of Ithaca in 1952.

There are approximately 10,000 violations of one kind or another on the campus annually. Of these, approximately 5,000 are for students and are largely parking violations. It would appear, therefore, that the faculty, employees and visitors are responsible for the other 5,000 violations.

Since January 1, 1954 the Ithaca Police Department has been recording separately all student traffic arrests. These data for the first three months are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic accidents in Ithaca</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of drivers involved</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of student drivers involved</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of arrests in Ithaca</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of student arrests</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of student arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed operators</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired plates</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No proof of insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized turns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning wrong way on one way street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to stop at stop signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to stop at red light</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Traffic Division insists that all persons involved in accidents resulting in personal injury or property damage of $50.00 or more report the accident to the Ithaca Police or the Sheriff's Department, depending on where the accident takes place.

Problems

An analysis of the situation and the available statistics focus attention on the following:

1. An extreme shortage of parking space for staff, employees and students who are eligible for parking permits.

2. The "shuttle" service operated by fraternities and other organizations with large numbers of automobiles, without parking permits, moving across campus at the time classes change greatly increases the congestion for brief periods. It is during this time that infractions for speeding, reckless and discourteous driving frequently occur.

3. The problem of violations is one which affects both students and staff. In some cases violations are serious; yet as a whole the violations are no higher than might be expected.

4. Insufficient patrolmen for proper enforcement of present rules may be a contributing problem. Some difficulties are encountered in enforcing existing rules and regulations.

The major problem is the existence of automobiles. They are likely to continue in our modern society. Any accident is serious and it is the feeling of the committee that some recommendations are in order that might help alleviate some of these problems.

Recommendations:

On the basis of the available information which shows that the traffic problems on the Cornell campus are due to a combination of factors, including vehicles owned and operated by faculty and employees, students (both graduate and undergraduate), other citizens of the community, and visitors to the Campus, the Committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty for its approval and transmittal to the Board of Trustees for action and to the Board on Traffic Control:

1. That the following changes in the regulations governing students use and operation of automobiles be made:

   (a) That new legislation should be adopted "prohibiting the operation of a motor vehicle in a careless, negligent, dangerous or grossly discourteous manner", a violation of which would be classified as a "moving traffic violation". Such legislation would be designed to apprehend persons driving recklessly, in the usual sense of the term, but...
who may not be guilty of the crime of reckless driving in the legalistic sense (a crime involving wanton or heedless indifference to consequences).

(b) That present regulations, providing for automatic suspension of vehicular privileges upon conviction for a third moving traffic violation upon the campus only, be amended to provide for automatic suspension of vehicular privileges upon conviction (or upon the forfeiture of bail) for a third moving traffic violation in any location within Tompkins County, including the campus. The Safety Director shall collect periodically information from the records of the City Court of Ithaca and other courts within Tompkins County, and upon the cumulation of convictions (or forfeiture of bail) for three moving traffic violations within Tompkins County, vehicular privileges of the student concerned shall be automatically suspended.

(c) That the Safety Division require staff members to submit clear and convincing evidence of need when recommending parking privileges for students.

(d) That as soon as convenient, the present $2.00 fee for car registration be abolished, and to replace it, the Board of Trustees increase the general fee for each student by $1.00.

2. That the penalty of temporary suspension of driving privileges against students guilty of moving violations be invoked frequently.

3. That the Board on Traffic Control institute and assume responsibility for promoting an educational program among the faculty, employees and students on traffic problems on the campus and the need for more safety in the operation of motor vehicles. Every owner of an automobile should be urged constantly to allow the operation of his automobile only when the driver is physically and mentally alert and can drive with sufficient care and caution not to endanger himself or the life of others. The University should support, (and if need be subsidize) the student-sponsored educational and safety program.

4. That sufficient (additional) patrolmen be added to the Safety Division to implement the necessary educational program and enforce the rules and regulations.

5. That the Board on Traffic Control consider controlling strategic parking spaces more effectively, perhaps by placing two or three meters in front of the Library, Campus Stores, Willard Straight, Day Hall, and other places where many persons need to make a brief stop.
This change and others should be preceded by a campaign to (1) assure the community that we establish such regulations reluctantly, regard them as temporary expedients, and hope to work out better solutions; and (2) apprise the community by publicity based on available statistics, how desperate the parking situation has become, and how necessary for the present are cooperation, consideration for others, and observation of rules if we are to maintain any degree of order.

6. That necessary steps be taken to increase parking space by any or all of these means: by constructing large parking areas at the periphery of the campus, by expansion of existing parking areas wherever possible to accommodate more cars, and by constructing new parking areas on the campus, wherever practicable and with due regard for aesthetic considerations. (adopted by a 4 - 1 vote).

7. That the Board on Traffic Control refuse permission to a student on academic probation to keep or operate a car in Tompkins County for the duration of the probation. Exceptions may be made in the case of students who can show clear and convincing proof of need for the operation of an automobile. (adopted by a 3 - 2 vote).

8. That the Faculty empower the Committee on Student Conduct to forbid students placed on parole to keep or operate cars in Tompkins County.

9. That the Administration request officials of the City of Ithaca to provide traffic police patrol on Thurston Avenue, especially between the hours of 8 - 10 a. m., 12 - 2 p. m., and 4 - 6 p. m.

D. L. Finlayson  
F. S. Freeman  
W. H. French  
R. I. Fricke  
K. L. Turk, Chairman
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of April 14 were read and approved.

The President commented briefly on the case of Professor Marcus Singer, who has been cited for contempt of Congress. The President said that the University is taking no action and making no pronouncement at present. He assured the Faculty, however, that everything possible would be done to protect both Professor Singer and the University.

The Dean read a communication from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees announcing that at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board held April 19, 1954, the calendar adopted by the University Faculty for the period 1955-56 to 1959-60 inclusive was approved.

The Dean stated that communications have been received from the President announcing the appointment of the following committees to award prizes:

- To award the Corson French Prize:
  F. B. Agard, B. L. Rideout, M. G. Bishop, Chairman

- To award the Goethe Prize:
  M. H. Abrams, W. F. Oechler, Friedrich Solmsen, Chairman

- To award the Mary B. Knoblaugh Prize:
  W. T. Dean, Dexter Perkins, Mrs. L. D. Rockwood, Chairman

- To award the Luana L. Messenger Prize:
  James Hutton, Gregory Vlastos, M. L. W. Laistner, Chairman

- To award the Morrison Poetry Prize:
  R. H. Elias, Victor Lange, W. R. Keast, Chairman
To award the Sampson Fine Arts Prize:
K. V. Evett, F. O. Waage, R. B. Schlesinger, Chairman

To award the Sherman-Bennett Prize:
W. M. Simon, R. S. Stevens, Mario Einaudi, Chairman

To award the J. G. White Prizes in Spanish:
A. R. Holmberg, W. M. Sale, Jr., F. B. Agard, Chairman

The Dean read a communication from the Chairman of the Committee appointed by the President to review medical care and hospitalization of members of the Cornell staff, Professor John McConnell, asking that Faculty members return enrollment cards promptly.

There being no special order, the President called for unfinished business. The Vice President for Research, T. P. Wright, moved that the committee report concerning deferred rushing be considered before the unfinished business. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor G. E. Peabody, commented on the report of the committee concerning deferred rushing. A copy of the report is appended to the minutes.

Professor Peabody then moved for the Committee on Student Activities that, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, effective beginning in the academic year 1955-56, the fraternity rushing period for freshmen come at the beginning of the second term. The motion was seconded, and considerable discussion followed.

The Professor of Fine Arts, Professor D. L. Finlayson, moved to amend the motion so that if deferred rushing is adopted, inauguration of the system would be delayed for one more year. The motion was seconded, and was discussed at some length. When put to a voice
vote, the motion to amend was lost.

The original motion was then passed by a voice vote.

Under unfinished business, the Chairman of the special Committee on Questions Arising from the Operation of Cars by Cornell students, Professor K. L. Turk, called attention to the recommendations which were circulated to the Faculty in advance of the meeting. A copy of these recommendations is attached to the minutes. Professor Turk noted that no change had been made in the wording of the recommendations as adopted at the April meeting of the Faculty, but that the committee had introduced into the text the names of the persons and bodies to whom the several recommendations should be directed, and had rearranged the proposals accordingly. Professor Turk noted also that the committee had reconsidered, and wished to withdraw that portion of the original section 5 which was referred to it for further study. For the committee, Professor Turk then moved the substitution of the recommendations just presented for those adopted at the April meeting. The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

As a member of the special Committee on Questions Arising from the Operation of Cars by Cornell Students, Professor F. S. Freeman then presented a minority report with additional recommendations on the operation of automobiles by Cornell students. This report is appended to the minutes. Professor Freeman said that he wished to insert the phrase "and other motor vehicles" following the word "cars" wherever reference is made to cars in the minority report.

Professor Freeman then moved that section la be adopted and recommended to the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded. The voice vote was divided, but there being no call for a show of hands, the
President ruled that the motion was lost.

Professor Freeman then moved that section 2 be adopted and referred to the Board on Traffic Control. The motion was seconded. Since the result of the voice vote was in doubt, the President asked for a show of hands. The motion was lost, with a vote of 79 to 85.

Professor Freeman then moved that the Faculty adopt section 4 and refer it to the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded.

The Professor of English, Professor R. H. Elias, moved to amend the motion by adding "and those students for whom the Board on Traffic Control may make exceptions, in cases of serious hardship". Professor Freeman and his second accepted the amendment. The motion, as amended, was then put to a vote and by a show of hands lost.

Professor Freeman then moved that the Faculty adopt section 3 with the amendment proposed by Professor Elias, and refer it to the Board of Trustees. This motion was seconded. It was put to a vote by a show of hands and carried.

The President said he assumed that if approved by the Board of Trustees, this regulation would go into effect for the academic year 1954-55.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Report and Recommendations of Committee on Student Activities on Deferred Rushing

The present action of the Student Activities Committee on deferred rushing is an outgrowth of a general review of freshman orientation initiated in November 1949 by a sub-committee appointed by the Deans' Conference. The review covered the overall problem of adjustment to the University during the entire freshman year. The sub-committee reported that "fraternity rushing during the first two weeks of the term is a disturbing influence of considerable importance in the orientation of freshman men" and recommended a separate study of the feasibility of deferred rushing.

The recommendation was referred to the Student Activities Committee in October, 1950. A sub-committee consisting of Prof. G. H. Healey, Prof. L. C. Petry, and Prof. C. A. Hanson, Chairman was appointed to make an initial fact-finding survey and to submit recommendations for action as it saw fit. To this group was added a sub-committee of three students appointed by the Interfraternity Council. A number of meetings were held over a six months period and in May 1951 a report was made to the Student Activities Committee which decided to withhold a decision on the question of deferred rushing until an opportunity had been given for open meetings for discussion of the report.

The Cornell Sun was apprised of the plan in October, 1951 by a communication from Prof. Petry, Chairman of the Student Activities Committee, in which he announced that November 14 and 28 were selected as the first two dates for hearings. Invitations were extended to all persons and organizations interested in the problem including the Cornell Interfraternity Alumni Association. Special invitations were extended to the Deferred Rushing Committee of the Student Council, the Interfraternity Council and the Independent Council.

Further hearings were held on January 9 and January 16, 1952. At the conclusion of the hearings two meetings were held to discuss the findings of the sub-committee of the Student Activities Committee and the Interfraternity Council plus the material gathered at the hearings.

At the meeting on April 9, 1952 the following resolution was passed by the Committee:

Resolved:

1. That it is the considered opinion of this Committee that when adequate dormitory accommodations for men are available it will be in the best interests of the University to transfer the time of fraternity rushing to the opening of the sophomore year.

2. That the breaking of ground for the construction of dormitories to accommodate about 1200 men shall be considered evidence that adequate dormitory accommodations will be available and in operation within three years.
3. That at the time of the breaking of ground for the construction of such dormitories this Committee will notify the fraternities that, beginning with the third September following, rushing of freshmen is to be discontinued.

4. That these resolutions be transmitted to the Interfraternity Council, and to any fraternities not members of the Council which now pledge freshmen, for their consideration and for a report to this Committee.

The chief reasons advanced by the Committee for this action were as follows:

(a) Acceptance of the statement in the report of the sub-committee appointed by the Deans' Conference "that rushing in the first two weeks of the first term is a disturbing influence of considerable importance in the orientation of freshman men". During its study the committee came to feel that it was the most serious disturbance likely to occur during the freshman year. This disturbance could affect the whole freshman year, thus disrupting the freshman's total adjustment to college life.

(b) That the proposed plan for dormitory units would make it possible to house all freshman men adequately.

(c) That it would be possible to better orient all freshman men with an adequate counselling program plus a good program for recreational and social experience which could be provided with the new dormitory provisions.

(d) That by deferring rushing it could be possible to integrate the freshman men into a more cohesive group which should be advantageous to both the student body and the University.

In several communications to the present Chairman of the Committee the right of the Faculty to defer rushing in the fraternities has been challenged. Prior to the passage of the April, 1952 Resolution an opinion on the authority of the Committee was sought from the University Counsel. Mr. Neal Stamp, Assistant to the University Counsel, in a report to Dean Murdock makes the following statement: "I have studied the By-Laws of the University, the minutes of the Board of Trustees and its various standing committees and a limited number of outside cases. Very briefly it appears to me that there is no basis for a direct control of fraternities or sororities by the University or its Faculty. These organizations as such are independent of the University, own their own houses and are self-supporting and self-perpetuating in every way."

"At the same time it would appear that the University has a very comprehensive authority over the conduct and extracurricular activities of the student so long as he remains a student in the University. It is my opinion that through this channel the University has an indirect but nevertheless a most effective means of controlling fraternities, sororities, or any other student organization."

Regarding a suit involving a related problem the court said, in part, "Every student upon his admission into an institution of learning
impliedly promises to submit to and be governed by all the necessary and proper rules which have been or may thereafter be adopted for the government of the institution."

Mr. Stamp concludes, "It would seem that the University, through the University Faculty and the proper committees thereof, has the basic right and power to control rather completely the conduct and activities of a student so long as he remains a student at the University. This power would naturally include by implication the power to control any fraternity, sorority, or other student organization to the extent that such organization interferes with or affects the relationship between the individual student and the University."

As no dormitory construction had begun by the beginning of the academic year 1952-53, the Student Activities Committee decided to await the breaking of ground before bringing a resolution to the Faculty. In the meantime the question would be examined from time to time as conditions warranted. However, a Special Committee of the Interfraternity Council on Deferred Rushing was working on a report which was presented to the committee at its regular meeting in February, 1953. This was a carefully prepared analysis of the fraternity position on deferred rushing. The committee accepted the report as an objective and unbiased presentation. Two conclusions were made in the report: 1. That it opposed deferred rushing until the University presents a positive plan for freshman living that will remedy the weakness in counselling, social life, eating facilities and group living discussed in the report; and 2. That it take place no later than the end of the freshman year and that fraternities be given three years to minimize the financial burden of deferred rushing.

In October of 1953, with dormitory construction already begun, a sub-committee of the Student Activities Committee was appointed with the following members: Prof. Ludlow Brown, Prof. John Moynihan, and Prof. Arthur Mizener, Chairman. A similar sub-committee of the Interfraternity Council, consisting of five members, was appointed by that group to work with the Faculty sub-committee. These two groups began a series of meetings in early November under the general Chairmanship of Prof. Mizener. Their report was presented to the Student Activities Committee at the January, 1954 meeting. The report contained no specific recommendation but after a general agreement was reached that deferring rushing to the second year was inadvisable at Cornell, it offered three proposals with a digest of the major points for and against each. The proposals were: 1. to continue the present system of first term rushing, 2. to defer rushing to some point within the second term, and 3. to defer rushing to the beginning of the second term. It was stated that "the Committee's conviction is that if deferred rushing is to be tried at all it ought first to be tried at the beginning of the second term".

This report was the chief concern of the committee for three successive meetings. In addition, a closed hearing was held with a group of fraternity men selected by the President of the Interfraternity Council.
Two weeks later a similar closed hearing was held with a group of men selected by the President of Student Council.

At the April 15 meeting of the Student Activities Committee the following resolution was considered and passed by a vote of 10 - 3, "Resolved that this committee recommend to the University Faculty that, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, effective beginning in the academic year 1955-56, the fraternity rushing period for freshmen come at the beginning of the second term."

Reasons for this action may be briefly stated as follows:

(a) The committee concurred with reasons expressed at the time of the passage of the original resolution of April, 1952 on deferred rushing.

(b) Recognizing that a change in the rushing period would create a problem for fraternities, the committee felt that a minimum of harm would result if the rushing period were to be deferred to the second term rather than the second year as in the first resolution.

(c) That much of the desired improvement in the orientation of freshmen to the University could be gained during the first term.

(d) That in view of the present plan to use the new dormitories beginning in the fall of 1954-55, it would be important to the success of the orientation program to reduce the handicap of the presently existing disturbance and division of freshman men in the first term as soon as possible.

(e) That in view of the recommendation to defer rushing to the beginning of the second term with the financial problem for fraternities reduced to the loss of dues and dining for pledges during the first term, part of which loss would be balanced by not losing pledges at the end of the first term because of being dropped from the University, the further recommendation to make the ruling effective "beginning in the academic year 1955-56" seems reasonable.

Prior to the April 15, 1954 meeting the Cornell Interfraternity Alumni Association sent copies of a Report on Fraternity Rushing to each member of the Student Activities Committee. This report had been prepared to send to all members of the Faculty according to Mr. Grohman, Past President of the Association. At the top of page 2 a paragraph reads as follows:

"In view of our deep interest in the subject of freshman rushing, this Association maintains that it should be fully consulted before any change is considered or contemplated. Up to the present time this Association has not been invited or requested to attend meetings with Committees of the Faculty or the Administration on the subject of deferred rushing. In fact, we have never been advised by anyone of the objections to the present time of rushing. Surely, our position in considering this subject should be fully explored before any final action is taken. This
Association, through its Board of Directors and Executive Committee, will be very happy to meet with representatives of the Faculty or the Administration at an appropriate time."

According to the files of the committee, Prof. Petry, the Chairman, wrote to Morris Van Patten, Secretary of the Interfraternity Alumni Group, in October, 1950 regarding the deferred rushing question now before his committee. In a letter acknowledging this communication, Mr. Van Patten on October 31, 1950 states, "We honestly believe that anything pertaining to rushing is not primarily within the realm of our Alumni Program". In his reply Prof. Petry gave a resume of incidents to date, offered to discuss the matter at any time, and mentioned the collaboration of a sub-committee from the Interfraternity Council.

On April 11, 1952 Prof. Petry sent a copy of the committee resolution passed on April 9 to Mr. Victor Grohman, President of the Cornell Interfraternity Alumni Association, one to Mr. Van Patten, and one to the President of the Interfraternity Council. Shortly after this Prof. Petry was invited to attend the annual meeting of the Alumni Association held in New York on June 11, 1952. At this meeting Prof. Petry reported on the action of the committee and participated in a discussion period on the subject.

During the year 1952-53 there was considerable correspondence in addition to many phone calls between the present Chairman and Mr. Grohman. The committee was requested in March, 1953 to meet with a committee from the Alumni Association at the time of the Annual Fraternity Awards dinner. Most of the members of the Activities Committee were present at the meeting. The primary purpose of this meeting was to receive the opinion of the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association regarding compulsory contract dining. After this was disposed of, the question of deferred rushing was discussed. Opinions were expressed on the original resolution and a possible change to the second term of the freshman year. The alumni representatives made it very clear that they opposed any change but that the second term was to be preferred and would be much less a problem to the fraternities. The meeting was concluded by a statement from Mr. Grohman and agreed to by the others present that though they were opposed to any change in the existing system, they were Cornellians first and fraternity men second, and if in the best judgment of the Faculty a change seemed necessary for the welfare of the student body and the University, they would accept it in good grace.

During the current academic year there have been many letters and telephone calls. Mr. Van Patten spent the better part of a day in December with Prof. Mizener and in March had a conference with the committee Chairman. Both Mr. Grohman and Mr. Van Patten were constantly reminded that representatives of the Interfraternity Council had been collaborating with the Faculty Committee from the beginning. Mr. Will, Past President of the Interfraternity Council, Mr. Van Patten, President, and Mr. Grohman, Past President of the Cornell Interfraternity Alumni Association have been informed of the action of the committee. Letters have also been sent to Prof. Donald Finlayson and Prof. J. J. Wanderstock representing the Interfraternity Alumni Association on the Faculty.
During the week of April 5 a copy of a letter sent to all fraternity alumni by the local chapters was left on the desk of the Activities Committee Chairman. This letter, prepared by the steering committee of the Interfraternity Council, presented arguments against deferred rushing and urged the alumni to write to the Chairman of the Student Activities Committee protesting any change in the present system. According to a member of the steering committee, a letter was sent to each of the approximately sixteen thousand living fraternity alumni. In spite of the fact that sub-committees representing the Interfraternity Council have participated in the study of the problem, little consideration was given to the reasons for the majority position on the question. At the time this report is being prepared, two hundred seventy communications have reached the Chairman. Two hundred thirty favor retention of the present system and forty favor a change to second term rushing.

To a majority of the Student Activities Committee the issue is a simple one. It is their judgment, after a long and exhaustive study of the question, that a program to orient freshman men to university life, with adequate living accommodations provided by the new dormitories and with an adequate plan for counselling, social and recreational activities, would be best accomplished by deferring rushing by fraternities to the second term of the freshman year and that this can be done without, in the end, harming the fraternity system at Cornell.
Please bring this with you to the Faculty Meeting of May 12

Report to the Faculty of Committee to

Study and Report on the Questions Arising

from the Operation of Automobiles by

Cornell Students

History

According to the legislative records of the University Faculty, this is the third Faculty Committee appointed by the President to make a study and report on the problems arising from the use and operation of automobiles by students.

In 1930 a committee report was accepted and transmitted to the Board of Trustees with the resolution that the University Faculty approves in principle of the following: (1) licensing of student owned and operated automobiles, (2) licensing of all student drivers, (3) limitation of parking privileges on the campus, (4) regulation and control of commercial traffic upon the private roads and driveways of the campus, and (5) the establishment of a Motor Vehicle Bureau to put these recommendations into effect and administer them.

After a temporary period during World War II when student cars were banned, a second committee was appointed in 1945 to consider what, if any, changes should be made in the legislation governing the student use of automobiles. In May, 1946, the Faculty adopted the following recommendations:

1. That no fundamental change be made at the present time in the regulations governing student ownership and operation of cars, except that the parking fees be abolished and that the reasons for levying of a car registration fee be adequately publicized.

2. That in a limited number of cases blanket parking privileges be granted to disabled or other students to whom fixed parking is a real hardship.

3. That the speed limits on and adjacent to the campus be better publicized and posted.

4. That the traffic laws be enforced to the fullest extent and that all possible precautions be taken to avoid accident.

5. That fines for traffic violations which endanger life or property be raised within reasonable limits at the discretion of the traffic board.
6. That the sending of a letter from the President’s office to parents of prospective new students discouraging the student operation of cars at Cornell be repeated as often as seems appropriate.

7. That the Board of Trustees be requested to designate a resident committee or board to survey the vehicular circulation and parking problems of the campus area with authority to make recommendations directly to the Board of Trustees on measures designed to alleviate congestion and danger.

8. That the Committee on the Student Use of Automobiles be continued to explore with other appropriate groups the possibilities of turning over to a student court certain cases of student traffic violations.

On July 8, 1949 the Board on Traffic Control recommended to the Board of Trustees that for a trial period of one year (1949-50) freshmen not be allowed to have cars in Ithaca. Subsequently, on April 12, 1950, the University Faculty voted to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the temporary regulations, prohibiting the use of cars by freshmen, be continued together with provisions similar to those now in effect under which exceptions are possible. The Board of Trustees adopted this legislation.

Present Situation

According to the records of the Safety Division Office, there were 6,671 automobiles registered as of November 30, 1953. The staff and employees had 3,882 of these vehicles. There were 2,789 student vehicles.

The percentage breakdown of student cars by classes is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the student cars registered with the University 1,164 have been issued parking permits for various reasons which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written requests approved by Board on Traffic Control Representative</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the commuters have been assigned spaces in the peripheral areas, such as Kite Hill, Clara Dickson, near Hoy Field, and near the Livestock Barns.

The total available parking spaces on campus, including the areas on the outskirts, amount to 2,538. Of this number of spaces, 657 are not utilized by the staff because of the distance from their offices. Therefore, 3,882 staff members are trying to park their vehicles in 1,881 spaces. Disabled students and those students using their cars in connection with University business (mostly graduate assistants) require approximately 400 of the same 1,881 spaces.

The parking problem is further aggravated by visitors to the Campus. This is true when large conferences are scheduled and when daytime athletic events are held.

Another factor contributing to congestion on the campus is the "shuttle" service operated by fraternities to bring students on campus for classes in cars having no parking permits.

Since accidents will always be a problem where automobiles are driven, some statistics are presented here on accidents in Ithaca and on the campus involving Cornell students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total passenger vehicles registration for City of Ithaca plus student vehicles*</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total drivers involved in accidents in City of Ithaca</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of drivers involved**</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles registered by students</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents in City of Ithaca involving students</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of student drivers involved in accidents</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated. Does not include commercial vehicles.
**Estimated because of unknown number of county cars driving in city.
***For full semester. (figure given on p. 2 is for the term up to November 30)
As one examines these data it is evident from the traffic accidents reported that Cornell students have a record which compares with any other similar area.

Included in the above statistics were five accidents in Ithaca in 1953 in which a fatality occurred. Of these five accidents, three vehicles were driven by Cornell students. Two of them were pedestrians hit and killed by student drivers. In the third case, a student lost control of his car and was thrown out and killed. There were no fatal accidents in the City of Ithaca in 1952.

There are approximately 10,000 violations of one kind or another on the campus annually. Of these, approximately 5,000 are for students and are largely parking violations. It would appear, therefore, that the faculty, employees and visitors are responsible for the other 5,000 violations.

Since January 1, 1954 the Ithaca Police Department has been recording separately all student traffic arrests. These data for the first three months are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic accidents in Ithaca</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of drivers involved</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of student drivers involved</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of arrests in Ithaca</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of student arrests</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of student arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed operators</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired plates</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No proof of insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized turns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning wrong way on one way street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to stop at stop sign</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to stop at red light</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Traffic Division insists that all persons involved in accidents resulting in personal injury or property damage of $50.00 or more report the accident to the Ithaca Police or the Sheriff's Department, depending on where the accident takes place.

Problems

An analysis of the situation and the available statistics focus attention on the following:

1. An extreme shortage of parking space for staff, employees and students who are eligible for parking permits.

2. The "shuttle" service operated by fraternities and other organizations with large numbers of automobiles, without parking permits, moving across campus at the time classes change greatly increases the congestion for brief periods. It is during this time that infractions for speeding, reckless and discourteous driving frequently occur.

3. The problem of violations is one which affects both students and staff. In some cases violations are serious; yet as a whole the violations are no higher than might be expected.

4. Insufficient patrolmen for proper enforcement of present rules may be a contributing problem. Some difficulties are encountered in enforcing existing rules and regulations.

The major problem is the existence of automobiles. They are likely to continue in our modern society. Any accident is serious and it is the feeling of the committee that some recommendations are in order that might help alleviate some of these problems.

Recommendations:

On the basis of the available information which shows that the traffic problems on the Cornell campus are due to a combination of factors, including vehicles owned and operated by faculty and employees, students (both graduate and undergraduate), other citizens of the community, and visitors to the Campus, the Committee makes the following recommendations

1. That the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees:

   (a) That new legislation should be adopted "prohibiting the operation of a motor vehicle in a careless, negligent, dangerous or grossly discourteous manner", a violation of which would be classified as a "moving traffic violation". Such legislation would be designed to apprehend persons driving recklessly, in the usual sense of the term, but
who may not be guilty of the crime of reckless driving in the legalistic sense (a crime involving wanton or heedless indifference to consequences).

(b) That present regulations, providing for automatic suspension of vehicular privileges upon conviction for a third moving traffic violation upon the campus only, be amended to provide for automatic suspension of vehicular privileges upon conviction (or upon the forfeiture of bail) for a third moving traffic violation in any location within Tompkins County, including the campus. The Safety Director shall collect periodically information from the records of the City Court of Ithaca and other courts within Tompkins County, and upon the cumulation of convictions (or forfeiture of bail) for three moving traffic violations within Tompkins County, vehicular privileges of the student concerned shall be automatically suspended.

2. That the Faculty recommend to the Safety Division that it require staff members to submit clear and convincing evidence of need when recommending parking privileges for students.

3. That the Faculty recommend to the Board on Traffic Control:

(a) That the penalty of temporary suspension of driving privileges against students guilty of moving violations be invoked frequently.

(b) That the Board on Traffic Control institute and assume responsibility for promoting an educational program among the faculty, employees and students on traffic problems on the campus and the need for more safety in the operation of motor vehicles. The University should support the student-sponsored educational and safety program.

4. That the Faculty recommend to the President:

(a) That sufficient patrolmen be provided in the Safety Division to implement the necessary educational program and enforce the rules and regulations.

(b) That necessary steps be taken to increase parking space by any or all of these means: by constructing large parking areas at the periphery of the campus, by expansion of existing parking areas wherever possible to accommodate more cars, and by constructing new parking areas on the campus, wherever practicable and with due regard for aesthetic considerations.
(c) That the Administration request officials of the City of Ithaca to provide traffic police patrol on Thurston Avenue, especially between the hours of 8 - 10 a. m., 12 - 2 p. m., and 4 - 6 p. m.

D. L. Finlayson  
F. S. Freeman  
W. H. French  
R. I. Fricke  
K. L. Turk, Chairman

At the April meeting of the Faculty the foregoing recommendations were adopted. The Faculty was in doubt, however, what persons or bodies should deal with the various proposals.

After consulting with Administrative Officers, the Committee has, therefore, introduced into the text the names of these persons and bodies to whom the several recommendations should be directed and has rearranged the proposals accordingly. No changes have been made in the wording of any recommendations.

At the next meeting of the Faculty, Professor Turk, Chairman of the Committee, will ask approval of the Faculty for this editing.
Minority Report

Additional Recommendations on the Operation
of Automobiles by Cornell Students

1. (a) Students shall be prohibited from driving cars on (certain specified roads)* of the campus between the hours of 7:30 A.M. and 5:30 P.M., Monday through Friday; and 7:30 A.M. and 12 noon, on Saturday. Exceptions may be made by Board on Traffic Control in cases of serious hardship.

(b) One conviction for the violation of this regulation shall result in suspension of driving privileges for a period of 16 weeks (the equivalent of one semester).

*The roads to be closed off to students are:
1. Central Avenue from Campus Road to University Avenue
2. Tower Road, from Garden Avenue to Central Avenue
3. Campus Road, between East and Central Avenues
4. All of East Avenue

2. The Board of Traffic Control shall discontinue unrestricted so-called "half-hour" student-parking on the campus, as, for example, along Central Avenue, opposite Willard Straight; and the so-called "ten-minute" parking in front of Library.

3. Possession and operation of cars (in Tompkins County) shall be limited to juniors, seniors, and graduate students.

OR

4. Possession and operation of cars (in Tompkins County) shall be limited to seniors and graduate students.

(signed) F. S. Freeman
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of May 12 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Albert Edward Wells, Sibley Professor of Mechanic Arts, Emeritus, on May 12, 1954. The Faculty rose in respect to the memory of their former colleague.

For the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor Peabody, made the following motion:

Resolved that the University Faculty, the Board of Trustees concurring, designate Saturday, May 11, 1955, as Spring Day, a University holiday, and instruct the Committee on Registration and Schedules to schedule evening hours which members of the Faculty may use for classes and laboratory periods which are normally scheduled on that day.

The motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Professor of Law, Professor J. W. MacDonald, then moved for reconsideration of the motion that "Possession and operation of cars and other motor vehicles (in Tompkins County) shall be limited to juniors, seniors and graduate students". He also moved referral of the motion back to the committee for reconsideration, and spoke briefly on his reasons for proposing these motions.

The first motion, i.e., to reconsider, was seconded, and by a show of hands, carried.
The motion being before the Faculty in the same condition as it was before the vote was taken on May 12, the Professor of English, Professor Keast, moved to table it. The motion, duly seconded, was passed by a show of hands.

Professor Keast then moved that the present special committee be discharged with the thanks of this Faculty, and a new committee be appointed to make a fresh and full study of the problems arising out of the operation of motor vehicles by Cornell students and Faculty and to make recommendations to this Faculty at its January 1955 meeting of measures appropriate to deal with these problems.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor Black, in order to clarify the meaning of the term "new committee" moved as an amendment, the addition of the clause "in which no previous member is to serve". The motion to amend was seconded, and, by a voice vote, lost.

The Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Professor Murdock, stated that the motion before the Faculty contained two points, (1) that there be further study of the problems arising out of operation of cars by Cornell students, and (2) that a new committee be appointed to make this study. Professor Murdock then moved to amend the motion by deleting reference to a new committee, and directing that further study be made by the existing committee. The motion to amend was seconded, and by a show of hands, lost.

The original motion was then passed by a show of hands.
Although no direct mention was made of a statement entitled "Reasons Why the Student Council Hopes That the Faculty Will Re-commit the Student Car Problem to Its Special Committee for Further Consideration," this statement was distributed to members of the Faculty at the beginning of the meeting, and a copy is appended to these minutes.

For the Administrative Committee of the Division of Unclassified Students, Professor Rideout, the Director of that division, presented the committee's second annual report. A copy of this report is appended to the minutes together with the tables which were distributed to the Faculty at the meeting. The report was received with applause.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
OF
THE DIVISION OF UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS
(delivered orally to the University Faculty, May 26, 1954, by B. L. Rideout)

At the Meeting of the University Faculty on September 26, 1951, when Mr. Malott presided for the first time, the following legislation was passed:

"The University Faculty recommends to the Board of Trustees that there be established a Division of Unclassified Students on an experimental basis for a period of three years beginning on November 15, 1951."

"The Administrative Committee shall make annual reports to the University Faculty during the three-year experimental period in order that changes in the organization may be made during the progress of the experiment as seems desirable."

As we are now in the fifth term, this is the Second Annual Report, and it is being made on behalf of the Administrative Committee which is, at present, composed of:

The Professor of Regional Planning, Dean Thomas W. Mackesey
The Professor of Economics, Prof. Chandler Morse
The Professor of Sanitary Engineering, Prof. Howard M. Giffit
The Professor of Biophysics and Physics, Prof. LeRoy L. Barnes
The Professor of Forestry, Prof. Cedric H. Guise
The Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Prof. James Campbell

For the benefit of those who have not been on the campus for the past eight years, and to refresh the memories of others, I think a brief review of history is in order. The Faculty should be aware of the painful and lengthy labor we suffered in giving birth to this Division.

The problem dates back indefinitely, but many of you will recall that it became particularly acute in 1946 when we experienced the G. I. bulge. Each college was strictly limited as to its enrollment, and no pattern had been developed for the accommodation of campus transfers. For a while there was tried a "Round Table Exchange" whereby certain Deans and Directors exchanged students across the table on an even basis. Such a device was both unfair and unsatisfactory.
In September, 1949, the President's Conference of Deans and Directors, concerned with Freshman Orientation, appointed a Committee with Prof. Petry as Chairman. In May, 1950, the Petry Committee reported back to the Deans' Conference. I read from that report:

"In the opinion of the Committee at least one other important feature of Freshman orientation requires further study. This is the problem produced by those freshmen who find themselves, for various reasons, registered in Schools and Colleges for which their training or interest is not adequate. This Committee is satisfied that these students constitute an important element in the total of students dropped or dropping voluntarily; that they also contribute a source of strain on the stability of the student body; and that they have an important effect on the public relations of the University. The Committee further believes that admission to the University constitutes some obligation upon the University to insure a fair opportunity to carry out the purposes for which admission is gained."

"As a result of the ensuing discussion on the above matter, Acting President de Kiewiet appointed an interim committee composed of Mr. Williams as chairman, Dean Murdock, and Professor Petry to consider these points. They reported as follows:

"The purpose of this Committee has been to investigate the nature and extent of the intercollege transfer problem here at Cornell and to bring recommendations to the Deans' Conference such as to define the problem and recommend a form of committee to undertake a study of it and propose a solution to it."

"The Committee identified at least four reasons why transfers are requested. First, misplacement of the student in college at the time of his admission; second, bona fide change in the educational and vocational interests of the student; third, the development of identifiable blocks in certain individual subjects which would, therefore, prevent further progress in related fields; fourth, generally poor scholarship either because of poor preparation or because of other conditions which have arisen since the student entered the University. It was felt that the first three reasons for transfer were of interest to this Committee, that the fourth was in general a problem of the division in which the student was originally enrolled."

"It was the unanimous feeling of the Committee that regardless of whether or not a student has been admitted to an individual college, which alone has the responsibility for that admission, that same student upon matriculation immediately becomes a responsibility of the University in the minds of the general public, the parent, the secondary school, and the alumnus. Because of this fact, the University, as a whole, must be prepared to assume a certain degree of responsibility for the student regardless of the degree of his success in the division in which he has originally been enrolled. Such responsibility has in fact been assumed in the non-academic areas administered by the Offices of the Deans of Men and Women. In the academic area, very little University-wide responsibility has been accepted to date."
"It was generally agreed that there are at the present time inadequate facilities for intercollege educational advising and no adequate means to effectuate changes in course or curriculum should such educational advising identify cases where such changes seemed desirable. It was agreed that misplacement at admissions, change in vocational or educational interest of the candidate, and developed blocks for specific subjects might individually or collectively constitute adequate grounds for transfer consideration."

"Data were assembled which convinced the Committee that the transfer problem was sizable enough to warrant more thorough study."

"As a result of its investigation, the Temporary Committee on Intercollege Transfers recommended the appointment of a Committee on Intercollege Transfers, charged with making a full study of this problem, and with the formation of a plan or proposal as a solution to it."

At this point the Deans' Conference appointed the Mackesey Committee, which recommended the organization of the Division of Unclassified Students. After clearing through the Committee on University Policy, where certain changes were made, the University Faculty passed the legislation already read.

When it looked into the experience at other comparable universities in an effort to learn how the transfer problem has been solved on other campuses, the Mackesey Committee discovered that all seven institutions it queried had organized special divisions similar to the one we are now operating at Cornell. We are not, therefore, unique in setting up such a division, but in many ways the way we have functioned is unique.

I should like to mention at least four of the other institutions where a comparable arrangement has been made. At Purdue University a Division of Unclassified Students was established in 1946. Its purpose was to accommodate two groups of students: those who do not meet their entrance requirements and those not eligible to continue in the school in which they originally enrolled. The maximum registration in this division at Purdue is four terms. For students not qualified for a four year academic program, "practical courses" are arranged to qualify them for special work in industry. Some do go on to technical institutes.
Iowa does not have a Division of Unclassified Students, but with a centralized office of admissions for their nine colleges, campus transfers are handled by that agency. We are informed that transfers are frequent and that the records established have been generally good.

At Michigan State College, a Division of Unclassified Students replaces to a certain extent the General College which they have abandoned. At that institution, the division handles the kind of transfer cases we deal with and also "pressure cases" and "unusually meritorious experiments". The Registrar has reported to us that students enrolled as Unclassified are generally not wanted by any other Dean. There are a few exceptions in the case of the "explorers". High School graduates, sons of Michigan tax payers, who have been rejected for admission, often call upon pressure people to exert their influence with the admissions authorities at Michigan State. The Registrar informs us that these candidates are given an entrance examination and are admitted if they come fairly close to passing it. Or he may be put on trial in the Summer Session. Michigan State allows a student to remain unclassified only two or three terms.

At the Pennsylvania State University a Division of Intermediate Registration was established in 1929 on an experimental basis for two years. It was made permanent in 1951 and the Director has written me recently that they are now considering developing it into a basic college. The administrative setup is rather elaborate with a Director, assistant Director, two assistants to the Director, two clinical assistants and an office clerical staff. The reason for the large administrative hierarchy is their large enrollment. Students are placed in the Division when they fall below a certain average, but they also service the same kind of cases we do. The maximum registration is two terms.
Mo3t of you are familiar with the operation of the Division on this campus. Many of you have been asked to appraise the prospects of a student who originally enrolled in your college and who wishes to transfer to the status of an Unclassified student. You know that we ask for certain information with respect to the candidate's work habits, attitude, etc., while registered with you. The Administrative Committee considers these appraisals very seriously when it makes rulings on applications.

There is one matter on which we hope for a little more cooperation, and that is the timing of certain applications. It has been our experience that many of those who do not apply until they receive a bust notice are unable to make a very strong case for themselves. Therefore, we urge you to send us prospects as early as possible.

As a rule, we honor the recommendations made by a responsible official of the school where the candidate is currently enrolled, but on occasion we have ventured to admit certain rather dubious prospects. For example, candidate "A" whose fall term average was only 52% and who had failed three out of his four courses, was admitted at the last minute in February. His mid-term average was 76.6% and he has already been granted provisional approval by the School of Industrial and Labor Relations for September admission. Case "B" had a 55% average at the end of the fall term, 1953, in Mechanical Engineering, having failed four out of his five courses. After his admission to this Division, his mid-term average was 79% and on the basis of that performance he was granted provisional approval by Arts and Sciences for admission this coming fall.

I now call your attention to the tables which have been distributed so that we may note the performance of students who have been admitted to the Division up to the present. (See appended Tables)
Table 1 shows that students accepted by this Division were originally enrolled in ten different colleges. The second part of Table 1 shows that the Administrative Committee denied admission to more candidates than it approved.

Table 2 presents evidence that students enrolled in the Division have been accepted by no less than eight different schools on the campus. The forty-nine successful "graduates" of the Division represent a salvage rate of approximately 70% which is considerably higher than the 50% record of which Penn State is very proud. As a matter of fact, the Cornell salvage rate of 70% is perhaps not an accurate figure because some withdrew without explanation, others left the campus to attend other schools, and two men were retained by the Division for a second term.

Table 3 summarizes the record made by Unclassified students during the first four terms of the operation of the Division. In scrutinizing the scale of grades it should be borne in mind that we are dealing here essentially with students who have been busted or placed on probation.

Table 4 demonstrates that graduates of the Division have done rather well after enrollment in one of the degree-granting schools on the campus. Thirty-five of the thirty-nine students have averages better than 70%, and only three students have been delinquent after leaving the Division. One was dropped by Arts even though he had not failed a single course, another has been placed on strict probation by Hotel and a third has been given a warning in Electrical Engineering.

In Table 5 it will be seen that the average increase after transfer into the Division has been about 11%. Only two students have done less well and it is interesting to note that they have both changed from Arts to Engineering Physics after a term in Unclassified.
Table 6 shows that the currently enrolled group, the largest to date, was already doing well at mid-term. Seven of the thirty-six students have been granted provisional approval by other schools on the basis of their mid-term grades.

While the Division is too new to draw definite conclusions as to its ultimate success, there is evidence in these tables that nearly all the students thus far admitted have taken advantage of the opportunity and have achieved records which - if not distinguished - are at least no worse than the run of the mill.

At any rate, you have here evidence that seems to justify our effort to salvage some of our delinquent students and provide at the same time an agency for others to go into neutral territory for a term or two to sit "on the fence" and explore new fields before making a decision on a final goal.

If retained, the Division of Unclassified Students will help students in many ways so that we will have fewer failures, and a greater percentage of our students will be able to adjust themselves earlier and go on successfully to the bachelor's degree. I speak for the Administrative Committee when I say that the Division may be looked upon as a regular and necessary function in our total educational program on this campus.

The number of students has purposely been kept small. There is no intention to build up an ugly monster in the form of a large enrollment or a larger and more costly set-up.

This is a service organization to the entire University. It has not been operated as a "dumping ground" to keep students in the University if they do not belong here. Our object has been to avoid paternalism which, if followed, may lead to an accentuation of weaknesses inherent in the individual.
We believe that the student must learn to stand on his own feet and we do not make a specialty of coddling weak sisters. We are trying to save a few worthwhile and promising students so that their educational careers will not be terminated before they have an opportunity to demonstrate what they can do in a different program.

The Administrative Committee is not at this time making any recommendations to you. In accordance with your own legislation, this report has been made to give you an opportunity to make changes in the organization as may seem desirable. Your suggestions or comments will be appreciated by the Administrative Committee. Or we shall be glad to answer your questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

************

**TABLE 2**

Present Status of Students Enrolled During First Four Years (Spring '52 - Fall '53)

- Accepted by Architecture: 1
- Accepted by Arts & Sciences: 25
- Accepted by Agriculture: 1
- Accepted by Civil Engineering: 1
- Accepted by Hotel Administration: 10
- Accepted by Home Economics: 1
- Accepted by Engineering Physics: 3
- Accepted by Industrial & Labor Relations: 6

- Rejected by Division of Unclassified Students: 6
- Rejected admission by other colleges on campus: 13
- Withdraw without explanation: 1
- Withdraw to attend other schools, enter the service, or to take a job: 1
- Retained by Unclassified for a second term: 6

TOTAL 75
TABLES TO ACCOMPANY
SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
OF
THE DIVISION OF UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS
(delivered orally to the University Faculty, May 26, 1954, by B. L. Rideout)

TABLE #1
ORIGIN OF STUDENTS ACCEPTED BY DUS - FROM FEB. '52 TO AND INCLUDING FEB. '54 (5 Term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch E</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>ARTS</th>
<th>ILR</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>AG-ENG</th>
<th>HoEc</th>
<th>GRAD HO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION OF REFUSALS - COVERING THE SAME TERMS AS ABOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch E</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>ARTS</th>
<th>ILR</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>AG-ENG</th>
<th>HoEc</th>
<th>GRAD HO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr. '54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE #2
PRESENT STATUS OF STUDENTS ENROLLED DURING FIRST FOUR TERMS (SPRING '52 - FALL '53)

Accepted by Architecture........................................... 1
" " Arts & Sciences............................................. 25
" " Agriculture.................................................. 1
" " Civil Engineering......................................... 4
" " Hotel Administration..................................... 10
" " Home Economics............................................. 1
" " Engineering Physics....................................... 3
" " Industrial & Labor Relations............................. 4
Dropped by Division of Unclassified Students................. 6
Refused admittance by other colleges on campus............ 13
Withdrawed without explanation.............................. 1
Withdrawed to attend other schools, enter the service,
or to take a job............................................... 4
Retained by Unclassified for a second term............... 2
TOTAL 79
TABLE #3

SUMMARY OF RECORDS MADE BY STUDENTS IN FIRST FOUR TERMS

| Total No. of Students..... | 75 |
| Total Academic Hours..... | 1520 |
| Total Hours Passed......... | 12/140 (95%) |
| 1196 Hours Passed (79%) at 70 or better |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% - 100%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% - 80%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% - 70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE #5

PERCENT OF INCREASE IN CUMULATIVE AVERAGE AFTER TRANSFER INTO DIVISION OF UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS (AND SUBSEQUENT TRANSFER) - COVERING THOSE REGISTERED IN FIRST 3 TERMS OF DUS

Involving 40 Students - as of Spring Term, 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>% of Increase</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>% of Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 - 9</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>**1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 or better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stephen M. Harris, transferred from Arts to EP - 89.6% in Arts, 87% in DUS, and 80.8% in EP.
**Clive M. Usiskin, transferred from Arts to EP - 84.9% in Arts, 74% in DUS, and 77.7% in EP.

TABLE #6

SUMMARY OF MID-TERM AVERAGES OF ALL STUDENTS REGISTERED IN DUS SPRING TERM 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>83 79 78 77 76 75 74 73 72 71 70 69 68 67 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Students or 89% of all enrolled, have averages of 70% or better.

**********
Reasons Why the Student Council Hopes That The Faculty Will Recommit The Student Car Problem To Its Special Committee For Further Consideration

I. Likelihood of student cooperation in solution of traffic problem.

1. The Student Council Traffic Safety Committee and the Men's Judiciary Board stand ready to cooperate with the Faculty Committee in arriving at a solution which might actually meet the existing difficulties.

2. Possible solutions already under student consideration:
   
   (a) That the Student Traffic Safety Committee attempt to combat the problem of discourteous student driving by establishing and operating an orientation program for student drivers.

   (b) That the Men's Judiciary Board prescribe further driving instruction for students found guilty of dangerous or discourteous car operation.

   (c) That all student traffic on campus be barred from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 7:30 a.m. to noon on Saturday.

II. Value of student cooperation.

That students will respond, if given the opportunity, to requests for help in the solution of problems facing the University community is shown by the progress made in the handling of student conduct cases by the recently established Men's Judiciary Board, and by the new house social rules recently enacted by I. F. C.

III. The sophomore car ban does not really solve the problem.

1. It would take only 12% instead of all student cars out of campus traffic.

2. It would not help the parking situation because the only sophomores who have parking permits at present are the ones who would be excepted from the proposed ban for special reasons.

3. There appear to be no statistics establishing any direct relation between student cars and academic performance.

IV. The students' privileges as citizens.

The ban would curtail a privilege common to all citizens. Granting that the University has the power to deprive a student of some of his privileges as a citizen as long as he is a student at Cornell, the power is a drastic one which the Student Council suggests should be exercised only if necessary to the accomplishment of important ends. The Council submits that the University should not exercise the power in this instance, since as pointed out above, it would not solve the campus traffic problem.

Gill H. Boehringer, President
Cornell Student Council

Robert W. Black
Representative-at-large
Cornell Student Council

May 25, 1954
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of May 26 were read and approved. The President announced the death of Helen Canon, Professor of Economics of the Household and Household Management, Emeritus, on July 9, 1954. The Faculty rose in tribute to their former colleague.

The Dean reported that he had received communications from the President announcing the following appointments to committees:

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Albert Edward Wells: C. D. Albert, W. C. Andrae, and R. L. Geer, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Helen Canon: Beulah Blackmore, Jean Warren, and M. L. Rollins, Chairman.


To the Committee on University Policy to fill temporary vacancies caused by the absence on leave of K. L. Turk during the academic year 1954-55, and of J. R. Moynihan and W. A. Wimsatt during the first term of that year: H. F. DeGraff, G. P. Adams, Jr., and H. B. Adelmann.

To the Committee on Nominations until December 31, 1954, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation from the Faculty of C. W. Jones: Lauriston Sharp.

To the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to fill the temporary vacancy caused by the absence on leave of A. E. Kahn during the academic year 1954-55: B. J. Conta.

To the Committee on Music to fill the temporary vacancy which will be caused by the absence on leave of R. B. Schlesinger during the second term: C. L. Rossiter.
To the Committee on Student Activities to fill the temporary vacancy caused by the absence on leave of J. R. Moynihan during the first term: A. B. Credle.

To the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events to fill the temporary vacancy caused by the absence on leave of J. L. Gregg during the academic year: N. R. Gay.

To succeed R. S. Stevens, retired, on the special committee to confer with the Trustee committee regarding faculty representation on the Board of Trustees: H. F. DeGraff.

The Dean announced that communications had been received from the Board of Trustees as follows:

A communication announcing that at the meeting of its Executive Committee held June 13, 1954, the designation by the Faculty of Saturday, May 14, 1955 as Spring Day and a University holiday was approved.

A communication announcing that at the meeting of the Board held June 14, 1954, the decision of the Faculty made at its meeting of May 12, 1954 that effective in the academic year 1955-56, the fraternity rushing period for freshmen come at the beginning of the second term, was approved.

A communication acknowledging receipt of the recommendations which the Faculty at its meeting of May 12, 1954 voted to make to the Board with respect to changes in the Trustees' legislation governing campus motor vehicle traffic; and announcing that at the Board meeting of June 14, 1954 the previous actions of the Board of Trustees regulating traffic and parking as applied to students, faculty and staff, were rescinded as to them, and that the regulation of such traffic and parking upon the premises of the University was referred to the Administration with power.

The Dean of the School of Business and Public Administration, Dean Litchfield, spoke briefly concerning the reasons for the proposals concerning the School which had been distributed in advance of the meeting.
For the Committee on University Policy, Professor R. E. Cushman, a member of the committee, then proposed the following motion:

Whereas the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration proposes to raise its general entrance requirement for Cornell students from three years of college work to a college degree, subject to exceptions permitting acceptance of Cornell engineering students after four years, Cornell agricultural students after three years, and Cornell students embarked upon the Arts-Law-Business and Public Administration combined program after three years, the change to be effective when in the judgment of the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration such change has become feasible; and

Whereas the University By-Laws provide that it shall be the duty of each separate college or school faculty to determine the entrance requirements for its own students but that actions of such faculties shall be subject to right of revision by the University Faculty on all matters affecting general University policy; and

Whereas the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration has requested that the University Faculty express its attitude toward the proposed increase in the general entrance requirement of said School,

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that it is the sense of the University Faculty that the proposed increase in the general entrance requirement of the said School is desirable from the standpoint of general University policy; and

Be It Further Resolved that the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration be authorized to make the proposed increase in its general entrance requirement whenever in its judgment such change has become feasible.

The motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Professor Cushman then proposed the following motion:

Whereas the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration proposes that the name of the School be
changed to the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration should the proposed increase in its general entrance requirement become effective, and has requested that the University Faculty express its attitude toward such change of name at such time; and

Whereas it appears that the proposed change in name would be desirable under the condition stated, and would in no way prejudice the programs and operation of other divisions of the University or interfere with their jurisdiction,

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that if and when the proposal to increase the general entrance requirement of the School of Business and Public Administration becomes effective, the name of the School be changed to the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration.

This motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

For the Committee on University Policy, Professor Schlesinger, a member of its Sub-committee on the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan, moved that the Faculty request the Board of Trustees to authorize Cornell's participation in the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan. The motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote. A copy of the description of the plan, which was circulated to the Faculty in advance of the meeting, is appended to these minutes.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, Professor L. P. Smith, a member of the committee, moved that the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the new Director of CURW, in his capacity as Director, be made a member of the University Faculty without academic title. The motion was seconded.
The Professor of Botany, Professor Petry, suggested that the word "new" be struck from the motion. This suggestion was accepted by Professor Smith and the second. In the course of the discussion the President asked the Dean to take the chair. The President then commented that the recommendation was made because the Director of CURW takes part in the counseling program and should have the benefit of deliberations of the Faculty. He noted that the motion was not concerned with the teaching of religion, nor with the work of the chaplains, but was designed to integrate the counseling functions of the Director of CURW into the counseling system of the University. The President commented further that he did not know what the future of courses on religion at Cornell University would be. He assured the Faculty, however, that development along this line, if it came about, would be initiated in the usual way, presumably from faculty interested in it, and would be treated in the same manner as any other addition to the curriculum of the University. After a lively discussion the question was called for and passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
At least 88 colleges (list appended to this memorandum) are at present members of the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan, and it is expected that additional institutions in considerable numbers will become members during the coming year.

Under the Plan, faculty children of the participating institutions become eligible to receive free tuition while undergraduates at any one of those institutions, if duly accepted for admission and approved for inclusion under the Plan by the faculty member's own college and the other institution involved.

1. Children eligible. If Cornell University were a member of the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan, the child of any member of the University staff who, under existing legislation of the Board of Trustees, is eligible to receive free tuition at Cornell would become eligible for participation in the Tuition Exchange Plan.

2. Amount of remission. The amount of remission under the Plan for eligible children is usually the normal, regular, tuition charge. Fees over and above the regular tuition fee are not normally remitted. Each college makes its own determination in establishing the tuition fee remitted. The normal admission requirements or procedures of each college are unaffected by the Plan.

3. Upon entering the exchange each college commits itself to remit, during the next five years, the tuition of a stated number of faculty children. This commitment serves as a tentative guide to the availability of tuition remissions at member colleges. Each college may increase or decrease its commitment any time it wishes—except that the commitment may not be decreased below the point which will cover debts already incurred.

4. Tuition credits may be earned by tuition remission at undergraduate schools, either professional or liberal arts.

5. Cornell's, or any other member college's, ability to accept faculty children from another institution will depend, over a period of time, upon the extent to which it sends its own faculty children elsewhere. Thus there can never be assurance that all faculty children who wish to attend an institution in the Plan other than that at which the faculty member is employed can actually receive the benefit of free tuition at the college of their choice. Two conditions must be met:

1) The applicant must be accepted for admission at the college of his or her choice, in the regular way.

2) There must be a place for that student within the commitment of that college.
**MEMBERS OF FACULTY CHILDREN’S TUITION EXCHANGE PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albright</td>
<td>Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Milwaukee-Downer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>M.I.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Moravian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard</td>
<td>Mount Holyoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard</td>
<td>Muhlenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Oberlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington</td>
<td>Penn College for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowdoin</td>
<td>Polytechnic Insti. of Bklyn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Randolph-Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Crest</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson</td>
<td>R.P.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Sarah Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Skidmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Sweet Briar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin &amp; Marshall</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
<td>Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goucher</td>
<td>Tufts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ursinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwick</td>
<td>Utica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>Vassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart &amp; William Smith</td>
<td>Wabash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniata</td>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Western College for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keuka</td>
<td>Western Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>Willamette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Valley</td>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/17/54
SURVEY OF AGES AND COLLEGE PLANS OF CORNELL FACULTY CHILDREN

Note: Please complete and return this form to the Director of Admissions, Day Hall, before October 4. This data is needed to estimate as accurately as possible the commitments which Cornell would have to make as a participant in the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan and will serve as a permanent record for future estimates.

1. My children who are now undergraduates in any college are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Present Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate terms remaining after June '55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. List all children from age 3 through 18. For those who will reach 18 by 1960, list also their probable choice of college. Note that the present list of FCTE colleges will probably be much enlarged as time goes on. If you have at present no "probable choice", but do know it will probably be an FCTE college other than Cornell, indicate that by reporting "FCTE college".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Probable Choice of College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. My name is:

Faculty rank or administrative position: ________________________________

Date: ____________________

9/17/54
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of September 29 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Carl Stephenson, Professor of History, Emeritus, on October 1, 1951. The Faculty rose in tribute to their former colleague.

The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the President announcing the following committee appointments, all of which are for four-year terms ending October 31, 1958 unless otherwise specified:

1. To the Committee on University Lectures - H. E. Shadick.

2. To the Committee on Music for a three and a half year term beginning February 7, 1954 and ending October 31, 1958 - R. A. Hall, Jr.; and C. L. Rossiter for the fall term of the current academic year. (It will be remembered that Prof. Rossiter had already been appointed to this committee for the second term of this academic year to fill the vacancy which will be caused by the absence on leave of R. B. Schlesinger next spring.)

3. To the Committee on Student Conduct - J. W. McConnell and H. F. Newhall.

4. To the Committee on Student Activities - A. T. Blomquist and Kenneth McEntee.

5. To the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships - C. F. Hockett and T. W. Silk; and to be Chairman until October 31, 1955, H. F. Weigandt.

6. To the Committee on Entrance Credentials - C. L. Kulp and W. M. Sale, Jr.

7. To the Committee on Requirements for Graduation - J. O. Mahoney to serve without term.

8. To the Committee on Military Curricula - J. B. Rosser; and to be Chairman until October 31, 1955 - J. W. McConnell.
9. To the Committee on Calendar - J. M. Hanson and N. A. Tolles; for a one-year term ending October 31, 1955 to fill the vacancy created by the retirement of G. I. Dale - Baxter Hathaway; and to be Chairman until October 31, 1956 - Gordon Danks.


11. To the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events - H. S. Tyler and to be Chairman until October 31, 1956 - F. M. Wells.

12. To the Committee on Prizes - R. H. Siegfried; and to be Chairman until October 31, 1955 - R. H. Elias.

13. To the Committee of Award of the Moses Coit Tyler Prize - Dexter Perkins for a three-year term expiring October 31, 1957.

14. To the Committee on University Broadcasting - W. L. Hodges and R. A. Polson; and for a one-year term to fill the vacancy caused by the absence on leave of H. E. Guerlac - W. H. French.

15. To the Orientation Advisory Board - A. W. Smith; and to be Chairman until October 31, 1956 - Whiton Powell.

The Professor of Regional Planning, Professor Mackesey, a member of the Committee on University Policy, discussed a Statement Concerning the Purposes, Operation and Accomplishments of the Division of Unclassified Students. A copy of this statement, which was circulated to the Faculty in advance of the meeting, is appended to the minutes.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, Professor Mackesey then moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas The three-year trial period of the Division of Unclassified Students will terminate at the end of the Fall Term of 1954-55 and

Whereas The Division of Unclassified Students has successfully accomplished the purposes for which it was
established and has performed and is performing a vital function in the University, and

Whereas The need for such organization on a permanent basis is apparent, be it

Resolved That the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Division of Unclassified Students be made a permanent component of the University structure.

The motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, its Chairman, Professor Schultz, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved that the University Faculty establish a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing;

That the committee comprise five members of the University Faculty, who shall elect one of their number as chairman;

That initially the committee consist of members appointed by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty: one member to serve until December 31, 1955, one until December 31, 1956, one until December 31, 1957, one until December 31, 1958, and one until December 31, 1959;

That except as hereinbefore provided, members of the committee shall serve five-year terms to commence on January 1;

That when a vacancy occurs through the expiration of the term of any member, it shall be filled in accordance with the procedure established for the election of members of the other elective standing committees of the Faculty;

That vacancies due to absence on leave or other temporary cause be filled by appointment by the Dean of the University Faculty;

That permanent vacancies due to the death of a member or the severance of his connection with the University and occurring prior to September 1 be filled for the remainder of the calendar year in the same manner, but that a member to serve the unexpired portion of the term remaining after December 31 be elected in the usual manner;
That the committee form a corporation under the laws of the State of New York, of which they shall be the sole stockholders, to operate, or to contract with an appropriate agency for the operation of a staff cooperative purchasing venture in which all members of the University staff, both academic and non-academic, shall be permitted to participate; and

That the committee shall proceed substantially in accordance with a plan, of which the University Administration has knowledge, and of which a copy is to be filed with the Faculty minutes.

Professor Schultz then read the plan for a purchasing agency for University employees, a copy of which is appended.

The motion being duly seconded, considerable discussion followed in the course of which the President pointed out that fulfillment of the hope expressed in the statement of the plan, that purchases by staff members from College Stores might be permitted, was unlikely.

The question was raised whether it was proper for the Faculty to set up a tax free enterprise in competition with local business firms. Professor Schultz replied that the business of the proposed corporation would be carried on in Barnes Hall, which is not a tax exempt structure.

Explanation of the plan to the Chamber of Commerce, in advance of general public announcement, was suggested as a means of avoiding misunderstanding.

During the discussion doubt was expressed as to the propriety of having the University Faculty serve as the parent of the committee and the corporation referred to in the motion. Several alternatives were suggested: (1) that the Cornell Chapter of the American Associ-
tion of University Professors might substitute for the University Faculty in this role; (2) that the Statler Club would be a possible parent organization; (3) that the Co-op Food Store might be able and willing to handle the discount purchasing contemplated by the plan and (4) that a cooperative corporation might be formed by a group of Faculty volunteers.

Professor Asdell thereupon moved as an amendment to the motion that the question be referred back to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty for further study, particularly for study of the suggestion (1) that the organization of the Co-op Food Store be used and (2) the alternate suggestion that a cooperative organization be formed of independent volunteers.

The motion to amend was seconded, and by a show of hands, lost.

The original motion was then put to a vote and carried by a show of hands.

The meeting adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Statement Concerning the Purposes, Operation, and Accomplishments of the Division of Unclassified Students

The Division of Unclassified Students was established on an experimental basis in February, 1952 by the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the University Faculty. The action of the University Faculty came after study of the problems attendant upon the transfer of students from one school or college to another within the University by a series of committees over a period of three years. A Committee on Intercollege Transfers, appointed by the Deans' Conference, recommended to the Faculty the legislation which subsequently led to the creation of the Division.

In its report the Committee of the Deans' Conference identified a number of categories in which the Division of Unclassified Students might be effective. These included students who entered the wrong colleges either through ignorance, faulty counseling by school advisors, or family pressures; those who had experienced a genuine change in educational and vocational interests after entering the University; and those who had developed blocks in specific subject areas which made further progress in the original field doubtful. The committee corresponded with a number of other universities where the internal structure was somewhat similar to that at Cornell and found that several of them had created machinery similar to that recommended by the committee, and for the same purposes.

It is the objective of the Division to offer students who find themselves in the wrong college or school an opportunity to demonstrate that they are capable of doing satisfactory work in another area. Each admitted student follows a program of study worked out in consultation with a faculty advisor in the area to which he wishes to transfer. A student may not remain in the Division for more than two terms.

STAFF

The staff of the Division consists of the Director, Professor Rideout, and a part-time secretary. The policy of the Division is formulated by an Administrative Committee of six, appointed by the President.

ADMISSION

It has been the policy of the Division to admit only those students already registered in the University who desire to transfer to another division of the University, but who are not at the time acceptable to that division. The Administrative Committee reviews each application. It approves only those where it finds some evidence that the student is in the wrong place and where there is also evidence that he has a good prospect of doing successful work in the field to which he desires to transfer.
About 45 percent of those who have applied have been admitted. Among students admitted have been those who were in good standing academically at the time, those who were on probation, and some who had been dropped for academic reasons.

THE RECORD

Since its inception in February, 1952, the Division has registered an average of 22 students a term. Students have entered the Division from every undergraduate division in the University, except Home Economics, and "graduates" of the Division have been subsequently enrolled in eight of the undergraduate colleges.

During these five terms, 110 students have passed 95 percent of the total hours taken; 79 percent of all hours taken were passed at a grade of 70 or better.

Seventy-eight students have been accepted by the undergraduate colleges and schools from the Division of Unclassified Students. Sixteen students or 15 percent have been refused admission to the college to which they were pointing, 9 percent were dropped by the Division, and 5 percent withdrew voluntarily.

The following resolution will be offered on behalf of the Committee on University Policy:

Whereas The three-year trial period of the Division of Unclassified Students will terminate at the end of the Fall Term of 1954-55 and

Whereas The Division of Unclassified Students has successfully accomplished the purposes for which it was established and has performed and is performing a vital function in the University, and

Whereas The need for such organization on a permanent basis is apparent, be it

Resolved That the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Division of Unclassified Students be made a permanent component of the University structure.

October 6, 1954.

Thomas W. Mackesey
On Behalf of the Committee on University Policy
The plan is for an elected University Faculty Committee to have authority to form and be sole stockholders of a corporation to operate or to contract with the Cornell Campus Store or other appropriate agency for the operation of a staff purchasing venture. Stock would be passed on from each retiring committee member to his successor. It is hoped that a way will be found by the committee to ensure broad representation of University employees on the board of the corporation.

The statement of the balance of the plan is not presented with the intention of so restricting the committee in its action that the success of the operation is prejudiced or freedom of action for satisfactory development limited. The basic idea is to broaden the opportunity for all University employees to make major purchases at a discount just as the employees of most large firms or other institutions are able to do. It is expected that the corporation will contract with the Campus Store for necessary clerical, ordering, and catalogue maintenance service for which the Campus Store will be paid on the basis of so much per order, the charge to be determined in the light of experience. A fixed fee per order has been suggested, but this must be settled by the corporation.

It is expected that an ordering service on a direct wholesale or discount basis will be provided to include expanded lines of merchandise compared to what is now available from vendors. It is further expected that all orders will be cash with order and all delivery charges paid by the purchaser on delivery in order.
initially to avoid excessive bookkeeping or credit costs. It is further hoped that purchases may be permitted from College Stores by staff members, but only upon presentation of a suitable authorizing slip from the purchasing organization. And it is also expected that the corporation will issue a brochure fully explaining the service to all staff members and encouraging them to use it in an open and above-board manner. Rules should probably be adopted for withdrawing the purchase privilege from persons who abuse or misuse the function.

It is hoped that this plan will result in greater opportunity for economy on major purchases by individuals and also, since the corporation is staff owned, provide desirable protection of the University from criticism of the sort that has made it inadvisable for the administration to provide such a program.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of October 13 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Katherine Wyckoff Harris, Professor of Institution Management, on October 19, 1954, and the death of Horace Leonard Jones, Professor of Classics, Emeritus, on October 30, 1954. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleagues.

The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Carl Stephenson: Harry Caplan, F. G. Marcham, M. L. "". Laistner, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Katherine Wyckoff Harris: A. M. Burgoin, H. B. Meek, Grace Steininger, Chairman.

The Dean announced the receipt of the following communications from the Board of Trustees:

1. A communication announcing that at a meeting held October 14, 1954, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees voted to grant the Faculty's request that the University be authorized to participate in the Faculty Children's Tuition Exchange Plan.

2. A communication announcing that at a meeting of the Board of Trustees held October 16, 1954 the Director of CURW was elected a member of the University Faculty without academic title in accordance with the recommendation of the University Faculty.

3. A communication announcing that at a meeting held October 16, 1954, the Board of Trustees voted that the President be authorized, upon the recommendation of the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration, to put into effect increases in the general
entrance requirements of the School whenever in the judgment of its Dean and the President such change has become feasible, and further that when such increases in the general entrance requirements in the School of Business and Public Administration become effective, the name of the School be changed to the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration.

In reporting this latter communication, the Dean noted that while this Board action is substantially in conformity with the recommendation which the Faculty voted to make at its meeting of September 28, 1954, the Board's action departs from the Faculty's recommendation in two respects: (1) Whereas the Faculty recommended that the Faculty of the School of Business and Public Administration be authorized to raise its general entrance requirement for Cornell students, the Board's authorization of an increase in general entrance requirements is in terms broad enough to include students applying from other institutions as well as from Cornell; and (2) Whereas the Faculty recommended that the Faculty of the School be authorized to make the increase in entrance requirements whenever in its judgment such change has become feasible, the Board's action provides that such increase shall be made whenever in the judgment of the Dean of the School and the President the change has become feasible.

As a special order, on behalf of the Committee on Nominations, its Chairman, Professor Petry, placed the following names in nomination for the positions indicated:

For the Committee on University Policy
   Jean Failing
   M. F. Neufeld

For the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
   J. G. B. Hutchins
   F. E. Mineka
This slate of nominations, together with background information concerning the nominees, had been circulated to the Faculty with the call for the meeting. Following the report of the committee's nominations for each position, opportunity was offered for nominations from the floor. There being none, in each case, on motion the nominations were closed.

Professor Petry then moved that the list of nominations be referred to the Committee on Elections for a ballot by mail. The motion, duly seconded, was passed without dissent by a voice vote.

There being no unfinished business, the President called for reports of committees.

For the Committee on Military Curricula, its Chairman, Professor McConnell, presented the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Whereas the Faculty at its regular meeting of 11 January 1953 considered the proposed Army Branch General ROTC curriculum and without dissenting vote declared the sense of the Faculty to be

1. That the curriculum in question is sound in principle;

2. That its effectiveness in actual operation should be carefully studied before its establishment at any college or university having a ROTC program be made compulsory;

3. That special study be given to ways and means for providing for the assignment of ROTC cadets upon graduation
to the arm or service in which their interests and qualifications will be most fully utilized; and

1. That if and when the Army requests the University to decide whether or not it wishes the curriculum to be instituted at Cornell, further consideration be given by this Faculty to the desirability of this curriculum, taking into account its effectiveness in operation at other institutions.

and "Whereas the Army has requested the University to adopt the program

and Whereas the Committee on Military Curricula has, from correspondence with other institutions and other sources, received assurance that the qualifications expressed in (2) and (3) above with respect to effectiveness of program and assignments of graduates have been met.

Therefore Be It Resolved that this Faculty recommend the initiation of the proposed Branch General Curriculum for the Army ROTC in the Fall of 1955 and request the President so to notify the Department of the Army.

The motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Calendar, its Chairman, Professor Danks, moved

That, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, the University Calendar for the academic year 1955-56 be amended so that instruction will be suspended for the Christmas recess on Tuesday, December 20, 1955 at 10:00 p. m., and will be resumed on Wednesday, January 4, 1956 at 8:00 a. m.

The motion was seconded and passed without dissent by a voice vote.

The Professor of Mathematics, Professor Agnew, noted the recent dedication at the University of Kansas of a new science building, Malott Hall, named in honor of the President. Professor Agnew suggested that the Faculty ask the Dean to have its hearty congratulations on this happy event recorded in the minutes. The Faculty indicated its endorsement of Professor Agnew's suggestion by lively applause.

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p. m. 

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 10 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Frederick Miller Smith, Professor of English, Emeritus, on November 11, 1954. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

1. To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Horace Leonard Jones: M. G. Bishop, James Hutton, Harry Caplan, Chairman.

2. To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Frederick Miller Smith: H. A. Myers, F. C. Prescott, E. H. French, Chairman.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the President stating that the Adjutant General of the Army has informed him that, pursuant to the request of the Faculty, the General Military Science curriculum will be established at Cornell at the beginning of the academic year 1955-56.

The Dean reported that a communication has been received from the Chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty announcing that, pursuant to the Faculty action of October 13, 1954, that committee has appointed the following members of the Faculty to its standing Committee on Cooperative Purchasing:

H. F. Wiegandt to serve until December 31, 1955
J. M. Rathmell to serve until December 31, 1956
R. F. Holland to serve until December 31, 1957
H. A. Freeman to serve until December 31, 1958
L. B. Darrah to serve until December 31, 1959

A communication has been received from the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing announcing the election of H. A. Freeman as its Chairman.

As the special order, on behalf of the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing, 501 ballots were cast for L. B. Darrah, 500 for H. A. Freeman, 230 for R. F. Holland, and 230 for J. M. Rathmell, a majority, were cast for L. B. Darrah, a majority, were cast for H. A. Freeman, 105 for R. F. Holland, and 105 for J. M. Rathmell.
Purchasing announcing the election of H. A. Freeman as its Chairman.

As the special order, on behalf of the Committee on Elections, its Chairman, the Dean, reported that:

501 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on University Policy, of which 266, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Neufeld.

497 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, of which 331, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Business History and Transportation, Professor Hutchins.

508 ballots were cast for a member of the Board of Physical Education and Athletics, of which 269, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Extension Education, Professor Leagans.

431 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene, of which 230, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Military Science and Tactics, Professor Lyon.

501 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 256, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Romance Languages and Literature, Professor Rideout.

484 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 256, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Plant Pathology, Professor Kent.

478 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 259, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Heat-Power Engineering, Professor Mackey.

There being no unfinished business, the Provost called for reports of committees.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, Professor Andrew Schultz, Jr., directed attention to the committee report which had been sent to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and a copy of which is appended to these minutes. After stating that to avoid misinterpretation the word annual should be deleted from line 7, page 2 of the report, Professor Schultz...
moved:

That the report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty with respect to Faculty salaries and retirement income and dated December 1, 1954, be approved, and that the President be requested to transmit it to the Board of Trustees.

The motion, being duly seconded, was put to a voice vote and passed without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary

FACULTY SALARIES

In recent years it has been the custom of the Economic Status Committee to provide in tabulated form detailed information concerning changes in the salary status of major divisions of the University. Since only comparatively small changes took place during the past year, this detailed information is not provided. The following table summarizes the changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Salaries: Percent Changes in Average Faculty Salaries 1952-53 to 1954-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Endowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY

The two most important problems of the economic status of the Cornell Faculty continue to be salaries and retirement plans. Faculty salaries remain relatively low, particularly for associate and full professors. In the endowed colleges the retirement plan continues to be inadequate. The Committee realizes that improvements in these items will cost money and is aware of the financial problem which faces Cornell as well as most other endowed colleges. Yet, it cannot help but agree with the philosophy of Dr. Harold W. Dodds, President of Princeton, who stated in a recent announcement of increase of faculty salaries "... Our faculty is our greatest asset, and its members must not be asked to shoulder the whole burden of an independent university's financial plight."

FACULTY SALARIES

In recent years it has been the custom of the Economic Status Committee to provide in tabulated form detailed information concerning changes in the salary status of major divisions of the University. Since only comparatively small changes took place during the past year, this detailed information is not provided. The following table summarizes the changes.

Percent Changes in Average Faculty Salaries 1953-54 to 1954-55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Endowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the state colleges the listed percent changes are for the formal budget as of July 1, 1954. Most members of the faculty are aware that a general New York State salary increase went into effect this October, (it was announced last spring) and many people assumed that this would result in major salary increases for the faculty of the State Colleges. Unfortunately the increases have turned out to be comparatively small. The stated "normal" increase is $120 and presumably the average increase is close to this figure although the individual increases vary from nothing at all in some cases to amounts well above the normal. The average increase for the State College faculties thus amounts to well under 2 percent. In view of the relatively low average salaries reported last year for the associate and full professors in the State Colleges, it must be concluded that sizeable increases beyond those of October are still needed.

As this Committee pointed out in a prior report, the most serious problem for Cornell is that its salaries do not appear to be competitive with those of comparable institutions, either state or private. An illustration of this may be found in the detailed survey of college salaries, page 632 of the Winter 1953-54 issue of the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors. Although it appears that the percentage increases in Cornell (endowed) faculty salaries since 1948-49 have been similar to those of other private colleges, and greater than some, the actual dollar position of the Cornell salary scale continues to be low.

Within the past few weeks, two of Cornell's competitors, Yale and Princeton, have announced broad salary increases. At Yale an
announced increase of 10 to 12\% percent in faculty salaries is correlated with a further increase of $200 in tuition and fees. At Princeton the increase is $1,000. for full and associate professors with no announced tuition raise. The implication of these announcements is that another round of faculty salary increases is in progress and consequently that unless Cornell also institutes significant increases the relative position of its actual salary scale will be lower still.

**RETIREMENT PLANS**

Last year this Committee issued a detailed report on the retirement plan of the endowed colleges and pointed out that Cornell's 10 percent T.I.A.A. plan, even with Social Security in addition, fails to yield adequate retirement income. The specific retirement income for an individual depends upon the details of his salary history. It can be stated roughly, however, that a person who is covered by the plan for thirty years and has an average salary during his final ten years of service of between $8,000 and $12,000 per year will receive from \(\frac{2}{3}\) percent to 37 percent of this sum as annual retirement income. A joint committee of the A.A.U.P. and Association of American Colleges has recommended a retirement life annuity equivalent to approximately 50 percent of the average salary over the last ten years of service. Since plans yielding the recommended annuity are already in effect in neighboring and competing institutions, and since Cornell's plan can be brought up to this standard at a relatively small cost to the University, we urge that action on this matter no
longer be deferred.

The State College retirement plan appears to be more adequate as far as retirement income is concerned, but in another respect appears to be deficient. The difficulty is that, in contrast to most university retirement plans, the State College plan gives to a faculty member who leaves or who dies before the retirement age only his own contributions. It is realized that the plan is state-wide and involves all state employees, but it would be desirable if something could be worked out to meet the needs of the faculty.

Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Bart J. Conta
William H. Farnham
M. Slade Kendrick
Franklin A. Long
N. Arnold Tolles
Andrew Schultz, Jr., Chairman
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 1:30 p. m.

The minutes of the meeting of December 18 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Liberty Hyde Bailey, Professor of Agriculture, Emeritus, on December 25, 1954. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean reported the receipt of several communications:

1. A communication from the President announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Liberty Hyde Bailey for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: Lewis Knudson, W. I. Myers, G. H. M. Lawrence, Chairman.

2. A communication from the Board of Trustees announcing that at a meeting held December 7, 1954, the Executive Committee of the Board adopted the recommendation of the Faculty that the Division of Unclassified Students be made a permanent component of the University; and the recommendation of the Faculty that the calendar for the academic year 1955–56 be amended so that instruction will be suspended for the Christmas recess on Tuesday, December 20, 1955 at 10:00 p. m., and so that instruction will be resumed on Wednesday, January 4, 1956 at 8:00 a. m.

3. A communication from the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty announcing the election of M. S. Kendrick as its Chairman for the calendar year 1955.

4. A communication from the Committee on Nominations announcing the election of G. P. Adams, jr. as its Chairman for the calendar year 1955.

As a Special Order, the report of the Special Committee on Questions Arising from the Operation of Cars by Cornell Students and Faculty was presented by its Chairman, Professor A. H. Peterson. This report was distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and a copy is appended to the minutes, Professor Peterson
stated that the report had the unanimous endorsement of members of the Special Committee. He noted the need to put the proposed penalties, on page 10 of the report, into appropriate legal language. On behalf of the Committee, Professor Peterson moved that the report be received. This motion, duly seconded, was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Professor Peterson then moved that the report be approved and transmitted to the administration.

The motion being duly seconded, the Professor of Botany, Professor Petry, moved to amend the report by substituting the word **enlarge** for the word **limit** in section 10, on page 8, so that the recommendation would read:

That the Board on Traffic Control be urged to take further steps to enlarge the parking privileges of graduate student assistants. At present there appears to be wide disparity in the ease with which assistants in the various schools obtain parking permits.

The motion to amend was seconded. The result of a voice vote being uncertain, the Provost called for a show of hands. The amendment was passed.

Following extensive discussion on the amended motion, Professor Petry moved that recommendation 12, beginning at the bottom of page 8, be stricken out. This motion duly seconded was debated at length. When put to a vote, by a show of hands, the motion was carried.

The Professor of Law, Professor R. I. Fricke, then moved to restore the first part of section 12, so that the recommendation would read:
That the faculty and staff also recognize their responsibility for safe driving and for the observance of moving vehicle regulations on the campus.

The motion was seconded. After some discussion, the question was called for, and passed by a show of hands.

The Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Loberg, then moved to amend the report by deleting the first part of recommendation 15, which reads:

That the staff of the Safety Division be increased at once by at least two uniformed officers and

Recommendation 15 would then read:

That the rules and regulations governing motor vehicles adopted by the Board on Traffic Control be strictly enforced.

This amendment, duly seconded, was discussed briefly, and passed by a show of hands.

Professor Petry then moved that the section relating to penalties for traffic violations be recommitted for further study. The Professor of Law, Professor J. W. MacDonald, suggested that before recommitting, the sense of the Faculty be ascertained concerning the schedule of fines, and automatic suspension of driving privileges as set forth in the proposed penalties. Professor Petry withdrew his motion with the understanding that Professor MacDonald would propose motions to ascertain the sense of the Faculty on these points.

Thereupon the Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Professor Murdock, moved that the Faculty go into committee of the whole to discuss certain points in the report. This motion, being seconded, was passed by a show of hands.
When the committee of the whole arose, its Chairman, the Provost, reported to the Faculty that the committee of the whole considered the schedule of fines, as set forth in the report, satisfactory.

On motion, the Faculty adjourned at 6 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
REPORT TO THE FACULTY OF THE COMMITTEE
ON CAMPUS TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

Introduction

There have been at least three previous reports to the Faculty by committees appointed to study some phase or other of the traffic problem on the Cornell campus. The committee which reported to the Faculty in the Spring of 1954 was directed to confine its study to the problems arising out of the use and operation of automobiles by students. The present committee was given a broader charge--it was instructed to survey the problems arising from the operation of motor vehicles by students, faculty, and staff.

This Faculty has jurisdiction with respect to these problems, whatever they may be defined to include, to the extent that educational policy and programs and student conduct are involved. This committee has assumed that its assignment extended beyond these areas to those in which the Faculty has only the power to recommend action to the Administration and the Board of Trustees.

With respect to educational policy and the conduct of students, the basic question seems to be whether students should be permitted to have cars in Tompkins County while attending Cornell. Almost everyone has an opinion on this subject, and numerous arguments have been advanced for and against student operation of cars. Each member of the present committee has an opinion on this question. After having considered the matter at some length we are unable to find or to develop a body of factual information from which to
draw a conclusion. We therefore make no recommendation concerning student possession of cars, and we assume that present regulations will be continued.

The immediate and practical problems with which this report deals are the problems of parking on the campus and the problem of moving vehicles.

Findings:
I. Parking. At one time or another we have all found it difficult to locate a convenient parking place on the campus.* It would appear that this problem results from an absolute shortage of parking space in relation to the number of cars authorized to park on the campus.

The files of the Safety Division show that as of October 15, 1954, there were 3,553 parking permits outstanding. Of these 479 can be excluded from our analysis, since they are issued to persons employed at such off-campus locations as the service buildings, heating plant, farm barns, and the like, who would only infrequently have occasion to use the campus as defined. Excluding these permits, there are 2,945 parking permits for the campus, and there are only 2,007 parking spaces available. This is a ratio of 1.47 cars per parking space. A

* The campus is defined for the purposes of this report as the area bounded on the east by Judd Falls Road, on the south by Cascadilla Creek, on the west by the Library Slope, and on the north by Fall Creek.
review of the parking problems on twelve other university campuses indicates that an acceptable ratio is from 1.25 to 1.3 cars per space.

The impression created by these figures is not borne out by a physical check of the use of parking space on the campus. Counts of available parking spaces made on several week-days, at varying hours in the forenoon, reveal that there are from 200 to 300 empty parking spaces. Faced with this conflicting information, the Committee selected six representative buildings and made an analysis of the parking permits outstanding for employees of each building. This analysis revealed that the files of the Safety Division contained many permits for persons no longer associated with Cornell, some of those still listed had left the University as much as five years ago. The number of such permits exceeded 25% for each building examined. On the basis of this sample, the total number of active parking permits is in fact approximately 2,209; and the actual ratio of permits to parking spaces is about 1.1 to 1. These figures confirm the two impressions mentioned above—of crowding and of unused parking spaces. The parking problem on this campus is not a lack of total parking spaces, but rather a lack of space convenient to a number of the major buildings. The problem is primarily one of distribution, and secondarily one of limiting the number of permits issued and preventing illegal use of parking space by those not authorized to park on campus. (We take it for granted that whenever large numbers of people outside the
campus community come to the University the generalization above will not hold: on football weekends, Farm and Home Week, and during large conferences there is no possibility of providing convenient space either for the guests or for the faculty and staff.)

Of the total campus parking permits, only about 1/3 are outstanding to members of the faculty. The other 2/3 are largely to employees who work regular hours, who are not required to use their automobiles in carrying out their assigned duties, and who use their cars primarily in getting to and from the campus.

We have not been able to determine from the records of the Safety Division the exact number of student cars illegally parked on campus. More than 100,000 parking violation tickets are issued annually. The best estimates indicate that not less than half—or 5,000—of these tickets are issued to students.

II. Moving Vehicles. Many of the streets and roads on the campus must serve as city streets. This fact precludes such measures as prohibiting all moving traffic between ten minutes before the hour and the hour during the academic day. Pedestrian traffic is unusually heavy during certain hours, and the same care, or even greater care, must be taken to observe safe driving rules as on any congested city street. The need for caution is the same for all drivers—whether students, faculty, staff, or those not associated with the University.

Statistics available in the Safety Division and in the City Police Department indicate clearly that student drivers contribute
to the total number of moving vehicle violations and that they are occasionally involved in accidents. The statistics will support a variety of interpretations, but we do not find conclusive evidence that students contribute a disproportionate number of either violations or accidents.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

On the basis of this summary of findings, reached after a study of available statistics, traffic flow charts, campus maps, information from other universities, and interviews with interested persons, including representatives of student organizations, this committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty.

I. Parking:

1. That between July 1st and the opening of the fall term of each year new campus parking permits be issued to the faculty, staff, and employees. The parking identification stickers should be varied in color, size, or shape each year so that a currently valid parking permit will be readily identifiable. The method by which these permits are issued is the responsibility of the Safety Division, but it should include a signed application in order that the files of the Division may be kept current.

2. That four parking areas be restricted to holders of special lettered permits. Holders of these permits should not be permitted to park on the campus except in their designated areas between 8 AM and 5 PM from Monday through Friday, and from 8 AM to 1 PM on Saturday, holidays excluded. The four areas to be designated
are (1) the parking lot immediately west of Bailey Hall Circle and east of Rockefeller Hall, 45 cars; (2) the parking area immediately east of Teagle Hall, 76 cars; (3) the parking area south of Barton Hall, 80 cars; (4) the first 20 spaces on Tower Road immediately west of Garden Avenue. Parking permits for these areas will be issued to persons employed in Schoellkopf Hall, Teagle Hall, Statler Hall, Barton Hall, Day Hall, Stimson Hall, Goldwin Smith Hall, Rockefeller Hall, and other buildings who regularly drive to the campus, whose duties require them to be on campus the full working day, and who are not expected to use their cars on their jobs. Assignments to these parking areas can be made by the appropriate administrative officers so that no one will have more than a two-block walk from parking area to office; in exchange for the inconvenience of this walk each person assigned to these areas will have a guaranteed parking space. Moving 221 all-day parkers from the center of the campus toward the areas in which parking space is at present not used to capacity will greatly relieve the pressure on the most congested part of the campus.

3. That a new 40-car parking lot be constructed on the State Campus south of the circle in front of Bailey Hall, and north of the present broadcasting studio. This lot will compensate for the area restricted for parking by lower-campus personnel under the preceding paragraph, and will provide needed space for parking at Bailey Hall events.

4. That eight parking spaces at the southwest corner of the parking lot between Barnes Hall and Sage Chapel be equipped with parking meters providing for 15 minutes' parking for 1 cent
between 8 AM and 5 PM Monday through Friday and between 8 AM and 1 PM Saturday, holidays excluded. This recommendation is intended to insure parking for those who wish to make purchases at the Campus Store or to use the Post Office. Parking in these spaces should be unrestricted, and hence available to students. The penalty for overparking by anyone is $1, payable at the Office of the Treasurer. In addition, students will be fined $5 for the third violation in this area, and the fourth and subsequent violations will result in a 30-day suspension of vehicular privileges.

5. That ten spaces on East Avenue south of Tower Road be reserved solely for visitors who are not required to have campus parking permits. All these spaces should be for 1 hour parking. The present 10-minute limit is not long enough to allow the transaction of business.

6. That the Statler Hall parking area be reserved as far as possible for the guests of Statler Hall and the members of the Faculty Club, by (1) prohibiting student parking in this area at any time, day or night, and (2) assigning regular employees of Statler Hall, whether they work on day or night shifts, to the parking areas adjacent to Barton Hall or Teagle Hall.

7. That as part of the long-range plan for University development, the Administration be requested, in planning new buildings, to include as part of the plan and the construction costs parking areas sufficiently large to accommodate the cars of staff members who are to be regularly assigned to the buildings. With this in view, the
adjustments of the campus parking pattern proposed in paragraph 2 above assume a parking lot adjacent to Phillips Hall of 63 spaces.

8. That all parking areas be repainted as needed, and no less than once a year, in order that drivers may be encouraged to park carefully and make maximum use of the space available.

9. That faculty and staff members who have children enrolled at Cornell be urged to restrict the daytime campus use of their cars to the faculty or staff members themselves, to the end that all students may be treated alike, and that campus parking spaces may be kept open for those who are eligible to use them.

10. That the Board on Traffic Control be urged to take further steps to limit the parking privileges of graduate student assistants. At present there appears to be wide disparity in the ease with which assistants in the various schools obtain parking permits.

11. That the Faculty and staff recognize that parking on the campus is a privilege and not a right, and that they recognize that the Cornell tradition involves responsibility as well as freedom.

II. Moving Vehicles:

12. That the faculty and staff also recognize their responsibility for safe driving and for the observance of moving vehicle regulations on the campus, and that they endorse the efforts of the Safety Division to enforce these regulations by agreeing that
arrests for infraction of moving vehicle regulations by faculty and staff members be referred to the city police and city court for disposition in the same way as for similar violations elsewhere in Ithaca.

13. That the Student Council and the Interfraternity Council be requested to promulgate their own rules to control the student taxi service between fraternities, sororities, dormitories, and the campus. In the judgment of the committee, vigorous action by the students themselves, together with continued manual operation of traffic signals at critical hours, and with the impending change in the rushing season, should bring this problem under control.

14. That a new code of penalties relating to the use of cars by students be adopted: Sections XVII and XVIII of the present code are attached as Appendix I.
Present Penalty

(a) Parking on the Campus
   First violation $1
   Second violation $2
   Third violation $5.
   Fourth or subsequent $10. and automatic suspension of vehicular privileges.

(b) Failure to Register $5.

(c) Moving Traffic Violations
   First violation $5. if committed on campus
      (privileges may be suspended for any violation)
   Second violation $10. if committed on campus
   Third violation $10. if committed on campus
   Three or more violations anywhere in Tompkins County Automatic suspension of vehicular privileges

* All suspensions of vehicular privileges are to be executed in leaves of absence, etc.
Proposed Penalty

$5
$10. and automatic suspension of vehicular privileges for 30 days.*
Same as for second violation.
Same as for second violation.

$10. and automatic suspension of vehicular privileges.*

$5. and automatic suspension of vehicular privileges for 30 days
if violation committed in Tompkins County including the campus.*

$10. and automatic suspension of vehicular privileges for 90 days if violation committed in Tompkins Co. including the campus.*

Same as for second violation.

Same as for second violation.

full regardless of interruptions for vacations,
III. Safety Division:

15. That the staff of the Safety Division be increased at once by at least two uniformed officers and that the rules and regulations governing motor vehicles adopted by the Board on Traffic Control be strictly enforced.

IV. Procedure:

16. That these recommendations be approved by the Faculty and transmitted to the Administration with the recommendation that they be put into effect on July 1, 1955.

F. C. Baldwin
W. R. Keast
A. J. McNair
M. L. Nichols
W. Powell
T. U. Silk
A. H. Peterson - Chairman
XVII. Enforcement and Penalties.

1. Enforcement and penalties may be prescribed as in Section 70 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law or

2. Enforcement and penalties may be prescribed by the following:

A. Fines

The fines which may be imposed upon any person to whom these rules apply for the violation of any of these rules, or of any laws or other rules which may be adopted or made applicable to the University by its Board of Trustees pursuant to Section 5708 of the Education Law, shall be:

(a) A fine of $1.00 for the first parking violation.

(b) A fine of $2.00 for the second parking violation, within any year commencing 1st July.

(c) A fine of $5.00 for the third parking violation within a year commencing 1st July. (For three violations, any student may be deprived of his vehicular privileges. (See Section XVII-3).

(d) A fine of $10.00 for a fourth or subsequent parking violation within a year commencing 1st July, with automatic suspension of vehicular privileges until the matter has been reviewed by the Men's Judiciary Board and/or the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct.

(e) A fine of $5.00 for failure to comply with any summons from the Board on Traffic Control or its official representatives.
II.

(f) A fine of $5.00 for failure to register a motor vehicle as required in these rules and display registration and parking permits as requested in these rules.

(g) A fine of not more than $5.00 for the first moving traffic violation on the campus. (For any moving traffic violation any student may be deprived of his or her vehicular privileges. See Section XVII-3)

(h) A fine of not more than $10.00 for the second and third moving traffic violation on the campus while a student in the University.

(i) If a person, while a student at the University accumulates three or more moving traffic violations occurring anywhere in Tompkins County including the campus his vehicular privileges shall be automatically suspended until the matter has been reviewed by the Men's Judiciary Board and/or the Chairman of the Committee on Student Conduct or by the full committee as the chairman may elect.

All fines imposed, as herein provided, shall be collected by the Treasurer of the University in the same way as other University fines and fees.

If a student is fined by, or forfeits bail to, any other
III.

duly constituted authority under any other law, ordinance or rule, for the same offense that constitutes a violation of any of these rules, then the fine that may be imposed hereunder by the Board on Traffic Control for any such violation shall not, together, with the fine so imposed by or bail forfeited to such other authority, exceed the maximum fine or penalty provided for the violation of such other law, ordinance, or rule.

3. Cancellation of Privileges.

In addition to the fines above provided, any student may be deprived for a definite time of any, or all vehicular privileges as follows:

(a) Vehicular privileges may be revoked, suspended, or cancelled as a penalty for one or more moving traffic violations occurring anywhere in Tompkins County, including the campus, or for four or more parking violations on the campus, or for repeated failure to comply with a summons of the Board on Traffic Control.

Note: The Committee on Student Conduct has granted authority to the Board on Traffic Control or its representative to TEMPORARILY revoke, suspend, or cancel vehicular privileges of a student as provided above, pending a final decision upon that by the Committee on Student Conduct.

(b) The Board on Traffic Control must cancel, suspend or revoke such privileges:

1. Upon request of the student's college for scholastic reasons,
2. If required by action of the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, taken upon matters within that Committee's jurisdiction.

Any student who is deprived by the said Board of his or her vehicular privileges for any reason shall not be entitled to a refund of his or her registration fee or any part thereof.

(c) Right of Appeal.

Any person penalized by an official representative of the Board on Traffic Control shall have the right of appeal to the said Board.

XVIII. Automatic Cancellation.

1. A student's vehicular privileges shall be automatically cancelled if his or her state operator's license or registration certificate is cancelled, revoked or suspended, or upon withdrawal of his or her parent's or guardian's consent in cases where that is required.

2. Suspension for the fourth parking ticket violation. (See Section XVII, 2A (d).)

3. Suspension for the third moving traffic violation. (See Section XVII, 2A (1).)
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 12 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of Victor Raymond Gage, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Emeritus, on January 12, 1955. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the President announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to prepare a memorial article concerning Victor Raymond Gage for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: C. D. Albert, B. S. Monroe, W. C. Andrae, Chairman.

Under the heading of unfinished business, the Chairman of the Special Committee on Questions Arising from the Operation of Cars by Cornell Students and Faculty, Professor A. H. Peterson, reminded the Faculty that, in the committee of the whole, the proposed schedule of fines had been approved at the January meeting but that automatic suspension of driving privileges as set forth in the proposed penalties had not yet been considered. Professor Peterson then moved that the Faculty go into committee of the whole for further consideration of this section of the Committee's report.

The motion was seconded, and passed by a voice vote.

When the committee of the whole arose, its Chairman, the President, reported to the Faculty that the committee of the whole approved the recommendations concerning automatic suspension of driving privileges, as embodied in the report. Professor Peterson then moved that the report, as amended at the meeting of January 12
be approved and transmitted to the administration. The motion, duly seconded, was passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean moved:

(1) That a special committee be established to advise the President regarding the selection of a successor to Professor Dexter Perkins as John L. Senior University Professor of American Civilization;

(2) That the committee comprise five elected members;

(3) That the election be by ballot at this meeting;

(4) That the five candidates receiving the greatest number of ballots be declared elected; and

(5) That the ballots be counted by the Committee on Elections, and that the results be announced at the next meeting of the Faculty.

This motion, duly seconded, was passed by a voice vote.

The Dean reported that after consulting with the Committee on Inter-Faculty Relations, the Committee on University Policy had prepared a slate of the following candidates for election to this special committee; S. S. Atwood, R. H. Elias, P. W. Gates, M. R. Konvitz, C. C. Murdock, Dexter Perkins, C. L. Rossiter and R. B. Schlesinger. The President then called for nominations from the floor. There being none, ballots were distributed, and the President designated two members of the Faculty to collect the ballots at the close of the meeting.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, its Chairman, the Registrar, moved:
(1) That the Faculty be reminded that the daily schedule of classes, lectures, and other academic exercises allows for a minimum of 10 minutes in which students may change over from one meeting to another;

(2) That class periods in general (excepting laboratories, seminars, and exercises otherwise scheduled) are expected to begin on the hour and end promptly at ten minutes before the next hour;

(3) That the appropriate officers of administration consider ways and means of synchronization of clocks throughout the university buildings and of the sounding of signals in buildings used primarily for classes and lectures at ten minutes of each hour and on each hour throughout the working day;

(4) That the Faculty recommend that the Administration consider whether, in view of the possible increase of enrollment and expansion of the Campus in the next decade, some kind of public transportation about the Campus should be introduced.

This motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Dean at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of February 9 were read and approved.

The Dean reported the receipt of two communications concerning the special committee to advise the President regarding the selection of a nominee for the John L. Senior University Professorship in American Civilization:

(1) A communication from the Committee on Elections announcing the election of the following members of the Faculty to this special committee: S. S. Atwood, P. W. Gates, C. C. Murdock, Dexter Perkins, C. L. Rossiter.

(2) A communication from the President announcing the appointment of S. S. Atwood as Chairman of the special committee, and the appointment of the following additional members: H. F. DeGraff, F. E. Mineka, Peter Ward.

The Dean reported that he had received communications from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

To the Committee on Requirements for Graduation:
D. W. Bruner until December 1, 1955 to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of Peter Olafson.

To the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships:
M. W. Sampson until September 19, 1955 to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of H. F. Wiegandt; and to be Acting Chairman until that date, N. C. Brady, to fill the vacancy in the Chairmanship created by the absence of Professor Wiegandt.

To the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events:
Mark Barlow to fill the vacancy created by the resignation from the University's administrative staff of W. C. Heasley, jr.

The Dean reported receipt of a communication from the Director of the School of Electrical Engineering, Professor Burrows, tendering the use of Room 101 in Phillips Hall for University Faculty meetings.
The Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Professor W. F. Willcox, then moved that the Committee on Registration and Schedules be requested to study and report on the advisability of holding University Faculty meetings in Room 101, Phillips Hall instead of in Olin M. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Graduate School, its Dean, Professor Atwood, moved the following resolution:

Whereas the College of Veterinary Medicine has proposed the establishment of a new degree, Doctor of Science in Veterinary Medicine (D. Sc. in V. M.), and

Whereas the Graduate Faculty and the Medical College Faculty have approved this proposal,

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty approve this proposal and recommend the establishment of this degree by the Board of Trustees; and

Be It Further Resolved that the University Faculty recommends that the Board of Trustees authorize the granting of this degree to persons who have satisfactorily completed the program leading to such degree prescribed by the Division of Veterinary Medicine of the Graduate School, and who are recommended for such degree by the Faculty of the Graduate School.

The motion was duly seconded. After considerable discussion of the proposal had ensued, Professor Peter Ward moved the previous question. This motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The motion proposed by Professor Atwood was then put to a voice vote. The results being in doubt, the Dean called for a show of hands. The motion was carried by a vote of 50 - 17.

Copies of the Proposal for the Degree of Doctor of Science in Veterinary Medicine and of the Statement prepared by Professors Atwood and Whitlock in explanation of this proposal, both of which were distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, are appended to these minutes.
The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
PROPOSAL FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SCIENCE IN VETERINARY MEDICINE

The Faculty of the Graduate School recommends to the University Faculty the establishment of a new professional degree to be known as Doctor of Science in Veterinary Medicine (D. Sc. in V. M.). To administer this degree, a Division of Veterinary Medicine will be established in the Graduate School. Admission to candidacy for the degree, Doctor of Science in Veterinary Medicine, is a function of the Division of Veterinary Medicine of the Graduate School. The following requirements must be met before admission to candidacy:

1. The candidate must have been graduated from an approved school of veterinary medicine for at least five years.

2. He must have demonstrated by published papers his ability to do independent meritorious research.

3. He must have offered satisfactory evidence to the Division of his ability to read accurately the French and German* literature in his field.

Candidates who have no graduate credit beyond their D. V. M. degree must complete not less than four residence units to qualify for the degree.** Those who have a Master of Science degree or its equivalent from an approved college or university may complete the minimum residence credit by acquiring at least two additional units.

After a candidate has been admitted, he will select a member of the Faculty in Veterinary Medicine to serve as chairman of his special committee. The Faculty of the Division will then select two other members of the committee. These three individuals will have charge of the candidate's program and will be responsible to the faculty of the Division for supervising his work. The candidate's work must fall in the following categories:

1. Advanced courses in any of the sciences which have a relation to medicine. Selected courses which are part of the regular curriculum of the Cornell University College of Medicine may be accepted for not more than half of the total credit in this category. In no case shall credit be granted for courses which are part of the regular curriculum in Veterinary Medicine or for similar courses in the Medical College curriculum.

2. Regular attendance and study in any of the clinics of the Veterinary College or of the Medical College.

* In special cases other languages may be accepted according to the provisions of Paragraph 118 and 119 of the Code of Legislation of the Graduate Faculty.

**It is considered that at least two units of work leading to the degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine are an integral part of this professional degree.
All candidates must take at least 2/3 of their work in courses that may properly be included under category 1. If desired, they may take all of their work in category 1. Not more than 1/3 of their work may be taken in category 2.

Courses shall be deemed to have been satisfactorily completed only upon receipt of a regular transcript of credits. Following completion of his course work, each candidate for this degree shall present an acceptable monograph or thesis in the area of his special interest and shall submit to a general examination covering the subject matter of his work. The special committee shall set the time and place of his examination and invite all members of the Division and all members of the Graduate Faculty of other fields who have participated in his training to attend. They shall have the right to examine the candidate and to express to the Special Committee their opinions of the candidate's competency, but the special committee alone shall be responsible for recommending him for the degree. The recommendation shall be addressed to the faculty of the Veterinary Division of the Graduate School, which then shall make recommendations to the Graduate School.
STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSAL
FOR THE DEGREE OF D. Sc. IN V. M.

This proposal was developed by the Faculty of the College of Veterinary Medicine after a number of years of study. It was approved by that Faculty on November 23, 1954, by the Graduate Faculty on January 28, 1955, and by the Executive Faculty of the Medical College on February 10, 1955.

Why a new professional degree? Specialization in Veterinary Medicine has reached a point where the traditional Ph. D. program no longer supplies all of the various types of advanced training that are needed. The Ph. D. degree still serves well in the basic sciences (such as anatomy, bacteriology, and physiology), but it is not well adapted to the clinical sciences (such as medicine, surgery, and therapeutics).

In the clinical sciences most research workers are forced to obtain experience through an apprentice system rather than through a Ph. D. program, since clinical research materials are more limited than in other fields by reason of economic factors and questions of professional ethics. In the past decade, only 1 Ph. D. degree has been granted at Cornell for work in the clinical sciences, whereas 22 have been granted in the basic sciences.

The proposed degree should not compete or conflict with the Ph. D. program. It is parallel to it and is characterized by a professional rather than a general research objective. It is designed specifically (1) to serve those areas of veterinary medicine for which the Ph. D. degree is of limited usefulness and (2) to meet the needs of those persons who have learned research principles through an apprenticeship but who need more specific, advanced, scientific and professional knowledge in order to equip themselves for careers in teaching and research.

Manpower needs in Veterinary Medicine. At the present time there is a real need for many more well-trained persons than are now available in order to staff adequately the several new and rapidly expanding schools and research organizations of veterinary medicine. Since 1931 there has been an almost threefold increase in veterinary students in the U. S., and the number of veterinary schools has grown from 11 to 17, but there has been essentially no increase in the number of American Ph. D. candidates. This lack of suitable numbers of advanced students has occurred despite the availability of financial support from both assistantships and fellowships.

General justification. The recognition of the need for professional degrees to take over certain of the specialized functions of the general degrees has been part of the developing pattern of higher education throughout its history. The Graduate Faculty has favored separation of such professional programs from the general wherever the aims are distinctly professional.

For several years Cornell has offered successfully the J. S. D. and Ed. D. degrees. In regard to the type of product and need within the profession, the proposed D. Sc. in V. M. is very comparable to the J. S. D.

This proposed offering should bring distinction to Cornell in the solution of a specific new problem.

S. S. Atwood

March 1, 1955

J. H. Whitlock
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of March 9 were read and approved.

The President announced the death of James Courtenay Hening, Associate Professor of Chemistry, on February 17, 1955; of Donald Reddick, Professor of Plant Pathology, Emeritus, on April 2, 1955; and of George Henry Howe, Associate Professor of Pomology, on April 13, 1955. The Faculty rose in tribute to their former colleagues.

The Dean reported that communications had been received from the President announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to prepare a memorial article concerning James Courtenay Hening for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: D. B. Hand, J. D. Luckett, C. E. Pederson, Chairman; and the appointment of the following to a special committee to prepare such an article concerning Donald Reddick: Lewis Knudson, L. M. Massey, D. S. Welch, Chairman.

Since there was no unfinished business, reports of committees were called for.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, a member, Professor R. E. Cushman, moved:

That the Director of Women's Physical Education and the Supervisor of Men's Physical Education be invited to attend the meetings of the University Faculty as auditors.

The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor Peabody, moved that the University Faculty enact the following legislation:
Be It Enacted, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, that no incoming student organization be allowed on campus which includes in its constitution, by-laws, or ritual discriminatory provisions with respect to the national origin, race, creed, religion, or color of candidates for membership; that each such organization be required to deliver to the Faculty Committee on Student Activities a copy of its constitution and by-laws, and a signed pledge that its ritual contains no such discriminatory provisions; and that this action shall not be construed as preventing student organizations established for specifically avowed religious purposes from requiring their members to accept certain religious tenets.

The motion being duly seconded, Professor Peabody outlined the sequence of activities on the part of the student body at Cornell, in its effort to solve the problem of discrimination in social organizations. A copy of the report of Student Council concerning this matter is appended to these minutes.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor S. M. Brown, Jr., moved that the motion be amended by affixing a preamble and by substituting for the phrase, discriminatory provisions with respect to the national origin, race, creed, religion, or color of candidates for membership; the expression provisions which are discriminatory in such respects; so that the amended motion would read as follows:

Whereas this Faculty disapproves of practices and policies discriminatory with respect to the national origin, race, creed, religion, or color of candidates for membership in organizations other than religious,

Be It Enacted, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, that no incoming student organization be allowed on campus which includes in its constitution, by-laws, or ritual provisions which are discriminatory in such respects; that each such organization be required to deliver to the Faculty Committee on Student Activities a copy of its constitution and by-laws, and a signed pledge that its ritual contains no such discriminatory provisions; and that this action shall not be construed as preventing student organizations established for specifically avowed religious purposes from requiring their members to accept certain religious tenets.
The amendment being seconded, considerable discussion ensued concerning the preamble or justifying clause.

The Professor of Chemical Microscopy and Metallography, Professor C. W. Mason, moved an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the first word, whereas, and to put a period after the word religious, at the end of the first paragraph, and to strike out all of the second paragraph so that the motion would read:

This Faculty disapproves of practices and policies discriminatory with respect to the national origin, race, creed, religion, or color of candidates for membership in organizations other than religious.

The motion being duly seconded, it was put to a voice vote and lost.

The amendment proposed by Professor Brown was carried by a voice vote.

The original motion, as amended, was then put to a voice vote and passed.

Under the heading of New Business, the Provost reported on the financial problems of the University.

The meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The following is a Chronology of the efforts since 1947 on the part of the Student Body at Cornell to solve the problem of discrimination in Social Organizations.

In 1949, the Cornell Board of Trustees gave the Inter-Fraternity Council "initial jurisdiction" in matters concerning Fraternity life at Cornell.

On December 11, 1951, Student Council established a committee to study discrimination at Cornell, delegating to the IFC "the complete jurisdiction to study problems of discrimination within the fraternity system, working actively toward lasting and intelligent solutions of such problems."

For this purpose, the IFC established on January 13, 1952, a committee consisting of eight seniors and six underclassmen, including two independents and seven chapter presidents.

On April 7, 1952, the IFC committee made public its report. Rather than try to summarize the report, we refer you to the Brief entitled "IFC DISCRIMINATION COMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORT April 6, 1952."

On May 8, 1952, the IFC passed the following resolution by a 11-2 vote:

"Be it resolved that the Cornell IFC believes discrimination in membership selection on the basis of race, religion, or national origin is wrong because it is unfair, in that it judges a person on the basis of group membership rather than on individual merit. Furthermore, discrimination on these bases is not to the best interest of fraternities in that it deprives a fraternity of good members.

"Be it further resolved that we are opposed to clauses in national fraternity constitutions, by-laws, and rituals which limit membership on basis of race, religion, or national origin, and we encourage and actively support attempts of member fraternities to remove such clauses."

1953 saw the independent membership on the IFC dropped, and the committee itself turned into an advisory group to assist those locals who wanted to try to remove their clauses.

1954 saw the committee run on a temporary basis. The Cornell NSA delegation, however, reported back to Council at the beginning of the 1954 term that other schools were moving more rapidly toward the solution of their bias clause problems than we were. Council, however, felt that we should try to work with the IFC once more, and hoped that they would increase their efforts in the field.

At the beginning of the 1954 Spring Term, the NSA branch of Council was authorized by the Executive Committee of Council to establish a joint S.C.-IFC-PanHell committee to renew effort in the field. The new committee was composed of two appointed representatives from each group. They were as follows:

S.C. - Bernard Yudowitz
Barbara Krause
Each representative was unofficial and could only act and speak for himself. After three months of discussion and thirteen meetings, the six people decided to ask their respective groups if they would back the following resolution when it was brought before Council:

"No incoming group be allowed on campus which contains in its constitution and/or by-laws, and/or ritual, discriminatory clauses with regard to race, color, religion, creed, or national origin. This shall not prevent groups set up for specifically avowed religious purposes from requiring their members to accept certain religious tenets.

"To insure the above action:

"That all incoming groups be required to hand into the Student-Faculty Activities Committee a copy of their constitution and by-laws, and a signed pledge that their ritual contains none of the aforementioned clauses."

All reported back that their respective groups would support the resolution when it was brought before Council.

On March 23, 1954, the resolution was passed by Council by a vote of 16-1. Both IFC and Pan-Hell publicly supported the resolution at the meeting. The resolution was then submitted to the Student-Faculty Activities Committee for its consideration.

On October 23, 1951, Council voted to establish a joint Student Council-IFC-Faculty committee "to investigate, evaluate, and make recommendations both to Council and IFC, regarding bias clauses in social organizations on the Cornell Campus." The Committee is composed of three representatives each from the Faculty, IFC, and Council. They are as follows:

Faculty - Prof. E. A. Suchman
Prof. Stuart H. Brown
Prof. Robert H. Smock

IFC - Robert Cowie
Tom Litwin
John Browning

Student Council - Robert Attiyeh
Dick Strouge
Bernie Yudowitz

On December 2, 1954, the Student-Faculty Committee on Discrimination raised questions as to what had become of the March 23 resolution and unanimously approved the following resolution:
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p. m.
The minutes of the meeting of April 13 were read and approved.
The President announced the death of William Harold Dunn, Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, on February 12, 1955; the death of Clement Biddle Penrose Cobb, Assistant Professor of Clinical Pediatrics, on March 11, 1955; and the death of Henry Alonzo Myers, Professor of English, on May 2, 1955. The Faculty rose in tribute to their memories.
The Dean reported receipt of a communication from the President announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to prepare a memorial article concerning George Henry Howe for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: F. L. Gambrell, J. D. Luckett, Richard Wellington, Chairman.
The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees announcing that at a meeting held April 18, 1955, the Executive Committee of the Board, pursuant to the recommendation of the Faculty, authorized the establishment of the new degree, Doctor of Science in Veterinary Medicine, and the granting of such degree to persons who have satisfactorily completed the program leading to such degree prescribed by the Division of Veterinary Medicine of the Graduate School, and who are recommended for such degree by the Faculty of the Graduate School.
On behalf of the Committee on Commencement Policy, its Chairman, Professor Rideout, reported briefly on the activities of this com-
mittee and its plans for the 1955 commencement. His report was greeted with applause.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor Peabody, introduced the following resolution:

Resolved that the University Faculty, the Board of Trustees concurring, designate Saturday, May 12, 1956, as Spring Day, a University Holiday, and instruct the Committee on Registration and Schedules to schedule evening hours which members of the Faculty may use for classes and laboratory periods which are normally scheduled on that day.

This motion, duly seconded, was passed without dissent by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean moved:

That the report of the Committee on University Policy dated May 4, 1955 on the rule barring Ithaca women-students from fall term residence in sororities and University dormitories be approved; and that the Faculty transmit this report to the Administration with the request that the rule be rescinded.

The committee's report had been sent to Faculty members with the call for the meeting, and a copy is appended to these minutes.

The motion being duly seconded, discussion followed. Several Faculty members spoke in favor of the motion, stressing various points in the committee's report. The President emphasized that the rule was based entirely on considerations of problems of financial management. The issue was not decided on its educational merits. The Professor of Home Economics Administration, Professor Canoyer, commented that an additional point not brought out in the committee's report is that by releasing some bed-space, the rule had been helpful to colleges which depend on women students in that
it enabled them to increase enrollment.

When put to a voice vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

On behalf of the Committees on Military Curricula and Requirements for Graduation, the Dean moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved that it is the sense of this Faculty that the basic ROTC program should be continued on its present basis.

The motion was seconded.

The joint report of the Committees on Military Curricula and Requirements for Graduation had been sent to Faculty members with the call for the meeting, and a copy is appended to these minutes.

After a brief discussion the question was put to a vote. Since the results of the voice vote were in doubt, the President called for a show of hands. The motion passed by a vote of 57 to 37.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Report and Recommendation by Committee on University Policy in regard to Rule Barring Ithaca Women Students from First Term Residence in Dormitories and Sororities

May 4, 1955

In March, 1954, without consulting the Faculty, the Administration issued a Statement of Policies governing University Housing for Undergraduate Women. This statement included the following paragraph:

"Town of Ithaca residents usually may not live in residence halls or sororities in the fall term of any college year. Second term applicants will be cared for as opportunities permit. Exceptional circumstances will always be reviewed upon written application to the Dean of Women."

In April, 1954, the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on University Policy received the following communication dated April 21, 1954 and signed by 15 members of the University Faculty:

"The recent University announcement restricting campus residence of all women living in the Ithaca area to only the spring terms of their attendance at the University has prompted some of us to protest and to ask that your committee consider the effects of this ruling upon the educational opportunities of daughters of the faculty. Further, it is hoped that the results of your deliberations on the matter may be presented to the University Faculty so that appropriate representations may be made to the administration.

"This new discriminating, restrictive ruling, which applies to residence in sororities as well as university dormitories, will limit substantially the opportunities of our daughters to participate in a full, normal undergraduate life. At the very outset of their attendance at the University they are to a great extent walled off from their classmates and sit apart as an underprivileged group. As time passes and sororities make their selections of new members, once again faculty daughters will find themselves in a most unfavorable position as compared to other women of their class.

"The ruling certainly represents a most substantial withdrawal on the part of the administration of full educational privileges for faculty children at Cornell."

Pursuant to the request contained in this letter, the Policy Committee gave preliminary consideration to the regulation on May 3, 1954.

---

1 The rule was intended to be applicable to, and is currently being applied to, women students resident in the City of Ithaca and the Village of Cayuga Heights, as well as to students in the Town of Ithaca who are not residents of the city or village.
and invited the Provost, the Dean of Women, the Director of Admissions, and the Controller for the Endowed Colleges to discuss the regulation with the committee on May 31, 1954.

At this meeting the Provost stated in substance that the regulation had been adopted for the following reasons: (1) the number of undergraduate women annually admissible from outside the Ithaca area is limited by the housing accommodations available in the dormitories and sororities; (2) by excluding from this housing Ithaca women who can live at home, the number of non-Ithaca women who can be accommodated in the dormitories and sororities, and therefore admitted, can be increased; (3) because the majority of Ithaca women wishing to attend Cornell do so even though they cannot live in dormitories or sororities during the first term, enforcement of the regulation will result in an increase in the enrollment of undergraduate women; (4) the University can hope to profit to the extent of some $15,000 to $20,000 a year from this increase; and (5) in view of the University's recurring annual deficits, it cannot afford to forego this source of revenue. All of the representatives of the Administration, however, including the Provost, agreed with the committee that the regulation was educationally undesirable, particularly when made applicable to freshman women.

The committee voted to lay the matter aside until the fall. This decision was based on two considerations: (1) that it would probably be impracticable to make any change in the rule effective for the academic year 1954-55 in view of the imminence of the beginning of that year; and (2) the expectation that by October, 1954 the committee would be able to base its conclusions concerning the rule on actual experience under it rather than on speculation.

On November 3, 1954 the Policy Committee met again with the Provost, the Dean of Women, and the Director of Admissions. The Dean of Women reported that there had been an unexpected expansion of the facilities of one of the sororities during the summer, which had come too late to permit of the admission of more undergraduate women residing elsewhere than in the Town of Ithaca, but early enough to enable the University to accommodate in dormitories quite a number of Ithaca women students who would have been excluded by the regulation under normal conditions. The committee's expectation that it would be able in the fall to consider the rule in the light of its actual impact was, therefore, not fulfilled.

The Dean of Women also pointed out that several practices had been instituted to help such Ithaca freshman women as could not be accommodated in dormitories to become acquainted with their class. More specifically, arrangements were made to give them temporary dormitory quarters during Orientation Week. Each was made a non-resident member of some dormitory group. Each was informed that she would be invited to visit in a dormitory whenever accommodations became temporarily available (normally over week-ends). And finally the policy was established of encouraging them to buy meal tickets and eat in the dormitory dining halls whenever they found it convenient. The committee understands that these practices will continue.
The Provost reiterated at the fall meeting the statements he had made in the spring as to the importance of the rule to the financial interests of the University. He said further in effect that even a substantial increase in the available housing for women would not appreciably diminish the financial importance of the regulation to the University, because its deficit, present and prospective, is so great that the University would, for an indefinite period in the future, find it necessary to maintain its tuition income from women students at the highest possible point, and because the reservation of all dormitory and sorority housing for non-Ithaca women during the first term of each year was essential to the attainment of this goal.

The committee voted nevertheless to inform the Administration that in its opinion the regulation is neither sound educational policy nor good public relations. Notice of this action was promptly given to the Provost. The committee's decision to take no further action at the time was based upon its recognition of the difficult position in which a conflict between the financial needs of the University on the one hand and sound educational and public relations policies on the other, places the Administration.

On February 18, 1955 the Provost notified the Chairman of the Policy Committee that the Administration, with great regret, and only because constrained by financial necessity, had decided to keep the regulation in force unmodified. At its meeting of February 21, 1955 the committee was informed of the Administration's decision.

After giving further consideration to the regulation at three subsequent meetings, the committee, on April 25, 1955, again concluded that it contravenes sound educational policy and is prejudicial to the University's public relations; and voted to report its opinion to the Faculty with the recommendation that the Faculty request the Administration to reconsider the rule.

The committee believes that the regulation contravenes sound educational policy for two reasons. In the first place, there is no doubt that experience in group living plays an important role in the education of undergraduates. In recognition of this fact, the University has erected dormitories whenever funds have been available. By denying the privilege of group living to approximately 80 women students during at least half of their course, the University is depriving them of one of the most important parts of their education.

In the second place, sound educational policy requires the recruitment and retention of competent teaching and research staff. As the impending increase in college enrollment leads to keener competition for teaching and research personnel, the accomplishment of this task will become increasingly difficult. The regulation in question will undoubtedly add to the difficulty. Many members of the Faculty, when deciding whether to come to or remain at Cornell, assumed that the tuition-free educational opportunities available to their
daughters, included the privilege of group living available to other students. They are disappointed and shocked to find that this assumption is false. Unless the regulation in question is rescinded, the Faculty will begin to wonder whether it can count on the continued existence of the free tuition privilege itself. If the Administration creates the impression that its policies in this area are variable, Faculty with families will find outside offers more attractive than before, and department heads and deans will have one less important inducement to offer when negotiating with family men whom they wish to bring to Cornell.

The committee believes that the regulation is prejudicial to the University's public relations because it is basically unfair, and because unfairness breeds a sense of injury. Its unfairness lies in its treatment of part of the student group as second-class citizens; not because they deserve such treatment, but for financial reasons. The sense of injury engendered by the rule will ultimately prove detrimental to the University.

Residents in the Ithaca area, feeling that their support of the Greater Cornell Fund campaign has been shabbily rewarded, may support the University less generously in the future; and their general attitude toward the University may become less friendly and constructive. While the members of the Faculty and staff prejudiced by the rule will, of course, serve the University faithfully so long as they remain in its employ, the blow to their morale struck by the rule will prove to be a serious one. The students set apart from their classmates by the rule cannot help but feel that they were never really wanted at Cornell; and this feeling will shape their attitude toward the University for the rest of their lives to an appreciable degree.

The fact that several other universities deny dormitory privileges to students living nearby does not per se justify such action at Cornell. The University should follow the good examples rather than the bad. Furthermore, some of the institutions which follow this practice can at best accommodate only half of their women students in dormitories or sororities. In these universities the group excluded is so large that the members of it can organize effectively and achieve a sense of belonging despite their exclusion from university housing. At Cornell, however, the group excluded is proportionately so small that the few girls whom the University consigns to it find it difficult to achieve a real unity with their class in activity and feeling. This condition will probably continue despite the best efforts of the Dean of Women and conscientious student leaders to alleviate it.

It is true that prior to the adoption of the rule in question the University suffered financially because some Ithaca girls signed up for dormitory and sorority housing in the fall term and withdrew in the spring without adequate excuse. It would be surprising, however, if regulations could not be devised which would protect the University from such loss and which would at the same time be acceptable to the parents of students resident in the Ithaca area.

The committee will, therefore, at the Faculty meeting to be held on May 11 move the approval of this report by the Faculty; and that the Faculty transmit this report to the Administration, with the request that it rescind the regulation barring women students resident in the Ithaca area from living in sororities or University dormitories during the fall term.
Committee on University Policy

R. E. Cushman
Horrell DeGraff
J. W. Macdonald
T. W. Mackesy
J. K. Moynihan
M. F. Neufeld
L. P. Smith
W. A. Wimsatt
W. H. Parnham, Chairman

We are pleased that the Student Council recommended to the University Faculty that the basic ROTC program at Cornell be placed on a voluntary basis.

We ask the Student Council to recommend to the University Faculty that the basic ROTC program at Cornell be placed on a voluntary basis.

We urge that the committee hold open hearings on this issue, so as to promote the free expression of student opinion to the Faculty.

From its opening in 1865 until the present the University has included Military Training in its curriculum in fulfillment of its commitment as an land-grant institution under the Morrill Act of 1862. While this act did not obligate the University to require any of its students to take Military Training, and while its subsequent federal and New York State legislation has imposed such an obligation, the University has, except during the periods from 1875 to 1878, and 1907 to 1909, voluntarily imposed such a requirement on a substantial fraction of its male undergraduates ever since its founding. During some periods Military Training was required of all male students. During others, the election was imposed only on freshmen. The plan under which successful completion of four terms of basic Military Training during the freshman and sophomore years is made prerequisite to the graduation of male students with a baccalaureate degree, and advanced Military Training is offered as an elective for seniors and seniors, was inaugurated substantially in its present form in 1917 and has continued in force ever since, except during World War II. There has, of course, usually been provision, as there now is, for the excuse of absence, conscientious objection, and for the physically disqualified from the underclass basic Military Training requirement.

During the winter of 1953-54 Student Council sent out questionnaires to alumni and students chosen at random from each University class soliciting their opinions as to whether basic Military Training at Cornell should be made elective. The replies showed that about two-thirds of the student body believed that a shift to elective basis would be desirable, while approximately two-thirds of the alumni were of the opinion that basic Military Training at Cornell should continue to be compulsory.
In April, 1954 the Dean of the University Faculty received the fol-
lowing communication from the President of the Student Council:

Dear Sir:

At the Cornell Student Council meeting of April 6, 1954, the fol-
lowing resolution was passed with one dissenting vote:

"Be it resolved that the Student Council recommend to the University Faculty that the basic ROTC program at Cornell be placed on a voluntary basis."

We submit this resolution to you, and trust that you will remand it to the appropriate Faculty committee for consideration and recommendation to the University Faculty.

We urge that the committee hold open hearings on this issue, so as to promote the free expression of student opinion to the Faculty.

From its opening in 1868 until the present the University has included Military Training in its curriculum in fulfillment of its commit-
ment as a land-grant institution under the Morrill Act of 1862. While this act did not obligate the University to require any of its students to take Military Training, and while no subsequent federal or New York State legislation has imposed such an obligation, the University has, except during the periods from 1875 to 1878, and 1942 to 1945, voluntarily imposed such a requirement on a substantial fraction of its male under-
graduates ever since its founding. During some periods Military Training was required of all male students. During others, the exaction was imposed only on freshmen. The plan under which successful completion of four terms of basic Military Training during the freshman and sophomore years is made prerequisite to the graduation of male students with a baccalaureate degree, and advanced Military Training is offered as an elective for juniors and seniors, was inaugurated substantially in its present form in 1917 and has been continued in force ever since, except during World War II. There has, of course, usually been provision, as there now is, for the excuse of aliens, conscientious objectors, and the physically disqualified from the underclass basic Military Training requirement.

During the winter of 1953-54 Student Council sent out questionnaires to alumni and students chosen at random from each University class soliciting opinions as to whether basic Military Training at Cornell should be made elective. The replies showed that about two-thirds of the student body believed that a shift to elective basic would be desirable, while approximately two-thirds of the alumni were of the opinion that basic Military Training at Cornell should continue to be compulsory.
Efforts made by the Dean of Men and the Cornell Daily Sun to discover whether the Army, Navy, and Air Force thought that a change from compulsory to elective basic would be prejudicial to the national interest were abortive. The tenor of the replies received warrants the inference that the armed forces believe that they should not attempt to influence the decision of an educational institution when it is considering the relative merits of compulsory and elective basic Military Training.

Pursuant to Student Council's request that its resolution be referred to the appropriate Faculty committee, the Dean of the Faculty laid it before the Committees on Military Curricula and Requirements for Graduation. He selected them because the Faculty legislation of January 18, 1950 provides that it shall be the duty of the Committee on Military Curricula

"To acquaint itself with the curricula of the military departments, to make suggestions to the head of any of these departments regarding such changes as are within his jurisdiction, to make recommendation to the University Faculty for transmission to the Department of Defense regarding changes not within the jurisdiction of the head of a military department, and to serve as liaison between the military departments and the faculties of the University in matters relating to curricula, facilities, and academic credit."

and the duty of the Committee on Requirements for Graduation

"To administer those requirements for graduation which are prescribed by University Faculty legislation."

Those requirements include the one under consideration.

The committees above referred to began joint consideration of the Student Council resolution on April 13, 1954 and invited the submission of student briefs favoring and opposing the Council's resolution. After the briefs submitted by the students had been studied by the committees, they were argued by their student draftsmen before the committees at a joint meeting held May 25. On June 1 the faculty committees in joint session adopted the following resolution by a vote of 11 to 1, the three military members of the Committee on Military Curricula abstaining:

"Resolved that it is the sense of the Committees on Military Curricula and Requirements for Graduation that the basic ROTC program should be continued on its present basis."

Several of those who voted for the retention of the compulsory basic program stated that if a compulsory Military Training program had not been in existence at Cornell for years and if one were to be established for the first time, they would prefer to have the basic as well as the advanced courses elective.

In view of Student Council's request that the committee which considered its resolution should make a recommendation to the Faculty in regard to it, the Faculty committees also decided that a joint committee report be prepared and submitted to the University Faculty in the fall of 1954 with a request for approval of the committees' resolution.
During the summer of 1954 the Department of Defense issued an order forbidding the formal enrollment of a student in the basic Military Training courses unless he had executed a certificate known as DD Form 98. A student who executes this form certifies that he has not engaged in espionage or sabotage, that he has not advocated the accomplishment of change in our economic, political or social systems by force or violence, that he has not disclosed classified information without authority, that he has not acted in such a way as to serve the interests of another government rather than the interests of the United States, and that he has not been a member of an organization which appears on the Attorney General's subversive list.

Prior to the fall of 1954, only students receiving commissions were required to sign this form. That formerly exacted of the students in the basic courses was simpler and more general, and while it was sometimes executed upon enrollment, it did not have to be completed until application was made for admission to the advanced course.

In September, 1954 the committees met to consider the new certificate requirement, and its relation to the compulsory versus elective basic problem. They concluded that the effect of the new requirement in institutions requiring basic Military Training was highly undesirable, because all male students entering such institutions except aliens, conscientious objectors, and the physically disqualified, would be confronted with these alternatives: (1) to execute the certificate, thereby running the risk of an inadvertent false answer, and in some cases identifying themselves as persons from whom information about subversive organizations could be obtained; or (2) to decline to execute the certificate, and have their refusal to do so made part of their permanent military records which would be open to governmental investigating agencies. The committees realized that if basic Military Training at Cornell were put upon an elective basis, the new loyalty certificate requirement would become relatively unobjectionable because no student would be confronted with the above alternatives unless by electing the basic military courses he had shown his willingness to face them. The committees therefore concluded that the existence of the new loyalty certificate requirement might conceivably afford a new argument for a shift to elective basic Military Training, and decided that their final decision as to whether to recommend such a shift to the Faculty should be delayed until it could be determined whether the efforts being made by the Association of Land Grant Colleges and the American Council on Education to secure a rescission of the Department of Defense Order were likely to succeed. After waiting several months during which these organizations issued nothing but discouraging reports, and the statements made by the Department of Defense indicated a firm intention to stand by its order, the committees concluded that their decision must be made upon the assumption that there would be no rescission of the objectionable requirement.

After hearing further student arguments on the compulsory versus elective basic issue as affected by the requirement of Form DD 98 of students in the basic military courses, the committees, on April 4, 1955, by a vote of 7 to 5 (the military members of the Committee on Military Curricula abstaining), decided to confirm their resolution of June 1, 1954 "that the basic ROTC program should be continued on its present basis".
It was also decided that since the five voting against the resolution did not wish to submit a minority report, the committees' joint report should set forth the principal arguments in favor of elective basic, as well as those in favor of compulsory basic.

Five days after this action was taken, the President received word from the Department of Defense that it had rescinded the rule requiring the execution of DD Form 98 by students in the basic military courses; and had substituted the following oath:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God."

The committees have, therefore, excluded from the list of arguments set forth hereinafter all those based on the assumption that the execution of DD Form 98 is to be required of students in the basic military courses.

In the spring of 1955 the Student Council by a unanimous vote reaffirmed its preference for elective basic Military Training and on April 21, 1955, in a referendum on the compulsory versus elective basic question, 2790 students voted for elective basic, while 1084 voted for compulsory basic; a ratio of about 2 1/2 to 1.

Arguments in Favor of a Shift to Elective Basic

1. While the armed services have been making efforts to improve the content of and the instruction in their college Military Training courses, the improvement achieved thus far is not sufficient to justify their retention on a compulsory basis. If students were not forced to take these courses, they could and would elect others which would be of more value to them.

2. Elimination of unwilling participants in the basic courses would relieve the military instructors from the serious morale problem which they now face, and enable them to accomplish better results with those voluntarily taking the courses.

3. By barring from the basic military courses all students who cannot pass the physical examination for officer candidates, the armed services have shown that they are not concerned with giving a military education to all college men and they they are interested in the basic courses only as pools from which to draw students for the advanced military courses. Since conscripts are an unlikely source of officer material, it follows that no student should be put into the pool against his will.

4. As long as the Selective Service Act is in effect, and its life expectancy appears to be considerable, the University is relieved of the responsibility which it might otherwise feel to see to it that all of its male students receive some sort of military education. Indeed, if the University keeps its basic military courses on a compulsory basis, those students who are drafted after leaving Cornell will have been com-
elled to undergo two periods of Military Training; and as much of the work done in the military courses is repeated when the students enter the armed forces, the time spent in such courses is largely wasted.

5. Although asked to give their opinion as to the importance to the national defense of retention of compulsory basic in the land grant colleges, the armed services declined to express it. This, coupled with the fact that the standard form of ROTC contract which the services offer the universities, is so worded as to allow the universities a choice between elective and compulsory basic, warrants the inference that retention of the latter is not essential to the national welfare.

6. A shift to elective basic would not involve the University in financial loss. Our right to use the Drill Hall is not conditioned upon our continuance of compulsory basic, nor do we receive any federal or state funds which are so conditioned.

7. While most land grant institutions require their students to take basic Military Training, in two such institutions, Minnesota and Texas A. and M., the basic courses are on an elective basis. Cornell would not, therefore, be standing alone if it decided to make its basic military courses elective.

Arguments in Favor of Retention of Compulsory Basic

1. The University should, as a public service, see to it that the male students are informed with respect to our military situation and problems of defense, and that they receive at least elementary Military Training.

2. While the University's responsibility in this connection may be less pressing for so long as the Selective Service Act remains in force, the life of that act is uncertain. If it should be repealed, the University's responsibility with respect to the military education of its students would be revived in full force. Shifts back and forth between compulsory and elective basic, depending upon the absence or presence of a draft law, would be expensive and time-consuming.

3. The basic military courses supply a training and discipline which most students need, and which they are unlikely to receive from other sources.

4. Even if a student does not go on into the advanced ROTC courses and obtain a commission, the basic training will be of value to him and to the armed forces when he is called in the draft. He will to some degree have acquired the military skills, and he will be better able to adjust to the military life than he would be if he had had no such training.

5. While the advantages incident to enrollment in advanced ROTC courses are not constant in kind or number, they are usually considerable, and are open only to students who have successfully completed the basic Military Training program. By compelling all students to take this program, the University prevents them from losing by a hasty and ill-considered decision the advantages incident to eligibility for the advanced courses.
6. Maintenance of the compulsory feature of the basic military courses furthers the main purpose of the program from the standpoint of the military, which is the production of reserve officers. The percentage of the total male student body electing advanced ROTC with a view to obtaining commissions, is higher in universities, having compulsory basic than in those having elective basic.

7. The failure of the Department of Defense to express an opinion as to the importance of compulsory basic to the national defense is probably referable more to a reluctance on their part to appear to dictate to the University than it is to indifference to the abolition of compulsory basic.

8. Compulsory basic Military Training in the universities helps to counteract the feeling, particularly of the draftee who could not go to college, that college men are unfairly privileged with respect to military service.

9. All decisions made in this country on military questions, great or small, are carefully noted abroad. A general shift from compulsory to elective basic in our universities might be misinterpreted by our enemies as evidence of a lack of sympathy in university circles with the national policy of maintaining military strength adequate for our defense.

10. The fact that two-thirds of the alumni, looking back upon their Military Training here with the viewpoint of mature and experienced persons, favor retention of compulsory basic is strong evidence of its general value to the student, the University, and the nation.

11. In any event, there should be no shift in present military policies at Cornell until the final decisions have been made by Congress in regard to the pending proposals for the creation of a large military reserve. At this juncture it is impossible to foresee what the status of the college military programs will be; and a change made in our military set-up at Cornell before the overall plan has been formulated, might turn out to be a step prejudicial to the University and to our students.

At the May 11 meeting of the Faculty, a motion to adopt the following resolution will be made on behalf of the Committees on Military Curricula and Requirements for Graduation:

"Resolved that it is the sense of this Faculty that the basic ROTC program should be continued on its present basis."

Members of the Committee on Military Curricula
J. G. Bouker
P. D. Coates
R. H. Comstock
W. H. Farnham
H. M. Giff
J. B. Rosser
Peter Ward
J. W. McConnell, Chairman

Members of the Committee on Requirements for Graduation
D. W. Bruner
A. W. Gibson
C. A. Hanson
H. J. Loberg
J. O. Mahoney
H. B. Meek
R. L. Perry
B. L. Rideout
E. H. Stocks
W. H. Farnham, Chairman
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of May 11 were read and approved.

The Provost announced the death of Madison Bentley, Professor of Psychology, Emeritus, on May 29, 1955. The Faculty rose in respect to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the President announcing the appointment of the following committee to prepare a memorial article concerning Henry Alonzo Myers for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: H. D. Albright, M. R. Konvitz, F. E. Mineka, Chairman.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, its Chairman, Dr. Bradford, reported on its investigation of the proposal made at the March meeting that Room 101, Phillips Hall be the regular meeting place of the Faculty instead of Room M, Olin Hall, as at present. For the committee, Dr. Bradford moved that beginning with the next meeting, the regular meeting place of the Faculty be Room 101, Phillips Hall.

The motion was seconded and carried by a voice vote.

After reading a statement, the Dean moved, on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the Faculty request the President to inform the Board of Trustees that in the judgment of the Faculty it would be contrary to sound educational policy for the Board to delete that part of sec. 3(a) of Art. XIV of the present University By-Laws which provides that the University Faculty

"shall have disciplinary jurisdiction over the students of the University except for unsatisfactory work"
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and to retain as part of the proposed University By-Laws sec. 4 of Art. VI, which reads:

"4. The President shall be responsible for the proper regulation of student conduct and the extra-curricular activities of students. He may delegate authority in these matters to such faculty committees as he may determine."

unless the Board, in connection with the above proposed actions, adopts the following proposals made by the President in which the Faculty, although it prefers the present By-law provision above quoted, acquiesces: viz.,

That sec. 4 of Art. VI of the proposed By-Laws be amended by inserting the phrase "or student committees" in its last sentence; and

That there be included in the President's Plan for Organization of the University when adopted by the Trustees (1) provision for student committees as well as faculty committees under the heading of Personnel Officers; and (2) the following statement:

"The President proposes to delegate authority to the Committee on Student Conduct and the Committee on Student Activities appointed by him. Such delegation would not be subject to his veto nor would he act as a court of last resort in specific cases. He would expect to work with and consult with these committees in the formulation of general policies affecting student life."

The Professor of Electrical Engineering, Professor Credle, moved to delete that portion of the resolution following the quotation of section 4. The motion was seconded. The Professor of Philosophy, Professor S. M. Brown, Jr., asked if Professor Credle would accept the addition of the clause: "and that the Faculty prefers the present provision of the By-Laws". With permission, this addition was made to the amendment. When put to a voice vote, the amendment passed.

The motion to approve the resolution as amended, was carried by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman,
the Dean, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the Faculty request the President to communicate to the Board of Trustees its approval of the proposal of the Board's special Committee on the Revision of the University By-Laws that sec. 2 of Art. XVI of the present University By-Laws, which reads as follows:

"There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty, who shall be its chief administrative officer, and in the absence of the President, he shall conduct the meetings of that Faculty. In nominating a dean of the University Faculty to the Board of Trustees the President shall report the opinion of that Faculty upon such nomination; such opinion to be ascertained as that Faculty shall determine."

be transferred to Art. XIII of the proposed University By-Laws as sec. 3 of that article, and amended to read as follows:

"3. Dean of the University Faculty: There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty who shall be elected by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board. In recommending a candidate for the deanship the President shall report to the Board the opinion of the University Faculty concerning such recommendation - such opinion shall be ascertained as that Faculty may determine. The dean shall be the chief administrative officer of the University Faculty."

And its approval of the President's proposal that Trustee legislation be contemporaneously adopted providing that the deanship of the University Faculty, as a part-time position in a specialized area of academic administration, shall be filled normally for a definite term not to exceed five years;

And its approval of the President's proposal that his Plan for Organization of the University, when adopted by the Trustees, include the following provisions:

"Under the By-Laws, the President as Chief Executive Officer, will have reporting to him the following with such duties as may be assigned by the President, except as otherwise determined by the By-Laws or by Board action:

(2) The Dean of the University Faculty -- chiefly a liaison relationship as his duties consist largely of administering the committee work which carries out those matters which lie within the jurisdiction of the University Faculty to which he is responsible."
This motion, duly seconded, was passed without dissent by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean then moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the Faculty inform the Board of Trustees that in the judgment of the Faculty the recommendation to the President of persons for appointment to staff is one of the most important functions of the deans, directors, and heads of separate academic departments, and that it would therefore be inadvisable to adopt the proposal of the Board's special Committee on the Revision of the University By-Laws to omit from the proposed By-Laws the provision, included in sec. 4 of Art. XVI of the present By-Laws, imposing on such persons, except the Dean of the Graduate School, the duty to "recommend to the President, persons for appointment as academic and non-academic staff".

This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean then moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the University Faculty wishes fully to discharge its responsibilities with respect to educational matters, and to cooperate with the Board of Trustees and the Administration in the solution of problems of an educational nature,

The Faculty requests that if the Board of Trustees should contemplate taking action on any of the proposals with respect to the By-Laws, Trustee legislation, and the President's Plan for Organization of the University, which would be contrary to the opinions of the Faculty on these matters expressed at its meeting of June 8, 1955, the Board, before taking such contrary action, appoint a committee to confer concerning these matters with a committee to be appointed by the Faculty pursuant to sec. 10 of Art. II of the present University By-Laws.

This motion was seconded.

The Professor of Mathematics, Professor Olum, moved to amend the resolution so as to introduce a new second paragraph, to read as follows:
The Faculty requests that the Board of Trustees postpone action on the proposed revision of the By-Laws until this Faculty shall have had an opportunity adequately to discuss and consider these matters during the fall term of 1955,

and to begin the third paragraph with the word and, and to insert the word nevertheless between should and contemplate.

The Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Neufeld, moved an amendment to the amendment, to insert a paragraph following the first paragraph "and whereas copies of the proposed By-Laws, Trustee legislation, and President’s Plan for Organization of the University were not distributed to members of the Faculty for their study". This motion was seconded.

The Goldwin Smith Professor of History, Professor Marcham, then introduced a substitute motion, which after various suggestions from the floor, took the following form:

Whereas the University Faculty has today received a report of the Committee on University Policy regarding proposed changes in the By-Laws of the University, regarding proposed Trustee legislation, and regarding the proposed President’s Plan for Organization of the University which affect the prerogatives of the University Faculty and of the separate college and school faculties,

And whereas the University Faculty has considered this report, so far as the time of this meeting has allowed,

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty request the President

(1) To inform the Board of the following resolutions adopted by the University Faculty:

(A) Be It Resolved that the Faculty request the President to inform the Board of Trustees that in the judgment of the Faculty it would be contrary to sound educational policy for the Board to delete that part of sec. 3(a) of Art. XIV of the present University By-Laws which provides that the University Faculty

"shall have disciplinary jurisdiction over the students of the University except for unsatisfactory work"
and to retain as part of the proposed University By-Laws sec. 4 of Art. VI, which reads:

"4. The President shall be responsible for the proper regulation of student conduct and the extra-curricular activities of students. He may delegate authority in these matters to such faculty committees as he may determine."

and that the Faculty prefers the present provision of the By-Laws.

(B) Be It Resolved that the Faculty request the President to communicate to the Board of Trustees its approval of the proposal of the Board's special Committee on the Revision of the University By-Laws that sec. 2 of Art. XVI of the present University By-Laws, which reads as follows:

"There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty, who shall be its chief administrative officer, and in the absence of the President, he shall conduct the meetings of that Faculty. In nominating a dean of the University Faculty to the Board of Trustees the President shall report the opinion of that Faculty upon such nomination; such opinion to be ascertained as that Faculty shall determine."

be transferred to Art. XIII of the proposed University By-Laws as sec. 3 of that article, and amended to read as follows:

"3. Dean of the University Faculty: There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty who shall be elected by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board. In recommending a candidate for the deanship the President shall report to the Board the opinion of the University Faculty concerning such recommendation - such opinion shall be ascertained as that Faculty may determine.

The dean shall be the chief administrative officer of the University Faculty."

And its approval of the President's proposal that Trustee legislation be contemporaneously adopted providing that the deanship of the University Faculty, as a part-time position in a specialized area of academic administration, shall be filled normally for a definite term not to exceed five years;

And its approval of the President's proposal that his Plan for the Organization of the University, when adopted by the Trustees, include the following provisions:
"Under the By-Laws, the President as Chief Executive Officer, will have reporting to him the following with such duties as may be assigned by the President, except as otherwise determined by the By-Laws or by Board action:

(2) The Dean of the University Faculty—chiefly a liaison relationship as his duties consist largely of administering the committee work which carries out those matters which lie within the jurisdiction of the University Faculty to which he is responsible."

(C) Be It Resolved that the Faculty request the President to inform the Board of Trustees that in the judgment of the Faculty the recommendation to the President of persons for appointment to staff is one of the most important functions of the deans, directors, and heads of separate academic departments, and that it would therefore be inadvisable to adopt the proposal of the Board's special Committee on the Revision of the University By-Laws to omit from the proposed By-Laws the provision, included in sec. 4 of Art. XVI of the present By-Laws, imposing on such persons, except the Dean of the Graduate School, the duty to "recommend to the President, persons for appointment as academic and non-academic staff".

(2) To express to the Board the University Faculty's regret that through lack of time it is unable to give adequate attention to other questions raised by proposed changes in the By-Laws, by proposed Trustee legislation, and by the proposed President's Plan for Organization of the University, in so far as they affect the faculties;

(3) To present to the Board the University Faculty's request that it be allowed further time to consider these remaining items and to make recommendations concerning them; and

(4) To request the Board that if it should, nevertheless, contemplate taking action on any of the proposals with respect to the By-Laws, Trustee legislation and the President's Plan for Organization of the University which would be contrary to the opinions of the University Faculty on these matters, as expressed at its meeting of June 8, 1955, or to such opinions as it may express on additional matters in consequence of further study, that the Board, before taking such contrary action, appoint a committee to confer concerning these matters with a committee to be appointed by the Faculty pursuant to sec. 10 of Art. II of the present University By-Laws."
This motion was duly seconded.

The movers and seconders of the previous amendments withdrew their motions, and the Dean then withdrew his resolution, so that the motion by Professor Marcham was the only one remaining for consideration. When put to a voice vote, it passed unanimously.

The Professor of Botany, Professor Petry, moved that as a matter of record the statement read by the Dean be appended to the minutes of this meeting.

This motion, duly seconded, was passed without dissent.

The meeting at which approximately three hundred Faculty members were present adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Statement Read by the Dean and Ordered Appended to the Minutes

For more than two years a special committee of the Board of Trustees has been studying the University By-Laws with a view to their revision. Prof. DeGraff was appointed to this committee during his term as Faculty Representative on the Board, and was continued as a member of the committee after his term as Faculty Representative expired. He was not, however, free to divulge to or discuss with the Faculty the proposals which the Trustee committee was considering.

It should be borne in mind that under the University's Charter, absolute control over the University is vested in the Board of Trustees; and that they have therefore power to amend the By-Laws at any time. It was, nevertheless, understood as early as April, 1954, that the Faculty would be given an opportunity to comment upon such of the Trustee committee's proposals as affected the Faculty before they were presented to the full Board for action. Pursuant to this understanding the President, on March 23 of this year, informed me that he would present the Trustee committee's By-Law revision proposals to the Faculty Committee on University Policy later in the spring in order that that committee might study them, and formulate recommendations to the Faculty concerning them.

Pursuant to this understanding the President on May 24 supplied the Policy Committee with three documents: (1) a composite draft of the By-Laws - i.e. a draft containing the present By-Laws and the proposed changes; (2) a draft of the legislation which it was proposed to enact simultaneously with the adoption of the By-Laws; and (3) a draft of a Plan for the Organization of the University, which the President would be required to prepare and submit to the Board, if par. 2 of sec. 3 of Art. VI of the proposed By-Laws should ultimately be adopted; the plan, if and when adopted, to remain in effect until amended or superseded by Board action.

In view of the fact that the Policy Committee received these documents only 15 days prior to the scheduled date of the June Faculty meeting, the committee lost no time in getting to work on them. The committee held its first meeting two days after its reception of the documents - i.e. on May 26. It met with the President on May 30 to discuss them; and met again on June 1 and June 4 to formulate the resolutions which are in your hands and which I shall in due course present on behalf of the committee.

During its consideration of the proposed By-Laws and the related documents, the Policy Committee discovered - and this will not surprise you any more than it did the committee - that many of the proposed changes were not of direct concern to either Faculty or students, but were matters primarily within the domain of the Board of Trustees. I have reference to the proposal to decrease the size of the Board's Executive Committee and to redefine its powers; and the proposal to reduce the number of the Board's standing committees. Concerning such proposals the Policy Committee has no resolutions to offer; believing that they
would be as inappropriate as Trustee resolutions concerning the committee organization of this Faculty.

The Policy Committee also discovered during its consideration of the proposed By-laws and the proposed correlative Trustee legislation, that many of the changes contemplated involve no more than a substitution of Trustee legislation for certain parts of the existing By-laws. For example, while it is proposed that Art. XXVI of the present By-laws, establishing and defining the powers of the Library Board, shall be omitted from the new By-laws, it is also proposed that the text of the present Library Board By-Law be enacted as Trustee legislation, and thus kept in force. Again, while it is proposed to omit from the new By-Laws Art. XXX of the existing By-Laws on the Board of Physical Education and Athletics, which article includes the important provision that control over eligibility and leaves of absence to participate in athletic contests shall reside in a subcommittee of five to include the three faculty members of the board, it is also proposed that the text of the present By-Law on the Board of Physical Education and Athletics, be enacted as Trustee legislation, and so kept in force. Similar transfer is proposed for present Art. XXII on the Summer Session; Art. XXIII on the University Press; Art. XXVII on the Administrative Board for the School of Education; Art. XXVIII on the Administrative Board for the School of Nutrition; Art. XXIX on the Board of Governors of Willard Straight Hall; and Art. XXXII on the Board on Student Health and Hygiene.

In one important instance, it is proposed to divide the present By-Law between the new By-Laws and Trustee legislation. I have reference here to sec. 4 of Art. XX dealing with the dismissal of Faculty members. The provision in which the Trustees reserve the right to dismiss a Faculty member for cause, and the provision that a member of the Faculty charged with an offense shall be entitled to reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard, are retained in the draft of the proposed new By-laws. On the other hand, the detailed statement of procedures to be followed, adopted a few years ago, are included in their entirety in the proposed Trustee legislation.

Whether the proposed transfer from the By-Laws to Trustee legislation of so much material of considerable importance to the Faculty is entirely acceptable from the Faculty point of view may, of course, be considered debatable. Under the proposed By-Laws, as under the existing By-Laws, the concurring votes of 18 Trustees are prerequisite to an amendment; and the Board must have been notified of the proposed amendment at least five days before the meeting. Trustee legislation, on the other hand, can be amended or repealed by a majority vote of a quorum of the Board, which is set at 15 in the proposed By-Laws as in the present By-Laws. In other words there is some basis for the fear that the foundations of institutions, such as the Library Board, will become too unstable, if they rest on Trustee legislation rather than on the By-Laws themselves. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the present By-Laws include much detail which really does not belong in such a document;
and that there may well be occasions when the Faculty will find facility of amendment to be to its own advantage. It should be noted too that it is proposed to carry over into the new By-Laws the provisions which are of the most fundamental importance to the Faculty. Thus it is intended to retain in the new By-Laws the provision for the control of the separate faculties over the curricula of their several colleges and schools. Likewise the right of any of the faculties to present its views on any question directly to the Board of Trustees through a Faculty committee appointed by it to confer with a Trustee committee. For these reasons, the Policy Committee doubts that the Faculty should object to such transfers of By-Law material to Trustee legislation as have been proposed.

Some proposals have been made, however, which the Policy Committee believes are objectionable from the Faculty viewpoint; and in the judgment of the committee there are more proposals in this group than can practically be dealt with at a single Faculty meeting. In view of these facts, it occurred to the Policy Committee that it might come to the Faculty today with but one recommendation; viz., that the Faculty request the Board of Trustees to give it further time in which to study the By-Law amendment proposals. For the following reasons, however, the Policy Committee concluded that such a recommendation would be inadvisable. The proposed By-Law revisions and the proposed correlative Trustee legislation are on the agenda for the June meeting of the Board; and it is conceivable that the Board might act on the proposed By-Laws and legislation at that meeting. Whether the Board will act so promptly cannot, of course, be predicted. But in view of the possibility that it might, the Policy Committee believes that the Board should have before it at that meeting expressions of Faculty opinion on three points which in the judgment of the committee are of special importance to the Faculty.

The first of these has to do with control over student conduct and extra-curricular student activities other than intercollegiate athletics. More than 50 years ago, i. e. in 1901, the Board of Trustees expressly entrusted disciplinary jurisdiction over the students of the University to the University Faculty. Although I have not had time to ascertain definitely in whose hands such jurisdiction lay prior to 1901, I believe that even then it was in faculty as distinguished from administration; i. e., either in a body known as the General Faculty, or in the separate faculties. In short, it is clear that disciplinary jurisdiction has been in Faculty hands for at least 53 years; and I believe that it has been in Faculty hands for a much longer period.

In the present University By-Laws the following provision is found in sec. 3(a) of Art. XIV:

"and it (meaning the University Faculty) shall have disciplinary jurisdiction over the students of the University except for unsatisfactory work"
It is proposed by the Trustees' special committee on the Revision of the By-Laws to delete this passage; and to enact as sec. 1 of Art. VI of the new By-Laws the following statement:

"The President shall be responsible for the proper regulation of student conduct and the extra-curricular activities of students. He may delegate authority in these matters to such faculty committees as he may determine."

In brief, the Trustee committee proposes that the jurisdiction over student activities and conduct, which the University Faculty has been exercising through its Committees on Student Activities and Conduct, be transferred from the Faculty to the President.

At its meeting with the President on May 30, the Policy Committee asked the President why the Trustee committee deemed it advisable to make such a proposal. He replied that the Trustee committee was influenced by the dissatisfaction among alumni and trustees with the social atmosphere at Cornell. The President also stated that the Trustees objected to the fact that under the existing By-Laws, there was no single person whom they could hold responsible for student activities and conduct. The Policy Committee admits, of course, that the social atmosphere at Cornell is not all that it might be; and that under the existing By-Laws, there is no single person whom the Trustees can hold responsible for the activities and conduct of Cornell students. There remains, nevertheless, an important question: Is the transfer from the Faculty to the President of jurisdiction over student activities and conduct and the concentration of responsibility achieved thereby, the best way to improve the social atmosphere at Cornell?

The Policy Committee believes that the way proposed by the Trustee committee is not the best. It will be noted that the Trustee committee proposes to make the President responsible for the proper regulation of student conduct and extra-curricular activities; and that it would be unthinkable to charge him with this responsibility unless he were given correlative authority and power over student activities and conduct. While the proposed By-Law does not include a grant of such authority and power in express words, the intent to make such a grant is clear. This interpretation is supported by the provision:

"He may delegate authority in these matters to such faculty committees as he may determine."

If the President were not given the authority by the sentence charging him with responsibility, he would have no authority to delegate.

As no restrictions whatever are imposed on the authority and power over student activities and conduct which it is proposed
to confer on the President, such grant of authority and power would have the following consequences, even if the President, pursuant to his authority to delegate power to Faculty committees, reconstituted the present Committees on Student Activities and Conduct as administrative boards: The President could

1. Promulgate regulations governing student activities and conduct, even if the faculty boards deemed such regulations inadvisable.

2. He could refuse recognition to a student organization even if the Board on Student Activities believed that it should be recognized.

3. He could modify or reverse a decision of the Board on Student Conduct.

4. He could suspend or expel a student charged with misconduct even though the student had not had a hearing before the Board on Student Conduct, provided the President himself had given the student a hearing.

5. He could modify or abolish the charters of the existing student self-government bodies such as the Women's Self-Government Association, the Interfraternity Council, and the Men's Judiciary Board.

In the judgment of the Policy Committee this concentration of power in the hands of the President is inadvisable. It should be definitely understood that the Policy Committee's objection to this concentration of power is not lodged ad hominem. The Policy Committee believes that it would be unwise to confer such sweeping authority on any President which Cornell might have; and that any university which has conferred such power on its presidents has taken injudicious action. It is true that some universities have done this. Just how many the Policy Committee does not know. And the Policy Committee has not been much interested in the statistics on the point; for it believes that such a concentration of power over students in the hands of a single man should not exist at Cornell, even if it existed at every university in the country. When a single man disposes of serious misconduct cases involving possible suspension or expulsion, it is inevitable that the student's fate will sometimes be determined by the individual reaction of the particular man to the nature of the student's offense. The Policy Committee believes that a decision resulting from the interplay of the points of view of a group of persons will normally be preferable to a decision reached by one individual. In the judgment of the committee, this point has added force when the individual with the power of disposition has the executive rather than the judicial temperament; and it scarcely can be doubted that the executive rather than the judicial temperament prevails among university presidents, taken as a group.
I have spoken of the proposed powers of the President as absolute. This statement requires qualification to this extent. Since the President is made responsible to the Board, it would probably enforce this responsibility in part by modifying an erroneous decision if he made one. But it seems probable that very few cases would actually be reviewed by the Trustees; and that there would be some cases needing review which would never come to their attention.

If the existing Faculty Committees on Student Activities and Student Conduct had been falling down on the job, there might be some shadow of justification for the radical proposal made by the Trustees' committee. But in the judgment of the Policy Committee, the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct have always done good work and are currently doing good work. It is true, as previously admitted, that the social atmosphere at Cornell leaves something to be desired; but the committees have been working steadily toward the improvement of this atmosphere and are making progress. The committees have always believed that rehabilitation rather than punishment was their principal function; and proceeding on this basis have been notably successful in their handling of individual offenders. It is only rarely that a student needs to be called before a committee a second time. That the Ithaca community is not on the whole dissatisfied with the Faculty committees is shown by the fact that the local authorities are in most instances content to leave student offenders in the hands of the Faculty committees. And in recent years, notable progress has been made toward securing active and effective student cooperation in the betterment of student conduct and social conditions. The establishment and two years' successful operation of the Men's Judiciary Board affords an important example. The revision of the constitution of the Interfraternity Council, and the increasing willingness of that body to fulfill its responsibility with respect to the conduct of its constituent members affords another. The Faculty Committees on Student Activities and Student Conduct do not, of course, take sole credit for this progress, credit for which must be shared with the office of the Dean of Men and Dean of Women and with the Proctor, with which and with whom the Faculty committees always work in close cooperation.

It should be noted that thus far the student body's reaction to the proposed shift and concentration of power has not been sought. It is quite conceivable that this reaction might be adverse, and that the movement toward cooperation between students, administration, and faculty in the solution of common problems might be seriously impeded.

During its conference with the President, the Policy Committee gathered that the President himself doubts the advisability of carrying through the proposal of the Trustees' Committee without modification. It is conceivable that the President feels that he is already so heavily loaded with responsibilities and powers that it would be unwise for him to assume more. It is possible also that he might realize that if he had the power
to modify decisions in student conduct cases, he would, as an individual, be under constant pressure from many quarters. It may also have occurred to him that it might be difficult to find members of the Faculty who would be willing to serve on the Student Activities and Conduct Boards, with the knowledge that their judicial, legislative, and policy decisions were amendable or reversible by the President.

But whatever his reasons may be, the President suggests that if the By-Law changes proposed by the Trustees' committee are adopted, he should be empowered in his Plan for the Organization of the University to make a delegation of legislative and judicial powers to the Boards or Committees on Student Activities and Conduct which he should not have the power to revoke, and which would be revocable only by the Trustees. If this proposal of the President were adopted by the Board in conjunction with the proposals of the Trustees' committee, the net effect would be substantially this: that while the Boards or Committees on Student Activities and Conduct would be the President's administrative bodies, instead of the Faculty's committees, as they now are, these presidential boards or committees would have the same legislative, judicial, and policy powers which the Faculty committees now possess.

When the President was asked by the Policy Committee whether it would be worthwhile to have the By-Laws amended so as to shift the power to him, when he would contemporaneously request that it be transferred back to the Faculty through a Plan of Organization to be drawn by him and adopted by the Board, the President replied in substance that one change of importance to him would be accomplished by these maneuvers. Inasmuch as the President personally receives many of the complaints in regard to the activities and conduct of Cornell students, he believes that he should have the right to consult with the Committee on Student Activities and Conduct or with their chairmen about these complaints. As a matter of fact, the President has, from his assumption of office until now, discussed policy, and even particular cases, with the chairmen of the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct, and occasionally with individual members of these committees. The President feels, however, that under the existing By-Laws, these consultations are accorded by the Faculty committees as a matter of grace, whereas he believes that his right of consultation should be founded upon the By-Laws. He seems to feel, furthermore, that if his right of consultation were so grounded, he could exercise it more effectively than under present conditions, despite the fact that he would still not have the power to reverse or even modify the legislative and judicial decisions of his activities and conduct boards.

Inasmuch as the Policy Committee does not entirely concur in the President's opinion that he needs a By-Law foundation for his right to consult with the Committee on Student Activities and Conduct; because the Policy Committee believes that problems of student activities and conduct lie in the educational area, which is, in general, the Faculty's domain; and because the Policy
Committee believes that it would be unwise to adopt any By-Law which curtailed, even to a small degree, the Faculty's jurisdiction in the educational area, the Policy Committee would prefer the maintenance of the status quo. However, because it seems so likely, in view of the drastic nature of the proposal made by the Trustees' committee, that the full Board may feel impelled to take action of some sort in the area of student affairs, either at the June meeting or later, the Policy Committee is disposed to go along with the President's proposal; and will, therefore, recommend the adoption by this Faculty of a resolution which, while expressing a preference for the status quo, also expresses disapproval of the proposal of the Trustees' committee unless modified as suggested by the President. This resolution appears on the first page of the compilation in your hands.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, I move the adoption of the following resolution:

(The Dean then read the resolution.)

The second of the three important points which the Policy Committee wishes to call to your attention this afternoon has to do with the status of the Dean of the University Faculty. The existing By-Law provision with respect to him is found as sec. 2 of Art. XVI dealing with deans and directors and reads as follows:

(See the second page of the compilation.)

The Trustees' committee proposes to transfer this section to Art. XIII of the proposed By-Laws; to number it as sec. 3; and to amend it so as to read as follows:

(See the second page of the compilation.)

The changes proposed are minor:

1. Express provisions that the Dean of the University Faculty shall be elected by the Board of Trustees and shall hold office at its pleasure are substituted for implications to that effect.

2. The provision that the dean shall conduct meetings of this Faculty in the absence of the President is eliminated.

The Policy Committee approves both of these changes; the first because it clearly expresses what is already understood; and the second because the dean of the faculty finds it necessary to take the floor on so many occasions that he finds it inconvenient to serve in the chair. The meetings can be run more smoothly if the Provost, or one of the Vice President presides in the absence of the President.

The President proposes (see the second page of the compilation). The Policy Committee approves this proposal, because it is in con-
formity with satisfactory existing practice.

The President also proposes that his Plan for Organization of the University shall include the following provisions:

(See the second page of the compilation.)

The Policy Committee approves this proposal as well because as a liaison link between the President and the Faculty, it is only proper that the Dean should report to the President as well as to the Faculty. Since it has become customary for the Dean of the Faculty to perform certain minor duties for the President, such as answering inquiries concerning the status, powers and organization of the faculties at Cornell, the Policy Committee sees no objection to the inclusion of the statement that the dean shall have such duties as may be assigned by the President, in view of the fact that the statement concludes with a phrase making it clear that the dean is responsible to the University Faculty, and in view of the further fact that this phrase would prevent the President from assigning any duties to the dean which were incompatible with the discharge of his responsibility to the University Faculty.

Therefore, on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, I move the adoption of the resolution appearing on the second page of the compilation in your hands. As I have already read it part by part, I shall not take time to read it in its entirety, unless requested to do so.

The third point to which the Policy Committee wished to call your attention has to do with the functions of the deans, directors, and heads of separate departments. In sec. 4 of Art. XVI of the present By-Laws, it is provided that the deans, directors, and heads of independent departments, except the Dean of the Graduate School, shall recommend to the President persons for appointment as academic and non-academic staff. The new By-Law draft proposed by the Trustee committee omits this provision. Inasmuch as the Policy Committee believes that such omission would be unwise, I therefore, on behalf of that committee, move the adoption of the following resolution:

(The Dean then read the resolution.)

It is, of course, possible that the Trustees may not concur in all of the resolutions passed by the Faculty today. In view of that possibility, and of the desirability of an exchange of views between the Trustees and the Faculty in the event of disagreement, the Committee on University Policy has requested me to present the following resolution on its behalf:

(The Dean then read the resolution.)
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of June 8 were read and approved.

The President announced the deaths of Henry Sylvester Jacoby, Professor of Bridge Engineering, Emeritus, on August 1, 1955; James Batchelor Sumner, Professor of Biochemistry, Emeritus, on August 12, 1955; and Dennie Hammond Udall, Professor of Veterinary Medicine, Emeritus, on September 9, 1955. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleagues.

The Dean reported that communications had been received from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Madison Bentley: H. S. Liddell, R. M. Ogden, T. A. Ryan, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Henry Sylvester Jacoby: J. E. Perry, C. L. Walker, Carl Crandall, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning James Batcheller Sumner: C. M. McCay, J. M. Sherman, W. L. Nelson, Chairman.

To a special committee to write a memorial article concerning Dennie Hammond Udall: A. G. Danks, S. J. Roberts, M. G. Fincher, Chairman.

The Dean read the following communication dated June 16, 1955 which had been received from the President announcing the actions taken by the Board of Trustees at its meetings of June 12 and 13, 1955 with respect to recommendations of this Faculty then pending before the Board.
"The Board of Trustees meeting in Ithaca on June 12 and 13, took the following action of concern to the University Faculty:

(1) Approved Spring Day, in May, 1956.

(2) It confirmed the action of the Faculty in its proposal to deny recognition in the future to organizations, other than religious, which have discrimination provisions, excepting of course those already sanctioned on the campus.

(3) It voted to seek legislation amending the Charter of the University to increase the number of Trustees by four, thus giving regular status to the Faculty Representatives, who would then be elected by the Board from nominations of the Faculty.

(4) It voted to adopt, effective at once, the new By-Laws as recommended by the Board's Committee on By-Law Revision, and as further modified by the suggestions of the Faculty Committee on University Policy."

Commenting upon the By-Law Revision, and pointing out that he spoke as President and not for the Board of Trustees, the President said that the revision was made in response to a long-felt need which had been called to his attention by the Trustees even before he assumed the presidency. As examples of defects in the former By-Laws, the President cited the mingling of operational directions with enabling provisions; conflicts of authority in many areas, and the need for an overhauling of the Board's own organization and procedures.

On the question as to why the By-Laws were passed in such a hurry, the President said that he had not realized that the Faculty would consider the action hasty. Revision of the By-Laws had been under consideration for six years, and for two years a committee of the Board, which included Faculty representation, had been
actively at work on it. He said that he believed the Board expected some protest from the Faculty, but believed that Faculty protest and its point of view had been ably and persuasively represented by the committee member on the By-Law Committee and by Faculty Representatives on the Board of Trustees.

The President noted that at the June meeting, the Board was disposed to take definite action on the question of voting Faculty Trustees, and that there seemed to be a general inclination to get the whole job done. The President thought he might possibly have prevented action on the By-Laws at the June meeting, but he believed that if the proposed revision were presented as a package, on which the Trustees might vote at once, the right of Faculty Representatives on the Board of Trustees to vote might have better likelihood of carrying.

The President thought that communications were not what they should have been, and for this he assumed responsibility. He expressed regret that he had not been at the June meeting of the Faculty, because of his required presence at the Medical College commencement.

The President pointed out that to meet any possible ill effects of haste in passing the revised By-Laws, the Board of Trustees has continued its By-Law Committee for one year.

With regard to the change in By-Laws which places responsibility "for the proper regulation of student conduct and the extracurricular activities of students" on the President, with the provision that "he may delegate authority in these matters to such
faculty committees or student committees as he may determine", the President said that this action had apparently been contemplated by the Trustees for several years as it had been discussed with considerable vigor before he came to Cornell. The President noted that the management experts were not responsible for it, pointing out that while they read the proposed By-Laws toward the end of May, and made a few suggestions, none of them were in areas affecting the Faculty. The President thinks the action of the Board was wise, as it removes old conflicts in the By-Laws and gives him the legal right to counsel in important areas of student affairs, as he has been doing all along, but without legal authority. The President believes the net result, therefore, will be no change in procedure. He pointed out that he has delegated authority in these areas completely; that the committees on Student Conduct and Student Activities are operating with the same personnel and exactly the same responsibilities as before; and that he has retained no power to dictate or to change committee policies. The President said that he will be exercising no more authority in these areas than previously. He added that this delegation of authority is part of the President's Plan of Organization, and therefore it cannot be revoked without Trustee action. The President concluded by stating that he is sure that if members of the Faculty have complaints of failure of the new By-Laws to work satisfactorily in any area, they would be given opportunity to present these to the Board of Trustees.

The President then commented on the Faculty's request to the Administration, embodied in a motion made at the meeting of
May 11, 1955, that the rule barring Ithaca women students from fall term residence in sororities and University dormitories be rescinded. He noted that he had consulted with the Dean of Women and the Registrar, and had learned that although the decision had apparently been sound from the fiscal standpoint, it was extremely difficult to administer equitably, and that it would therefore be rescinded beginning with the year 1956-57.

There being no unfinished business, the President called for reports of committees.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its chairman, the Dean, presented the joint report and recommendations of the Special Committee of the University Faculty Appointed to Consult with the Special Committee of the Board of Trustees in regard to the Recommendation of the Faculty that its Representatives in the Board be Constituted Faculty Trustees with Full Powers as Trustees of the University, the Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees, and the Committee on University Policy in regard to the By-Law amendments adopted and actions taken by the Board of Trustees on June 13, 1955 affecting the status of the faculty representatives in the Board of Trustees and looking toward the creation of voting Faculty Trustees.

This joint report, dated September 15, 1955, was distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and a copy thereof is appended to the minutes.

After summarizing the report, the Dean, as chairman of the Committee on University Policy, moved on behalf of the reporting committees, that the Faculty adopt the following resolution:
Whereas the University Faculty concurs in the statement made by President Jacob Gould Schurman in 1912: viz., "What is needed in American Universities today is a new application of the principles of representative government"; and

Whereas the decision of the Board of Trustees on June 13, 1955 to seek an amendment to the University Charter providing for the election by the Board of three Faculty Trustees from nominees submitted by the University Faculty at Ithaca and one Faculty Trustee from nominees submitted by the Medical Faculty in New York is a significant step toward the fulfillment of the need referred to by President Schurman,

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty request the President to express to the Board of Trustees the Faculty's appreciation of this decision of the Board; and

Be It Further Resolved that the University Faculty request the President to transmit to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees the following recommendations:

1. That the number of nominees to be submitted by the Faculty when a vacancy in the office of Faculty Trustee has occurred or is impending be fixed at three.

2. That there be included in the amendment to the University Charter to be sought by the Board a provision authorizing it to elect as Trustees the Faculty Representatives whose terms as such expire December 31, 1956, December 31, 1958 and December 31, 1960 for terms as Trustees expiring on these dates;

3. That the Board elect such Faculty Representatives as Trustees for such terms if such legislation is enacted; and

4. That the special Faculty Committee (Professors R. E. Cushman, H. F. DeGraff, and W. H. Farnham) appointed in April, 1952 to consult with the Trustees concerning the Faculty's request that provision be made for voting Faculty Trustees, be allowed to confer with the Trustee By-Law Revision Committee in the event that discussion of these recommendations should appear desirable.
The motion to adopt the resolution was duly seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Joint Report and Recommendations of

The Special Committee of the University Faculty Appointed to Consult with the Special Committee of the Board of Trustees in regard to the Recommendation of the Faculty that its Representatives in the Board be Constituted Faculty Trustees with Full Powers as Trustees of the University;

The Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees; and

The Committee on University Policy

In Regard To

The By-Law Amendments Adopted and Actions Taken by the Board of Trustees on June 13, 1955 Affecting the Status of the Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees and Looking Toward the Creation of Voting Faculty Trustees.

To be Presented at the Meeting of the University Faculty to be Held September 28, 1955.

The Special Faculty Committee
R. E. Cushman, H. F. DeGraff, W. H. Farnham

Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees
R. E. Cushman, J. W. MacDonald, L. P. Smith

Committee on University Policy
H. W. Briggs T. W. Mackesey
R. E. Cushman J. R. Moynihan
H. F. DeGraff L. P. Smith
J. W. MacDonald W. A. Wimsatt

W. H. Farnham, Chairman

*M. F. Neufeld, a member of the Committee, but now on leave, participated in the preparation of this report.*
I. Historical Background

In 1916 the Board of Trustees, in response to the Faculty's request for voting representation in the Board, authorized the Faculty to select delegates to represent it in the Board, which delegates should meet with the Trustee Committee on General Administration, and have the usual powers of Trustees except the right to vote. In 1920, 1921, and 1933 the Faculty renewed its request for voting representation. In 1934 the Board voted to inform the Faculty that the Board found itself in full agreement with the principle that the Faculty Representatives should have the right to vote; that provision for this right would require amendment of the University Charter; that it was not a suitable time to seek such an amendment; but that the Board was disposed, when a favorable occasion arose, to try to secure the required amendment to the charter.

In December, 1951 the Faculty adopted two resolutions:

1. That the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Faculty Representatives be constituted Faculty Trustees with full powers as Trustees of the University; and

2. That the Faculty suggest to the Board of Trustees the desirability of an amendment to the By-Laws of the University to permit a distribution of committee assignments so that a Faculty Representative might sit on each of the principal committees of the Board.

In January, 1952, the Board appointed a special committee of three to consider the Faculty's recommendation and suggestion. In April, 1952, the President, pursuant to the Faculty's request, appointed a special Faculty committee of three to consult with the special committee of the Board.

At this time the text of the University By-Law (Art. II, sec. 10) with respect to Faculty Representatives in the Board read as follows:

"The University Faculty is authorized and invited to select from the Faculty four representatives who shall represent it at meetings of the trustees. Three of these representatives and their successors may be selected by the University Faculty, exclusive of the Medical College at New York. They shall be chosen by ballot for such terms as shall be fixed by said Faculty. One representative and his successor may be selected by ballot by the Faculty of the Medical College at New York for such term as shall be fixed by that Faculty. These Faculty Representatives shall have the right to meet with the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee, and at these meetings shall enjoy the privileges of Trustees, except the right to vote."

At a meeting held in April, 1953, it was agreed by the Faculty conferees as well as by the Trustee conferees that since no class of Trustees is under the By-Laws guaranteed representation on any Trustee Committee, the Faculty was seeking preferential treatment for its Faculty Representatives when it requested on the one hand that they be given full Trustee status, and on the other, that a Faculty Trustee sit on each principal Board committee, if Faculty Trustees should ultimately be provided for. At this same meeting the Trustee conferees expressed a wish to know how large a proportion of the Faculty believed that provision for Faculty Trustees with full powers was advisable.
The Faculty conference committee rendered its first report to the Faculty at its May, 1953 meeting. That report, which was concurred in by the Committee on University Policy, of which the Faculty Representatives are ex officio members, included (1) a recommendation that the Faculty withdraw its suggestion that it would be desirable to amend the By-Laws so as to provide a seat for a Faculty Representative on each of the principal committees of the Board; and (2) a recommendation that each member of the Faculty be furnished with a copy of the committee's report, together with a ballot on which he might indicate whether or not he believed that the Faculty Representatives in the Board should be accorded full Trustee status including the power to vote. The Faculty adopted both recommendations without audible dissent.

Although the ballot forms furnished to the Faculty contained an announcement of the Faculty's withdrawal of its request for representation on each of the principal Trustee committees, and although the Faculty conference committee report, which accompanied each ballot form, emphasized the fact that the Faculty could not count on representation on any Board committee, if Faculty Trustees with full powers were substituted for the Faculty Representatives, the vote in support of the request for the creation of Faculty Trustees was overwhelming. More specifically, as reported to the Faculty in September, 1953, of the 910 members of the Faculty who were both eligible and able to vote, 643 or 71% voted. Of the votes cast, 611 were in favor of the Faculty's request, and 32 were opposed. In short, the ratio of affirmative to negative votes was 19 to 1.

At a meeting of the Faculty conferees with the Trustee conferees held in March, 1954 and attended by some of the members of the special Trustee committee on the amendment of the By-Laws, the question was raised as to how Faculty Trustees should be elected, if provision were made for them. The Faculty conferees suggested that they be elected by the Faculty, pointing to the analogy afforded by the section of the University Charter governing the election of Alumni Trustees. The Trustee conferees, on the other hand, suggested that Faculty trustees, if provided for, should be elected by the Board from a list of nominees chosen by Faculty ballot and submitted to the Trustees. The Trustees argued that no body of persons with a specialized interest such as education should be entitled to elect Trustees. They distinguished the alumni from the Faculty on the ground that the alumni had interests as diverse and numerous as those possessed by the general public. Although the Faculty conferees recognized that this argument had a certain force, they informed the Trustee conferees that while the Faculty's request for voting Faculty Trustees had not specified that they were to be elected by the Faculty, a provision for their election by the Trustees from nominees put forward by the Faculty might not be satisfactory to the Faculty, and that it would be advisable to ascertain the Faculty's opinion on this point before an amendment of the charter to provide for Faculty Trustees was sought from the Legislature. Inasmuch as it then seemed quite unlikely that the Trustees would vote to ask for such an amendment, even though it provided for the election of the Faculty Trustees in the manner suggested by the Trustee conferees, the Faculty conferees concurred in the suggestion of the chairman of the Trustee conferees that it would be inadvisable to raise the matter of the method of election with the Faculty until the position of the Board had become more fully clarified.
II. Recent Developments

After discussing at several meetings the Faculty’s request for voting Faculty Trustees, and after noting the memorandum of arguments for and against voting Faculty Trustees prepared by the President at the request of the Chairman of the Board, the Board on June 13, 1955

1. Decided by a unanimous vote that if an amendment to the charter providing for voting Faculty Trustees were to be sought by the Board, the amendment should provide for their election by the Board from a group nominated by the Faculty.

2. Decided by a divided vote to seek such an amendment.

3. Amended Art. II, sec. 10 of the old By-Laws quoted above to read (see Art. II, sec. 9 of the new By-Laws)

9. "Faculty Representatives and Special Representatives:
The University Faculty is authorized and invited to select from the Faculty four representatives who shall represent it at meetings of the trustees. Three of these representatives and their successors may be selected by the University Faculty, exclusive of the Medical College at New York. They shall be chosen by ballot for such terms as shall be fixed by said Faculty. One representative and his successor may be selected by ballot by the Faculty of the Medical College at New York for such term as shall be fixed by that Faculty. These Faculty Representatives shall have the right to meet with the Board of Trustees, and at these meetings shall enjoy the privileges of trustees, except the right to vote.

The Faculty Representatives shall have the right to attend meetings of the Executive Committee on such rotational basis as the Committee may prescribe, provided that one such Representative is invited to attend each meeting of the Executive Committee. When attending meetings of the Executive Committee, Faculty Representatives shall have all the rights and privileges of Trustees except the right to vote."

The situation with respect to Faculty representation in the Board and the Board's standing committees may, therefore, be summarized as follows:

1. Present situation: While the Faculty still has four non-voting Faculty Representatives on the Board of Trustees, the number entitled to sit with the Executive Committee of the Board has been reduced from four to one.

2. If the charter amendment which the Trustees have voted to request is granted by the Legislature: The Faculty will have four voting Trustees on the Board, each one of whom will be eligible for election or appointment to any committee of the Board. There will, however, be nothing in the charter or in the By-Laws guaranteeing Faculty representation on any Trustee committee.
III. Recommendations and Reasons Therefor:

For the following reasons the special Faculty committee to confer with the special Trustee committee in regard to the Faculty's request for voting Faculty Trustees, and the Committee on University Policy, of which the Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees are ex officio members, believe that it would be advisable for the Faculty to communicate to the Trustees an expression of the Faculty's appreciation of the decision of the Board to seek an amendment to the charter providing for voting Faculty Trustees, even though no Faculty representation on any Trustee committee is guaranteed and even though they are to be elected by the Trustees from nominees chosen by the Faculty,

1. The Faculty in 1953, by a vote of 19 to 1, made it clear that it wanted voting Faculty Trustees, even if it meant that the Faculty Trustees would be on no better footing than the rest of the Trustees with respect to election or appointment to Trustee committees.

2. The considerations which presumably influenced the Faculty vote at that time are still valid:

   a. The calibre of the Faculty Trustees would be such that their chances of election or appointment to Trustee committees in proportionate numbers would be good.

   b. In view of the desire which the Trustees have shown in the past to have Faculty opinion expressed at committee meetings as well as at Board meetings, it is not unreasonable to hope that the Trustees will see to it that the Faculty Trustees, if provided for, will have a proportionate share of committee places.

   c. While the Faculty might be glad to have a guaranteed place for one of its members on the Executive Committee of the Board, the Faculty cannot in equity insist on such a place while at the same time asking that its representatives be put on the same footing as other Trustees by giving them the vote. Of the two roles, non-voting consultant to Trustee committees and to the full Board on the one hand, and voting membership in the full Board with the possibility of voting membership on Trustee committees, the latter appears to be the more desirable and significant from the standpoint of the Faculty.

3. While it is more than likely that if the Faculty were in a position to choose between electing the Faculty Trustees and selecting nominees from whom the Trustees would elect them, the Faculty would choose the former alternative, and while some members of the Faculty may believe that the distinction attempted by the Trustee conferees between Alumni Trustees and Faculty Trustees is not entirely valid, acquiescence by the Faculty in the mode of election prescribed by the Trustees seems advisable for the following reasons:
a. In view of the unanimous Trustee vote against election of Faculty Trustees by the Faculty, it seems most unlikely that the Faculty can expect to persuade the Trustees in the foreseeable future to approve the election of Faculty Trustees in that manner. Voting Faculty Trustees, even though elected in the manner prescribed by the Trustees, are better than no voting Faculty Trustees at all.

b. The President has tentatively suggested that whenever a vacancy in the office of Faculty Trustee impends, the Faculty should nominate three candidates for the position. If the Trustees and the Faculty should accept this suggestion, it seems certain that all three nominees would be of such high calibre that the exercise by the Trustees of their power of election could not prejudice the Faculty to any appreciable degree.

c. While it is probable that the Board would reverse its decision to seek an amendment of the charter if the Faculty should object to the election of Faculty Trustees by the Board from Faculty nominees rather than by the Faculty, there appears to be little reason for assuming that such action would be accompanied by a restoration of the arrangement in force until June, 1955 under which the four non-voting Faculty Representatives sat with the Executive Committee, as well as with the full Board. It was apparently the intention of the Board to reduce not only the number of non-Faculty members of the Executive Committee, but also the number of Faculty Representatives sitting with that committee, even though no decision were made to seek a change in the charter authorizing Faculty Trustees.

4. Even if it be granted for the sake of argument that the creation of voting Faculty Trustees under the conditions set by the Board involves risk of disadvantage to the Cornell Faculty, the Faculty might be well advised to run the risk in view of the possibility that the example set by Cornell in arranging for voting Faculty Trustees might eventually be widely followed, and might ultimately lead to the adoption of a new general pattern of university government in the United States under which a significant fraction of the trustees of every institution would be chosen from its Faculty. If such a trend did develop in the field of university government, the Cornell Faculty could look forward with confidence to the eventual elimination of such features of the Trustees' present proposal as seem undesirable.

5. In sum, this is one of the instances in which half (perhaps three-quarters) of a loaf is better than none.

It is true, of course, that if the Faculty were required to put forward an unreasonably large number of nominees whenever a vacancy in a Faculty Trusteeship were imminent, the mode of election decided upon by the Trustees would be definitely undesirable from the Faculty's standpoint. It would seem advisable, therefore, for the Faculty to recommend
to the Trustees that the number of nominees to be submitted for any single vacancy be fixed at three in conformity with the informal suggestion made by the President, and referred to above. If this recommendation were adopted, the Faculty might well consider the advisability of providing places of honor and responsibility for the two candidates not selected by the Board by increasing the size of the Policy Committee, and by enacting that any Faculty member nominated for the office of Faculty Trustee automatically becomes a member of the Policy Committee. In the opinion of some members of the Faculty, this committee as at present constituted is too small in view of the importance and number of questions which come before it, of the numerous sub-committees on which the committee members are called upon to serve from time to time, and of the frequent but unavoidable absences of some of its members from committee meetings because of other University business. An increase in the size of the Policy Committee at this time would, therefore, serve more than one important purpose.

It would be most unfortunate, of course, if the amendment to the charter should be in such form as to prevent the Faculty Representatives now in office and the Faculty Representative to be elected this fall from completing their normal terms of service. It seems clear at any rate that neither the Trustees nor the Faculty would wish to be deprived prematurely of the services of Professors L. P. Smith and R. E. Cushman, whose terms expire Dec. 31, 1956 and 1958 respectively; and it would seem somewhat abrupt to put the Representative elected this fall out of office within his first year. Moreover, a Faculty election to choose simultaneously three nominees for each of three Faculty Trusteeships - nine nominees in all - would have certain obviously undesirable aspects, particularly if two of the three Faculty Trustees were up for election for terms shorter than the normal five-year period. And to choose three Faculty Trustees for five-year terms beginning and ending concurrently would create a situation in which for a considerable period all of the Faculty Trustees would be without previous experience. A recommendation to the Trustees that the charter amendment be so formulated as to constitute these three Faculty Representatives voting Faculty Trustees for periods equal to their unexpired terms as Faculty Representatives would therefore appear to be in order.

In view of the foregoing considerations, a motion will be made by the chairman of the Committee on University Policy on behalf of the reporting committees at the meeting of the Faculty to be held on September 28, 1955 that the Faculty adopt the following resolution:

Whereas the University Faculty concurs in the statement made by President Jacob Gould Schurman in 1912: viz., "What is needed in American Universities today is a new application of the principles of representative government"; and

Whereas the decision of the Board of Trustees on June 13, 1955 to seek an amendment to the University Charter providing for the election by the Board of three Faculty Trustees from nominees submitted by the University Faculty at Ithaca and one Faculty Trustee from nominees submitted by the Medical Faculty in New York is a significant step toward the fulfillment of the need referred to by President Schurman,
Be It Resolved that the University Faculty request the President to express to the Board of Trustees the Faculty's appreciation of this decision of the Board; and

Be It Further Resolved that the University Faculty request the President to transmit to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees the following recommendations:

1. That the number of nominees to be submitted by the Faculty when a vacancy in the office of Faculty Trustee has occurred or is impending be fixed at three.

2. That there be included in the amendment to the University Charter to be sought by the Board a provision authorizing it to elect as Trustees the Faculty Representatives whose terms as such expire December 31, 1956, December 31, 1958 and December 31, 1960 for terms as Trustees expiring on these dates;

3. That the Board elect such Faculty Representatives as Trustees for such terms if such legislation is enacted; and

4. That the special Faculty Committee (Professors R. E. Cushman, H. F. DeGraff, and W. H. Farnham) appointed in April, 1952 to consult with the Trustees concerning the Faculty's request that provision be made for voting Faculty Trustees, be allowed to confer with the Trustee By-Law Revision Committee in the event that discussion of these recommendations should appear desirable.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 P.M.

The minutes of the meeting of September 28 were read and approved.

The Dean reported that communications had been received from the President announcing the following committee appointments:

To the Committee on University Policy for the academic year 1955-56 to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of M.F. Neufeld, H.W. Briggs.

To the Committee on Nominations for the first term of the academic year 1955-56 to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of M.A. Rollins, H.I. Patterson.

To the Committee on University Lectures, M.S. Kendrick to be chairman and W.R. Sears to be a member for terms expiring October 31, 1959; and Friedrich Solmsen for a term expiring October 31, 1960, during the first year of which he will be filling the temporary vacancy caused by the absence on leave of W.R. Keast.

To the Committee on Music for a term expiring October 31, 1956, R.B. Schlesinger to be chairman, and G.S. Butts to be a member of that committee for a term expiring October 31, 1959.

To the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, W.M. Sale, Jr., to be chairman for a term expiring October 31, 1957; M.W. Sampson and P.J. Zwerman to be members of that committee for terms expiring October 31, 1959; S.A. Asdell to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of L.J. Daniel during the second term of the academic year 1955-56; and W.W. Lambert to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of C.F. Hockett during the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee on Entrance Credentials, for terms expiring October 31, 1959, Marvin Bogema and R.J. Walker.

To the Committee on Military Curricula, J.B. Rosser to be chairman for a term expiring October 31, 1958; and J.S. Ahmann to be a member of that committee for a
term expiring October 31, 1959.

To the Committee on Calendar for terms expiring October 31, 1959, N.C. Brady and Baxter Hathaway; and J.O. Jeffrey to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of F.W. Ocvirk during the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee on Registration and Schedules for terms expiring October 31, 1959, T.R. Cuykendall and C.C. Winding, and C.I. Sayles to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of U.W. Lattin during the second term of the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events for terms expiring October 31, 1959, N.R. Gay and R.L. Hull, and H.A. Michelins to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of H.D. Albright during the first term of the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee on Prizes, F.B. Agard to be chairman for a term expiring October 31, 1957; Frederick Stutz to be a member of that committee for a term expiring October 31, 1959; and L.J. Williamson to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of H.F. Neufeld during the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee of Award of the Moses Coit Taylor Prize for a term expiring October 31, 1958, R.H. Elias.

To the Committee on University Broadcasting, A.B. Credle and W.B. Ward, for terms expiring October 31, 1959; and T.A. Ryan to fill the temporary vacancy created by the absence on leave of J.J. Gibson during the academic year 1955-56.

To the Committee on the Festival of the Contemporary Arts, W.H. Stainton to be chairman for a term expiring October 31, 1959; Baxter Hathaway and T.H. Canfield to be members of that committee for terms expiring October 31, 1957; and R.H. Adams, K.W. Evett, Judith Hodge, Karel Husa, R.L. Hyers, Sarah Neblett and R.R. Wilson to be members of that committee for terms expiring October 31, 1959.

Vice President J. L. Zwingle then spoke to the Faculty on "Some Fundamentals of University Development". His remarks were greeted with applause. The text of his address is appended to the minutes.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, Dr. T. P. Wright, Vice President for Research and Chairman of the Policy Committee's
Sub-committee on University-Corporation Relationships, presented a report on University-Corporation Relationships. A copy of the complete report, and a copy of the excerpt which had been circulated to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, are appended to the minutes.

Dr. Wright emphasized that policies must be pursued which assure that, no matter what the source of financial support, the ultimate responsibility for teaching and basic research shall remain in the hands of the Faculty. He noted, however, the several benefits to the Faculty which may result from appropriate contacts with corporations, and the need for agreement on certain basic definitions of policy governing such relationships. He stated that the approach of the Sub-committee to corporation support was positive rather than restrictive and said that the Sub-committee conceived its function as being one of preparing a report of the Faculty which would encourage turning toward corporation support at the same time that it defined methods of avoiding any inherent dangers and pitfalls.

Following his introductory remarks, Dr. Wright referred to the document which had been distributed to the Faculty, and after a brief discussion of each statement under I Findings, he moved, on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the endorsement of each such statement. Similarly, he moved the adoption of each of the items under II Recommendations to the Faculty, and III Recommendations to the Administration, with the exception of item IIIA, relating to the General Electric agreement. Concerning this, he said that the President had authorized him to state that negotiations had been completed to form an appropriately constituted Cornell-General Electric
advisory committee on Joint Relationships to establish and monitor suitable relationships between the University and the General Electric Advanced Electronics Center. Dr. Wright stated that in view of this new approach, and through mutual agreement, the contract with General Electric has been terminated. The recommendation concerning it (IIIA) was, therefore, withdrawn as unnecessary and undesirable since without possible injury to either party, its objectives had been achieved by mutual rather than unilateral action.

On conclusion of this report, Dr. Wright made a blanket motion on behalf of the Committee on University Policy, to cover endorsement of the several findings and adoption of the several recommendations which had previously been moved separately, the text of which follows:

I. Findings

A. General

It is important to the University to foster good relations with corporations, both from the standpoint of faculty teaching proficiency in some disciplines and budget considerations for the University as a whole.

B. Graduate School Code

The present rules governing graduate study leading to the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts and Master of Science are satisfactory.

C. Differences Between Situation of Endowed and State Colleges When Dealing with Corporations

Such differences reside chiefly in the lesser need for financial aid on the part of the state-supported colleges. Also, the larger proportion of applied
research in the state supported colleges as distinguished from fundamental research in the endowed colleges makes a difference in approach necessary.

II. Recommendations to the Faculty

A. Industrial Cooperative Program of the College of Engineering

The University Faculty commends the principles of this program to the attention of other segments of the University for their high educational value and possible application in other fields. Such a program should not be expected to contribute to University income beyond such amounts as are necessary to make it self-sustaining.

B. Need for Corporation Employee Training

Insofar as is geographically practicable and consistent with prior duties and responsibilities, the University Faculty recommends that the Faculty and staff of Cornell exhibit willingness to undertake extension teaching of employees of industrial corporations along lines worked out to meet the particular needs of each group as a special program and not for graduate degree credit.

C. Professional Graduate Degrees

The University Faculty recommends that the Graduate Faculty continue consideration of such degrees, and reconsider the possibility of some type of professional engineering degree at the Master's level.

III. Recommendations to the Administration

A. General Electric Agreement

(This recommendation was withdrawn for reasons hereinbefore stated.)
B. B.F. Goodrich Grant

Inasmuch as the 1949 agreement with the B. F. Goodrich Company is satisfactory, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear its terms in mind when negotiating for corporation grants in the future. The Faculty also recommends, however, that when formulating the clause of such contracts governing the purposes for which the gift may be used, consideration be given to including training as well as research.

C. Corporation Sponsorship of Professorships

1. While the University Faculty approves the professorship agreement with the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory as suitable in view of the fact that the Laboratory is an affiliate and wholly owned subsidiary of the University, the Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind the possibility that this agreement might not afford an appropriate pattern when seeking the support of professorships by outside firms.

2. The University Faculty recommends that the Administration, when soliciting corporation professorship sponsors, use as models and as examples of approaches, the three forms developed by the Policy Committee's Subcommittee on University-Corporation Relationships.

D. Corporation Research Campus

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration encourage business firms (additional to the General Electric Company) to establish research facilities in the community
near to the campus. The Faculty recommends location adjacent to the Airport on what is indicated on the College of Architecture master plan as "Research Campus" as suitable and desirable. The Faculty recommends further, however, that the Administration refrain from entering into any contracts other than leases with companies which may so locate in the future.

E. General Organization at Cornell for Corporation-University Dealings

While the University Faculty deems appropriate the organization and relationships involving the Development Office, the Provost's Office and the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Faculty recommends that the Administration take care to avoid multiple approaches to corporations save in those instances in which, after suitable consultation between appropriate segments of the University, it appears that more than one approach may properly be made.

F. Cornell Associates Program

While expressing general acquiescence in the Cornell Associates Program, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind two undesirable possibilities:

1. That in particular cases the Associates Program might interfere with the priority in approach to the corporation to which the so-called sustaining program for soliciting larger gifts is clearly entitled.

2. That unless the non-exclusive character of the privilege of recruiting Cornell graduates as employees is constantly emphasized, corporations affiliating with the Associates
Program are likely to assume that this privilege is open only to them or at least that they hold a preferred position.

G. Training Employees of Corporations (Extension of Extramural Division)

In recognition of the great need for industrial employees, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration set up suitable mechanisms to facilitate special efforts in this direction. The Faculty strongly recommends that the Extramural Division be utilized to the full for those qualified to meet its standards and that other teaching be promoted for those not qualified for the equivalent of existing Cornell course work. In particular, the Faculty recommends careful consideration of the advantage of a single coordinating office to cover and foster all types of extension and extramural work with special attention to the needs of industry.

H. Policy Relating to Corporation Grant Solicitation

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration inform Faculty or staff members approaching corporations for financial support that basic emphasis should be placed upon the following facts:

1. that the University is a main source of trained manpower upon which industry and commerce are dependent;
2. that tuition charges do not meet the full cost of training;
3. that the basic scientific research carried on at the universities is a prerequisite to much of the applied work carried on by the corporations themselves under our free enterprise system.
The Faculty believes that this approach is clearly preferable to an attempt to demonstrate that contributing corporations will receive a *quid pro quo* in the form of specific and definitely calculable benefits.

I. **Allocation within the University of funds derived from Faculty-Negotiated Corporation Grants**

The University Faculty recommends to the Administration that its Faculty representatives be informed of the extent to which they are authorized to use their discretion when negotiating with prospective corporate benefactors; and that the allocation of funds derived from the grant should be definitely decided upon at the outset so as to prevent the possibility of unpleasantness which might later arise if the matter were not settled in advance.

(Note: As the President was obliged to leave during the presentation of this report, he asked the Dean to preside over the remainder of the meeting.)

The motion to endorse the findings and to adopt the recommendations of the Committee on University Policy concerning University-Corporation Relationships being duly seconded, it was discussed briefly. When put to a voice vote, the motion passed without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 P.M.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT
J. L. Zivingle, Vice President

To most people the term "university development" is a circumlocution. Accurately stated, what we want is money, and the sooner the better. Simple, but devastatingly true.

Now in this imperfect world some universities have a great deal of money, some universities have very little, but none has enough. Those that have the least are determined to have more, and those that have the most are determined to continue to have more. The prospective donor is beset by institutions and causes other than educational which can demonstrate to their own satisfaction a prior claim on the money. Though we live in the most philanthropic country in the world, the scope of philanthropy is still growing. It is not sufficient, however, simply to deserve money. Such indeed is perhaps the most undistinguished position imaginable. The prospective donor, once located and ready to talk business, needs convincing that Cornell University has a greater claim on him than many other willing candidates.

An institution therefore which expects to thrive must first of all have a clear line of educational policy, a clear relationship between educational policy and general behavior, and further, a clear relationship between these two and fund raising.

University development, properly defined, begins with university planning, moves into general university public relations (or self-interpretation), and then into fund raising. Such a progression is logical and esthetically pleasing, but it does not conform to the prevailing facts. The university is in being, it has traditions, it has aspirations as various as its makeup of alumni and faculty and trustees and students. It has immediate problems to meet, it has salaries to pay, talent to attract, students to educate. The functions of planning, interpretation and of fund raising must go on simultaneously. Yet increasing self-consistency between the three must be constantly attempted.

My own function as vice president is not primarily that of fund raising. On the contrary it is primarily to interpret the aspirations of the University, and to encourage consistency between dollars received, dollars spent, and the priority of needs within the institution. Hence it is urgent--more, it is essential to ascertain the common aspirations of the faculty for Cornell University. I speak of common aspirations because, first of all, a university will be only as significant as its faculty aspires to make it. No amount of urgency in any other quarter will substitute for this factor. Now it might be said that formative aspirations are not those held in common by the faculty but rather those cherished by certain creative or strategically placed persons within the institution.

Here of course we strike a hard problem. I refer to the question of intent on the part of faculty members. In one sense the creative teacher and scholar has no local habitation. He lives most truly in the realm of his chosen studies. The institution is but a vehicle, perhaps as often an unavoidable obstruction. Nevertheless, I believe it correct to say that universities at their zenith represent more than
a fortunate collection of people, each one interested only in an individualistic pursuit. Along with this enthusiasm for a chosen field, the strategic difference for the university arises from a certain zeal of the faculty for the institution itself, its educational mission, its scholarly potential. Here, it seems to me, is the final essence of institutional greatness. Here is the element which makes the difference between stability and instability, provided other elements are relatively in balance.

Clearly it is not a function of the Development Office to formulate the curriculum, the program, the future course for the institution. The Development Office is at best a useful servant of the other creative elements in the institution. Good public relations do not arise merely by the repetition of news about the university, nor of pleas for loyalty among the alumni, nor importunate seeking of funds from the munificent. To have meaning, there must be a creative interplay between the development staff on one side, and the university faculty on the other side. This suggests, therefore, a complex function for the development staff, involving faculty, administration, trustees, alumni, students and all the media of communication. This is certainly not a one-man job, nor is it the proper job of one element within the university. Specifically it means that the faculties within the university must be constantly reflecting upon their educational policies and upon their bearing upon public policy. It means that the urgencies arising from the various colleges must somehow be reasonably sorted out and be listed in order of general urgency for the university. These things cannot take place mechanically nor by an arbitrary and exclusive division of labor.

I am told repeatedly about all the complexity and difficulty at Cornell. I recognize the facts behind these statements. At the same time I am frank to say I am not impressed by them. After all, there is nothing simple left in the world, nothing whatsoever. It is self-defeating to be obsessed by complexities and difficulties. For that reason, I have proposed to the Cornell Council that for three years we concentrate on a few things that are not controversial, but which are at the same time basic. These three consist of improved salaries, improved scholarships, and the improvement of the University library. I believe that within three years we can make real headway on all three. At least we should be able to finance the additional structure for the library, and we should be able to improve salaries and scholarship funds. Surely these things are essential. Surely these can occupy us adequately.

In the meantime perhaps we can find our way toward other areas of planning, which are truly more complex, and which require the patient thought of every responsible element within the University.

Let us bear in mind that in fund raising there are no windfalls. Apparent windfalls have their beginnings sometimes in obscure events. The institution which receives adequate financing, however, is the one which has put itself in a position to deserve it, and which has done an adequate job of representing itself to the public upon which it has a claim. This is an enterprise which requires the orderly participation of every member of the University.
Here I quote from remarks I recently addressed to the Cornell University Council:

"1957 will be a significant anniversary, falling as it does 150 years after the birth of Ezra Cornell and 125 years after the birth of Andrew D. White. It would be good for us all here today to read President White's account of the labors of these two men against hard circumstances and hostile people. The struggles of the first ten years of this university make any difficulties of our present time seem small by comparison. These men were under no personal obligation to extend themselves as they did, to risk indeed not only their personal fortunes, but their reputations, to establish here the beginnings of the institution which we so greatly admire today.

"Foremost among their achievements was the establishment of a library which became, in a few short years, the envy of all who know about it. Thirty years ago its need for more space was well recognized. Cornell University has made various plans to enlarge facilities to a size in keeping with its tremendously valuable collection of books and with growing enrollment. For reasons beyond our estimation, the solution was not reached. Now, however, the trustees will soon be considering another proposal. Designs will soon be submitted in harmony with recommendations of consultants whose suggestions are acceptable to every official of the University and to the Library Board."

These remarks may seem but empty generalizations. They are nevertheless fundamental. They will control our procedures. I have been told that Cornell is too odd an assortment of colleges to be clearly interpreted to the public or even to itself. That may be—but only if that is how we would have it be. At any rate, Cornell is a firmly established university of high rank. Its present strength is its best claim for new support. We can with assurance and self-respect make our needs known to all who will hear.

Such confidence as I feel is not self-confidence but confidence in Cornell. I hope you share this feeling and will help when you can.

October 12, 1955
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of October 12, a condensation of which had been distributed to the Faculty with the call of the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the death of Kenneth Post, Professor of Floriculture, on October 25, 1955. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleague.

The President announced that the major medical insurance plan has now been approved by 75 percent of the entire eligible group, and that such insurance will be available, on November 15, to each member of the Faculty.

The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the President announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to prepare a memorial article concerning Kenneth Post for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: A. W. Dimock, A. M. S. Pridham, and L. H. MacDaniels, Chairman.

There being no special order, and no unfinished business, the President called for reports of committees.

On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, its Chairman, Professor G. F. Adams, jr. presented the following slate of nominations, which had been sent to the Faculty with the call for the meeting:
For Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees  
A. W. Gibson and C. O. Mackey

For the Committee on University Policy  
G. E. Peabody and Andrew Schultz, Jr.

For the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty  
H. W. Sampson and Jean Warren

For the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing  
P. W. Gates and H. F. Wiegandt

For the Committee on Nominations  
J. H. Bruckner and M. S. Kendrick  
T. W. Silk and E. N. Warren  
M. G. Bishop and W. G. Noulton

For the Board of Physical Education and Athletics  
N. R. Gay and G. W. Lattin

For the Board on Student Health and Hygiene  
Two year term: D. W. Bruner and W. L. Nelson  
Three year term: Temple Burling and Harold H. Williams

Following the presentation of nominations for positions on each Committee or Board, the President called for nominations from the floor. No additional nominations were made, and in each case the nominations made by the Committee were accepted unanimously. Professor Adams then moved that the slate of nominations as read be referred to the Committee on Elections. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its chairman, the Dean, presented a report on the actions taken by Board of Trustees on the Faculty requests of June 8, 1955 concerning the University By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation. The complete text of the report and recommendations,
dated October 31, 1955, had been sent to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and a copy thereof is appended to the minutes.

In commenting on the fact that if the by-law and legislation be interpreted literally, the University Faculty, as a Faculty, has in general lost its judicial and legislative powers in the field of student activities and conduct, the Dean noted two exceptions, one of which, the power to determine the consequences of probation imposed for academic deficiencies, was mentioned in the Committee's report. The Dean reported the second exception, viz: that the President agrees that the Trustees did not intend to interfere with Faculty jurisdiction over cases of academic fraud.

The Dean also expressed the hope that if a Faculty Conference Committee was established as recommended in the report, that the committee would make clear to the Trustees that the Faculty's attitude toward the by-laws is not merely obstructive, but that the Faculty wishes to come to an understanding with the Trustees as to the ends to be sought in the area of student affairs, and to discuss with the Trustees the possibility of accomplishing these ends by an allocation of responsibilities and powers among Administration, Faculty, and students which would be satisfactory to these three bodies, and to the Trustees as well.
Following his oral condensation of the report, the Dean moved, on behalf of the Committee on University Policy that the Faculty adopt the following statement, including the title, and take the following actions:

Statement Adopted and Actions Taken by the University Faculty at Its Meeting of November 9, 1955

Preamble:

A few days before its meeting in June, 1955, the University Faculty learned officially for the first time that the Board of Trustees was contemplating a revision of the By-Laws of the University which would effect changes of very great concern to the Faculty. The most important of these was the transfer from the University Faculty to the President of responsibility for student conduct and student activities.

While a member of the University Faculty had served as a member of the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees he was at no time free to report to the Faculty on the deliberations or decisions of the Committee.

At its June meeting the University Faculty passed a resolution, objecting in principle to the proposed change in the by-laws relating to control over student conduct and student activities, and requesting the Board of Trustees to delay action, and to authorize a Trustee-Faculty Conference Committee, provided for by the University By-laws in such cases, to make possible the full presentation and consideration of the views of the Faculty.

At the June meeting of the Board of Trustees the Faculty Representatives on the Board strongly urged that the Faculty request for delay and a conference committee be granted. The Faculty Representatives did not undertake to argue the merits of the proposed changes in the by-laws, since there had not been time for adequate briefing, and since it was assumed by the Faculty and by its representatives that the Board, in accordance with the by-laws, would grant the Faculty's request.

The Board of Trustees, however, adopted the by-law revision, and thus rejected the request of the Faculty
for delay and an opportunity to express its views on the merits of the by-law changes.

In a supplementary action the Board continued its Committee on By-law Revision's authority for another year in order to provide an opportunity to the University Faculty or other interested groups to present to it proposals for changes in the newly adopted by-laws.

In the light of the foregoing facts the University Faculty takes the following actions:

1. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees its sense of surprise, disappointment, and regret at the Board's unwillingness to grant the Faculty's request for an opportunity to present to the Board, through a conference committee, its views on changes in the by-laws deeply affecting educational policy and Faculty interests. It wishes to convey further its hope that this action of the Board does not represent in reality, as it does in appearance, a deterioration of the relations between the Board and the Faculty which have for so long been grounded on mutual confidence and respect.

2. The University Faculty requests the President to inform the Board of Trustees of its acceptance of the Board's invitation to consult with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board, and to present the views of the Faculty on the transfer of responsibility over student activities and conduct and on various other features of the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation.

3. The University Faculty authorizes the Committee on University Policy to select a committee of five members of the Faculty for the purpose of consulting with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board and presenting to it the views of the Faculty.

4. The University Faculty requests the President to place a copy of this statement and these actions in the hands of each member of the Board of Trustees for his information.
The motion was seconded.

The Professor of the History of Science, Professor Guerlac, moved to amend the motion by inserting the following paragraph at the end of the preamble:

A careful study of the new by-law and implementing legislation relating to student activities and conduct has persuaded the Faculty that, far from promising the results hoped for by the Board, they are likely to make it more difficult to solve these problems. Although the President has not gained powers in these matters he did not already possess, the Faculty -- as a Faculty, would appear to have lost all jurisdiction over certain matters closely, perhaps inseparably, connected with educational policy. The students have lost any practicable channel of appeal. And there is now the clear possibility that future presidents of the University, without violating the new by-laws, could assume undivided control over student activities and conduct.

by amending paragraph 1 of the actions to read as follows:

1. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees its sense of surprise and regret that the Board was unwilling to grant the Faculty an opportunity to present to the Board, through a conference committee, its views on proposed changes in the by-laws deeply affecting educational policy and the Faculty's responsibility for it. The Faculty wishes further to convey its hope that this action of the Board does not foreshadow a deterioration of the relations between the Board and the University Faculty which have long been grounded on mutual confidence and respect.

by inserting the following paragraph between paragraphs 1 and 2 of the actions, the inserted paragraph to be numbered 2;

2. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees the Faculty's appreciation of the supplementary decision of the Board to continue its Committee on By-Law Revision for another year to provide an opportunity to the University Faculty to present its proposals for changes in the newly adopted By-Laws.
and by amending paragraph 2 of the actions to read as follows:

3. The University Faculty requests the President to inform the Board of Trustees of its acceptance of the Board's invitation to consult with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board, and of the Faculty's hope that its Conference Committee may have an opportunity to discuss with the Trustee Committee the purposes which the Trustees and Faculty should seek to accomplish in the area of student affairs, and the possibility of achieving them by a distribution of functions and powers among the Administration, the Faculty, and the recognized student organizations in a manner satisfactory to each of these groups and to the Trustees.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 in the actions would then be renumbered 4 and 5.

A draft of the statement and actions as they would read if Professor Guerlac's motion were adopted was distributed to Faculty members as they entered the meeting room.

The motion was seconded. After brief discussion it was put to a voice vote and lost.

The Professor of Law, Professor W. T. Dean, then moved to substitute for the statement and actions moved by the Dean, the following actions:

1. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees the Faculty's appreciation of the supplementary decision of the Board to continue its Committee on By-Law Revision for another year to provide an opportunity to the University Faculty to present its proposals for changes in the newly adopted By-Laws.

2. The University Faculty requests the President to inform the Board of Trustees of its acceptance of the Board's invitation to consult with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board, and of the Faculty's hope that its Conference Committee may have an opportunity to discuss with the
The motion was seconded, and, after some discussion, was put to a voice vote and lost.

The Professor of Chinese Literature, Professor Shadick, moved to amend the original motion by inserting the following paragraph at the end of the preamble:

A careful study of the new by-law and implementing legislation relating to student activities and conduct has persuaded the Faculty that, far from promising the results hoped for by the Board, they are likely to make it more difficult to solve these problems. Although the President has not gained powers in these matters he did not already possess, the Faculty— as a Faculty, would appear to have lost all jurisdiction over certain matters closely, perhaps inseparably, connected with educational policy. The students have lost any practicable channel of appeal. And there is now the clear possibility that future presidents of the University, without violating the new by-laws, could assume undivided control over student activities and conduct.

The motion was seconded, and after some discussion, was put to a voice vote and lost.

The Professor of Physics, Professor Philip Morrison, then moved to amend the original motion by inserting the follow-
ing paragraph between paragraphs 1 and 2 of the actions, the inserted paragraph to be numbered 2:

2. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees the Faculty's appreciation of the supplementary decision of the Board to continue its Committee on By-Law Revision for another year to provide an opportunity to the University Faculty to present its proposals for changes in the newly adopted By-Laws.

This motion being duly seconded, was put to a voice vote and lost.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor Max Black, then moved that the entire report be sent to the Board of Trustees and that paragraph 4 of the actions be amended so as to read:

4. The University Faculty requests the President to place a copy of this statement and these actions and the report of the Committee on University Policy in the hands of each member of the Board of Trustees for his information.

This motion was seconded and lost by a voice vote.

The original motion was then put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

Under the heading of new business, the Professor of Business History and Transportation, Professor J. G. B. Hutchins, moved that the Committee on Registration and Schedules be instructed to reconsider the question of the most suitable room for the meetings of the University Faculty, and report back to the Faculty its recommendation. This motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
October 31, 1955
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About two years ago the President informed the chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Activities, the chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, and the Dean of the University Faculty that the Board of Trustees had undertaken a revision of the University By-Laws and that it was probable that some change would be proposed in the provisions with respect to the jurisdiction of the University Faculty over student activities and conduct and other matters of concern to the Faculty. While the President requested that this information be treated as semi-confidential, he assured the dean that the Faculty would ultimately be informed as to the precise nature of any proposals affecting its position and would be given an opportunity to comment upon any such proposals before the Trustees took action upon them. Although Professor De Graff, as a member of the Trustees' By-Law Revision Committee, was aware of the nature and extent of the proposed changes, he was not at liberty to reveal them to the Faculty.

On May 23, 1955 the President delivered to the Faculty's Committee on University Policy copies of the proposed new by-laws and related Trustee legislation with the request that the committee render a report in regard thereto at the Faculty meeting scheduled for June 8th, and that the Faculty's opinion be transmitted to the Board before June 11th. As no copies of the by-laws or legislation were then available for distribution to the Faculty, and as the Policy Committee found it impossible in view of the little time at its disposal to distribute its report in advance of the Faculty meeting, the Faculty received no information whatever as to the proposed by-law changes affecting its position until June 8th. Even then the Faculty received only partial information; for the Policy Committee, realizing that not all of the provisions in the proposed by-laws and related legislation which were of concern to the Faculty could be dealt with at one meeting, confined its report at the June Faculty meeting to the three features of the proposed by-laws and legislation which, in the judgment of the Committee, were of most importance to the Faculty. These features were:

A. The transfer of jurisdiction over student activities and conduct from the University Faculty to the President.

B. The redefinition of the status of the Dean of the University Faculty, which included a statement that he is responsible to the University Faculty.

C. The omission of the former By-Law provision obligating the deans, the directors and the heads of separate academic departments to recommend to the President persons for appointment to staff.

Resolution Adopted by the University Faculty

After hearing this report the Faculty adopted a resolution for transmission to the Board of Trustees via the President which expressed the Faculty's opinion in regard to each of these features; viz.,

A. That it would be contrary to sound educational policy to delete the part of the old By-laws providing that the University Faculty shall have disciplinary jurisdiction over the students of the University except for
unsatisfactory work, and to retain in the proposed new By-Laws the provision:

"The President shall be responsible for the proper regulation of student conduct and the extra-curricular activities of the students. He may delegate authority in these matters to such faculty committees as he may determine."

and that it preferred the old By-Law provision.

B. That it approved the redefinition of the status of the Dean of the University Faculty.

C. That it would be inadvisable to omit from the new By-Laws the provision obligating the deans, the directors and the heads of separate academic departments to recommend to the President persons for appointment to staff.

To these statements of opinion in its resolution the Faculty added the following in substance:

A. An expression of regret that through lack of time the Faculty was unable to give adequate attention to other features of the proposed By-Laws and related legislation;

B. A request for further time in which to consider and make recommendations concerning these other features; and

C. A request that if the Board of Trustees should contemplate taking action on any of the proposed By-Laws or related legislation contrary to the opinion of the Faculty in regard thereto as expressed at its June meeting, or to such opinions as it might express on other features in consequence of further study, the Board, before taking such contrary action, appoint a committee to confer concerning these matters with a committee to be appointed by the Faculty pursuant to the By-Laws.

Trustee Actions in Conformity with the Faculty's Resolution

At its meeting of June 13, 1955 the Board of Trustees adopted the By-Law (Art.XIII, Sec.3) and related legislation (Board Legislation Implementing Revised By-Laws, pp. 2 and 5) concerning the Dean of the University Faculty which the Faculty had approved. The Board, moreover, adopted a By-Law (Art.XVI, Sec.2) which was in substantial conformity with the Faculty opinion with respect to the recommendation to the President by deans and other administrative officers of persons for appointment to staff.

Trustee Actions Contrary to the Faculty's Resolution

The wish of the University Faculty to retain its jurisdiction over student activities and conduct was not, however, granted by the Board. On the contrary, the Trustees rescinded that part of the old By-Law (Art. XIV, Sec.3a) which vested that jurisdiction in the University Faculty, and adopted the new By-Law (Art.VI, sec.1) making the President responsible for the regulation of student conduct and the extra-curricular activities of students, but authorizing him to delegate this authority to such faculty committees or student committees as he may determine. The Trustees contemporaneously enacted legislation putting into effect the President's Plan for Organization of the University which provided a place under the heading "Personnel Officers" for "The Faculty Committees on Student Conduct and Student Activities" and for
"Student Committees"; and which contained the following statement:

"The President proposes to delegate authority to the Committee on Student Conduct and the Committee on Student Activities as appointed by him. Such delegation would not be subject to his veto nor would he act as a court of last resort in specific cases. He would expect to work with and consult with these committees in the formulation of general policies affecting student life."

Moreover, by adopting the proposed by-laws and related legislation substantially in toto, the Board of Trustees disregarded the Faculty's request that action on the new By-Laws and related legislation be postponed until the Faculty had had an opportunity to consider them and make recommendations concerning them; and the Faculty's request that before taking any action contrary to the opinions which the Faculty had expressed or might express in regard to the by-laws and related legislation, the Trustees appoint a committee to confer concerning these matters with a Faculty committee pursuant to Sec. 10 of Art. II of the old by-laws. (This provision has been carried over into the new by-laws in the second paragraph of Sec. 2 of Art. XIII.) This disregard of the Faculty's request for a conference committee was, in the judgment of the Policy Committee, highly prejudicial to the Faculty. While the Faculty Representatives in the Board were heard fully as to the advisability of granting the Faculty's requests for delay and for a conference committee, they made no attempt to discuss the merits of the proposed by-law changes, because they expected that the Trustees would grant the Faculty's request for a conference committee in accordance with the by-laws, and because they had had no opportunity to prepare for a discussion on the merits. The Board acted, therefore, without having heard the reasons why the Faculty believed that it would be contrary to sound educational policy to enact the proposed by-law and legislation in regard to control over student activities and conduct.

Opportunity Open to the Faculty to Confer with the Trustees in Regard to the By-Laws

The Board of Trustees, however, apparently realizing the extent of the Faculty's concern over the by-law revision, and apparently recognizing that the Faculty, if it so desired, should have an opportunity to confer with the Trustees concerning such revision, voted to continue its By-Law Revision Committee for a period of one year for the purpose of considering the effectiveness of the Revised By-Laws in operation and to be available for consultation by the University Faculty or other interested groups with reference thereto.

The Policy Committee believes that the Faculty should take advantage of this opportunity.

Actions Taken by the President Under the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation

The President has established a Committee on Student Activities and a Committee on Student Conduct. Except for the Dean of the University Faculty, who asked to be excused, the membership of these President's committees is identical with that of the Faculty committees which they displace. To his new committees the President has delegated authority and jurisdiction.
coextensive with that possessed by the former Faculty committees. The Policy Committee believes that to such student organizations as the Student Council, The Women's Self Government association, the Interfraternity Council, the Men's Judiciary Board and the Women's Judiciary Board, the President either has delegated or will delegate authority and jurisdiction coextensive with that previously granted them by the University Faculty; and this report is written on the assumption that this belief is true.

The President's Delegations of Authority to His Committees are Revocable only by the Trustees

At the September Faculty meeting the President stated in substance that once he had delegated authority to his committees, Trustee action was necessary to the revocation of their authority. To support this conclusion reference can be made to the presence in the President's Plan for Organization of the University, made effective by its incorporation into Trustee legislation, of the following text:

"The President proposes to delegate authority to the Committee on Student Conduct and the Committee on Student Activities as appointed by him. Such delegation would not be subject to his veto (emphasis supplied) nor would he act as a court of last resort in specific cases."

To reach an opposite conclusion, the probable relation of the word "Such" to the first sentence of the proposal must be ignored, and the phrase "Such delegation would not be subject to his veto" must be read as the first part of a statement doing no more than to indicate the President's inability to reverse decisions in particular cases. The Policy Committee accepts the President's interpretation of his proposal, not only because he has chosen the literal one, but also because the President, as the draftsman of the proposal, can be presumed to know its meaning, and because the President, having presumably discussed the matter with the Trustees, knows the meaning which they attributed to his proposal when they legislated it into effect.

EXTENT OF CHANGES EFFECTED BY THE NEW BY-LAW AND IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION IN THE AREA OF STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND CONDUCT

The New Emphasis on the President's Existing Right to Confer with the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct

At the September Faculty meeting the President stated in substance that under the new arrangement he has no more authority in the area of student affairs than he possessed under the old, except in one respect: viz., that his privilege of discussing policy and specific cases with the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct is now founded on the by-laws instead of on custom. The Policy Committee accepts this statement and wishes merely to point out that as the President was under the old by-laws, as he is under the new, a member and the presiding officer of each of the faculties, including the University Faculty, a strong case could be made for the proposition that he has always had the right to confer and counsel with any committee of any faculty.

The power he has under the new arrangement to recommend to the Trustees, if he deems it advisable, that the authority of the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct be revoked, is one he always possessed.
Under the old by-laws, the President had neither judicial nor legislative powers in student affairs. Although he may have had such powers in the period between the adoption of the Revised By-Laws and his delegations of authority to his committees, he does not have them now; and will not regain them unless the Board of Trustees revokes the authority of his committees. That he cannot exercise judicial functions by reversing decisions in particular cases is made explicit by the statement in the Plan for Organization, "nor would he act as a court of last resort in specific cases". And that he interprets this phrase as precluding him from exercising legislative functions is evidenced by his statement at the September Faculty meeting that he has no power to change committee policies. Although this particular disability of the President is not expressly set forth in the Plan for Organization, the Policy Committee once more accepts his interpretation as the correct one because the President knows what he meant by his own words, and also knows what the Trustees understood them to mean when they adopted them.

University Faculty Loses Its Jurisdiction

The greatest change wrought by the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation is found in this area. Generally speaking, the University Faculty, as a Faculty, has lost the authority it formerly possessed over student activities and conduct, if the new by-law and legislation be literally interpreted. This change is substantial rather than merely technical. The fact that the President's committees are entirely made up of members of the Faculty is not inconsistent with this conclusion. When serving on these committees, members of the Faculty are acting for and are responsible to the President and the Administration rather than to the Faculty. They are free to make decisions, adopt policies, and enact legislation without regard to the judgment or wishes of the Faculty. To be sure, the Trustees might ask the Faculty's opinion on certain subjects, if it occurred to them to do so, or the Faculty might volunteer recommendations in regard to certain matters if it became aware that they were under consideration. The fact remains nevertheless that the Faculty itself may no longer review the decisions or control the policies of the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct, nor initiate policies of its own. In brief, the Faculty has been deprived of its judicial and legislative powers in the area of student affairs.

The statements just made are, however, subject to at least one exception. While the language of the new By-Law vesting delegable authority over student activities and conduct in the President is broad and without express qualification, the President and the Policy Committee are agreed that the Trustees did not intend to deprive the Faculty of the power to determine the consequences of probation imposed for academic deficiencies; that the Faculty legislation of February 12, 1947 prescribing the effect of academic probation on eligibility for participation in student activities is, therefore, still in effect; that the President's Committee on Student Activities should continue to interpret and enforce such legislation; that when performing this function it will be responsible to the University Faculty; but that when the committee is exercising authority delegated to it by the President under the Revised By-Laws, it will be responsible to the President. The President has furnished the Committee on Student Activities with a statement to this effect for its guidance.

And it may well be that it was the intention of the Trustees, though not expressly declared, to leave authority over other important sectors of the field of student activities and conduct to the Faculty. Legislation requiring the deferment of rushing was enacted by the Faculty in the spring.
of 1954, subject to the approval of the Board, which was given. Suppose that after operating under deferred rushing for a few years, the Interfraternity Council should petition for permission to return to first term rushing. Or suppose that the Student Council should petition for legislation with respect to discriminatory clauses in the constitutions of student organizations in addition to that enacted last spring and applicable only to new organizations. Would the Trustees want the President's Committee on Student Activities to take action on such petitions, subject only to the approval of the Board, or would the Trustees want the committee to recommend to the Faculty whatever disposition of the petition it thought proper, with a view to Faculty action, subject to the approval of the Board? Although the President in a conference with the Policy Committee last spring stated that deferred rushing and discrimination were educational problems about which the Faculty should be consulted, the Policy Committee cannot be certain as to the Trustees' intention in this regard, because the Revised By-Laws and related legislation afford no clue to it. But this much at least is clear: If the Trustees intended that the Faculty should have authority over certain important matters, the by-laws and related legislation do not say so. If, on the other hand, the Trustees have no such intention, the Faculty has indeed lost all of its legislative and judicial power over student activities and conduct, except its control over the consequences of academic probation.

Students Lose Right of Appeal

Under the old by-laws, students who were dissatisfied with a decision or ruling of the Faculty Committee on Student Activities or the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct could appeal to the University Faculty. Under the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation this recourse is not open to them, nor is any practicable substitute available. No appeal lies to the Faculty, because the Faculty has no authority over the President's committees. The Trustee legislation precludes the President from entertaining appeals. And appeals to the Trustees, while theoretically possible, would usually be impracticable, not only because of the delay involved, but also because the Trustees could not afford the time to hear them.

The Possibility of Administrative Control of Student Affairs in the Future

Inasmuch as the President has delegated to his Committees on Student Activities and Conduct authority and jurisdiction over student affairs co-extensive with that possessed by the former Faculty committees, and as such delegation is not revocable by him, an assumption of control over student affairs by the Administration appears to be unlikely as long as the incumbent holds office and the Trustee legislation passed last June remains in force.

When, however, the present President retires, his successor, the Policy Committee believes, would not be bound by any previous delegation of authority, and would, therefore, be free to decide for himself how much authority he wished to delegate to his Committees on Student Activities and Conduct. It will be noted that the by-law authorizing such delegation does not prescribe its extent, and that this lack is not supplied by the related Trustee legislation which prevents the President from revoking authority once he has delegated it, but is silent as to the amount of authority he must delegate. It follows that a future President of the University, by a limited delegation of authority to his committees, could retain in his own hands extensive or almost complete control over student affairs.
ARE THE CHANGES DESIRABLE?

The New Emphasis on the President's Right to Confer with the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct

In the opinion of the Policy Committee this new emphasis is entirely acceptable. Inasmuch as many of the persons complaining about student activities and conduct approach the President directly, and tend to think of him as responsible for the activities and conduct of Cornell students, he should feel completely free to express his opinions to the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct in regard to complaints and their disposition. If, as appears to be the case, the President will feel more free under the Revised By-Laws than under the old to express such opinions, the new emphasis in the revised By-Laws on his right to do so would seem to be justified.

The Loss of Jurisdiction by the University Faculty

In the judgment of the Policy Committee, the withdrawal from the University Faculty of the general jurisdiction hitherto exercised by it over student activities and conduct, which would be effected by a literal interpretation of the Revised By-Laws and related legislation, would be contrary to sound educational policy and therefore most undesirable. Granting that the routine week-by-week business in the area of student activities and conduct can be carried on quite satisfactorily by committees composed exclusively of Faculty members, as are the President's committees, the University Faculty, in the judgment of the Policy Committee, should continue to have the power, subject only to the overriding authority of the Trustees, to determine policy and to legislate in the areas of student activities and conduct. In these areas the judgment of a large body is to be preferred to that of small bodies, even though all the bodies in question are composed of educators. The existence in the Faculty of the power to modify, or even to veto, committee policy or legislation concerning student activities and conduct has been a salutary thing in the past, has been exercised to good effect, and should be perpetuated.

Further bases for the Policy Committee's objection to abolition of the Faculty's jurisdiction over student activities and conduct are found in its conviction that such abolition is not prerequisite to fulfillment of the President's desire for clearer by-law authority to confer and counsel with the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct, and in its further conviction that such abolition would not be conducive to an improvement of the social atmosphere at Cornell with which the Trustees and alumni are dissatisfied, according to a statement made by the President to the Faculty Committee last spring.

If the Revised By-Laws were to be amended so as fully to restore to the Faculty its former jurisdiction over student activities and conduct, the President could still be assured of unlimited access to the Faculty Committees on Student Activities and Conduct, and without the burden of committee routine, by the addition of a by-law provision making him chairman ex officio of these committees, with the power to delegate to vice-chairmen such of his powers as chairman as he sees fit.

The improvement of the social atmosphere at Cornell is a large and difficult task. To its accomplishment the cooperative efforts of all elements of the University community are essential. Yet authoritative participation in
this task by the Faculty, as a Faculty, is precluded by the Revised By-Laws, if literally interpreted. Although authoritative participation by the Faculty members of the President's committees is provided for, this will not, in the judgment of the Policy Committee, prove to be an adequate substitute for such participation by the Faculty as a Faculty. The Policy Committee believes that the student body is entitled to the benefit of the judgment and supervisory authority of the Faculty on major questions of policy; and that the students will respond more fully and quickly to measures having Faculty approval than to those adopted by small groups of Faculty members.

In brief, the Policy Committee is of the opinion that the student activities and conduct area is of sufficient size and importance to warrant the assignment of functions therein to the University Faculty as well as to the President, and that the desired results are more likely to be achieved by cooperation between the President and small Faculty groups than by cooperation between the President and small Faculty groups.

If, however, the Revised By-Laws and related legislation are not to be literally interpreted; if it is indeed the intention of the Trustees to continue in the Faculty jurisdiction not only over the consequences of academic probation, but over other important matters such as discrimination and rushing, the Policy Committee believes that the by-laws and related legislation should be amended so as to make this intention clear, and thus to avoid the uncertainty and confusion which is likely to arise if the Faculty's jurisdiction in these matters is left to rest on implied rather than on expressed intent.

The Students' Loss of Their Right of Appeal

The failure of the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation to preserve the right of appeal formerly possessed by the students, or to provide a satisfactory substitute therefor, is, in the judgment of the Policy Committee, an undesirable feature of the new plan for control over student activities and conduct. While the students seldom exercised their right of appeal, it was of considerable value to them, and tended to increase their confidence in the University's machinery for handling student affairs.

The Possibility of Administrative Control of Student Affairs in the Future

In the judgment of the Policy Committee, the existence of this possibility under the Revised By-Laws and related Trustee legislation is most regrettable. The by-laws, it would seem, should be formulated with an eye to the possible policies of future presidents of the University as well to the views of the one presently in office. And as control over student activities and conduct is an educational and therefore a Faculty matter, the Policy Committee believes that the by-laws should be so worded as to prevent any future President of the University from assuming extensive control over student activities and conduct by the simple expedient of failing to exercise his power of delegation to Faculty committees.

Delay vs. Immediate Action

The Policy Committee has given careful consideration to the suggestion that the Faculty should not seek to arrange for a discussion with the Trustee By-Law Revision Committee of the new by-law and related legislation governing
jurisdiction over student activities and conduct until they have been in effect long enough to permit their evaluation in the light of experience. Proponents of this suggestion stress the probability that the regular routine work of the Committees on Student Activities and Conduct will be carried on as satisfactorily under the new system as under the old.

However this may be, the Policy Committee opposes delay; and for the following reasons. In the first place, the committee believes that the defects in the new plan for control over student activities and conduct: viz., (1) the exclusion of the Faculty as a Faculty from authoritative participation in the control over student activity and conduct, if the by-laws are to be interpreted literally; (2) the uncertainty over the extent of the Faculty's jurisdiction if the by-laws are to be subjected to implied exceptions; (3) the failure to provide the students with a practicable method of appeal; and (4) the power given future presidents to assume complete control over student affairs, are so obvious that they need no demonstration by experience. The Policy Committee believes further that serious risk would be involved in attempting to carry so patently defective a plan through an experimental period. Proof of the reality of these defects would come in the form of mistakes in basic policy, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen or predicted; or in the form of deterioration in the relations of the students with the Administration and Faculty, or of the relation between Administration and Faculty. In short, in the judgment of the Policy Committee, the Faculty should attempt to secure remedial changes before the new plan for the control of student activities and conduct has had any real opportunity to cause harm.

Faculty Action Recommended by the Committee on University Policy

In view of the foregoing facts and considerations the Policy Committee recommends that the Faculty adopt the following statement and take the following actions:

Statement Adopted and Actions Taken by the University Faculty at Its Meeting of November 9, 1955

Preamble:

A few days before its meeting in June, 1955, the University Faculty learned officially for the first time that the Board of Trustees was contemplating a revision of the By-Laws of the University which would effect changes of very great concern to the Faculty. The most important of these was the transfer from the University Faculty to the President of responsibility for student conduct and student activities.

While a member of the University Faculty had served as a member of the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees he was at no time free to report to the University on the deliberations or decisions of the Committee.

At its June meeting the University Faculty passed a resolution, objecting in principle to the proposed change in the by-laws relating to control over student conduct and student activities, and requesting the Board of Trustees to delay action, and to authorize a Trustee-Faculty Conference Committee, provided for by the University By-laws in such cases, to make possible the full presentation and consideration of the views of the Faculty.
At the June meeting of the Board of Trustees the faculty representatives on the Board strongly urged that the Faculty request for delay and a conference committee be granted. The Faculty representatives did not undertake to argue the merits of the proposed changes in the by-laws, since there had not been time for adequate briefing, and since it was assumed by the Faculty and by its representatives that the Board, in accordance with the by-laws, would grant the Faculty's request.

The Board of Trustees, however, adopted the by-law revision, and thus rejected the request of the Faculty for delay and an opportunity to express its views on the merits of the by-law changes.

In a supplementary action the Board continued its Committee on By-law Revision's authority for another year in order to provide an opportunity to the University Faculty or other interested groups to present to it proposals for changes in the newly adopted by-laws.

In the light of the foregoing facts the University Faculty takes the following actions:

1. The University Faculty requests the President to convey to the Board of Trustees its sense of surprise, disappointment, and regret at the Board's unwillingness to grant the Faculty's request for an opportunity to present to the Board, through a conference committee, its views on changes in the by-laws deeply affecting educational policy and Faculty interests. It wishes to convey further its hope that this action of the Board does not represent in reality, as it does in appearance, a deterioration of the relations between the Board and the Faculty which have for so long been grounded on mutual confidence and respect.

2. The University Faculty requests the President to inform the Board of Trustees of its acceptance of the Board's invitation to consult with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board, and to present the views of the Faculty on the transfer of responsibility over student activities and conduct and on various other features of the Revised By-Laws and Implementing Trustee Legislation.

3. The University Faculty authorizes the Committee on University Policy to select a committee of five members of the Faculty for the purpose of consulting with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board and presenting to it the views of the Faculty.

4. The University Faculty requests the President to place a copy of this statement and these actions in the hands of each member of the Board of Trustees for his information.
Excerpt from Report of the Committee on University Policy
on University-Corporation Relationships

After a Subcommittee of the Committee on University Policy had studied the field of University-Corporation Relationships for two years, the Subcommittee filed a report with the Policy Committee in April, 1955. This report was approved by the latter body in June, 1955, and will be presented to the Faculty at a meeting to be held October 12, 1955 by Dr. T. P. Wright, Vice President for Research, and Chairman of the Subcommittee.

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are set forth hereinafter. The recommendations will be offered for adoption at the October Faculty meeting.

Any member of the Faculty who wishes to read the entire report, which is 60 pages in length, may obtain a copy by sending a note to the Dean of the University Faculty, 359 Day Hall, or by phoning his office. (Ext. 3816).

1. Findings

A. General

It is important to the University to foster good relations with corporations, both from the standpoint of faculty teaching proficiency in some disciplines and budget considerations for the University as a whole.

B. Graduate School Code

The present rules governing graduate study leading to the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts and Master of Science are satisfactory. (A minority of the Subcommittee dissented from this finding insofar as the masters' degrees are concerned.)

C. Differences Between Situation of Endowed and State Colleges When Dealing with Corporations

Such differences reside chiefly in the lesser need for financial aid on the part of the state-supported colleges. Also, the larger proportion of applied research in the state supported
colleges as distinguished from fundamental research in the endowed colleges makes a difference in approach necessary.

II. Recommendations to the Faculty

A. Industrial Cooperative Program of the College of Engineering

The University Faculty commends the principles of this program to the attention of segments of the University for their high educational value and possible application in other fields. Such a program should not be expected to contribute to University income beyond such amounts as are necessary to make it self-sustaining.

B. Need for Corporation Employee Training

Insofar as is geographically practicable and consistent with prior duties and responsibilities, the University Faculty recommends that the Faculty and staff of Cornell exhibit willingness to undertake extension teaching of employees of industrial corporations along lines worked out to meet the particular needs of each group as a special program and not for graduate degree credit. (See also III, G, at p.26a of this report)

C. Professional Graduate Degrees

The University Faculty recommends that the Graduate Faculty continue consideration of such degrees, and reconsider the possibility of some type of professional engineering degree at the Master's level.
III. Recommendations to the Administration

A. General Electric Agreement

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration terminate the contract between the University and the General Electric Company (relating to the special relationship with the General Electric Advanced Electronic Center) as provided in Article V of the present contract.

Note: Such cancellation would not affect the lease of the University's property at the Airport to the General Electric Company. (See Appendix 1 of this report)

B. B. F. Goodrich Grant

Inasmuch as the 1949 agreement with the B. F. Goodrich Company is satisfactory, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear its terms in mind when negotiating for corporation grants in the future. The Faculty also recommends however, that when formulating the clause of such contracts governing the purposes for which the gift may be used, consideration be given to including training as well as research.

Note: (See Appendix 2 of this report)

C. Corporation Sponsorship of Professorships

1. While the University Faculty approves the professorship agreement with the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory as suitable in view of the fact that the Laboratory is an affiliate and wholly owned subsidiary of the University, the Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind the possibility that this agreement might not afford
an appropriate pattern when seeking the support of professorships by outside firms.

2. The University Faculty recommends that the Administration, when soliciting corporation professorship sponsors, use as models and as examples of approaches, the three forms developed by the Policy Committee's Subcommittee on University-Corporation Relationships.

Note: (See Appendix 4 of this report)

D. Corporation Research Campus

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration encourage business firms (additional to the General Electric Company) to establish research facilities in the community near to the campus. The Faculty recommends location adjacent to the Airport on what is indicated on the College of Architecture master plan as "Research Campus" as suitable and desirable. The Faculty recommends further, however, that the Administration refrain from entering into any contracts other than leases with companies which may so locate in the future.

E. General Organization at Cornell for Corporation-University Dealings

While the University Faculty deems appropriate the organization and relationships involving the Development Office, the Provost's Office and the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Faculty recommends that the Administration take care to avoid multiple approaches to corporations save in those
instances in which, after suitable consultation between appropriate segments of the University, it appears that more than one approach may properly be made.

F. **Cornell Associates Program**

While expressing general acquiescence in the Cornell Associates Program, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind two undesirable possibilities:

1. That in particular cases the Associates Program might interfere with the priority in approach to the corporation to which the so-called sustaining program for soliciting larger gifts is clearly entitled,

2. That unless the non-exclusive character of the privilege of recruiting Cornell graduates as employees is constantly emphasized, corporations affiliating with the Associates Program are likely to assume that this privilege is open only to them or at least that they hold a preferred position.

G. **Training Employees of Corporations (Extension of Extramural Division)**

In recognition of the great need for industrial employees, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration set up suitable mechanisms to facilitate special efforts in this direction. The Faculty strongly recommends that the Extramural Division be utilized to the full for those qualified to meet its standards and that other teaching be promoted for those not qualified for the equivalent of existing Cornell course work. In particular, the
Faculty recommends careful consideration of the advantage of a single coordinating office to cover and foster all types of extension and extramural work with special attention to the needs of industry. (See also II, B at p. 24 of this report.)

H. Policy Relating to Corporation Grant Solicitation

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration inform Faculty or staff members approaching corporations for financial support that basic emphasis should be placed upon the following facts:

1. that the University is a main source of trained manpower upon which industry and commerce are dependent;
2. that tuition charges do not meet the full cost of training;
3. that the basic scientific research carried on at the universities is a prerequisite to much of the applied work carried on by the corporations themselves under our free enterprise system.

The faculty believes that this approach is clearly preferable to an attempt to demonstrate that contributing corporations will receive a quid pro quo in the form of specific and definitely calculable benefits.

Note: (See Appendix 3 of this report)

I. Allocation within the University of funds derived from Faculty-Negotiated Corporation Grants

The University Faculty recommends to the Administration that its Faculty representatives be informed of the extent to which they are authorized to use their discretion when negotiating with prospective corporate benefactors; and that the allocation of funds derived from the grant should be definitely decided upon at the outset so as to prevent the possibility of unpleasantness which might later arise if the matter were not settled in advance.
After a Subcommittee of the Committee on University Policy had studied the field of University-Corporation Relationship for two years, the Subcommittee filed a report with the Policy Committee in April, 1955 which was approved by the latter body in June, 1955. This report appears hereinafter. A summary of findings, and of recommendations to be presented to the Faculty for adoption, can be found at pp. 23-26b.
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The Subcommittee on University-Corporation Relationships has the honor to submit its report to the Faculty Committee on University Policy.

This Subcommittee was formed in the spring of 1953 to deliberate on its subject under the following terms of reference:

"To study and recommend basic policies to be followed when the University enters into research contracts."

At its first meeting, attended by Dean Farnham, it was stated that a broad coverage of the relations of the University to industry was desired, including corporation relationships and industrial support. Although relations with Government were not to be excluded, it was, nevertheless, to University-Industry relations that primary attention should be directed. Dean Farnham felt certain that the Committee on University Policy would concur in these interpretations.

In the letter of notification of the formation of the Subcommittee, the following members were named: D. R. Corson, S. C. Hollister, J. G. B. Hutchins, W. R. Sears, L. P. Smith, K. L. Turk, T. P. Wright, Chairman. At its first meeting on April 13, 1953, J. W. Hastie was named Secretary and in the fall of 1954, Herrell DeGraff was appointed by the Committee on University Policy to succeed K. L. Turk who would be absent during the school year 1954-55 on the Los Banos Project in the Philippines.

An indication of the history leading up to the formation of the Subcommittee appears appropriate. A contract between the University and the General Electric Company was signed on October 15, 1951. Although the provisions of this contract were approved by the Deans of the Graduate
School and the Faculty, by the Administration and by the Deans and Directors of the affected colleges and schools, "the contract did not receive unqualified approval from some departments and some individual faculty members".

Consequently, in order to explore all ramifications of the effects of the G. E. contract, on April 14, 1952, a meeting of twenty-five persons took place, with representation of Administration, Deans, Directors and Faculty. Provost Hill summarized the discussion as follows: "That he considered the most important question to be the effect of this somewhat new and special arrangement with one company upon our relations with other corporations. Moreover, we are in the process of working into new relationships with business organizations and each move should be most carefully considered."

The conclusions of this group were that the Faculty Committee on University Policy should consider the final amended G. E. contract to decide whether to present the matter to a meeting of the faculty or otherwise to determine action on the G. E. contract, such as immediate cancellation or termination (or renewal) at the end of the 3-year period provided in the contract. "In the course of this study, the agreement with General Electric can be used as an example in an attempt to formulate general policy on the relations between the University and corporations, both as to research laboratories and in general."

The appointment of the Subcommittee now reporting resulted from the deliberations of the University Policy Committee on the above question. Our report is organized under the following headings, this outline serving also as an index:
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1. Introduction

A few observations relating to the importance and urgency attached to the establishment of proper relationships between the University and Corporations are submitted. One matter of importance and urgency is the budget, "which has been out of balance for some time, and from present indications, will so continue for several years to come. Income of the University is derived from tuition; return on investments of endowment funds; and gifts, which may be from Alumni having an obvious interest in the University; from other persons having interest in education in general; or from corporations, which should have a similar interest. Another income source is unrestricted funds from research contracts—mostly from Government. All of these sources are being exploited at the present time, and it is hoped particularly that increased support from Alumni will result from the drives that are now being made. Gifts from persons other than Alumni are becoming more difficult to acquire because of drying up of large personal incomes due to increased taxes; it is also unlikely that there can be much increase in research contracts if we are still to maintain an appropriate balance between teaching and research; this leaves the corporation potential as an extremely important one, which must be realized if budget balance is to be achieved.

"Just as there is need for concern over the possible domination by Government, should endowed colleges continue in the red and therefore require more and more Government support, so also in determining University-Corporation relationships, policies must be pursued which assure that corporation domination is not substituted for that of Government. In other words, no matter what the source of financial support, the ultimate

* Throughout this report, passages enclosed in quotation marks are lifted from Minutes of the Subcommittee meetings except where some other source is specified.
responsibility for teaching and basic research must remain in the hands of the Faculty.

"However, if appropriate relationships can be instituted, there can be several benefits to the Faculty through appropriate contacts with corporations including enhancement of its proficiency in both the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. The degree of such benefits, of course, varies substantially between colleges - some disciplines obviously having much greater need for working closely with corporations than others. For instance, Engineering, Industrial and Labor Relations, Hotel Administration, Agriculture, Business and Public Administration would appear to call for greater knowledge of what is going on in the industrial world than would the Humanities. Other disciplines such as many departments in Arts and Sciences may fall between the two classes.

"Throughout discussions on these problems, the *quid pro quo* involved in corporation support of the University constantly comes up for careful scrutiny. Our Subcommittee has indicated its concept of this, which boils down to the obligation that corporations have in supporting institutions which are supplying them with the fundamental raw materials - namely, educated men and women, and fundamental contributions to knowledge in the Arts, Sciences and Professions. The proper amount of such support can well be expressed by computing the difference between the cost of education and tuition, which is the amount that the University, through return from endowment, is now subsidizing but finds itself in a position that makes it improbable that it can continue fully to do in the future. It is our task to convince Industry and other beneficiaries that it should take up the burden and responsibility of this subsidy."

However, it is going to take a considerable length of time to sell this idea to a skeptical Industry - which in general terms, definitely
looks for an immediate quid pro quo in the form of services. Gradually, an in-road is being made into this point of view, and many enlightened corporations are making unrestricted contributions."

In considering these general matters, the Subcommittee recorded many comments, a few of which are transcribed in this report:

"There followed a discussion of the long range nature of this Subcommittee's assignment in contrast to the shorter range work of the special groups in connection with certain approaches to corporations being made by Faculty members at the present time or to be made in the immediate future."

"There was agreement that certain basic definitions of policy needed by such groups should be made as quickly as possible by the Subcommittee."

"There was general agreement on the importance of defining policies to govern such corporation support and other relationships. The members also agreed that the Subcommittee's approach to corporation support should be positive rather than restrictive or critical, and that it should conceive its function as being one of preparing a report for the Faculty which will encourage a turning toward corporation support at the same time that it defines methods of avoiding any inherent dangers and pitfalls."

The report takes the form of an exploration of several specific problems and programs of the past and the determination of appropriate policy to guide the University's course in future relations to corporations,
2. Specific Problems

a. The General Electric Contract

The G. E. relationship takes the form of two contracts, one dealing with educational and campus relations between the University and the General Electric Advanced Electronics Center at Cornell University under such headings as: Projects; Equipment; Organization (faculty appointments of G. E. staff, social and athletic privileges, graduate student relations, patents, public relations and non-exclusive nature of contract obligations); and the other a contract for renting Cornell property at the airport to G. E. for its Center headquarters. Only the first forms the subject of our discussions, the second being of obvious mutual advantage.

The task for the Subcommittee has been to submit its recommendation on continuation or termination of the contract, and, if terminated, when such action should take place.

Some of the comments of members of the Subcommittee on advantages and disadvantages of the arrangement follow:

"The chief disadvantage is the classified nature of the work. The bulk of it is classified as "Military Security Information", but other parts are administratively classified by the company to protect its commercial interests. There seems little indication of any alteration in these classifications in the near future. The situation represents a distinct change from that predicted during the original discussions of the establishment of the Center at Ithaca. Another disadvantage is the concentration of the Laboratory on applied rather than fundamental research. A further negative aspect is the lack of opportunity for student participation, which is directly connected with the classified nature of the work."
Among the advantages are the opportunities afforded by the Center for consulting work by staff members of the University and the presence close to the campus of specialists in fields of interest to a number of departments. Two members of the Laboratory staff are being appointed as visiting professors in electrical engineering for teaching up to three hours a week without cost to the University.

The point was made that the existence of the contract with General Electric implies that the University assumes a responsibility and exercises a control (such as type of projects at the Center), which in fact, is not the case. The chief advantage to the University is derived from having the General Electric Center as a neighbor rather than from the contractual relationship. If there were no contract, certain matters would have to be the subject of specific negotiation—for example, the appointment of staff members as visiting professors.

Many other discussions took place, the burden of which was disagreement between Subcommittee members which could not be resolved. However, there was agreement in the following resolution:

"The Subcommittee unanimously agreed to recommend that the contract between the University and the General Electric Corporation be allowed to run its term to October, 1954, without change, but that it not be renewed thereafter."

However, it was suggested "that it will be appropriate for the administration to renew the agreement with a 30-day termination clause as a means of maintaining good business relations with General Electric during the period while the Subcommittee is formulating its report and the Faculty Policy Committee and the Faculty are considering it. The presence of the termination clause will keep open the opportunity to end the agreement if that course of action is finally decided on."
As a result, an amended contract was negotiated and is shown in Appendix 1. This will hold until cancelled as provided for in Article 5. Subsequently, the Subcommittee, after long debate, reaffirmed its recommendations for cancellation.

b. B. F. Goodrich Agreement

This agreement made October 3, 1949 was brought up for discussion. "The points emphasized were that the money was given on an unrestricted basis except for designation of broad fields of interest and that no specific *quid pro quo* was included" other than a potential educational opportunity (never utilized) for B. F. Goodrich employees. This agreement appears in Appendix 2. The position of the majority of the Subcommittee is the following:

"The 1949 agreement with B. F. Goodrich Company may properly be considered one existing agreement which is satisfactory. It should be noted that in negotiating future agreements, reference may need to be made to training as well as to research in naming the purposes for which the gift may be used."

c. Professorships -- Sponsored by Corporations

The Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory had decided in 1953 to support a professorship at Cornell University. A draft of a proposed agreement between these two institutions was drawn up and submitted to the Subcommittee for consideration and comment. The agreement outlines the mutuality of benefits with particular regard to the protection
of the tax exempt status of both parties. After incorporating a few suggested changes:

"The Subcommittee then adopted the revised draft, with certain changes, paragraph by paragraph. The version adopted is attached to and made a part of these minutes. The Subcommittee expressed its approval of proceeding to secure adoption of the agreement by both C.A.L. and the University."

Subsequently, the agreement was approved by the Directors of CAL and by the President of Cornell. The agreement is included as Appendix 3.

The Subcommittee next considered the case of corporation sponsorship of professorships in general. Its first observation was the following:

"The Subcommittee took the position that the terms of the agreement accepted for use in connection with the professorship to be supported by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory have been formulated on the basis that C.A.L. is an affiliate and wholly-owned subsidiary of Cornell University. The Committee emphasized that a similar agreement might not be an appropriate pattern for professorships supported by outside firms."

In seeking a formula for general application, the Subcommittee prepared several drafts. A final draft consisting of a preamble and three alternative methods of making grants in support of professorships was approved "as suitable for presentation to the Provost, the University Development Office, or others interested to serve as a model and example of approaches which the Subcommittee believe would meet with faculty approval". This approved draft appears herein as Appendix I.

d. Corporation Research Campus

When considering the General Electric Advanced Electronics Center matter, the question arose concerning the desirability of other corporations locating research establishments near the University, and more specifically, on its property adjacent to the Airport. Reference was made to a proposed development plan for the Airport area prepared by Dean Mackesey, on which a location designated as "Research Campus"
is shown. Recognizing the advantages to the Faculty and the University of such research establishments near to the campus, the Subcommittee approved the following resolution:

"It was further agreed to record that encouragement should be offered to other business firms (i.e., other than General Electric) to establish research facilities in the community. If other companies should do so in the future, the Committee believes it inadvisable to enter into a general contract agreement with them."

e. Engineering College Industrial Cooperative Program

For a number of years, the College of Engineering has conducted a program of study in cooperation with several corporations having in view the educational benefits to be derived from a suitable alternation of work on campus and at the plant of the cooperative company. After summarizing the operation, it was pointed out "particularly that the payments made by companies are designed to make this a self-sustaining program, but are not intended to provide increment to the general income of the University. The sums specified in the various agreements underlying the program have proved sufficient for the intended purpose. The program should be viewed essentially as an extension of Laboratory instruction into industrial plants as a supplement to the training available on the campus. The College of Engineering now has agreements with six corporations - General Electric, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Philco, American Gas and Electric, Air Reduction, and Procter & Gamble. The number of students involved in the program is in the order of 60."

"It was agreed that the Subcommittee should mention this program in its report, commending it to the attention of other branches of the University for its high educational value and recording its view that such a program should not be expected to contribute to University income beyond such amounts as are necessary to make it self-sustaining."

A sample agreement appears herein as Appendix 5.
3. Organization for University-Corporation Dealings

a. General

University organization for approach to corporations received some attention. The following summary and conclusion were recorded:

"1. Here at Cornell, such approach has until now been mainly the responsibility of the Development Office, including the Cornell Associates Program.

"2. A special informal group has now been formed by Provost Hill to coordinate direct Faculty approach to corporations.

"3. The Office of the Vice President for Research has a function in clearing and coordinating those corporation contacts which involve research grants and contracts or industrial fellowships."

b. Cornell Associates Program

However, the work of the Cornell Associates program impinges on the faculty to such an extent that it was felt appropriate to study this operation and report the Subcommittee findings in considerable detail.

This program was started several years ago upon the recommendation of the Cornell University Council (and with principal provisions established by a group of business executives, faculty and others associated with the Council). The brochure outlining the program was printed only after thorough consultation with Deans, Directors, Faculty and Administrators, throughout several revision stages. Its actual language as to the quid pro quo accruing to participating corporations appears satisfactory on careful reading. Nevertheless, many faculty members have been, at least at first, concerned over some provisions. Therefore, after receiving a list of the questions which had arisen prepared as a summary of many faculty comments, the Subcommittee made a careful study of the list,
resulting in the following discussion. (The item of concern is underlined in each paragraph).

"1. The view that this Program may be similar to those of other institutions so that it will not be readily acceptable to industry seems to be refuted by the experience of the first two years. Actually it varies substantially from the program of any other University.

"2. It is no objection to the Program to say that it will yield less income than needed by Cornell from industry provided the Program is viewed as only one of a number of non-conflicting approaches. The Committee strongly urged that the importance of multiple approach to the problem be constantly kept in mind. The feeling that administrative costs in the Associates Program would be excessive has been answered by actual experience.

"3. The Committee agrees that one of the most important approaches to industry should be on the basis of industry's obligation to help pay the full costs of educating the manpower on which it depends. But, because of its emphasis on the value of a number of different approaches to corporations, it feels that other methods such as represented by the Cornell Associates Program are appropriate as well.

"4. The objection that companies may feel that their obligations to higher education have been fully met on payment of the Associates' minimum dues is valid only if the so-called sustaining program for larger gifts from industry actually proves to be hampered. This danger must be guarded against, but apparently has not materialized.

"5. The reported feeling that the Associates Program may interfere with faculty members' consulting arrangements was felt to be without foundation in view of the language dealing with this point in the brochure of the Associates Program which actually increases the opportunities for personal contacts and consulting arrangements if desired.

"6. The objection that industrial Associates would receive preference in recruiting activities is without foundation since they are promised no such preference, the brochure merely calling attention to this general University service offered for the assistance of its seniors and alumni. The Committee is in full agreement that the giving of preference to any firm whether because of Associates membership or any other financial support to the University, would be completely unsound.

"7. The feeling that the Faculty was being committed to a program not fully understood was possibly true at the start of the Associates Program, but information is now widespread on the campus and brochures and other written material are readily available.
8. The statement that Associates may feel that they are entitled to certain use of faculty services and time apart from consulting is valid in the sense that all faculty members and other staff members of the University have an obligation to give a certain amount of time to anyone visiting the campus for a serious purpose. There is no evidence so far that the Associates have made excessive or unreasonable demands of this kind.

9. The objection that a $1000 annual membership fee is too low was countered by three points; first, the fact it was the industrial people on the Cornell University Council who recommended the $1000 figure; second, the fact that payments of this order can frequently be made by corporate management without the necessity for their board action; and third, such a minimum makes practicable the membership of numerous small companies.

The Committee feels that two dangers must be guarded against in the administration of the Program:

(a) The first is a possibility that the Associates Program might in particular cases interfere with an approach to a corporation under the so-called sustaining program for soliciting larger gifts. Clearly the latter must have priority in such instances.

(b) The second is a possible implication of preference to Associates members in the recruiting of Cornell graduates for employment. The non-exclusive character of this corporation privilege must be constantly emphasized.

In conclusion the Committee expressed its general acquiescence with the Cornell Associates Program on the basis of the comments previously noted.

A number of other questions were explored but did not result in any change in the Subcommittee conclusions. As a matter of interest, the financial results of this program are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>'52-53</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>18,650.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>'53-54</td>
<td>96,500</td>
<td>15,350.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>'54-55</td>
<td>125,000*</td>
<td>22,000.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budgeted
4. **Personnel Matters**

a. **Faculty Consulting**

On many occasions during the meetings of the Subcommittee, questions arose bearing on faculty personal consulting services rendered to corporations or others by many faculty members in certain fields. However, it was not deemed advisable nor strictly within the terms of reference of the Subcommittee to delve into this subject except as it might appear as a factor relevant to some other discussion.

b. **Graduate Student Relationships with Corporations**

The question of company employees taking courses of study at Cornell or becoming candidates for graduate degrees while continuing their employment arose many times during the meetings. The code of legislation of the Graduate Faculty provides for this on the basis of certain restrictions as to the allowable work week when the candidate is gainfully employed by the company, and certain limitations on the amount of credit that may be earned toward the graduate degree under these conditions. Usually companies and their employees want to make less restrictive arrangements than the Code allows. This whole matter, of course, comes within the jurisdiction of the Graduate Faculty, but as it is a very real problem from the standpoint of University-Corporation relations, it seemed appropriate to discuss it and record the conversations in some detail.

In a number of instances, certain corporations are making special arrangements with Universities located near them. One example is the Lockheed-University of Southern California Advanced Study Program.
quoted in Appendix 6. Another is the MacDonnell-Washington University (St, Louis) agreement. It was the consensus that such arrangements are likely (though possibly not necessarily) to degrade the granting University's degree. Certainly, dangers exist in such deals.

There was a rather extensive discussion of the so-called Professional Degree as distinguished from the existing degrees administered by the Graduate School. In view of the points discussed on the preceding page, it is the view of this Subcommittee that Cornell should come to grips with this subject and reconsider the possibility of some type of professional degree at the Master's level.

It is believed that the discussions of the thirteenth meeting of the Subcommittee, devoted entirely to these questions, are well suited to give the University Policy Committee an insight into the feelings of the members of the Subcommittee. Consequently, the thirteenth meeting minutes are furnished herein as Appendix 7.

Resulting from the deliberations of this meeting was a resolution, repeated below:

"Insofar as is geographically practicable and consistent with prior duties and responsibilities, the faculty and staff of Cornell should be willing to undertake extension teaching of employees of industrial corporations along lines worked out to meet the particular needs of each group as a special program and not for graduate degree credit."

The meeting minutes discuss methods of implementing the above resolution in the paragraphs immediately following it.

The final actions of the Subcommittee in this whole matter are given below:

"1. It was unanimously agreed that present rules for graduate study should continue in force for Doctor's degrees, and a majority agreed that the same position should be taken on the rules for Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees as well.

"2. The great need for additional training for employees of industry, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, is recognized."
"3. The Subcommittee therefore strongly urges that Cornell set up suitable mechanisms to facilitate special efforts in this direction. It particularly urges that the Extramural Division be utilized to the full for those qualified to meet its standards and that other teaching be promoted for those not qualified for the equivalent of existing Cornell course work. In particular, it recommends the careful consideration of the advantages of a single coordinating office to cover and foster all types of extension and extramural work with special attention to the needs of industry."

5. Policy Discussion

a. Corporation Grants to Cornell University

The Subcommittee spent a great deal of time on this subject, which is the nub of its whole job. In this connection, there are four points of contact between representatives of the University and corporations, as follows:

1. Service by University staff members as private consultants, to which reference is made in Section 4a of this report.

2. The Cornell University Associates program discussed in Section 3b of this report.

3. Direct appeal by eminent members of the faculty to corporations for grants to the University, discussed in this section of the Subcommittee's report.

4. Grants by corporations to the University made on the basis of formulae devised by the corporation itself. These are also taken up in this section of the report.

Early in its deliberations, the Subcommittee approved a resolution which, though it was elaborated upon extensively, the members saw no reason to rescind nor in its essentials to alter. This resolution reads as follows:

"That Faculty or Staff members approaching Corporations for possible support should place basic emphasis on the fact that the University is a main source of trained manpower upon which industry and commerce are dependent, and that tuition charges do not meet full cost of training. Another fundamental University contribution to industry in our free enterprise system is the basic science on which corporations are dependent for product applications. An approach based on these fundamentals, rather than attempts to define specific minor benefits of quid pro quo nature, should be used."
Such an approach, if successful, places no direct obligation on faculty for consulting or other abnormal service, nor on students to accept employment elsewhere than with the concern of their own choosing.

Also, this approach avoids an appeal on a basis of philanthropy or charity believed to be inimical to the dignity and, in the long run, to the interests of both parties.

As current programs were already underway involving University-Corporation negotiations for support, it was felt by the Subcommittee that it should set down its conclusions at greater length than appears in the above resolution and that it would be appropriate and in no way presumptuous to furnish the resultant statement to the Provost, who was heading up an ad hoc committee to deal with approaches to corporations by members of the faculty. As a result, the "Statement of Policy Concerning the Solicitation of Financial Support of the University from Corporation" appearing as Appendix 8 herein was approved and forwarded to the Provost on May 12, 1953. (Paragraph 2 was added to the Statement subsequently in order to make it compatible to the resolution quoted above.)

A problem frequently facing those within corporations responsible for corporations extending financial support to Universities is the legality of donations made without a tangible quid pro quo. Although it is our feeling that the supply of the raw materials - educated men and fundamental science - are very real, nevertheless, corporation stockholders have contested the view on many occasions. It was, therefore, with great satisfaction that universities and all those having the interests of higher learning at heart, viewed the decision of Judge Alfred A. Stein in the Superior Court of New Jersey in 1953.
In Appendix 9 there is reproduced a N. Y. Times article of May 22, 1953 which outlines this ruling.

This ruling is most encouraging. Nevertheless, the question will no doubt arise elsewhere and it may always be necessary to undertake each corporation negotiation on its own merits, with view to achieving a result as close to the ideal of our resolution as possible.

Now let us deal with the several grant formulae that a number of enlightened corporations have instituted during the past few years. That such programs as those of Bethlehem Steel, General Electric and General Motors have been instituted is very encouraging, for they are based on the fundamental premise that it is the educated man and woman that forms the backbone of American industry.

The Bethlehem Steel agreement is based on sound premises, but is subject to the possibility of grave misinterpretation under certain circumstances. A precis of their arrangement appears in Appendix 10 wherein the disadvantages as well as the advantages are cited. In accepting this plan, Cornell negotiated certain modifications aimed at removing the unacceptable implications. The Subcommittee suggested the following as a modified plan along the general lines, however, of the Bethlehem concept:

"The total amount of the corporation grant would be made on the basis of $X dollars for Cornell graduates who had entered company employment during the preceding five years and had remained for a stipulated minimum period. This total grant would be paid in fixed annual increments during the five succeeding years. At the end of that period a new grant would be pledged on a similar formula based on the experience of the immediately preceding five years. Names would not be mentioned in any case."
Another interesting corporation program for furnishing aid to universities is that of General Electric. The essence of this admirable formula is that the company will match the gift that any of its employees may make to his Alma Mater. The plan is described further in Appendix II.

Other plans have been announced such as those of Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation, CBS Foundation, duPont and Standard Oil of New Jersey. Some are based on direct unrestricted aid to the University - others on scholarship aid to students. Both avenues are important and good, as both fulfill urgent needs.

Important and encouraging as are these indications of a growing recognition of the responsibility of corporations to higher learning in America, we must, nevertheless, face the fact that this comes from a relatively small proportion of industry. We must, therefore, continue to "hammer home" our case, our importance to industrial progress and our need. Having this in mind, one of our members "described the need for a general publication, probably a quarterly, which would present the Cornell story to an audience of corporation executives; secondary school people; administration and faculty of undergraduate colleges; those alumni active in fund raising, scholarship or other University activities; and other interested people."

Preliminary plans for such a publication were worked up in 1953 and are from time to time brought up for consideration.

b. Differences in Corporation Dealings Between the State Supported and Endowed Colleges

In general, corporation dealings in the State supported Colleges are restricted to research programs. Therefore, great care is exercised in assuring that agreements to adhere strictly to the criteria of
acceptability of the University as modified to account for the special condition of tax support in the State Colleges. Three basic criteria for acceptability are:

"1. The research problem must be of importance to farmers and homemakers of the State of New York.

"2. The problem must be of the kind which the college would undertake with its own funds if available.

"3. There must be no curtailment of the right to publish the results. This means that the donor has no special proprietary rights to the results of the research."

The major difference in approach to corporations in the State supported Colleges as distinguished from the Endowed, may best be indicated by quoting from the minutes of the twelfth meeting:

"A major difference in relationships is that the State Colleges are not approaching industry for general support since they receive appropriations from the legislature for their basic program. The research grants themselves come to the Colleges and are not actively sought. It was pointed out that this is also true with respect to industrial research projects in the endowed Colleges where there is very little seeking out of industrial support to research. The active approach to industry by the endowed Colleges lies much more in the effort to secure general unrestricted donations.

"It was further pointed out that another important difference is the greater proportion of applied research in the State Colleges, a form of research in which industry has a more direct interest than in fundamental research. As a result there is less need for laying emphasis on the so-called quid pro quo since the benefits to industry from applied research are immediately apparent. It was estimated that the research of the College of Agriculture as a whole is divided
into about 40 per cent basic and 60 per cent applied. These ratios, of course, differ greatly from department to department. The actual amount of applied research could not be reduced in view of the obligations of the College to the tax-paying public of the State, but the College would be glad to see a larger amount of basic research which would alter the ratio.

"The belief was expressed that other forms of donation from industry to the State supported Colleges would be acceptable and could be used to expand the general program of the College beyond what can be expected from legislative appropriations. For example, a gift in support of a professorship could be used to release any funds provided in the budget for that post and the released funds would be available for equipment, unsponsored research, or further educational effort in another area less well supported."

c. Gift Allocation Within the University

"A number of differing opinions was expressed on the question as to proper allocation within the University of funds received from corporations without any restriction, or without restriction except as to the designation of a primary field of interest. These opinions centered around the relative weight to be given to the incentive factor where the department of the fund-raising professor is given a major share as against the needs of the University as a whole and of departments whose fields provide no attractive basis for a fund-raising appeal."

Further discussion failed to develop a consensus in either direction. In its final discussion on this point, the Minutes reveal the following:
"The Subcommittee feels that each instance is surrounded by special circumstances having to do with the three parties involved, namely, the corporation, the department, and the University as a whole. It may be proper for the grant to go all one way or all the other or part each way, depending on these circumstances. It was agreed that it was neither practicable nor desirable to recommend any fixed percentage in a report such as this. Flexibility in negotiation is necessary.

"Therefore, it was decided that there must be freedom of action for negotiation on the basis of advance understanding between the faculty negotiator and his administrative officers; however, any division of the grant should be decided upon definitely at the outset so as to prevent possibility of unpleasantness arising later in the absence of such agreement."
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6. Findings and Recommendations

I. Findings

A. General

It is important to the University to foster good relations with corporations, both from the standpoint of faculty teaching proficiency in some disciplines and budget considerations for the University as a whole.

B. Graduate School Code

The present rules governing graduate study leading to the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts and Master of Science are satisfactory. (A minority of the Subcommittee dissented from this finding insofar as the masters' degrees are concerned.)

C. Differences Between Situation of Endowed and State Colleges When Dealing with Corporations

Such differences reside chiefly in the lesser need for financial aid on the part of the state-supported colleges. Also, the larger proportion of applied research in the state-supported
colleges as distinguished from fundamental research in the endowed colleges makes a difference in approach necessary.

II. Recommendations to the Faculty

A. Industrial Cooperative Program of the College of Engineering

The University Faculty commends the principles of this program to the attention of other segments of the University for their high educational value and possible application in other fields. Such a program should not be expected to contribute to University income beyond such amounts as are necessary to make it self-sustaining.

B. Need for Corporation Employee Training

Insofar as is geographically practicable and consistent with prior duties and responsibilities, the University Faculty recommends that the Faculty and staff of Cornell exhibit willingness to undertake extension teaching of employees of industrial corporations along lines worked out to meet the particular needs of each group as a special program and not for graduate degree credit. (See also III, G, at p.26a of this report)

C. Professional Graduate Degrees

The University Faculty recommends that the Graduate Faculty continue consideration of such degrees, and reconsider the possibility of some type of professional engineering degree at the Master's level.
III. Recommendations to the Administration

A. General Electric Agreement

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration terminate the contract between the University and the General Electric Company (relating to the special relationship with the General Electric Advanced Electronic Center) as provided in Article V of the present contract.

Note: Such cancellation would not affect the lease of the University's property at the Airport to the General Electric Company. (See Appendix 1 of this report)

B. B. F. Goodrich Grant

Inasmuch as the 1949 agreement with the B. F. Goodrich Company is satisfactory, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear its terms in mind when negotiating for corporation grants in the future. The Faculty also recommends, however, that when formulating the clause of such contracts governing the purposes for which the gift may be used, consideration be given to including training as well as research.

Note: (See Appendix 2 of this report)

C. Corporation Sponsorship of Professorships

1. While the University Faculty approves the professorship agreement with the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory as suitable in view of the fact that the Laboratory is an affiliate and wholly owned subsidiary of the University, the Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind the possibility that this agreement might not afford
an appropriate pattern when seeking the support of professorships by outside firms.

2. The University Faculty recommends that the Administration, when soliciting corporation professorship sponsors, use as models and as examples of approaches, the three forms developed by the Policy Committee's Subcommittee on University-Corporation Relationships.

Note: (See Appendix 4 of this report)

D. Corporation Research Campus

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration encourage business firms (additional to the General Electric Company) to establish research facilities in the community near to the campus. The Faculty recommends location adjacent to the Airport on what is indicated on the College of Architecture master plan as "Research Campus" as suitable and desirable. The Faculty recommends further, however, that the Administration refrain from entering into any contracts other than leases with companies which may so locate in the future.

E. General Organization at Cornell for Corporation-University Dealings

While the University Faculty deems appropriate the organization and relationships involving the Development Office, the Provost's Office and the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Faculty recommends that the Administration take care to avoid multiple approaches to corporations save in those
instances in which, after suitable consultation between appropriate segments of the University, it appears that more than one approach may properly be made.

F. Cornell Associates Program

While expressing general acquiescence in the Cornell Associates Program, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration bear in mind two undesirable possibilities:

1. That in particular cases the Associates Program might interfere with the priority in approach to the corporation to which the so-called sustaining program for soliciting larger gifts is clearly entitled.

2. That unless the non-exclusive character of the privilege of recruiting Cornell graduates as employees is constantly emphasized, corporations affiliating with the Associates Program are likely to assume that this privilege is open only to them or at least that they hold a preferred position.

G. Training Employees of Corporations (Extension of Extramural Division)

In recognition of the great need for industrial employees, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, the University Faculty recommends that the Administration set up suitable mechanisms to facilitate special efforts in this direction. The Faculty strongly recommends that the Extramural Division be utilized to the full for those qualified to meet its standards and that other teaching be promoted for those not qualified for the equivalent of existing Cornell course work. In particular, the
Faculty recommends careful consideration of the advantage of a single coordinating office to cover and foster all types of extension and extramural work with special attention to the needs of industry. (See also II, B at p. 24 of this report.)

H. Policy Relating to Corporation Grant Solicitation

The University Faculty recommends that the Administration inform Faculty or staff members approaching corporations for financial support that basic emphasis should be placed upon the following facts:

1. that the University is a main source of trained manpower upon which industry and commerce are dependent;
2. that tuition charges do not meet the full cost of training;
3. that the basic scientific research carried on at the universities is a prerequisite to much of the applied work carried on by the corporations themselves under our free enterprise system.

The faculty believes that this approach is clearly preferable to an attempt to demonstrate that contributing corporations will receive a quid pro quo in the form of specific and definitely calculable benefits.

Note: (See Appendix 8 of this report)

I. Allocation within the University of funds derived from Faculty-Negotiated Corporation Grants

The University Faculty recommends to the Administration that its Faculty representatives be informed of the extent to which they are authorized to use their discretion when negotiating with prospective corporate benefactors; and that the allocation of funds derived from the grant should be definitely decided upon at the outset so as to prevent the possibility of unpleasantness which might later arise if the matter were not settled in advance.
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APPENDIX I

GENERAL ELECTRIC ADVANCED ELECTRONICS CENTER

AGREEMENT

This agreement, made this 15th day of October, 1952, by and between
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, a New York corporation (hereinafter called the
Company), and CORNELL UNIVERSITY, a New York charitable corporation (here-
inafter called Cornell),

WITNESSETH THAT:

WHEREAS, the parties hereto entered into an agreement dated October 15,
1951, containing recitals that

WHEREAS, the parties thereto were desirous of promoting
closer relations between the scientist, the industrialist
and the military services, and

WHEREAS, the company was desirous of promoting and
obtaining the benefit of increased research in electronics
and related sciences, and

WHEREAS, the parties were desirous of extending the
bounds of scientific knowledge and of promoting technical
education, and

WHEREAS, Cornell was desirous of cooperating in the
scientific and educational aspects of this undertaking; and

WHEREAS, the parties thereto now desire to modify that agreement
to read as set forth below;
NOW, THEREFORE, the parties thereto do hereby amend said agreement to read as follows:

1. The Company will establish at the Cornell University Airport, at Ithaca, New York, an advanced development laboratory to be known as General Electric Advanced Electronic Center at Cornell University (hereinafter called the Center).

2. Projects
   a). Projects assigned to the Center will be, in general, of a highly technical nature compatible with the purposes above stated. They will require a high level of analytical, creative, and applied research effort in fields of electronics and related technologies that are within the product interests of the Company.
   b). An authorized representative of Cornell will be kept informed of projects being considered for the Center and such of these projects as he may specify shall be referred to a joint Company and Cornell steering committee for discussion and decision. It will be Company policy not to assign projects to the Center against the wishes of Cornell.
   c). Where military classification applies to a particular project the Center and the personnel thereof will comply with the proper security requirements with respect to such classified projects.

3. Equipment
   a). Cornell agrees to rent and General Electric agrees to occupy under a lease containing such terms as are mutually agreeable, buildings, facilities, and surrounding grounds at the airfield now the property of Cornell. It is further understood that the said building will
will be modified and altered in accordance with the requirements of said lease agreement. Cornell will undertake the modification and alteration of the building in accordance with specifications prepared by General Electric and as from time to time amended. If additional space is required the parties may by mutual agreement detail specifications for construction to be performed by Cornell and lease arrangements for use of said construction by the Company.

b). The Company will pay the University a rent to be agreed upon. It is understood that the rent will include a reasonable payment for the use of the building and surrounding grounds together with a sum pro-rated over the period of the lease which will reimburse the University for the actual cost to the University of the modification and alterations made at General Electric's request.

c). Cornell will when required make available to the Center at reasonable times existing mechanical and machine work and laboratory facilities. General Electric will reimburse Cornell at reasonable rates to be agreed upon in advance, for the use of such facilities and materials and labor (if any) as are made available by Cornell. It is understood that normal Cornell teaching commitments will take priority whenever a conflict exists. Consideration will be given by Cornell to reversing this priority for brief periods should urgent defense requirements warrant.

d) The authorities of Cornell University will make available to staff members of the Center, in accordance with requirements agreed upon, those facilities which are normally available to the Cornell University faculty for the conduct of their business and study, such as, for example, library privileges.
4. Organization

a). The Center will be organized with a highly qualified Scientific, Managerial, Administrative, Clerical and Technical Staff at Ithaca, New York. Over-all responsibility for all phases of the operations at the Center will be vested in a Manager at Ithaca who in turn is responsible to higher management levels at Electronics Park, Syracuse, New York.

(1) Employees of the Center will be employed and paid by the Company at rates and conditions to be agreed upon between the respective parties.

(2) After the individual, Cornell University and General Electric have arrived at an agreement, one or more associate principal scientists from the Cornell Faculty may be chosen to assist and advise the staff at the Center.

(3) The scientific staff of the Center will be selected by General Electric with the advice of representatives of Cornell.

b). Cornell may in its discretion give faculty appointments without academic tenure or voting privileges to certain members of the scientific staff and accord to those selected such other faculty privileges as may seem appropriate. The Company agrees that those members of the scientific staff of the Center who are given faculty appointments may teach appropriate classes at Cornell University without expense to the University provided that such individuals are not required to teach more than one three-hour course or its equivalent in any academic semester. The Company
further agrees that it will to the largest extent possible assign duties to scientific staff members within the Center in such a way that such three-hour course will not be interrupted during a semester. General Electric agrees that scientific staff members of the Center having faculty appointments may be used as faculty advisors for theses or projects for reasonable periods without cost to the University.

c). Certain members of the Center staff to be designated yearly, though not given faculty appointments, will be eligible for those social and athletic privileges normally accorded to Cornell staff members, compatible with the rules of the several campus organizations.

d). Cornell agrees that a reasonable amount of time may be devoted by members of its staff and faculty at their volition in assisting the administration and other activities of the Center without requiring that any recompense or moneys be paid by the General Electric Company. Cornell reserves the right to judge whether or not such activities are excessive. Cornell further agrees that the Company may with the individual's consent employ or retain as consultants on a part-time basis members of the staff and faculty of Cornell and properly qualified students, in which case the Company will compensate on a part-time basis the said staff or faculty members or the students directly without liability to the University.

e). The personnel making up the staff of the Center will be eligible for entry in graduate courses in Cornell University provided they can satisfy the entrance requirement of the University for such course, and in other respects comply with the regulations of the Graduate School.
f). General Electric will on occasion arrange part-time schedules for employees at the Center in order that they may carry on work in the Graduate School of the University in satisfaction of requirements for a degree.

g). General Electric may permit students performing work at the Center to carry out work on their theses at the Center. Such students will permit General Electric Company to review their theses prior to publication. However, rights to publication will remain with the University. To the extent that said graduate students do any work in connection with classified matter, they will comply with all applicable security regulations.

h). Patents - Cornell agrees that any scientist, professor, faculty member, or employee of Cornell, who accepts an assignment on the staff of the Center, or is retained as a consultant in connection with any of its projects, shall be free to enter into appropriate agreements, relating to invention and patent releases and assignments, with the Company whereby any inventions or discoveries made by them as a result of, or growing out of, or directly related to, such assignments shall be the property of the Company, and whereby such scientist, professor or employee shall promptly disclose such inventions to the Company and shall assist the Company in all proper ways, at the Company's expense, to obtain patents therefor in all countries of the world, and Cornell agrees that neither it, Cornell Research Foundation, nor any College of the University or other Agency of Cornell, will make any claim to any right to, or under, any such invention.
i). In the event the resident General Electric Company representatives at the Center and the local Cornell University authorities determine that some matter should be submitted to higher authority for consideration, such matter shall then be referred to the Vice President for Research of Cornell University and the Vice President, General Electric Company, in charge of the Electronics Division, Electronics Park, Syracuse, New York.

j). It is understood and agreed that this relationship between the contracting parties shall not be used as a basis for any statement or implication that either party favors the other party over other organizations operating in the same or similar respective fields, or that either party sponsors or endorses the products of the other party, but this shall not prevent either party from announcing the establishment of this relationship nor from announcing the fact that such discoveries, inventions, or devices as may be developed at the Center, were developed there. However, both parties agree to submit to the other copies of any proposed brochures, announcements, advertising copy, or other publicity relating to the Center or its activities before making use of such material, and to use the same only when approved by both parties. For approval, the Company may submit such material to the Dean of the College of Engineering of Cornell, and Cornell may submit such material to the Resident Manager.

k). It is understood and agreed by the Company and Cornell that this entire Agreement is mutually non-exclusive. The Company shall be at liberty at all times to enter into similar agreements with any other educational institution. Likewise, Cornell shall be at liberty at all
times to enter into similar agreements with any other person, group, or corporation whatsoever.

5. This agreement may be terminated by either party upon thirty days written notice.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have signed this Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

ATTEST: GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

By: Assistant Secretary Vice President

ATTEST: CORNELL UNIVERSITY

By: Secretary Vice President for Research
Dr. Cornelis de Kiewiet  
Acting President  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York  

Dear Dr. de Kiewiet:

The Board of Directors of The B. F. Goodrich Company at its meeting on August 16, 1949, authorized a university cooperative program which, if it should have the approval of Cornell University, would involve, in brief, the entering into of an undertaking between Cornell and the Company whereby scientists employed by the Company and who otherwise meet the requirements of Cornell University as candidates for graduate degrees, special students of the graduate school or graduate research fellows, would have an opportunity by resident study at Cornell to secure specialized training in chemistry, physics and other related sciences on which the Company's progress in research and production in the years ahead is based. The directors at the above indicated meeting passed the following resolutions:

"RESOLVED, that the Company offer to the Greater Cornell Fund $50,000 for use in the field of fundamental research in the chemical and physical sciences, conditioned upon Cornell University extending to the Company the right for a period of five years to have not to exceed four employees at any one time resident at Cornell University for specialized or graduate study in such fields as the Company may designate, subject to the approval of Cornell University, with the understanding that any such employee while resident at the University shall continue to be an employee of the Company which shall be entitled to all benefits incident to such resident study as fully as it would were the employee located at and/or working in a plant of the Company, and

"RESOLVED FURTHER, that the officers of the Company be, and they hereby are, authorized and directed to negotiate a contract within the framework of the preceding resolution with Cornell University, which shall be separate and distinct from any specific contract now in effect, or which may be later made, between the Company and Cornell University, and upon the execution of such contract to pay to the Greater Cornell Fund $50,000,"
It is understood that while such candidates for graduate degrees, special students for the graduate school, or research fellows, hereinafter referred to as student—employees, are in residence at Cornell, they shall in all respects be subject to the applicable rules and regulations of the University and of the appropriate departments and that their work and conduct shall at all times be satisfactory to the University, which shall have the right in its sole discretion to determine whether any student—employee so selected for study is an appropriate candidate for such study and that the field of research designated by the Company is an appropriate one to be carried on under University facilities. Cornell University undertakes and agrees to pay to the appropriate departments out of the sums to be received by it from The B. F. Goodrich Company all requisite academic tuition and fees. The University shall not, however, be under any requirement to provide housing or dining facilities, but these will be made available to the extent possible on the same basis as they are available to other similar students at the University.

Subject to the applicable rules and regulations of the University and to any requirements that may be imposed by rules and regulations of the United States Government or any of its departments to which the University may be subject, such student—employees may report or make available to The B. F. Goodrich Company appropriate information and data with respect to the projects on which they are engaged and shall have the right to patents or copyrights with respect to their own work, subject to the applicable laws of the United States and to contractual relations between any such student—employee and The B. F. Goodrich Company, and in general shall have all such rights as are available to other students engaged in similar work.

In the event that Cornell is willing to enter into the arrangement hereinabove in this letter indicated, will you be good enough to accept for the University on each of the duplicate letters being sent you herewith, retaining one signed copy for your files and mailing to us the second signed copy.

Accepted at Ithaca, N. Y.
This 12th day of October, 1949
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
BY C. W. de Kiewiet
Acting President

Sincerely yours,
THE B. F. GOODRICH COMPANY

By W. J. Avery
Secretary
CORNELL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT dated June 15, 1953, between CORNELL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY, INC. (C.A.L.) and CORNELL UNIVERSITY (C.U.)

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, C.A.L., a University owned Laboratory engaged in research, 95% of which is under contract with agencies of the Federal Government, requires the services of scientists and engineers of the highest quality, and

WHEREAS, the C.A.L. is encountering great difficulty in acquiring such services of men of the necessary qualifications; most of whom would need to be graduates of divisions of universities and colleges such as the Graduate School of Aeronautical Engineering or the School of Electrical Engineering of the College of Engineering, or of certain Departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, of C.U., and

WHEREAS, C.A.L. can also effectively utilize members of the teaching staff of universities such as C.U. as technical advisors, consultants or seminar lecturers, and

WHEREAS, it is eminently desirable to maintain a close educational relationship between C.U. and its fully owned subsidiary C.A.L., this being important in connection with obtaining and retaining the services of employees at C.A.L. and

WHEREAS, certain of the staff of C.U. are interested in an opportunity to participate in sundry phases of the research work conducted at C.A.L., and

WHEREAS, C.U. is interested in the placement of its graduates in positions such as are frequently available at C.A.L., because, (particularly in its Engineering Colleges) the University needs to have a close relation with and an intimate knowledge of the quality and degree of success of its graduates in order to measure its own success as an educational institution, and

WHEREAS, C.U. will benefit by the support made available through this agreement to permit improved performance of its activities.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed:

1. In order to accomplish the above, C.A.L. will support a professorship at Cornell University for a period of three years at an annual salary for the incumbent professor of $12,500.
2. Predicated on mutual agreement in detail, C.A.L. as a subsidiary of Cornell University may conduct courses of study at its laboratory in Buffalo along the general lines specified by the Heads of the Schools or Departments of C.U., who, in such event, will render assistance in preparing and grading examinations and who may appoint or approve appropriate C.A.L. staff to conduct such courses.

3. C.U. will provide to C.A.L. services as technical advisor and/or seminar Lecturer of the professor who holds the chair supported under item 1 above to an extent of the equivalent of twenty days each year at Buffalo and ten at Ithaca without additional reimbursement, but with payment of travel expenses.

4. C.U. will cooperate with C.A.L. by placing before students graduating from the University the opportunities for employment with C.A.L., and in the case of graduates or undergraduates, of participating in summer employment at the Laboratory.

5. C.U. will cooperate with C.A.L. through the encouragement of other members of its teaching staff to serve in consulting or lecturing capacities with C.A.L. when suitable direct contract arrangements can be effected between the C.A.L. and the staff member involved.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed as of the date above written by their respective duly authorized officers.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

By Deane W. Malott

CORNELL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY, INC.

By C. C. Furnas
APPENDIX 4

1. Believing that the competitive position of American Industry and the future business stature of the Corporation is dependent basically on the steady flow of young people of adequate training in __________________________

(discipline or area);

2. And believing that new knowledge derived from the fundamental research which Universities are uniquely qualified to perform is another basic "raw material" of industry, including, directly or indirectly, the __________________________ Corporation;

3. And recognizing that it is logical and proper that corporations, whose progress and competitive position require such products of universities, assume a greater degree of financial responsibility for the support of adequate training and research programs in privately endowed universities;

4. And understanding that it is the primary function and responsibility of Cornell University to train young people and to carry on research, with the result that there is available to industry as well as to others a supply of well educated personnel competent to furnish leadership of the future and a store of basic scientific knowledge on which industry can build to meet the needs of the public and the nation;

(On the pages following, three alternative forms are given covering different methods of implementing gifts in support of professorships. Only one would be used in any particular case.)
Therefore:

The Corporation hereby gives to Cornell University the sum of $400,000 as an endowment, the income from which shall be used to support a professorship in [discipline or area].

It is suggested that the income attributable to $300,000 of the endowment be used for the payment of the salary of the professor and that the income attributable to the remainder of the principal of this endowment fund be added to the principal so as to increase the endowment fund. The Trustees of the University may, in their discretion, use the income for the support of one or more professors; and as the principal of the fund increases, and therefore the income attributable to it, the said Trustees may increase the salary of the holder of the professorship accordingly. The Trustees of said University may continue to add the income attributable to one-fourth of the principal to the principal from year to year so long as in their opinion such increases in principal endowment for a professorship or professorships in [discipline or area] shall be needed by the University.

When in the opinion of the Board of Trustees of the University it is no longer desirable to increase the principal as above requested, then the entire income attributable to the endowment fund may be used for the support of professorships in [discipline or area]. This professorship or these professorships shall be known as the [name of professorship].

If, in the future, the specific purposes or needs of the University herein provided for shall terminate, or shall, in the opinion of its Board
of Trustees, become inappropriate or undesirable and not for the best interests of the University, or if the entire gift shall not be needed for such needs or purposes, then the Board may direct that all or part of the gift or the income therefrom, as the case may be, be used for such then existing needs or purposes of the University as shall most nearly approach, or be in general harmony with, the purposes hereinbefore expressed. If there shall not then be any existing needs or purposes closely approaching or in general harmony with the specific purposes above mentioned, then the Board may in its discretion direct that the gift or the income therefrom, as the case may be, be used for any of the lawful purposes of said University.
Therefore:

The Corporation hereby agrees to give to Cornell University the sum of $300,000, payable in installments of $ each year on the day of to form an endowment for the support of a professorship in (discipline or area). The payments provided above shall, upon receipt, be invested by Cornell University. It is suggested that the income be added to the principal until the principal sum equals $300,000, at which time and thereafter the income from $300,000 may be used to pay the salary of the incumbent professor. The remaining installments paid by the Corporation subsequent to that time and the income earned on them may be added to principal so as to increase the endowment fund. The Trustees of the University may, in their discretion, use the income for the support of one or more professors; and as the principal of the fund increases, and therefore the income attributable to it, the said Trustees may increase the salary of the holder of the professorship accordingly. The Trustees of said University may continue to add to the income attributable to one-fourth of the principal to the principal from year to year so long as in their opinion such increases in principal endowment for a professorship or professorships in shall be needed by the University. When in the opinion of the Board of Trustees of the University it is no longer desirable to increase the principal as above requested, then the entire income attributable to the endowment fund may be used for the support of professorships in.
This professorship or these professorships shall be known as the _________

Professorship in___________________________.

If, in the future, the specific purposes or needs of the University herein provided for shall terminate, or shall, in the opinion of its Board of Trustees, become inappropriate or undesirable and not for the best interests of the University, or if the entire gift shall not be needed for such needs or purposes, then the Board may direct that all or part of the gift or the income therefrom, as the case may be, be used for such then existing needs or purposes of the University as shall most nearly approach, or be in general harmony with, the purposes hereinbefore expressed. If there shall not then be any existing needs or purposes closely approaching or in general harmony with the specific purposes above mentioned, then the Board may in its discretion direct that the gift or the income therefrom, as the case may be, be used for any of the lawful purposes of said University.
(Alternative 3: Support for Limited Period)

Therefore:

The Corporation agrees to sponsor a professorship in (discipline or area) for a period of years at Cornell University, and to give to it $ per annum to support the salary of the incumbent professor plus $ per annum to aid in the conduct of fundamental research.
ENGINEERING COLLEGE INDUSTRIAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

THIS AGREEMENT entered into this day of , 194, between the COMPANY, a company organized under the laws of the State of , and having its principal office at hereinafter called the Company, and CORNELL UNIVERSITY, hereinafter called the UNIVERSITY.

WITNESSETH, that

WHEREAS, the UNIVERSITY desires to give its students an opportunity for acquiring a practical engineering knowledge during the period of their college training, and

WHEREAS, the Company desires to secure graduate engineers of the University trained in both practical and theoretical engineering, and

WHEREAS, the cooperation of the University and the Company is essential to the accomplishment of such desired results.

NOW, THEREFORE, the University and the Company hereby mutually agree to conduct a course of cooperative engineering training in the manner set forth in memorandum attached hereeto and made a part of this contract, to continue from year to year but each party to have the privilege of terminating the arrangement by giving one year's notice to the other party. In case of termination by such notice each party is obligated to continue the course to completion for students already enrolled.

The Company in consideration of the services rendered and expenses incurred by the University in the conduct of such course agrees to pay the University for the establishment of the course the sum of $5,000 (Five Thousand Dollars) on the execution of this Agreement, and beginning with the University's fiscal year July 1, 194, a further sum payable annually by the following January 1, this amount to be $2,000 (Two Thousand Dollars) for the first year and $5,000 (Five Thousand Dollars) for each succeeding year, except as provided below for revision. The University agrees to assume all expenses normally incident to an educational institution which are necessary to the conduct of such course and are in excess of said amounts of $7,000 (Seven Thousand Dollars) for the first year and $5,000 (Five Thousand Dollars) per year thereafter.

It is understood, that in view of the possible changing numbers of students and educational costs in the course, a review and readjustment of the amount of the annual payment by the Company to the University and a corresponding modification of this contract by mutual agreement may be desirable from time to time.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement the day and year first above written.

Attest: ____________________________
Secretary

By ____________________________
COMPANY

Attest: ____________________________
By ____________________________
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
COOPERATIVE COURSES IN ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

THE COMPANY AND CORNELL UNIVERSITY

It is the purpose of this plan to provide, for selected undergraduate students, supervised assignments in industry totalling one year of coordinated experience. The interspersing of planned experience with the usual program of study on campus has been adequately demonstrated not only to advance the student in his orientation to the objectives and practices of industry, but also to improve comprehension of and interest in academic study.

Admission to the cooperative program will be open to selected candidates chosen from the upper third or half of the fourth term class in the regular undergraduate Electrical and Mechanical Engineering curricula who must satisfy by personal interview both the University and the cooperating Company of their scholastic and personal qualifications to pursue the program to a mutually successful conclusion.

The Company agrees to give employment to the selected students during the last three years of the course when work on which they can be used efficiently is available. In case the performance of a student in the Cooperative Course may lead the Company and the University to agree that he should not continue, he will be detached from the course.

While the student is with the Company he is an employee of the Company and subject to the Company's rules, regulations and discipline. His wages shall be determined by the Company, and the student will be paid the same weekly rate through the first period, a higher weekly rate the second period, and a still higher rate the third period.

Any patentable idea or device which a student may develop as a consequence of employment in the plant is assigned to the Company, and it is understood as a prerequisite to employment that each student will sign the usual employee patent agreement of the Company. The student will have full advantage of any bonus plan for patents which may be in effect at the Company at the time of his employment.

The cooperative plan involves costs in excess of those for regular courses, both for supervision and for instructing staff, especially during the Summer Term which cannot be coordinated with any regular University operation. The stated amounts to be paid by the Company are to reimburse the University for the incremental costs incurred by the Cooperative Program in excess of the regular curricula.

The Company, through the Cooperative Program secures an opportunity to observe and interest students from a selected group in the various activities of the Company with potential benefits both in personnel procurement and assurance of good will.
The Lockheed Missile Systems Division Announces an Advanced Study Program for Master of Science Degrees — University of Southern California, University of California at Los Angeles.

The Lockheed Graduate Study Council offers an Advanced Study Program to enable exceptionally qualified individuals to obtain Master of Science degrees in prescribed fields. Under this plan the participants are employed in their chosen fields in industry and concurrently pursue graduate study.

During the regular school year the industrial assignment will be coordinated with the Study Program to permit a half-time University schedule of advanced study. During the school vacation period participants will be employed full-time at the Lockheed Missile Systems Division.

Students who are United States citizens or members of the Armed Services being honorably separated and holding B.S. Degrees in Physics, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Aeronautical Engineering are eligible. Candidates must qualify for graduate standing.

Salaries will be determined by the individual's qualifications and experience in accordance with accepted current standards. Participants are eligible for health, accident and life insurance as well as other benefits accorded full-time staff members.

The industrial assignment will be on the Research and Engineering Staff of Lockheed Missile Systems Division. The Advanced Study Program will be at one of the Universities named above. If sufficient number of qualified students apply, as many as 100 awards will be granted.

Tuition, admission fees and costs of textbooks covering the number of units required by the University for a Master of Science Degree, will be borne by Lockheed. A travel and moving allowance will be provided for those residing outside the Southern California area.

How to apply: Contact your placement bureau or write The Graduate Study Council for an application form and brochure giving full details of the program.

Graduate Study Council
Lockheed Missile Systems Division
Lockheed Aircraft Corporation
Van Nuys, California
APPENDIX 7

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY POLICY

Subcommittee on Policies

Relating to Corporation-University Relationships

Minutes of the Thirteenth Meeting

February 2, 1955

The meeting was called to order by Vice President Wright, Chairman, at 2:30 p.m.

Members present:
Prof. Corson
Dean Hollister
Prof. Hutchins
Director Sears
Chairman Wright

Members absent:
Prof. DeGraff
Prof. Smith

Also present:
Dean Atwood

The minutes of the 12th meeting held on December 23 were approved in the form distributed to members.

Graduate Study by Corporation Employees

Dr. Wright reminded the Subcommittee that the only remaining subject for consideration was the University's educational relationships to corporations, particularly the requests made from time to time for special arrangements under which graduate study toward a degree might be undertaken on a part-time or off-campus basis by corporation employees.

Dean Hollister opened the discussion by pointing out that the problem is acute, especially in engineering, because of the large number of industrial employees who hold Bachelor's degrees but need further education in order to perform the work needed by the industries in which they are employed. Many arrangements have been tried by various educational institutions in cooperation with industrial firms. These include:

1. Work on campus
   a. Special evening courses.
   b. Regular courses on a part-time basis.

2. Off-campus
   a. By the educational institution's regular staff who commute to the place of instruction.
   b. By a specially recruited resident staff which may be made up of regular staff members transferred to this special duty or of instructors engaged for this purpose only.
Dean Hollister expressed the belief that the time has come for Cornell to consider making some type of special arrangements for graduate study for credit toward Master's degrees to meet such needs of industry and its employees. He believes, however, that no change should be made in graduate study for the Doctor's degree.

Dean Atwood illustrated the scope of the problem with statistics from the recently published study, America's Resources of Specialized Talent, prepared by Dael Wolfle under the auspices of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. This gives figures on the number of PhD's given annually since 1900 and shows the steady increase both in absolute numbers and in proportion of the population taking such degrees. He discussed the change in the character of the PhD degree which has resulted from the increase in numbers and from the changed emphasis on the purpose of the degree which has now become a sort of union card necessary to obtain many kinds of employment. In earlier years the PhD degree normally led to a career of scholarly study and research, but it is now taken as evidence of competence in many other kinds of professional work. There followed a discussion of the gradual increase in the use of special professional degrees such as Doctor of Education.

At this point and also later in the meeting there was discussion of the proper distinction to be drawn between the PhD and the professional Doctor's degrees. Differing conceptions seem to be held by those in different disciplines. The gist of the Subcommittee's discussions may be summarized by saying that it was agreed that use of the terms "broad" and "narrow" is confusing and should be dropped. Less confusion will result if it is assumed that the PhD degree is given to those who have qualified themselves as scholars or teachers and researchers in universities and that the professional Doctor's degrees are given to those qualified for direct practice in their professional disciplines outside universities (and institutions where comparable research is conducted). In some disciplines -- Prof. Hutchins cited economics as one example -- the "practitioner" may well require a broader knowledge of the subject and related fields than the scholar; in others -- such as certain branches of engineering and the physical sciences -- the reverse may be true. Therefore, the PhD should not be described as "broader" (or "narrower than the professional degree, but rather should be defined as the degree which is appropriate to the scholar-research worker in terms of his particular discipline.

Dean Atwood and Dean Hollister also discussed the Wolfle findings based on AGCT tests and particularly the fact that many whose AGCT scores are of the level of holders of Master's or Doctor's degrees are not entering college or proceeding to graduate education.

The general conclusion was that this study illustrates the acute problem of the wastage of talent. Dean Hollister pointed out that the matter, particularly in engineering, is so urgent as to call for a review and alteration of the traditional methods of providing for graduate study, particularly for devising means of giving training at the graduate level to talented persons while they are employed in industry.

Dr. Sears expressed the belief that the only proper method of attack on the problem by a university like Cornell is to provide special teaching in the form of extension courses specifically planned to meet the needs of industry and its employees. This
teaching should be completely distinct from graduate training for Master's and Doctor's degrees. He disagreed with Dean Hollister's distinction between the two degree levels in this connection. He believes that the Subcommittee should take the position that Cornell's established graduate study program -- including the use of special committees, the thesis, and the residence requirement, rather than an accumulation of course credits -- should be maintained for all those working toward graduate degrees whether Doctor's or Master's.

Dr. Wright pointed out that the motives behind the demand for graduate study by industrial employees are twofold. In the first place, industry and the employees both feel the need for more knowledge. In the second place, the individual employee wants a graduate degree for its real or supposed value in obtaining employment and advancement, while industry wants to be able to offer the opportunity for graduate study toward degrees as a recruitment devise. There was general agreement with Dr. Wright's statement that Cornell has no proper concern with the second type of motivation. Dr. Sears believes that Cornell should stick to its present practice and try to convince industry of the value of our approach and of the gains to be achieved through extension study even though it is not for degree credit. He believes that the distinction between extension training and graduate study could be maintained by devising a special diploma of some kind as recognition of completion of such extension study.

Prof. Corson pointed out that his experience in giving courses to industrial workers reveals that the needs of the employees are normally better met by a special type of course rather than by transfer of a university course unaltered. Dean Hollister urged that the need is for a series of courses including some of a special nature designed to prepare those lacking the proper background for regular courses and including others of regular graduate level.

There was a discussion of problems involved in extension teaching of any kind, such as the burden of commuting on the teaching staff, and the difficulties of a branch type of operation in which a series of courses is given by special staff resident at a location away from campus and convenient to industrial personnel. Dean Atwood in this connection pointed out that the opportunities for a university located in a metropolitan area are far different from those of a university situated as Cornell is.

The majority of those present expressed agreement with Prof. Corson's statement of the Subcommittee's position as follows:

In so far as is geographically practicable and consistent with prior duties and responsibilities, the faculty and staff of Cornell should be willing to undertake extension teaching of employees of industrial corporations along lines worked out to meet the particular needs of each group as a special program and not for graduate degree credit.

There followed discussion of methods for implementing this recommendation. Five possibilities were considered:

1. The existing Extranural Division, which is authorized to give courses provided they are exactly equivalent to those regularly given on campus and by the same instructor or one judged of equal
competence. These extramural courses may be used to satisfy part of the residence requirement for graduate degrees under a special formula and with the approval of individual student committees. The Subcommittee recommended more extensive use of the Extramural Division's facilities.

2. The University may make a formal arrangement with an industrial firm or other outside groups for instruction to be given to employees. There are two possibilities: (1) in connection with industrial support of a professorship in the University, which is the pattern of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory professorship presently held by Prof. Mark Kac in Mathematics; and (2) courses for which specific payment is made. The actual teaching program given in either (1) or (2) is worked out by the professor with the sponsor in terms of the needs and interests of his employees and without graduate credit. The Subcommittee endorsed this method.

3. Somewhat similar teaching programs are sometimes undertaken by individual professors retained by corporations in a status parallel to that of consultants. In this case the University has no direct connection with the matter, financial or otherwise. The Subcommittee did not recommend this approach.

4. Teaching centers might be established in connection with neighboring industries. For example, a center might be opened in the Binghamton-Endicott-Johnson City or in the Elmira-Corning-Horseheads area. Alternative methods of staffing such centers had already been discussed. Staffing difficulties were again emphasized and other difficulties might be anticipated due to the geographical distances between Ithaca and the major industrial centers. The Subcommittee did not recommend this approach.

5. Special summer courses, workshops, and conferences might be given on the campus at Ithaca during vacations, particularly during the summer. This is already done to some extent by individual schools and divisions. Expansion of this activity as a means of meeting the needs of industry would be particularly advantageous in that it would make use of otherwise idle university facilities and would as well increase opportunities for faculty members to supplement their regular income through summer work. The Subcommittee urged greater use of this method.

In discussing these five possibilities, it was pointed out that while several of them have been used to some extent, this has been done almost entirely at the level of the departments or schools. There is no central point for organizing such work, answering inquiries from interested corporations, and coordinating to prevent overlapping and unnecessary duplication of effort, except in the case of the Extramural Division whose services are important in this connection but of a specifically defined character so as to meet only part of the need of industry.

The Subcommittee expressed its support for the establishment of some additional administrative mechanism to initiate and foster extension work for industry and
its employees. It was reported that a suggestion has been made for a "director of summer activities" who would be in charge of the overall summer program on the campus of which the regular Summer Session is the major but not the only part. The Subcommittee now suggested that a still broader and different concept be considered, such as a coordinator with cognizance not only of the special summer activities (exclusive of the Summer Session) but also of the Extramural Division and all extension teaching, including any appropriate means of implementing our desire to cooperate in making further education available for the employees of industry.

In summary, the Subcommittee's actions at this meeting were as follows:

1. It was unanimously agreed that present rules for graduate study should continue in force for Doctor's degrees, and a majority agreed that the same position should be taken on the rules for Master's degrees as well.

2. The great need for additional training for employees of industry, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, is recognized.

3. The Subcommittee therefore strongly urges that Cornell set up suitable mechanisms to facilitate special efforts in this direction. It particularly urges that the Extramural Division be utilized to the full for those qualified to meet its standards and that other teaching be promoted for those not qualified for the equivalent of existing Cornell course work. In particular it recommends the careful consideration of the advantages of a single coordinating office to cover and foster all types of extension and extramural work with special attention to the needs of industry.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

J. W. Hastie
Secretary to the Committee
APPENDIX 8

Statement of Policy Concerning the Solicitation of Financial Support of the University From Corporations

It is recognized that the premises upon which financial support from business and industry should be sought are as follows:

1. The future business and competitive positions of all industries basically rests on the steady flow of young people of adequate training into these industries. Even the competitive position of the nation depends on this for it is by this means that the great industries of the country can assume positions of leadership. These well-trained people are the absolutely essential "raw material" of industry.

2. Cornell recognizes that the results of fundamental research are supplemental "raw materials" of great importance to industry. Such basic knowledge, largely made available through studies conducted by universities, serves as a foundation for the applied research and development programs of industry.

3. It is the primary business and responsibility of this nation's universities to supply the industries and government agencies with the well-trained personnel who will provide the leadership for the future.

4. It is logical and proper that the industries of the nation whose progress and competitive position requires the products of the university assume a greater degree of financial responsibility for the support of adequate training programs in the privately endowed universities.

5. Inflation, together with the more complicated aspects of university training to meet present day needs, has made it well nigh impossible for the privately endowed universities to meet the costs which now must be incurred for adequate training.

6. It is not in the best interests of the industries nor the nation that the support of the training program in the universities devolve entirely on governmental support.

On the basis of these underlying premises, the approaches for support to industries should be governed by the following underlying principles:

1. No specific quid pro quo should be offered to industries. It should be stressed that the real quid pro quo is the well-trained persons and the fundamental research findings which university provides. Stress should also be laid on the fact that the support should be given in the spirit of value received from the products the university turns out and not on the basis of charity.
2. That funds in support of university training should be sought on as broad a basis as possible but we should be prepared to accept funds in support of training in special fields. For reasons of continuity, industries should be encouraged to make agreements for support for a minimum of five years.

3. The exact terms under which industries would give funds to the university should be worked out with each industry as a special case in order that certain special desires on the part of a particular industry can be realized.

4. That the approach to industries be made by qualified people of the university who know the interests of the particular company and who have special facility or connections with leaders in the industry in question.

5. No approach to industry should be made in such a way as to obligate any member of the University Faculty to provide consulting services. All consulting arrangements with faculty members should in principle be regarded as a personal arrangement with industrial companies.
NEWARK, May 21 - Financial contributions from corporations to educational institutions were characterized as "a solemn duty, as well as a valid right under New Jersey Statutes" in a decision today by Judge Alfred A. Stein in Superior Court.

In his twenty-one page opinion, in effect a treatise on corporate development, education and law, Judge Stein said:

"I am strongly persuaded by the evidence that the only hope of survival by the privately supported American college and university lies in the willingness of corporate wealth to furnish in moderation some support to institutions which are so essential to public welfare, and therefore of necessity, to corporate welfare. What promotes the general good inescapably advances the corporate weal."

The decision was on an issue raised by a group of stockholders of the A. P. Smith Manufacturing Company of East Orange who had challenged the right of the board of directors to vote a $1,500 contribution to Princeton University in 1951.

They contended that the use of the company's funds was restricted by its charter and by statutes to "the purpose of creating profits for its stockholders".

Holding that under settled law both here and in England corporations possessed incidental as well as expressed powers, Judge Stein ruled that "the contribution here in question is toward a cause intimately tied into the preservation of American business and the American way of life".

"Such giving may be called an incidental power", the opinion continued, "but when it is considered in its essential character, it may well be regarded as a major, though unwritten, corporate power. It is even more than that. In the court's view of the case, it amounts to a solemn duty."

This question "must not be studied in the light of that earlier day when corporations were far fewer in number and had not developed in power and in influence to the point where the major part of the national wealth is owned by corporate entities. Nor must the matter be looked at through lenses which do not reflect conditions which did not exist fifty or a hundred years ago: real tangible threats to American business and American democracy".
"The Court upheld the Company's privilege to vote the contribution within the definition of two statutes relating to corporate powers, which the stockholders had attacked. The acts in substance empowered corporations to cooperate with other corporations or persons in the creation of community funds "or of charitable, philosophic instrumentalities conducive to public welfare".

Status of the Colleges

"It needs no proof that the universities and colleges of the land are eleemosynary institutions", the opinion said.

"At Princeton, as at most American colleges, the tuition paid for instruction meets only fractionally the per capita cost. Not only that, but a large segment of the student body is assisted by scholarships and by direct financial aid from the school's treasury."

Observing that the youth of today "furnished tomorrow's leaders in business and Government," the opinion added:

"The proofs before me are abundant that Princeton emphasizes by precept and indoctrination the principles which are very vital to the preservation of our own democratic system of business and government.

"I cannot conceive of any greater benefit to corporations in this country than to build respect for, and adherence to, a system of free enterprise and democratic government, the serious impairment of which may well spell the destruction of all corporate enterprise."

Judge Stein's decision granted the company a declaratory judgment that permits it to effectuate the contribution. The gift had been withheld pending the decision.

Josiah Stryker, who represented the stockholders, said tonight that he had "not as yet been authorized to appeal" but that he assumed an appeal would be taken "because the purpose of the litigation is to secure a decision of the court of last resort in this state".
1. Deals with Company's need of qualified college graduates.
2. Describes Bethlehem loop training course.
4. Recognizes financial problems of private colleges and states:
   "In fact, the financial status of most privately endowed colleges and universities has deteriorated to the extent that many of them, particularly the smaller ones, are in serious difficulties."
5. Discusses financial aid on basis of value received and states:
   "With this in mind, Bethlehem Steel Company has formulated a program of financial assistance to colleges and universities which approaches the problem of aid to education on what is believed to be a new principle. The novel feature of the Bethlehem program is that it makes financial aid available to an educational institution in direct proportion to the value of what the company receives in men who have potential leadership and technical and administrative ability.

   "Bethlehem proposes under this program to pay the sum of $3,000 to certain privately endowed educational institutions for each of their graduates who is recruited by the company for its Loop Course, and who remains with Bethlehem for at least four months. Through such payments Bethlehem will, in effect, be giving recognition to the fact that four years of education costs a college more than it receives from a student in tuition and other fees, and that his education makes the college graduate a valuable asset in the conduct of Bethlehem's business."
6. States that program is applicable to privately endowed colleges and universities, a substantial number of which have been approached. In this paragraph it is stated:

   "Bethlehem will not attempt to impose any limitation as to the use which the colleges or universities may make of the company's payments under the program, leaving each institution free in its discretion to apply the money either to scholarships or to any other purpose which will best meet its needs."
(From correspondence indicating dangers of such a program)

"1. The fact that the letter of transmittal accompanying the payment to the University would name the students related to the payment.

"2. The fact that the colleges and universities on the list vary greatly as to scholastic and technical standards and as to the amounts of money expended on the education of the individual student.

"3. The fact that the combined plans, such as that which some engineering colleges have with liberal arts undergraduate colleges, raises the question properly of whether or how the payments should be split.

"4. The fact that the total money contributed would be considered by the company to have discharged its responsibility to the annual support of higher education.

"5. The fact that acceptance might possibly influence other industrial firms which, it is believed, are now in the process of working out ideas that will provide a plan more suitable to the colleges than this one.

"6. The fact that there is no place in these plans for the Ph.D, who is the most expensive of our graduates and for the other graduates not hired on this plan."

(Final statement of Bethlehem intent written with knowledge of above)

"The ultimate purpose of our program is, by helping to strengthen the financial resources of privately endowed colleges and universities, to enable them to turn out more well-educated men of leadership caliber for careers in those industries where a shortage exists."
G. E. ACTS TO SPUR GIFTS TO COLLEGES

Company Will Match Funds Up To $1,000 Donated By Graduates In Its Employe

HOPES IDEA WILL SPREAD

Bids Businesses That Share Educational Benefits Help Bridge School Deficits

The General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund announced yesterday a new plan to provide more funds for American colleges and universities.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of trustees of the General Electric Company and head of the fund's trustees, said the fund would match contributions that college graduates employed by General Electric made to their alma maters in 1955.

Mr. Reed said the new plan, called the Corporate Alumnus Program, "is thought to be unique in business-education circles." He estimated that General Electric employs 23,000 college graduates with degrees from 540 schools. The fund will match any contribution by such a graduate up to $1,000.

Contributors must have been with the concern for at least a year and make an actual gift (not a pledge) to an accredited college or university at which the contributor earned his degree.

Program Is Experimental

Mr. Reed called the program "frankly an experiment" and said the trustees would decide whether to extend the program or make any changes after the first year.

"It is the hope that other companies may find in this idea an appropriate pattern for incorporation in the educational programs in which they are interested," he said.

The new program will supplement General Electric's over-all aid to education that has included gifts, endowments, equipment, scholarships and fellowships.

"It is clear," said Mr. Reed, "that the one who profits most from education is the individual graduate, but undeniably the benefits are shared by the organizations with which he is associated. In almost every
instance, the real cost of a college education was not covered by
the tuition paid - usually not more than half of it, in fact.

"It seems appropriate and fair, therefore, that both the
individual and the organization with which he has allied himself should
undertake some measure of support for the colleges and universities,
which play so important a role in American life and progress, so that
others can participate in those benefits."
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 9, a condensation of which had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, were approved.

On behalf of the Committee on Elections, its Chairman, the Dean, gave the following report:

581 ballots were cast for a Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees, of which 339, a majority, were cast for the Director of Resident Instruction in the College of Agriculture, Professor A. W. Gibson.

578 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on University Policy, of which 291, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Industrial and Engineering Administration, Professor Andrew Schultz, Jr.

578 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, of which 301, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Economics of the Household and Household Management, Professor Jean Warren.

579 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing, of which 300, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, Professor H. F. Wiegandt.

552 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics, of which 365, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Thermal Engineering, Professor N. R. Gay.

551 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene to serve a two year term, of which 364, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Biochemistry and Nutrition, Professor W. L. Nelson.

570 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene to serve a three year term, of which 294, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Clinical and Preventive Medicine and of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Temple Burling.
573 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 327, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Romance Literature, Professor M. G. Bishop.

584 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 297, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Poultry Husbandry, Professor J. H. Bruckner.

578 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 339, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Law, Professor E. N. Warren.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean, reported that pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by the Faculty at its meeting of November 9, 1955, the Committee on University Policy has appointed the following to the special Faculty committee to consult with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees concerning the Revised By-Laws, and to present to the Trustee Committee the views of the Faculty in regard to the Revised By-Laws: A. B. Credle, H. G. Fincher, L. P. Smith, and W. A. Wimsatt. The fifth member of the committee is the Dean of the Faculty, who, under the by-laws, is an ex officio member of all University Faculty committees to confer with committees of the Board. The Committee on University Policy appointed him to the chairmanship of the special Faculty Committee.

On behalf of the Committee on Registration and Schedules, its Chairman, the Registrar, reported that in accordance with the instructions of the Faculty at its meeting of November 9, the committee had reconsidered the question of a suitable room for meetings of the University Faculty. He then moved that the Faculty return to Room M, Olin Hall, for its subsequent meetings. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously, by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, its Chairman, Professor M. S. Kendrick, presented the Annual Report of the
Committee. This report had been distributed with the call for the meeting, and a copy thereof is appended to the minutes.

Professor Kendrick then moved that the Annual Report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty submitted and dated this 14th day of December 1955 be approved, and that the President be requested to transmit a copy to the Board of Trustees.

The motion was seconded, and after some discussion, was passed by a voice vote.

The President then commented briefly on the recent grants from the Ford Foundation. He said that thus far the only communication from the Foundation had been a telegram saying that Cornell is included. Details as to the use of the funds are not known, except that the main grant must be used for salary adjustments.

The Dean of the Graduate School, Professor John McConnell, presented the proposal for professional type advanced degrees in engineering, which had been approved by the General Committee of the Graduate School and by the Graduate Faculty. The proposal and a statement in explanation of it had been distributed with the call for the meeting, and copies are appended to the minutes.

On behalf of the Faculty of the Graduate School, Professor McConnell then moved approval of the following resolution:

Whereas the College of Engineering has proposed the establishment of new professional type degrees at the Master's level, entitled as follows: Master of Civil Engineering, Master of Mechanical Engineering, Master of Electrical Engineering, Master of Chemical Engineering, Master of Engineering Physics, Master of Metallurgical Engineering, and Master of Industrial Engineering, and

Whereas the Graduate Faculty has approved this proposal,
Be It Resolved that the University Faculty approve this proposal and recommend the establishment of these degrees by the Board of Trustees; and

Be It Further Resolved that the University Faculty recommends that the Board of Trustees authorize the granting of these degrees to persons who have satisfactorily completed the programs leading to such degrees prescribed by the Engineering Division of the Graduate School, and who are recommended for such degrees by the Faculty of the Graduate School.

The motion was seconded, and after some discussion, passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
(Confidential. For Faculty, Administration, and Trustee use only.)

December 11, 1955

Annual Report of the
Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

The time has come, in our opinion, to reexamine the adequacy of the existing level of faculty salaries at Cornell. We recognize that the University administration and the trustees have been sympathetic to larger compensation for members of the faculty. We appreciate the increases that have been made in recent years, and the additional contribution of the University toward the retirement plan. We acknowledge, with thanks, the cooperation of the University in the provision of major medical insurance, and in the organization of Ithaca Staff Purchases, Inc. Accordingly, we approach the subject of our report in no spirit of criticism. Our attitude, rather, is to bring out the facts and issues that bear upon the problem. These are the objective matters that, apart from any interests or feelings involved, must be considered by anyone who is concerned with the remuneration of University professors. We believe that the degree of recognition given these elements of the problem will, within the limitation of the available resources, govern any steps that may be taken toward a solution.

The determination of the proper level of faculty salaries has two aspects. Cornell is only one of many institutions of higher learning. The salaries of professors here are therefore part of the general level of professorial salaries. How adequate are they in view of the present and prospective demand for the services of teaching and research? But Cornell is also in competition with other universities for professors. Does it pay enough to attract and to hold the quality of professorial competence desired?

In Table 1, average changes in real income, before taxes, as compared with prewar, are indicated per capita, and for various occupations. With the goods and services consumed per member of the population in 1939 taken as 100, the amount consumed in 1953 was 164. The average worker in manufacturing improved his lot only slightly less, or to 156, and the bituminous coal miner somewhat more, or to 187. The average income of lawyers in 1951 was 107 per cent of its level in 1940, of dentists 122 per cent, and of physicians 165 per cent. On the other hand, the entire group of professors in 35 institutions had in 1953 only 89 per cent as much real income as they had earned in 1939. Full professors at Cornell, like the other professors, had 11 per cent less real income in 1953 than in 1939.

The relationship for the current year, were the necessary data available, would be no less unfavorable to professors than in 1953.
### Table 1. REAL INCOME a IN 1953 (or 1951) Expressed as a Percentage of Real Income in 1939 (or 1940) b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Income</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal income per member of the population</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weekly earnings of workers in manufacturing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weekly earnings of bituminous coal miners</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income of physicians</td>
<td>100 (1940)</td>
<td>165 (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income of dentists</td>
<td>100 (1940)</td>
<td>122 (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income of lawyers</td>
<td>100 (1940)</td>
<td>107 (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual salary of college professors (full, associate, and assistant in 35 institutions)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual salary of full professors in 35 institutions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual salary of Cornell full professors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Before taxes.

b. Except for Cornell, the data were obtained or calculated from material included in the survey of instructional salaries reported in the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors for the winter 1953-1954, Vol. 39, No. 4.
And in view of the various rounds of wage increases and of the mounting level of business profits, it may well be more unfavorable. Certainly the personal incomes of the population at large have risen substantially since 1953. The simple fact is that professors are worse off in terms of real income than in 1939, and the average individual in other occupations is much better off.

We do not pretend to know how much professors should receive for their services. We grant that professors are not primarily motivated by the monetary compensation, but by other considerations. We also recognize that the services of professors cannot be sold in the market place at a price sufficient to return their cost of production. The student who desires an education cannot pay the full amount required to maintain the necessary facilities. We know, too, that endowment funds, even as supplemented by annual gifts from alumni, have proved to be insufficient to supply the additional income needed. And we are aware that universities which depend on legislative appropriations must compete—usually with less than full success—with highways, public health, mental health, aid to the needy, and other demands on the public purse.

Unfortunately, however, this recital of the difficulties in the way of making an increase does not meet the issue of professors' salaries. And it is on that question, apart from any remedies or the lack of them, that our report is focused. The professor, even though not money-minded, must pay his bills in money. Usually he has a family to support, with interests not wholly academic. Unless he is one of the few persons with independent means, he is forced to give some consideration to his income.

But it may be argued that the plight of the professor is not relevant to the question of the adequacy of his compensation. In support of this view it may be said that whether from habit, lack of opportunity, or the value attached to the academic life, the professor will continue to teach. Why then pay him more? Undoubtedly there is truth in this proposition, not the whole truth but some. Later we shall give the results of a survey of faculty turnover.

At the moment, though, without prejudice to the evidence to be presented, suppose the argument to be conceded. The application, of course, is only to existing professors. But, as it happens, institutions of higher learning are approaching a period of increase in enrollments that at its peak, ten or fifteen years hence, will require a large expansion of staff. This is not a prophecy or even an estimate; it is a calculation. The college students of 1965 to 1970 are born and have been counted. When they arrive and begin to crowd the classrooms, the professors must be there to teach them. But the supply of professors does not respond immediately to an increase in the demand for their services. Time is required. Young men in college, and the brighter ones at that, must increasingly turn from preparation for the professions, business, agriculture, or other pursuits to preparation.
It is not to be expected that young persons primarily interested in making money will, upon receiving their degrees, enroll in graduate schools for advanced study. The highly successful lawyer, doctor, or business man will always earn much more than the highly successful professor. But it is to be hoped that when all the compensations of the academic life are considered, the number preparing for it will be sufficient to meet the need. Among these compensations, the expected salary, even though not dominant, is and must be important. At the stage when the decision to enter the teaching profession is made, other opportunities beckon, particularly to the brighter students. How then can more of them be expected to elect a field that is increasingly at a comparative disadvantage? And if only the poorer students go on into the graduate schools, what kind of universities will we have in the future, and, more important, what kind of a civilization? There is the problem of quantity—we must have more university teachers and before many years. But there is also a problem of quality, how to attract and to hold in the profession young persons of a high intellectual ability.

Evidence bearing on the relation of the compensation to the solution, both for established and for younger teachers, is provided by a recent survey of faculty turnover in the University of Tennessee. During a five-year period, 157 teachers, or 36 per cent of the peak number, left the University for reasons other than health, marriage and the like. One hundred and thirty-nine, or 89 per cent of those leaving, accepted higher-paying positions elsewhere, 77 in other universities and 62 in government or industry. Eighty-five of the persons taking other positions were assistant, associate, or full professors, and 62 were instructors. The increase in salary was not the sole reason for leaving the University. Even so, the importance of this inducement to move elsewhere is not to be denied.

What are the current salaries in Cornell for members of the faculty? Average and median salaries are given in Table 2 separately for the endowed and the State divisions of the University. The lowest and highest salaries of the institution are also included. We refrain from making comparisons between the rewards offered by the upper and the lower campuses, or between individual colleges, but are content with calling attention to the data.

How do Cornell salaries compare with those of competing universities? This was the most difficult part of our assignment. First, we selected the institutions that, in the judgment of the Committee, are most competitive with Cornell. Next, we sent a questionnaire on salaries to the proper finance official of each institution. Last, we tabulated the results. As always happens, not all replied, some refused to provide information or said that it was not available,
Table 2.

ANNUAL SALARIES OF PROFESSORS IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY (ITHACA)
for the Academic Year 1955-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDOWED COLLEGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$8,772</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,138</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$8,454</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 mo.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,571</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$9,537</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of above, plus Law, Hotel Adm. and Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,437</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE COLLEGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't professor</td>
<td>5,788</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7,853</td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>9,829</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,901</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial &amp; Labor Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>769</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Level</td>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>1931-1932</td>
<td>1932-1933</td>
<td>1933-1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>14,923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. professor</td>
<td>5,731</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, State Colleges</td>
<td>20,953</td>
<td>20,524</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>31,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All data supplied by courtesy of the finance officials in the University Administration and the College of Agriculture.
b. Includes department chairmen in Arts, but excludes Deans, and Directors in Engineering.
c. Excludes department chairmen, Deans, and Directors.
d. Excludes Law School.
others gave incomplete figures, and still others supplied us with the data desired. Where the incomplete figures gave us ground for an estimate, we did not hesitate to make one. But we always sought a conservative result. If we could not establish the exact truth, we tried to be able to say, "At least this much is true."

The results of our inquiry are presented in Table 3. Cornell pays the lower or lowest salary in each academic category. But it is only fair to say that much progress has been made at Cornell in recent years. In the report of this Committee, submitted in December 1952 for the preceding academic year, the salaries of professors in the College of Arts and Sciences were on the average 2,323 below those in four large eastern universities, including Cornell. They were also 692 below the comparable salaries in six large state universities. In that same year, salaries in engineering were 1,988 lower than in three institutes of technology.

The gain, however, is not cause for complacency. Cornell is still in the lower or lowest group of major institutions. We recognize that a comparison limited to the salaries paid is not complete. The prospect for advancement is part of the problem. Here we note that the proportion of professors who are of full rank is the same for the seven large private universities as for Cornell, both endowed and State, namely 47 per cent, but that it is less, 36 per cent, for the five large state universities. The teaching load, opportunities for research, housing situation, spirit of the institution, location, and other factors are also to be considered. Obviously we could not obtain data on all these elements. But even if we could, an evaluation of their importance in the choice of an institution would precipitate us into a maze of individual and irreconcilable differences. Some professors like to teach and would not have fewer classes and students. Others prefer research. Many of us love the hills, lakes, gorges, and waterfalls of this region, and the wonderful view from the top of the library slope. But there are professors who would choose nearness to a city, and the range of contacts that urban life brings.

Money, however, is command over many things. With few exceptions, whatever the interests to be served, the possession of money helps. Money buys the books and travel of the scholar, the luxuries and entertainment of the more worldly, and the necessities of housing, medical care, food, and clothing for everyone. Rightly used, it promotes learning, furthers joy, increases health, and yields the solid satisfaction of a good and secure livelihood. And who knows more about such effects than a professor? Who therefore is better able to spend money? Accordingly we are confident that our emphasis on the monetary comparison is not misplaced. And we believe that on general and particular competitive grounds alike, the case for additional increases in the level of faculty salaries in both the endowed and the State colleges at Cornell is strong.
Table 3. AVERAGE SALARIES OF PROFESSORS for the Year 1955-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven large private universities</td>
<td>£10,023</td>
<td>£7,093</td>
<td>£5,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Three Institutes of Technology)</td>
<td>9,356</td>
<td>6,910</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five large state universities</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>6,877</td>
<td>5,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (endowed)</td>
<td>8,859</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>5,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven large colleges</td>
<td>9,523</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>6,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>5,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Economics</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four colleges or divisions</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>5,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>7,853</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>5,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* b. Case, Carnegie, and California.
* c. Michigan, Illinois, Iowa State, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Colleges or divisions of Medicine, Agriculture, and Home Economics excluded.
* d. Iowa State, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Purdue, Michigan State, and California. The figures for the last three may be for 1954-55.
* e. Iowa State, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.
Now we wish to call attention to two other matters, (1) the minimum salaries, and (2) salaries in the upper brackets.

The minimum professional salaries at Cornell are low. This is unfortunate, not only for the persons directly concerned, but also for the standing of the University. A relatively low minimum tends to limit the payment of higher amounts and thus to make for a lower average remuneration for the faculty as a whole. Further, a low minimum may place the University at a competitive disadvantage in obtaining and retaining for teaching and research the services of the best of the oncoming prospects. As compared with the Cornell minimum of $6,000 for a full professor, the four higher-paying private universities have minimums of $9,000 or $10,000, the two higher-paying institutions of technology of $7,500 or $7,600, and the three higher-paying state universities of $7,000 or $7,200.

The tabulation below gives the lowest faculty salaries now paid in the endowed colleges at Cornell, the annual cost of raising these salaries to suggested modest levels, and the number of persons directly affected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest salary</th>
<th>Higher minimum</th>
<th>Cost of increase to University</th>
<th>No. of persons affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. prof.</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. prof.</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lowest salary paid to a professor in the State colleges is $6,225; to an associate professor, $5,448; and to an assistant professor, $5,010. No calculations were made of the cost of raising the first two salaries to the minimums indicated above, or of the numbers of persons affected.

One professor in the endowed colleges receives a salary of $18,000. The next highest salary is $15,000, and the next, $13,500. (The top salary in the State colleges is $14,923.) Thirty professors out of 177 are paid more than $10,000. Thus 27, or nine-tenths of that group, receive salaries between $10,000 and $13,500. We have made no study of upper bracket salaries in other institutions, but are content with expressing the opinion that the effective range at Cornell is too narrow, and the number of higher-paid positions too few. The problem, as we view it, is not limited to the occasional recruitment of an outstanding professor. Even the new prospect is interested, not only in the beginning salary, but also in the rewards to be expected for great success in the field that he is considering.
Respectfully submitted by the Committee on Economic Status.

William H. Farnham
John G. B. Hutchins
Alfred E. Kahn
Andrew Schultz, Jr.
N. Arnold Tolles
M. Slade Kendrick, Chairman
The Graduate Faculty recommends to the University Faculty for transmission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a group of new professional type degrees, at the Master's level, to be entitled as follows: Master of Civil Engineering, Master of Mechanical Engineering, Master of Electrical Engineering, Master of Chemical Engineering, Master of Engineering Physics, Master of Metallurgical Engineering, and Master of Industrial Engineering. To administer these degrees, the Engineering Division of the Graduate School will be established in the Graduate School.

Admission to candidacy for each of these degrees is a function of the Engineering Division of the Graduate School. The requirements for admission into candidacy for these degrees will be essentially the same as those stated in the Graduate Announcement of requirements for admission into candidacy for the general degrees of the Graduate School. Specifically the requirements are that the applicant (1) must hold a baccalaureate or equivalent degree from a college or university of recognized standing in a field of engineering or science deemed appropriate to the proposed advanced study, or have satisfactorily completed four years of appropriate work in the College of Engineering at Cornell, and (2) as judged by his previous record, or otherwise, must show promise of ability satisfactorily to pursue advanced study.

After a candidate has been admitted, he will work under the direct supervision of the Graduate Committee of the Field of his major interest, subject to the jurisdiction of the Engineering Division of the Graduate School. The advanced credit to be granted, the curriculum to be followed and the acceptance of the student's work are in the hands of this Committee. Each student shall have a Faculty member as an adviser to work with him on the details of his program and progress.

In these programs, all courses must be taught by, and all projects and case studies must be under the direct supervision of Cornell University Faculty members. Course credits are obtained either through course work on the campus in Ithaca or through courses offered under the Division of Extramural Courses. A minimum of fifteen credit hours is to be earned by study on the Ithaca campus.

To qualify for a degree, the candidate must satisfactorily complete at least forty-five credit hours of advanced technical courses or their equivalent. The required number of credit hours may be reduced, in special cases, to no less than thirty by allowing credit for advanced work completed before entrance into the program. The number of credit hours to be allowed in this way will be determined by examination administered by the Faculty. Professional experience substantially covering the same area as any part of the student's curriculum may, after investigation by the Faculty, be given corresponding credit, provided however that the credit hours earned in this way, plus the allowance for advanced work completed before entry into the program, do not exceed 15 hours.

The designation of advanced courses from which specific programs may be arranged shall be the responsibility of the Graduate Faculty of the School or Department in which the degree work is done, subject to approval.
of the Engineering Division of the Graduate School. These advanced courses shall be limited to subject matter beyond that usually included in a normal four-year engineering curriculum in the field of the student's study. A Cornell University undergraduate must have completed first degree requirements before the award of the advanced degree.

No more than ten years may intervene between the time of admission into candidacy for this degree and the completion of all requirements.

Recipients of these degrees may obtain the same credit toward the Ph.D. as is now given for the five-year engineering degrees from Cornell, but a holder of both a Cornell baccalaureate degree in engineering and the professional Master's degree may receive credit for only one.
In recommending the establishment of the professional type degrees at the Master's level, the Engineering College is seeking better to serve two groups of engineers who are coming to it for help. One of these groups is composed of engineers who have been graduated recently and who are presently employed in industry. The second group is composed of the outstanding members of the graduating classes at Cornell and elsewhere who wish further curricular type training. Both of these groups are faced with common problems in an era of rapidly advancing technology. They must be familiar with the advances in a particular field of engineering, as well as the continuing discoveries that are being made in the basic sciences related to their field.

Many prospective students already have experience in research of basic or developmental character; others may be in positions or seeking employment where they will not be called upon to do research, but where advanced training in technical subjects is indispensable. The need is not to educate these men in the methods of research, but rather to offer them the opportunity to study subject matter concerned with the latest technical advancements and to acquire new techniques and skills.

The proposed degrees, therefore, are not research degrees as is the case for the M.S. and Ph.D., but rather they are completely curricular in nature. This being so, no reference has been made to residence requirements. While courses of instruction given by Cornell faculty members may be conducted in off-campus locations, many of the courses included in these programs will have to be given at Cornell in order to utilize the unique resources that are available.

Because of the great diversity that exists in the practice of the different branches of engineering, the curricula of the several degrees will differ in content. There is a strong feeling, in spite of this, that an Engineering Division of the Graduate School should be established, rather than many small Engineering Divisions of the Graduate School. In this way, common minimum requirements may be established and administration of the program may be simplified. It is also hoped that, through the efforts of an Engineering Division of the Graduate Faculty, a certain amount of cross fertilization may occur within the College to bring about improved programs. It is expected, of course, that the Engineering Division of the Graduate Faculty will delegate to the Schools and Departments under its supervision much of the detailed work necessary to carry out this educational effort.

The proposed degrees would normally require at least one term of work beyond the Cornell five-year Bachelor's degree level. Thus, depending on the candidate's previous preparation and the specific branch of engineering, the proposed degrees would be considered to be at the five- and one-half to six-year level.

It seems to the Faculty of the College of Engineering that we have the responsibility and duty to bring to qualified persons suitable educational programs. The need for the program that is being proposed is very apparent.
We therefore urge the Graduate Faculty of the University to consider this need and to give this proposal its approval.

Graduate Committee of the Engineering College

A. H. Burr  H. S. Sack
H. G. Booker  B. W. Saunders
E. T. Cranch  B. M. Siegel
A. B. Credle  D. A. Stuart
H. M. Giff  G. Winter
J. E. Hedrick  C. C. Winding, Chairman
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.
The minutes of the meeting of December 14, a condensation of
which had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting,
were approved.

The President announced the death of Ephriam Shorr, Associate
Professor of Medicine, on January 6, 1956. The Faculty rose in tribute
to the memory of their former colleague.

The Dean announced the receipt of communications from the
Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty announcing the election
of H.A. Tolles as its chairman for 1956, and from the Committee on
Nominations announcing the election of H.J. Loberg as its chairman for
1956.

The President noted that both the amount of the Ford
Foundation gift and the conditions governing its use are still un-
certain, but stated that he proposes to present a plan to the Trustees,
whereby some of the anticipated income is included in the budget for
1956-57.

The President commented briefly on the management survey
which is nearing completion, pointing out that the additional expense
involved in the creation of new administrative posts recommended by the
management consultants will be more than offset by savings which will
be effected through the adoption of their recommendations with regard
to various operations.
The President informed the Faculty that the Andrew D. White barn was being remodeled to serve as an Alumni Center, and that the cost was being met by alumni donors who were making contributions for this purpose in addition to their regular benefactions to the University.

As a special order, Professor Henry Guerlac called attention to the fact that this Faculty meeting was being held on Founder's Day, an occasion which has been celebrated more in the past than recently. He pointed out that in 1957, however, we shall commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Ezra Cornell, and the 125th year since the birth of Andrew D. White, and that the committee which has been charged with making appropriate plans, hopes to begin the year of commemoration with an academic convocation of the University community on Founder's Day. The committee's expectation, he added, is to correlate some of the regular University activities, such as Messenger lectures and exhibits at the Cornell University Library, with the commemoration year and its special events. On behalf of the 1957 Commemoration Committee, Professor Guerlac invited suggestions from the Faculty.

The President noted that the proposal by the College of Engineering concerning the designation of its first degrees, which had been announced as a special order, had been withdrawn.

On behalf of the Committee on Requirements for Graduation, its Chairman, the Dean, reported for the information of the Faculty, that in conformity with the recommendations of Col. Coates, Col. Comstock and Dr. Showacre, the committee has decided that the University Medical Office should certify a student as physically fit to perform military duty, and therefore as eligible under the new Army and Air Force
regulations for the basic military training courses, if, but only if, he can meet the physical standards set for induction into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy and the Special Faculty Committee on the By-Laws, their Chairman, the Dean, moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

I. Resolved: that responsibility for and control over the pre-registration orientation program, which ought to be largely educational in content and motivation, should continue to reside with the University Faculty, with power of delegation to appropriate administrative, faculty, and student personnel, committees, or groups.

The motion was seconded and, after brief discussion, passed by a voice vote.

II. Resolved: that sound educational policy requires that before any voluntary flight training program or other military program to be given under the control of a military department of the University be accepted, the concurrence of the University Faculty be obtained.

The motion was seconded and, after considerable discussion, passed by a voice vote.

III. Resolved: that the University Faculty, while continuing to maintain its basic position that faculty control over all extra-curricular student activities is essential to the successful operation of a sound educational program, is specially desirous of jurisdiction over any student activity which, though voluntary and without academic credit, is closely related to the educational program of any academic unit of the University; and that the University Faculty should have jurisdiction over any extra-curricular student activity which is certified by any academic unit of the University to be closely connected with its educational program.

The motion was seconded, and after much discussion, was put to a voice vote. The result being in doubt, a show of hands was requested. The motion carried by a vote of 41 to 23.
The Professor of Philosophy, Professor S.M. Brown, moved that the meeting be adjourned, and that action on the remaining resolutions in the mimeograph/compilation of resolutions distributed at this meeting be postponed for consideration at a special Faculty meeting to be called by the Dean. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
A special meeting of the Faculty was called to order by the
President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 11, a condensation of which
had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, were
approved.

The President announced the death of George Young, Jr., Professor
of Architecture, Emeritus, on January 15, 1956. The Faculty rose in
tribute to his memory.

The Dean reported the receipt of communications from the President
announcing the appointment of the following to a special committee to
prepare a memorial article concerning George Young, Jr. for publication
in the Necrology of the Faculty: H. E. Baxter, D. L. Finlayson, and
R. M. Ogden, Chairman; and the appointment of James Campbell to the
Committee on Entrance Credentials and to the Committee on Requirements
for Graduation for six months from February first to fill the vacancies
on these committees which will be created by the absence on leave of
C. A. Hanson during that period.

Professor R. E. Cushman, a Faculty Representative in the Board
of Trustees and a member of the Committee on University Policy,
commented on the Report and Recommendations of the Committee on
University Policy and of the Special Committee on the By-Laws, which
had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and
a copy of which is appended to the minutes.
Professor Cushman noted that in passing resolutions concerning the By-Laws, the Faculty is not approving formal resolutions to be transmitted to the Board of Trustees, but is recording instructions for the guidance of the Special Faculty Committee on the By-Laws, which is shortly to confer with the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees. Such resolutions passed by the Faculty, he continued, would provide the basis on which the Special Committee could present the opinions of the Faculty to the Trustee Committee. Professor Cushman then noted revisions in the wording of two of the proposals to be submitted.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy and the Special Committee on the By-Laws, Professor Cushman moved that the Faculty adopt the following resolutions:

**Resolution regarding the Establishment of New Academic Units**

Resolved: That the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that Sec. 7 of Art. I of the University By-Laws be amended so as to read:

(New material is underlined; deleted material is in parentheses.)

7. Colleges, Schools, and other Academic (Departments) Units: Cornell University shall comprise such colleges, schools, divisions, research centers and separate academic departments as the Board of Trustees shall establish from time to time (.) after considering the recommendations of the University Faculty, and in the case of academic units which, if established, would be comprised within a college and/or school, after also considering the recommendations of such college and/or school.

**Resolution regarding Consultation with the Administrative Heads of Academic Units Before Action Substantially Affecting them is Taken**

Resolved: That the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the following provision, the principal substance of which now appears at p. 1 of Board Legislation to Implement Revised By-Laws, and formerly appeared in the old by-laws as sec. 3 of Art. VII, be introduced, with the changes indicated, in the Revised By-Laws as sec. 2 of Art. II, the succeeding sections of Art. II to be renumbered accordingly:
Before action is taken by the Board of Trustees or the President, substantially affecting any college, independent school or separate academic department of the University, the President shall consult with the Administrative heads concerned (with respect to the necessities of such college, independent school or department and the best ways of meeting them.) In the case of serious differences of opinion in major matters, he shall bring such differences to the attention of the Board.

Resolution regarding General Revision of Article XIII, and Specifically Dealing with

1. Distinction between Acting Professors and other Temporary Staff with Respect to Voting Rights.


3. Disability of Members of University Faculty to be Candidates for Degrees.

4. Power of University Faculty to Decide General Questions of Educational Policy.

5. Power of the Faculties to Choose the Members of their Committees to Confer with the Trustees.

Resolved: That the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that secs. 1 and 2 of Art. XIII of the Revised By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

The voting members of the University Faculty shall consist of the President, who shall be the presiding officer; emeritus professors, University professors and acting university professors; and all professors, associate professors and assistant professors, including all acting professors of these ranks, of the several colleges, schools, and separate academic departments, divisions and centers at Ithaca, (exclusive of the several extension services.) including those in the extension services, if they are not exclusively engaged therein.
colleges, schools, and departments of the University. The University Faculty may grant to any group of non-voting members the right to vote on any question deemed by the Faculty to be of interest to such group.

The Board of Trustees may elect other persons to membership in the University Faculty, from time to time, upon the recommendation of that faculty.

2. No member of the University Faculty may be a candidate for a degree administered by Cornell University.

3. Functions: It shall be the function of the University Faculty to consider and decide questions of general (educational) policy concerning (which concern) more than one college, school or separate academic department, division or center which are purely educational (respectively or are general) in nature; to consider and decide, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, questions of general educational policy concerning more than one college, school or separate academic department, division or center which have important aspects other than educational; to recommend to the Board, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification or discontinuance of degrees; and to define the University's academic calendar.

The University Faculty, or any college or school faculty, shall have the right to present its views directly to the Board concerning any questions which may arise. Such presentation of views shall be accomplished through a committee of not more than seven faculty members, one of whom shall be the dean or director of the particular faculty, and the rest of whom shall be chosen in such manner as the particular faculty may determine. Such committee shall meet with the Board or a committee of the Board designated by it. The arrangements for any such meeting shall be made through the President.

Resolved: Concerning the Election of Members by the Special Faculties

Resolved: That the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the second paragraph of sec. I of Art. XIV of the Revised By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

(New material is underlined; deleted material is in parentheses.)

Any college or school faculty may elect to either voting or non-voting membership such other persons as fall in either of the two following classes: (1) members of the academic or professional staff of the college or school; and (2) persons who are already members of some other college or school Faculty of the University. (other persons to membership from time to time.) An election of a person from the second class shall have force only so long as the person is a member of the other college or
school faculty. Elections of persons from either class may be made without following the procedure set forth in Article XVIII; but no such election shall have the effect of conferring any one of the professorial ranks or the rank of instructor on any person who does not already possess such rank.

Resolution regarding Procedures to be Followed when Dismissal of a Faculty Member is Under Consideration

Resolved: That the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the provisions specifying the procedure to be followed by the Board of Trustees when dismissing Faculty members, which now appear at p. 6 of Board Legislation to Implement Revised By-Laws, and which appeared in sec. 4 of Art. XX of the old by-laws, be incorporated in sec. 8 of Art. XVIII of the Revised By-Laws.

The motion being seconded, the President commented that he considered the proposal that the Faculty decide questions of educational policy as administratively unworkable, unless there was a clear delineation of the meaning of "educational policy", as nearly every decision the administrative officers now make has some concern with educational policy.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor Max Black, moved adoption of the following resolution as a substitute for the original motion:

Resolved: That the University Faculty expresses its confidence in its Policy Committee and By-Law Revision Committee and approves in principle the resolutions presented to it at its meetings of January 11 and January 25 while reserving the right to consider and approve any detailed changes in the By-Laws that may result from negotiations with the Trustees.

The motion was seconded.

The President asked if Professor Cushman would consider the resolution made by Professor Black as an appropriate substitute motion.

Professor Cushman commented that the Committee was aware of the difficulty in trying to absorb details of the proposals, but, he continued, the committee members were not entirely free agents. They
must get the views of the Faculty before the term of the By-Law Revision Committee expires; they could not go ahead without asking Faculty opinion, but if the Faculty did not wish to express its opinions, the Committee would go ahead. Professor Cushman accepted the substitute motion and withdrew his original motion.

The substitute motion was put to a voice vote, the result of which was in doubt. On show of hands, the motion was lost.

Professor Cushman again moved the original motion, which was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
January 18, 1956
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Explanation of the Resolutions Adopted at the January 11 Meeting

At the meeting of the University Faculty held January 11, 1956, the Policy and By-Law Committees presented, and the Faculty adopted, three resolutions related to the new University by-laws transferring control over student conduct and extra-curricular activities from the Faculty to the President. These resolutions are set forth in the condensation of the minutes of the January 11 meeting transmitted herewith. They were offered to the Faculty with the following explanation:

When the Faculty By-Law Committee meets with the Trustee By-Law Revision Committee, the Faculty Committee will, in conformity with the opinion which the Faculty has already expressed, urge that the new by-law with regard to control over student activities and conduct be repealed and that the old by-law be reenacted. If the Trustees accede to this request, Faculty control over the matters referred to in the three resolutions will be a necessary consequence, as the Faculty would once more have jurisdiction over extra-curricular as well as curricular student activities. If, however, the Trustees should deny the Faculty's request and leave the new by-law in force, the Policy and By-Law Committees believe that exceptions to it should be recognized under which jurisdiction over the orientation program and over extra-curricular student activities closely related to the curricular educational program of any academic unit of the University would be vested in the University Faculty, and under which the concurrence of the University Faculty would be prerequisite to the establishment at the University of any voluntary flight training or other military program. The Policy and By-Law Committees believe that the latter committee could urge these exceptions more effectively with the Trustee Committee if the Faculty shows a definite interest in them by adopting the resolutions.

General Comment on Resolutions to be Offered on January 25th

The resolutions to be offered by the Policy and By-Law Committees at the special Faculty meeting on January 25 have no relation to the new by-law placing control over student activities and conduct in the hands of the President, but deal rather with various other parts of the Revised By-Laws about which the Faculty may feel concern. It will be noted that the resolutions not only involve requests for the elimination of several of the changes made in the By-Laws by the Trustees last June, but introduce a few suggestions in regard to changes which the Trustees apparently have not thus far considered, and which the Faculty might deem desirable.

Resolution regarding the Establishment of New Academic Units

From time to time during the history of the University, the Trustees have been faced with the question as to whether or not to establish a new college, school, department, or other academic unit. The opinion of leading members of the Faculty concerning such questions has, we understand, usually been sought; but the Policy and By-Law Committees believe that provision should be made for ascertaining the opinion of the University Faculty in all cases and that of the separate faculties in some cases. The committees believe that such a provision would be helpful to the Trustees and further the educational interests of the University.
In view of these considerations, the Policy and By-Law Committees will move the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved: that the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that Sec. 7 of Art. I of the University By-Laws be amended so as to read: (New material is underlined; deleted material is in parentheses)

7. Colleges, Schools, and other Academic (Departments) Units: Cornell University shall comprise such colleges, schools, divisions, research centers and separate academic departments as the Board of Trustees shall establish from time to time (.) after considering the recommendations of the University Faculty, and in the case of academic units which, if established, would be comprised within a college and/or school, after also considering the recommendation of such college and/or school.

Resolution regarding Consultation with the Administrative Heads of Academic Units Before Action Substantially Affecting them is Taken

For many years there was in the old by-laws a section in the article dealing with the powers of the President which provided in substance that before action was taken substantially affecting any college or school, the President should consult with the dean concerned; and in case of a serious difference of opinion, bring it to the attention of the Trustees. When the by-laws were revised this section was eliminated from the by-laws but preserved as Trustee legislation.

The Policy and By-Law Committees, however, believe that this section is so important that its substance should be restored to the by-laws, where it is less likely to be overlooked; that it should be part of the article dealing with the Board of Trustees; and that revisions appropriate to its new location should be made.

In view of these considerations, the Policy and By-Law Committees will move the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved: that the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the following provision, the principal substance of which now appears at p. 1 of Board Legislation to Implement Revised By-Laws, and formerly appeared in the old by-laws as sec. 3 of Art. VII, be introduced, with the changes indicated, in the Revised By-Laws as sec. 2 of Art. II, the
succeeding sections of Art. II to be renumbered accordingly:

(New material is underlined: deleted material is in parentheses)

Before action is taken by the Board of Trustees or the President, substantially affecting any college, independent school or separate academic department of the University, the President shall consult with the (dean, or head, or professors) Administrative heads concerned (,),( with respect to the necessities of such college, independent school or department and the best ways of meeting them.) In the case of serious differences of opinion in major matters, he shall bring such differences to the attention of the Board.

Resolution regarding General Revision of Article XIII, and Specifically Dealing with

1. Distinction between Acting Professors and other Temporary Staff with Respect to Voting Rights.


3. Disability of Members of University Faculty to be Candidates for Degrees.

4. Power of University Faculty to Decide General Questions of Educational Policy.

5. Power of the Faculties to Choose the Members of their Committees to Confer with the Trustees.

The Policy and By-Law Committees have several changes to propose in Art. XIII of the Revised By-Laws. The first is concerned with the voting status of Acting and Visiting Professors.

1. Distinction between Acting Professors and other Temporary Staff with Respect to Voting Rights

For a considerable period of time, it has been customary for persons to be appointed to the academic staff of the University with such titles as Acting Professor or Visiting Professor. After such appointments have been made, the question has arisen as to whether such staff members were voting members of the Faculty. It was Dean Murdock's opinion that staff members in the Acting category were entitled to vote, whereas staff members in the Visiting category were not. The University Counsel and the present Dean of the Faculty have expressed the same opinion when the question has been put to them.

The Policy and By-Law Committees believe that the by-laws should clarify this matter, and are proposing that sec. 1 of Art. XIII be amended to that end. See the proposed wording of sec. 1, infra.
2. Preservation of Voting Rights of Extension Staff not Exclusively Engaged in Extension

Under the old by-laws staff members in the extension services were voting members of the University Faculty unless exclusively engaged in extension work. The Revised By-Laws, however, provide that a staff member is non-voting if he is in the Extension Services. This raises a doubt as to the status of a staff member who is in extension work, but also teaches on the campus. To remove this doubt, and to restore the former situation, which seemed to meet with general approval, the Policy and By-Law Committees are proposing appropriate amendments. See the proposed wording of the first two paragraphs of sec. 1, infra.

3. Disability of Members of University Faculty to be Candidates for Degrees

Sec. 3b of Art. XIV of the old by-laws contained a provision that no voting member of a college or school faculty could be a candidate for a degree administered by that faculty; and sec. 3d of Art. XIV contained a provision that no member of either the University Faculty or the Graduate Faculty could be a candidate for a degree under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Faculty.

These would permit a voting member of one college faculty to be a candidate for a bachelor's degree administered by another college faculty; and a member of the University Faculty, who was not a member of any college Faculty to be a candidate for a bachelor's degree administered by any one of the colleges.

The first of these two opportunities was eliminated by sec. 2 of Art. XIV of the Revised By-Laws, which provides that no voting member of a college or school faculty may be a candidate for a degree administered by Cornell University. As there are some members of the University Faculty who are not members of any college or school faculty (e.g., the members of medical and military departments and a few administrative officers of the University), the second of these opportunities exists, however, even under the new by-laws. As the Policy and By-Law Committees believe that the second opportunity, as well as the first, should have been eliminated it is proposing an appropriate amendment. See the proposed wording of sec. 2, infra.

4. Power of University Faculty to Decide Questions of General Educational Policy

In the old by-laws (sec. 3a of Art. XIV), it was stated that it should be the function of the University Faculty to consider questions concerning more than one college and questions of University Policy. Whether it was the function of the University Faculty to decide such questions was not stated. However, in sec. 3b of Art. XIV the statement of the duty of the special faculties to make certain determinations was preceded by the clause: "Subject to the right of revision by the University Faculty on all matters affecting general University policy." This clause afforded the basis for the assumption that the University Faculty had not only the power to consider but also the power to decide questions of University Policy. As the Policy and By-Law Committees believe that the University Faculty has acted on that assumption for many years; that it should continue so to act; and that its right to do so should be made clear beyond doubt, these committees are proposing an amendment to that end. See the proposed wording of line 2 of sec. 3, infra.
5. Power of the Faculties to Choose the Members of their Committees to Confer with the Trustees

There was in the old by-laws, and there is in the Revised By-Laws, provision for faculty committees to confer with Trustee committees whenever a faculty wishes to present its views on any question directly to the Board. In the old by-laws it was stated that the committee should be appointed by the faculty concerned. (2d par. of sec. X of Art. II). In the Revised By-Laws, however, the method of constituting the committee is not specified. Believing that the faculties should have the power to choose their conference committees, the Policy and By-Law Committees are proposing an amendment to that end. See the proposed wording of the second paragraph of sec. 3, infra.

In view of these considerations, the Policy and By-Law Committees will move the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved: that the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that secs. 1 and 2 of Art. XIII of the Revised By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

(New material is underlined: deleted material is in parentheses.)

1. Membership: The voting members of the University Faculty shall consist of the President, who shall be the presiding officer; emeritus professors, University professors and acting university professors; and all professors, associate professors and assistant professors, including all acting professors of these ranks, of the several colleges, schools, and separate academic departments, divisions and centers at Ithaca, (exclusive of the several extension services.) including those in the extension services, if they are not exclusively engaged therein.

The non-voting members of the University Faculty shall consist of the professors, associate professors and assistant professors, including all acting professors of these ranks, in (1) the Medical College, (2) the School of Nursing, (3) the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, and (4) those exclusively engaged in the extension services of the several colleges, schools, and departments of the University. The University Faculty may grant to any group of non-voting members the right to vote on any question deemed by the Faculty to be of interest to such group.

The Board of Trustees may elect other persons to membership in the
University Faculty, from time to time, upon the recommendation of that faculty.

2. No member of the University Faculty may be a candidate for a degree administered by Cornell University.

3. Functions: It shall be the function of the University Faculty to consider and decide questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school or separate academic department, division or center, respectively or are general in nature; to recommend to the Board, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification or discontinuance of degrees; and to define the University's academic calendar.

The University Faculty, or any college or school faculty, shall have the right to present its views directly to the Board concerning any questions which may arise. Such presentation of views shall be accomplished through a committee of not more than seven faculty members, one of whom shall be the dean or director of the particular faculty, and the rest of whom shall be chosen in such manner as the particular faculty may determine. Such committee shall meet with the Board or a committee of the Board designated by it. The arrangements for any such meeting shall be made through the President.

Resolution Concerning the Election of Members by the Special Faculties

In the old by-laws (sec. 3b of Art. XIV) it was provided that any college or school faculty may elect other persons to its membership subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. When this was carried over into the Revised By-Laws in the second paragraph of sec. 1 of Art. XIV, the concluding clause - subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees was eliminated.

The Policy and By-Law Committees believe that the new version is objectionable, because it would permit a separate faculty, without approval of the Board of Trustees, to make a person a member of the University Faculty by electing him to some professorial rank in the separate faculty.

These committees believe that the original version also was unsatisfactory, because it imposed no restrictions on the sources from which a college faculty could draw members under the provision.

On the assumption that the real purpose of the provision has been to enable college A to elect to its faculty a man who is a member of the faculty of college B, in furtherance of cooperative arrangements which are common among our colleges, and with the understanding that the membership of the
elected man on the faculty of college A would last only as long as his membership on the faculty of college B, the Policy and By-Law Committees are proposing an amendment to this end.

In view of these considerations, the Policy and By-Law Committees will move the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved: that the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the second paragraph of sec. 1 of Art. XIV of the Revised By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

(New material is underlined: deleted material is in parentheses.)

Any college or school faculty may elect a person who is already a member of any other college or school faculty, (other persons to membership from time to time.) such election to have force only so long as the person continues to be a member of the other college or school faculty.

Resolution regarding Procedures to be Followed When Dismissal of a Faculty Member is Under Consideration

In sec. 4 of Art. XX of the old by-laws there appeared a statement of the procedures to be followed by the Board of Trustees when dismissal of a faculty member was under consideration. While that part of the old by-law providing that reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard, must be given to an accused faculty member, was retained in the Revised By-Laws, the statement of procedures to be followed was omitted therefrom and enacted as Trustee legislation.

In view of the fact that Trustee legislation can be repealed by the concurring votes of as few as eight Trustees (a majority of a quorum of 15); and in view of the probability that in most of the few cases in which these procedures will be resorted to, the feeling will run high both in the Board and among the Faculty, the Policy and By-Law Committees believe that they should not be so readily repealable.

In view of these considerations, the Policy and By-Law Committees will move the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved: that the University Faculty recommend to the By-Law Revision Committee of the Board of Trustees that the provisions specifying the procedure to be followed by the Board of Trustees when dismissing Faculty members, which now appear at p. 6 of Board Legislation to Implement Revised By-Laws, and which appeared in sec. 4 of Art. XX of the old by-laws, be incorporated in sec. 8 of Art. XVIII of the Revised By-Laws.
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 25, a condensation of which had been distributed to the Faculty with the notice that a meeting would not be held in February, were approved.

The Provost announced the death of Robert Stanley Breed, Professor of Bacteriology, Emeritus, on February 10, 1956; and the death of Malcolm Strong McIlroy, Professor of Electrical Engineering, on March 1, 1956. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleagues.

The Dean reported that communications had been received from the President announcing the appointment of the following special committees to prepare memorial articles for publication in the Necrology of the Faculty: concerning Robert Stanley Breed, C. S. Pederson, J. M. Sherman and J. D. Luckett, chairman; concerning Malcolm Strong McIlroy, A. B. Credle, P. P. Kellogg and W. H. Erickson, chairman.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the Board of Trustees announcing the establishment, pursuant to the recommendation of the University Faculty, of the following degrees: Master of Civil Engineering, Master of Mechanical Engineering, Master of Electrical Engineering, Master of Chemical Engineering, Master of Engineering Physics, Master of Metallurgical Engineering, and Master of Industrial Engineering; as professional type degrees to be awarded to persons who have satisfactorily completed the pro-
grams leading to such degrees prescribed by the Engineering Division of the Graduate School and who are recommended for such degrees by the faculty of the Graduate School.

There being no special order, and no unfinished business, committee reports were called for.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, Professor Gates, chairman of its sub-committee on the Administration of the Hull Memorial Publication Fund, moved that the Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that this fund continue to be administered by the Board of Editors of the University Press. The motion was seconded.

The discussion which followed was focused on one point to which the sub-committee had given considerable attention, namely the possible conflict of interest if the administration of the fund were left with the Board of Editors of the University Press.

The Professor of Economics, Professor G. P. Adams, Jr. made a substitute motion that the matter be recommitted to the Committee on University Policy in order to give the Faculty time to ponder the issues involved and to make suggestions to the committee in case anyone cared to do so.

This motion was seconded, and after considerable discussion, was put to a voice vote and passed.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean moved the adoption of the following legislation:

"Be it enacted that the terms of office of members of the Faculty hereafter elected or appointed for regular terms to the following positions, boards, or committees shall begin on July 1 and end on June 30:
Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees
Faculty Trustee, if authorized by the Legislature
Board of Physical Education and Athletics
Board on Student Health and Hygiene
Standing boards or committees of the University Faculty

and that the terms of office of members of the Faculty
hereafter elected or appointed to fill permanent
vacancies in any of the said positions, boards, or
committees shall end on June 30, provided, however,
that appointments to fill a temporary vacancy may be
made for the period of such vacancy.

And be it further enacted that the terms of office
of members of the Faculty now serving in the positions
or on the boards or committees above referred to shall
be extended to the thirtieth of June immediately
following the dates on which their terms of office
would have expired except for this enactment."

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice

vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of March 1, a condensation of which had been distributed to the Faculty with the notice that a meeting would not be held in April, were approved.

The Provost announced passage by the Legislature of the State of New York of a bill providing for Faculty Trustees at Cornell. The bill, which became law on April 9, 1956, will take effect on July 1. The Dean commented on this gratifying announcement, paying tribute to those who originated the idea and who kept it alive.

The Provost suggested that the proposal concerning the professional degrees, Master of Nutritional Science and Master of Food Science, the text of which had been included with the call for the meeting, be treated as a special order. A statement concerning this proposal was distributed at the meeting, and a copy thereof is appended to these minutes.

On behalf of the Graduate School, its Dean, Professor McConnell, then moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the School of Nutrition has proposed to transfer the jurisdiction over the degrees of Master of Nutritional Science and Master of Food Science to the Graduate School, and

Whereas these professional degrees were approved by the Faculty of the Graduate School, and the University Faculty and established by the Board of Trustees of Cornell University nearly ten years ago, and

Whereas the Graduate Faculty has approved this proposal,

Be It Resolved the University Faculty approve this proposal and recommend to the Board of Trustees that these degrees be granted to persons who have satisfactorily completed the program leading to such degrees prescribed by
the Nutrition Division of the Graduate School, and who are recommended for such degrees by the Faculty of the Graduate School.

The motion was seconded, and the recommendation adopted without dissent, by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, Professor R. E. Cushman presented the following recommendation and moved its adoption:

The Committee on University Policy recommends to the University Faculty that it recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Hull Memorial Publication Fund be administered as follows:

1. The administration of the Fund shall be entrusted to the Board of Editors of the Cornell University Press as regularly constituted, augmented by five members of the University Faculty to be chosen by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from the fields of history, political science, philosophy, languages and literature, after consultation with the members of the Faculty working in these fields.

2. It shall be the duty of this enlarged Board of Editors to determine in the case of each manuscript submitted to it, or to any member thereof, whether such manuscript has sufficient merit and will sufficiently enhance the scholarly reputation of Cornell University in the field of liberal studies to make appropriate a subsidy from the Hull Memorial Publication Fund to facilitate its publication.

3. When the enlarged Board of Editors has approved a manuscript for publication, it shall be its further duty, in consultation with the University Publisher, and when it deems it desirable with other publishers as well, to determine the amount of the subsidy and the publisher. In making these decisions the Board is to be free to authorize the publication of a manuscript by any reputable publisher. Its action in this matter, as well as in fixing the amount of the subsidy, is to be based upon its judgment that the sound administration of the Hull Memorial Publication Fund will be best served thereby.

The motion was seconded.

The Professor of Modern Languages, Professor Houlton, then presented the following substitute motion:
The University Faculty recommends to the Board of Trustees that the Hull Publication Memorial Fund be administered as follows:

1. The administration of the Fund shall be entrusted to a standing committee of the University Faculty to be entitled Committee on the Hull Publication Memorial Fund.

2. The Committee shall consist of:
   a) the University Publisher, ex officio;
   b) those members of the Board of Editors of the Cornell University Press representing the fields of the liberal studies (history and political science, philosophy, languages and literature), ex officio; and
   c) five additional members in these fields to be appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

3. The members appointed by the Dean shall serve for terms of three years, except that members appointed initially may serve for shorter terms.

4. The Committee shall elect its own chairman annually.

5. The Committee shall report annually to the University Faculty.

6. After the Committee has been constituted, it shall formulate policies and procedures for administering the Fund, and shall submit them to the University Faculty for approval.

This motion was seconded, and was discussed at some length. When put to a voice vote the motion to substitute passed. There being no further discussion of the substitute motion, it was put to a voice vote and carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
School of Nutrition Proposal on Transfer of Professional Degrees:  
Master of Nutritional Science and Master of Food Science

For the past ten years, the professional degrees—Master of Nutritional Science and Master of Food Science—have been awarded under the jurisdiction of the Faculty of the School of Nutrition, with the approval of the Cornell University Faculty and the Board of Regents of the State of New York.

The degrees were created to provide suitably-trained personnel to meet the diversified needs of many fields: industrial, academic, and public service, in which a thorough knowledge of food and nutrition and their underlying sciences are of importance.

During the nine-year interval, 137 degrees have been granted: 90, Master of Nutritional Science, and 47, Master of Food Science. Graduates holding these degrees have found wide acceptance both here and abroad in industry, in academic circles, in health and welfare groups, and in public service. The School has built a reputation for providing a training which rests firmly on the sciences basic to food and nutrition, yet which is diversified and practical enough to find immediate application. One of the strengths of the training of its graduates is the broad and inclusive introduction which it gives to food and nutrition problems, both animal and human.

The Faculty of the School of Nutrition now requests the approval of these degrees by the Graduate Faculty and for their transfer to the Graduate School. If approval is granted, admissions, requirements, and curricula for the degrees would be announced and administered by the Faculty of the School of Nutrition which, for the purpose, acts as a Division of the Graduate Faculty. Degrees would be awarded upon recommendation of the Division to the Graduate Faculty.

Experience over the past ten years has led to the conclusion that the degrees might better be handled through the regular Graduate School channels than in the exceptional way now used. Included in the original philosophy was the provision for drawing suitably-qualified students from the Cornell undergraduate body at the end of their third year. For these students a combined curriculum could then be planned which would enable them to receive the bachelor's degree in their colleges and simultaneously complete the first year of work of the School of Nutrition. Over the years such students have proved only a minor portion of the program. Hence it is no longer necessary to maintain this arrangement, and it seems advisable to use the regular Graduate School channels.

Statement on Professional Degrees

Degrees: Master of Nutritional Science - M.N.S.  
Master of Food Science - M.F.S.

Admission to Candidacy: See School of Nutrition Announcement, page 8, with deletion of provisions for joint registration and advanced standing.

Inquiries and filing of applications related to degrees would be handled through the Graduate School office. The Director of the School of Nutrition would serve as field representative for the Faculty of the Division. Control of the degrees would rest with the Faculty of the School of Nutrition, acting as a Division of the Graduate School.
Requirements for Degree: Requirements for graduation and recommendation by the Divisional Faculty for the respective degrees include:

1. Residence

The record of each candidate must show at least two units of residence to qualify. (Units defined as in Graduate School Announcement, pp. 12-13).

2. Course work

Each student's program shall be carried out under the guidance of a faculty adviser from the Divisional Faculty. The requirements for graduation shall include completion of: (1) 30 semester hours of specified required courses, (2) in addition, electives approved by the adviser. These electives are intended to insure that the student's practical and theoretical training shall satisfy the standards set by the Faculty of the Division for the professional degrees in nutritional science and food science, respectively. (See School of Nutrition Announcement, p. 10, for specified required courses).

3. Special problem

Each candidate for a degree must present a written report on an approved problem which may or may not require laboratory research. The work involved in the report may be carried out, with the approval of the student's faculty adviser, under the direction of any member of the Faculty of the Division whom the student may choose and who is willing to supervise it. The report must be approved by the supervising Divisional Faculty member.

4. Examination

A final examination, either oral or written, or both, will be required of candidates for either degree. Examination(s) will be conducted by a committee consisting of the Faculty adviser plus one other member to be designated by the Faculty of the Division or its delegated agent.

5. Language

The Division has no language requirement either for entrance or for graduation.

Transfer of Residence Credit Toward Ph.D.:

Transfer of residence credit toward that required for the Ph.D. shall be according to the usual provision outlined in the Graduate School Announcement: "Candidates for the Doctorate are usually permitted to count study elsewhere for the Master's degree as equivalent to two residence units; and those who have received training of an exceptional quality and amount may petition for more. But no commitment regarding this may be made until after the student has entered into residence and his Special Committee has had further opportunity to judge his accomplishments."
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of May 9, a condensation of which had been distributed to the faculty with the call for the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the deaths of the following:

Richard L. Harris, Assistant Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, on November 23, 1955; Andrew J. Akelaitis, Assistant Professor of Clinical Medicine, on November 24, 1955; Hans J. Schwartz, Professor of Clinical Medicine, Emeritus, on February 15, 1956; Sydney Weintraub, Professor of Clinical Radiology, on March 24, 1956; Thomas A. C. Rennie, Professor of Psychiatry, on May 21, 1956; Frank Pores Bussell, Professor of Plant Breeding, Emeritus, on May 27, 1956; Alpheus Mansfield Goodman, Professor of Agricultural Engineering, Emeritus, on May 29, 1956; Horace Eugene Whiteside, J. DuPratt White Professor of Law, on June 9, 1956; Malcolm Goodridge, Professor of Clinical Medicine, Emeritus, on July 16, 1956; Ida Virginia Gibson, Assistant Professor of Food and Nutrition, on September 16, 1956; and Louis Michael Roehl, Professor of Farm Mechanics, Emeritus, on September 16, 1956.

The Faculty rose in tribute to their memory.

The Dean reported the receipt of communications from the Board of Trustees announcing that on June 11, 1956 it

Elected as Trustees of the University the following members of the Faculty: D. P. Barr for a term expiring June 30, 1957; R. E. Cushman for a term expiring June 30, 1959; and A. W. Gibson for a term expiring June 30, 1961;

Approved the action of the Faculty taken on March 11, 1956 extending by six months the terms of Faculty members of the Board of Physical Education and Athletics and of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene; and

Approved, pursuant to the recommendation of the Faculty made May 9, 1956, the granting of the degrees of Master of Nutritional Science and Master of Food Science to persons who have satisfactorily completed the program leading to such degrees prescribed by the Nutrition Division of the Graduate School and who are recommended for such degrees by
the Faculty of the Graduate School: the action to be effective with the year 1957-58.

The Dean reported receipt of a communication from the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees announcing that on June 30, 1956 it voted that the income from the Hull Publication Memorial Fund shall be appropriated by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of a standing committee of the University Faculty to be entitled "Committee on the Hull Publication Memorial Fund", to be constituted as follows: (a) the University Publisher, ex officio; (b) those members of the Board of Editors of the Cornell University Press representing the fields of the liberal studies (history and political science, philosophy, languages and literature), ex officio; and (c) five additional members in these fields to be appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The members appointed by the Dean shall serve for terms of three years, except that members appointed initially may serve for shorter terms. The Committee shall elect its own chairman annually. The Committee shall report annually to the University Faculty and the President. The Dean noted that this action by the Trustees was substantially in conformity with the recommendation of the Faculty made at its meeting of May 9, 1956.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the Committee on University Policy announcing the appointment of Professor A. W. Gibson to fill the vacancy in the special Faculty Committee on the By-Laws created by the resignation from the Faculty of Professor L. P. Smith.

The President recalled to the attention of the Faculty the proposal mentioned at the Faculty meeting of May 13, 1953 that the organization known as Cornell United Religious Work be taken into the corporate structure
of the University. This proposal has been studied, and the conclusion reached that departmental status is not now called for by the activities of CURW. The President stated that the only action now anticipated is dissolving the Cornell University Christian Association and combining it with CURW. The work of CURW will be carried on much as it has been for many years, although the present Board of Control of CURW is being reconstituted along lines of similar boards in the University.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Activities, its Chairman, Professor James Campbell, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved that the University Faculty designate Saturday, May 11, 1957, as Spring Day, a University Holiday, and instruct the Committee on Registration and Schedules to schedule evening hours which members of the Faculty may use for classes and laboratory periods which are normally scheduled on that day.

The motion was seconded and passed without dissent by a voice vote.

The Dean reminded the Faculty that in accordance with its request, the President in the spring of 1952 appointed a special committee of the Faculty to consult with the special committee of the Board of Trustees established to study the recommendation of the Faculty that the Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees be constituted Faculty Trustees with full powers as Trustees of the University. The Dean noted that the University Charter and By-Laws have been amended to provide for voting Faculty Trustees; the Board has already elected three Faculty Trustees, and is prepared to elect a fourth upon receipt of nominations from the Faculty. In view of these events, the committee believes it has no further duties to perform. The Dean moved, therefore, on behalf of the special committee, that it be discharged. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.
On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, its Chairman, the Dean, moved the enactment of the following legislation to govern the selection of nominees for the office of Faculty Trustee:

Candidates for the office of Faculty Trustee shall be chosen in the following manner:

1. Whenever a permanent vacancy of more than one semester's duration impends or has been created in the office of Faculty Trustee by expiration of term, resignation, death, or other occurrence, the Committee on Nominations shall canvass the Faculty for suggestions as to nominees. When conducting this canvass the committee shall furnish the Faculty with a copy of sections 3 and 7 of this legislation, and with a table showing the members of the Faculty who have served as Faculty Representatives in the Board of Trustees or as Faculty Trustees during the preceding seven years, or are currently serving as Faculty Trustees. The table shall also show the college or school faculty to which each such Faculty member belonged.

2. After considering the results of the canvass, and taking into account the advisability of providing for representation in the Board of Trustees of the several colleges and schools and the probabilities as to retirement or as to the absence on sabbatic or other extended leave during the term to be served of the several nominees under consideration, the committee shall choose a slate of not less than six nor more than nine members of the Faculty as nominees for the vacancy.

3. A Faculty member who has served as Faculty Representative in the Board of Trustees or as Faculty Trustee for more than one calendar year shall not be eligible for nomination for the office of Faculty Trustee for a term commencing less than two years after the expiration of his former term. While professors emeritus, if resident in Ithaca, and members of the Faculty serving as University administrators, deans or directors are eligible for nomination, preference shall be given to active members of the Faculty who do not hold such offices, other factors being equal. Membership on the Committee on University Policy does not render a Faculty member ineligible for nomination. If a member of the Policy Committee is elected Faculty Trustee, his unexpired term as an elected member of that committee shall be filled by the Faculty member among the Faculty nominees for Faculty Trustee not elected by the Board of Trustees who received the largest number of votes. A faculty member who has been nominated for the office of Faculty Trustee but has not been elected by the Board of Trustees, may be renominated for that office whenever occasion arises for the choice of another group of nominees.
4. The Committee on Nominations shall send copies of its slate to all of the members of the University Faculty with a notice of the Faculty meeting at which it will be presented, and with a statement that the committee's slate may be augmented by nominations from the floor. The slate shall also be accompanied by a biographical sketch of each nominee.

5. After the slate of the Committee on Nominations has been presented at a Faculty meeting, the Committee on Elections shall conduct a mail ballot among the Faculty, including on the ballot the names of all nominees. When supplying the Faculty with ballots, the Committee on Elections shall send with the ballots biographical sketches of the Faculty members nominated from the floor.

6. After counting the ballots, the Committee on Elections shall report to the President the names of the three nominees receiving the largest number of votes, stating that they are the candidates chosen by the Faculty for the office of Faculty Trustee, and requesting him to transmit their names, together with the number of votes received by each, to the Board of Trustees.

7. When acting as Faculty Trustees, Faculty members are privileged to express their independent opinions and judgments. However, in view of the fact that the Faculty, when it wishes to inform the Board of Trustees of its views, does so either by requesting the President to transmit them to the Board, or by establishing a special Faculty committee to confer with a Trustee committee appointed by the Board, Faculty Trustees shall not assume to speak for the Faculty, unless expressly authorized by the Faculty to do so in particular cases. They may, however, state their opinion as to probable Faculty reaction to any proposal affecting academic or educational policy.

8. Faculty Trustees shall be ex officio members of the Faculty Committee on University Policy.

Copies of the proposed legislation had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, together with a memorandum from the Committee on University Policy concerning the proposed legislation. A copy of the memorandum is appended to these minutes.

The motion was seconded, and brief discussion of paragraph 7 of the proposed legislation followed. The question being called for, the motion was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.
The President reported informally on several items of interest, including enrollment, the present building program, parking problems, and on the financial situation of the University.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p. m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
To the Members of the University Faculty:

From the Committee on University Policy:

In re Legislation Governing the Selection of Nominees for the Office of Faculty Trustee.

At a meeting held on September 28, 1955 the Faculty voted to recommend to the Board of Trustees that if the New York Legislature should amend the Charter of the University so as to provide for Faculty Trustees to be elected by the Board from nominees presented by the Faculty, the Board in the first instance elect as such Trustees the Faculty Representatives in the Board. The Charter having been amended in the spring, the Board at its June meeting elected as Faculty Trustees two of the three Representatives from the Ithaca faculties: Professor R. E. Cushman for a term expiring June 30, 1959 and Professor A. W. Gibson for a term expiring June 30, 1961. The third Representative from the Ithaca faculties, Professor L. P. Smith, could not be elected Trustee because of his resignation from the Faculty. Also at its June meeting the Board of Trustees voted to elect a third Faculty Trustee from the Ithaca faculties for a term expiring June 30, 1960 when the University Faculty had presented nominees for the vacancy, who, under the Charter, must be not less than three in number.

There being no Faculty legislation governing the selection of nominees for the office of Faculty Trustee, the Committee on University Policy has prepared a draft of legislation to supply this lack, and will recommend passage of this legislation at the September meeting. A copy of this draft is attached. In formulating this legislation, the committee has in the main paralleled the Faculty legislation in force in former years with respect to the nomination and election of Faculty Representatives.

In one respect, however, the Policy Committee is recommending a modification of the old pattern: viz., whereas the Faculty legislation of May 13, 1953 provided that the Committee on Nominations should submit nominees in pairs, the Policy Committee is recommending that the names of candidates for nomination for the office of Faculty Trustee be submitted in a group comprising not less than six nor more than nine. The Policy Committee recommends this innovation in view of the following considerations:

1. Whenever a vacant Faculty trusteeship is to be filled, the Charter requires that the Faculty submit to the Board the names of at least three nominees. The Policy Committee believes that when selecting these three nominees, the number of candidates to be voted on by the Faculty should be at least twice the number of nominees to be chosen.

2. If the candidates to be voted on are submitted in three or more pairs the members of which run against each other, it is conceivable that one of the unsuccessful candidates in one pair might be considered by the Faculty to be more desirable than the successful candidate in another pair. More specifically, if the candidates are A, B, C, D, E, and F and are paired as follows: A vs. B; C vs. D; E vs. F; and if A, C, and E win their respective pair contests, they would be the Faculty's nominees; and yet the Faculty might have preferred to have had A, C, and D or A, E, and F. This situation could
arise whenever the Committee on Nominations misjudged Faculty opinion; and paired the two candidates who in the judgment of the Faculty were the most desirable.

3. If nominations are submitted in pairs, and one or more nominations are made from the floor, it would be difficult to arrive at an equitable method of assigning the additional candidate or candidates to the pairs already submitted by the Committee on Nominations.
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of September 26, a condensation of which had been distributed to the Faculty, were approved.

The President reported informally on a number of items of interest to the Faculty:

(1) That the Cornell Aeronautical Engineering Laboratory in Buffalo is now offering ten graduate fellowships.

(2) That the Association of Universities operating the Brookhaven Laboratory proposed the establishment of certain fellowships.

(3) That Vice President Wright had reported a notable increase in funds made available by industries and by government for research.

(4) That there had been a large increase in gifts from the Ford Foundation.

(5) That Alpha Phi Alpha, a fraternity for negroes founded at Cornell sixty years ago but no longer active at Cornell, had established a $2500 fund for a scholarship.

(6) That the current Fall term enrollment is the largest in the history of the University.

(7) That the University Library had received a gift of a collection of Bernard Shaw from Bernard Burgender.

(8) That the Cornell University Library now ranks ninth among the university libraries in the United States.

(9) That there are a large number of charitable foundations interested in the support of higher education.

(10) That the operating budget for the University this year is $170,000 per day, and that expenditures in the endowed divisions have gone up 47½%.

(11) That an increase is in prospect in Faculty salaries, Library support, and student aid.

There were no communications, no special order of business, no unfinished business, and no reports of committees. Accordingly the Faculty turned to new business.
On behalf of the School of Nutrition its Director, R. H. Barnes, presented the following resolution:

Whereas the Faculty of the School of Nutrition proposes that the name of that School be changed to the Graduate School of Nutrition and has requested that the University Faculty express its attitude toward such change of name; and

Whereas it appears that the proposed change in name would be desirable and would in no way prejudice the programs and operations of other divisions of the University or interfere with their jurisdiction,

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the University Faculty recommend to the Board of Trustees that the name of the School be changed to the Graduate School of Nutrition.

His motion that the resolution be adopted was seconded and carried.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor Max Black, presented the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty establish a special Committee, with power to appoint its own subcommittees, to examine the procedures now used by the University Faculty, whether in general assembly or through its committees, for considering and acting upon questions of academic policy; and to make specific recommendations to the Faculty for continuing or modifying the present organization and procedures.

Be It Further Resolved that the members of the Special Committee, and its chairman, be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty, after obtaining the advice of the University Policy Committee.

His motion that the resolution be adopted was seconded and carried.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

E. F. Bradford  
Acting Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of October 10, a condensation of which had been distributed with the call for the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the death of James Morgan Sherman, Professor of Bacteriology, on November 5, 1956. The Faculty rose in tribute to his memory.

The President announced that since the Dean is one of the candidates for the office of Faculty Trustee, the Committee on Elections had been temporarily reorganized as follows: the Registrar, Dr. Bradford, to serve as chairman; the Secretary of the Faculty, Professor Hauck; and Professor Hertel to fill the vacancy created by the Dean’s temporary ineligibility.

The President reported briefly on the progress of plans for a new graduate and research library.

The President then called upon Vice President Zwingle, who outlined the plans for a dinner to be given by the Trustees in New York City on December 3 as part of the program in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birthday of Ezra Cornell and of the 125th anniversary of the birthday of Andrew D. White.

The Dean reported that a communication had been received from the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees announcing that at its meeting of October 25, 1956 the committee, in accordance with the recommendation of the Faculty, changed the name of the School of Nutrition to the Graduate School of Nutrition.

On behalf of the Committee on Nominations, its chairman, Professor Loberg, presented the following slate for the office of Faculty Trustee:

- G. P. Adams, Jr.
- M. G. Bishop
- W. H. Farnham
- Catherine J. Personius
- Andrew Schultz, Jr.
- W. A. Wimsatt
Professor Loberg then moved approval of the recommendations of the Committee on Nominations. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The President then called for nominations from the floor. There being no further nominations, Professor Loberg moved that the slate of nominations be referred to the Committee on Elections. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p. m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 11th, a condensation of which
had been distributed with the call for the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the death of Alexander Magnus Drummond,
Professor of Speech and Drama, Emeritus, on November 29, 1956. The
Faculty rose in tribute to his memory.

The President reported briefly on the dinner given by the Trustees
in New York City on December 3 as part of the program in commemoration
of the 150th anniversary of the birthday of Ezra Cornell and the 125th
anniversary of the birthday of Andrew D. White. At the dinner, announce-
ment was made of the gift from John Olin of approximately three million
dollars for the start of the new graduate and research library, and the
gift of an endowed professorship from Joseph Eastwick.

On behalf of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty, its
chairman, Professor Tolles, reported briefly on items of current interest
to the Committee. The fact that certain rights of the Faculty in con-
nection with the education of their children at Cornell and other institu-
tions, have not been extended to members of the Faculty of the Medical
College and the School of Nursing in New York, has been investigated.
A recommendation that this inconsistency be remedied, is to be presented
with the support of the Administration to the Executive Committee of the
Board of Trustees at its next meeting.

Professor Tolles stated that the Committee has also been exploring
the following subjects:

1. Whether the University might support in some way
   optional free medical examinations for the Faculty.
2. How the comprehensive health and medical coverage can be improved.

3. Rights, if any, of Faculty to discounts at the campus store.

4. The possibility of better provision for lower cost housing, especially for young Faculty members.

and invited members of the Faculty to communicate with the Committee concerning items of interest to them. He expressed the hope that the Committee might report from time to time when it has matters of immediate interest to present, and commented that from the standpoint of the budgetary process a comprehensive report could be made in May or June more readily than in December. The Committee's report on Gross Annual Salaries of Cornell University in Ithaca, N. Y. for the academic years 1955-56 and 1956-57, was made available at the meeting, and a copy is appended to the minutes.

Under new business, the President announced his intention to propose to the Board of Trustees the name of Professor H. M. Giff as Dean of the University Faculty to succeed Dean Farnham on February 1, 1957.

The President then asked the Dean to take the chair in order to ascertain the reaction of the Faculty to this proposal, and withdrew from the meeting.

After ballots had been distributed, the Professor of Philosophy, Professor Max Black, asked if the results of the preferential ballot could be made known. The Dean said that he did not know the results in this instance but he understood that the President had given general information concerning the results of such a preferential ballot on a similar previous occasion.

A motion was made and seconded that the Faculty proceed to ballot. In the ensuing discussion, questions were raised concerning the respon-
sibility for the final decision, and the effect of a negative vote at this time. The Dean reviewed briefly the provisions of the By-Laws and the practice of the Faculty in relation to choice of a Dean. After further discussion, the previous question was moved. This motion was seconded and when put to a voice vote, appeared to have the support of the majority. The original motion, to proceed to ballot, was then put to a voice vote and passed. The Professor of Philosophy, Professor S. M. Brown, Jr., then asked whether a motion on the previous question could carry with a simple majority vote. After consulting Roberts' Rules of Order, the Dean replied that a 2/3 majority was needed, and then called for a rising vote. The motion to close debate received the necessary 2/3 majority, the vote being 82 to 33 in favor of proceeding to the question.

The Dean then declared the balloting to be in order and asked Professors Tolles, Lynch and Hauck to serve as tellers. When the ballots had been counted, the Dean announced that 100 were marked Yes, and 32, No.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
GROSS ANNUAL SALARIES OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY FACULTY IN ITHACA, N.Y. 1/

Academic Years, 1955-1956 and 1956-1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK AND SALARY MEASURE</th>
<th>ENDOwed COLLEGES 2/</th>
<th>STATE COLLEGES 3/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8,859</td>
<td>9,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>7,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5,137</td>
<td>5,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information assembled by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty from data furnished by the Budget Director's Office of the University.

1/ Salaries are for the nine-month academic year in ranks of assistant professor and higher. Excluded are faculty serving in the Medical College, and the Experiment Station at Geneva, N.Y.

2/ Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Business and Public Administration, Architecture, Law, Hotel Administration, and Nutrition.

3/ Agriculture, Home Economics, Veterinary, Industrial and Labor Relations.
Olin Hall
Room M
23 January 1957

The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of December 12, a condensation of which had been distributed with the call for the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the death of Mancel Thornton Munn, Professor of Seed Investigations, Emeritus, on November 16, 1956; of Howard Merrill Giffit, Professor of Civil Engineering, on December 20, 1956; and of George Jarvis Thompson, Edwin Hamlin Woodruff Professor of Law, on January 9, 1957. The Faculty rose in tribute to the memory of their former colleagues.

The President reported briefly on several recent events. In respect to the offer to purchase the Country Club of Ithaca, the President noted that this is the last available tract adjacent to the University, and that most of the purchase price would come from proceeds from the sale of the airport and from University Development funds which are available for this sort of purpose only.

The President reported on recent gifts to the University, including (1) a collection of political memorabilia given to the University by Mr. and Mrs. Damon G. Douglas, and (2) the only significant collection of James Joyce papers, which have been given to the University Library.

In respect to the budget for 1957-58 for the endowed colleges at Ithaca, the President stated that estimated expenditures were approximately $27,500,000 as compared to an estimated income of about $26,900,000. He noted that the actual deficit will probably be less than the budgeted deficit of $600,000, however, since some funds allotted for use within the present fiscal year will not be expended, and some additional income
may also be obtained. He reported that an increase of $330,000 in the item for faculty salaries will be used for salary increases on the basis of merit.

On behalf of the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty its Chairman, Professor Tolles, commented on a plan to make a more adequate analysis of faculty salaries than has been possible heretofore. A one-page questionnaire, designed to obtain the information needed, is to be sent out with the call for the next meeting. Professor Tolles urged that all members of the Faculty fill out the questionnaire and return it promptly, since the accuracy of the proposed analysis will depend on obtaining a full response.

The President noted that this was the last meeting during Dean Farnham's term of office, and expressed, on behalf of the Faculty, appreciation of the Dean's devoted and tireless efforts during the past four and one-half years. The Faculty applauded this tribute to the Dean.

Under new business, the President announced his intention to propose to the Board of Trustees the name of Professor C. A. Hanson as Dean of the University Faculty to succeed Dean Farnham on February 1, 1957. He described the professional experience of the nominee, and noted that among the four nominees on the preferential ballot, Professor Hanson received neither the highest nor the lowest number of votes. He commented that less than half of the Faculty members voted, but that Professor Hanson received a sufficient number of votes to indicate confidence in him.

The Professor of Law, Professor B. F. Willcox, then said that inasmuch as information about the Faculty's preferences is relevant to
each Faculty member's vote for or against the nominee for Dean of the University Faculty, he moved that:

The University Faculty respectfully requests the President to announce the results of the recent ballot, by numbers of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices for each candidate.

The motion was seconded.

The President then asked the privilege of speaking to the motion. He commented that he had been meticulous in carrying out the provisions of the By-Laws and of the Faculty legislation relating to the selection of the Dean, and that he seriously questioned the desirability of requiring him to divulge the vote, on the basis of possible embarrassment to candidates whose names appeared on the preferential ballot.

After some discussion, a rising vote was called for. The motion was lost by a vote of 87:97.

The President then asked the Dean to take the chair, in order to ascertain the reaction of the Faculty to his nomination, and withdrew from the meeting.

When the Dean asked if the Faculty was prepared to ballot, considerable discussion ensued on the nature of the Deanship and the manner of man qualified to fill this post, and on the procedure by which the Dean of the Faculty is chosen. In the course of the discussion, the Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Professor W. F. Willcox, noted that he could be of service to the Faculty by reporting history. By unanimous voice vote of the Faculty, the full statement made by Professor Willcox is incorporated into the minutes:

The following statement was drafted a few days ago by several experienced members of the University Faculty.

The central issue in the present choice of a dean of the Cornell University Faculty, in our opinion, is this:
Should the new dean and the Committee on University Policy, of which he is ex officio the chairman, continue to perform the duties traditionally associated with that office, or should those duties be changed in the direction of strengthening his responsibility to the President and weakening his responsibility to the University Faculty?

We desire to have these duties changed, not, however, in that direction, but by returning toward what President White and President Schurman planned for the office and from which, as we believe, they have deviated with growing rapidity since President Schurman retired.

Cornell's reputation in the field of academic freedom is shown by the following quotation from a recent authoritative book on the subject:

"In theory, the bureaucratic system is adaptable to autocratic or democratic procedures.... In practice, the academic bureaucracy functions in a situation that combines autocracy and democracy in varying degrees and ways. Cornell University can be cited as an example of a university at the democratic extreme. In 1917-18 Cornell was the only institution out of 100 public and private colleges and universities that allowed for faculty representation on the board of trustees, was one of the 10 institutions that provided for faculty nomination of deans, was one of the 27 institutions that gave professors the formal right to participate in the determination of educational policy. Cornell was atypical, as was the institution where all important decisions were handed down through channels from above and where the faculty whiled away its time voting on academic trivia."  

The following quotation states Dr. White's plan on the subject:

"I had observed in various American colleges that a fundamental and most injurious error was made in relieving trustees and faculty from responsibility and concentrating all in the President. The result, in many of these institutions, had been a sort of atrophy - the trustees and faculty being, whenever an emergency arose, badly informed as to the affairs of their institutions and really incapable of managing them. This was the real cause of President Tappan's failure at the University of Michigan and of President Nott's at Union College. The tendency in these institutions was to make the trustees in all
administrative matters mere ciphers and to make the faculty more and more incapable of administering discipline or conducting current university business. I determined to prevent this state of things at Cornell. I insisted that the faculty should have full legislative powers to discuss and decide university affairs and should be steadily trained in the use of them." (White, A. D., Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White, Vol. 1, p. 435.)

President Schurman stated his views as follows:

"The fact that there is in American universities a professorial problem itself shows that something is seriously wrong. The university began as a guild of scholars, and throughout the seven or eight hundred years of its history the faculty essentially constituted the university.

"Whatever organization may be necessary in a modern American university the institution will not permanently succeed unless the faculty as a group of free individual personalities practically control its operations. This is said with a full consciousness of the fact that there is a large amount of business ancillary to the main object of the university which members of the faculty ought not to be asked to perform.

"As American universities are now organized the faculty has a partner in the board of trustees, which, if legal rights are asserted, is undoubtedly predominant; it has its own administrative officer or dean; and both faculty and trustees have a representative in the president with powers and duties and responsibilities impossible to define. If he succeeds in gaining public confidence, he may acquire and exercise functions which properly belong to the trustees or to the faculty and of which they have been deprived, either by unchallenged acts of usurpation on his part or perhaps merely by the natural gravitation of human affairs under the influence of the activity of an individual and the inertia of a multitude. At any rate American professors have come to feel that their independence is imperilled and their proper influence in the university organization seriously impaired by the activity of deans, presidents, and trustees.

"Unless state legislatures are ready to make the scholars and scientists who are the soul of the university its corporate body also - as is the case, for example, with the ancient colleges of Oxford and Cambridge - there will be no way of legally establishing the faculty as the controlling power of the university. But the end in view can readily be accomplished without state legislation or even without institutional reorganization. Let the faculty recommend what it deems important for the university to do or not to do, and, so far at any rate as Cornell
University is concerned, not only the President but the Board of Trustees will be too thankful for the recommendations and will not think of raising any questions of jurisdiction or prerogative....No greater good could come to Cornell University than a quickening and deepening of the Faculty sense of responsibility for its welfare. Too often the faculties of American universities have rolled off all responsibility on the president and the trustees." (Schurman, J. G., Annual Report of the President, 1909-10, pp. 14-16.)

Professor Willcox's remarks were greeted with vigorous applause.

The Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Professor Tolles, moved to refer the method of selection of the Dean of the University Faculty to the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, for study and conference with the Administration.

This motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

After further discussion, the Professor of Government, Professor Rossiter, moved that the Special Committee to Study the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty be asked to study the Deanship including, among other considerations, its powers, its status and its relation to both the President and the Faculty.

This motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.

Further discussion ensued before the suggestion was made that the Faculty proceed to ballot. Ballots were then distributed, and the Dean appointed the following tellers to count them: P. J. McCarthy, L. D. Brown, D. D. Phillips and Robert Langbaum.

The tellers reported that 62 ballots were marked yes, 151 were marked no, and one voter abstained.

The Professor of History of Science, Professor Guerlac, then moved that the following resolution explanatory of the Faculty's vote be adopted, and that the President be requested to transmit it to the Board of Trustees:
Be It Resolved:

(1) That the University Faculty recognizes that its present role in the selection of a nominee for Dean of the University Faculty is advisory or consultative.

(2) That it does not desire to protest the rejection by the President of whatever candidate may have received the largest number of Faculty votes in the preferential poll.

(3) That the University Faculty nevertheless holds that the Deanship of the University Faculty is an office of outstanding importance for the proper conduct of University affairs, in the formation of policy and in maintaining flexible communication and mutual understanding between the Faculty and the Administration.

(4) That the Dean of the Faculty ought not to be chosen in disregard of the very special qualifications needed in this important office.

(5) That these qualifications - an acknowledged position of leadership on the Faculty, scholarly distinction, reasonable academic seniority, a wide experience in University affairs - ought to be considered necessary conditions for the appointment as Dean of the Faculty.

The motion was seconded.

The Professor of Chemical Microscopy and Metallography, Professor C. W. Mason, moved to amend the motion by deleting section 2. This motion was seconded, and when put to a voice vote, was lost.

The main motion was then put to a voice vote and carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p. m.

The minutes of the meeting of January 23, a condensation of which had been distributed with the notice of the meeting, were approved.

The Provost announced the death of John Courtney, Professor of Hotel Administration, Emeritus, on January 27, 1957. The Faculty rose in tribute to his memory.

On behalf of the Committee on University Policy, the Dean reported that in connection with his retirement from the Deanship, Professor Farnham had advised the Committee of his intention to resign from the chairmanship of the Committee to Confer with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees in Regard to the University By-Laws. The Committee on University Policy has, however, persuaded Professor Farnham to continue to serve on the By-Law Committee as its Chairman.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, its Chairman, Professor Black, announced that a special subcommittee composed of G. P. Adams, Jr., R. S. Pasley, Andrew Schultz, Jr., A. M. Srb and G. C. Murdock, Chairman, had been designated to undertake the assignments made to the committee by the Faculty at its January meeting, i. e., to consider the method of selection and the responsibilities of the Dean of the University Faculty.

Professor Black reported informally on the progress of the committee's work and its plans. The committee has prepared a prospectus of all proposals which have been submitted to it, and is discussing them in detail. The committee plans to present a series of draft proposals for discussion in March and at the April meeting, expects to make specific recommendations which the Faculty can vote to accept or reject.
Professor Black called attention to the memorandum which was distributed with the notice of the meeting, a copy of which is appended to the minutes. He said that the question: Should certain non-voting members of the Faculty now be given the right to vote? had been referred to the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty by the Committee on University Policy, and that the special committee would like to try the technique of having the Faculty discuss the issue before the committee makes its recommendations.

In the ensuing discussion, the Professor of Pomology, Professor Heinicke, spoke for the Faculty members at the Geneva Experiment Station. The Director of Extension of the New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Professor Bond, discussed the question as it affects Faculty members in the Extension Service, and the Vice President for Research, Dr. T. P. Wright, commented that he thought more members of the staff of the Aeronautical Laboratory at Buffalo should be members of the University Faculty and that he was making this recommendation to the Special Committee.

Professor Black then asked if it would be in order to have a straw vote on the question: Should certain non-voting members of the Faculty now be given the right to vote? There being no objection, a show of hands was called for. Opinion appeared to be divided on the question. The suggestion was then made that a straw vote be taken on the question of extending voting privileges to Faculty members at Geneva. On show of hands, more of those voting appeared to favor than to oppose.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
Memorandum of a question presented by the Special Committee on Faculty Procedures and Organization to the University Faculty for discussion.

The question: should certain non-voting members of the faculty now be given the right to vote?

A. Background

1. Relevant legislation

"The non-voting members of the University Faculty shall consist of the professors, associate professors and assistant professors in (1) the Medical College, (2) the School of Nursing, (3) the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, and (4) the extension services of the several colleges, schools, and departments of the University. The University Faculty may grant to any group of non-voting members the right to vote on any question deemed by the Faculty to be of interest to such a group."

"The Board of Trustees may elect other persons to membership in the University Faculty, from time to time, upon the recommendation of that faculty." (By-Laws as amended June 11, 1956, Article XIII, Sec.1

Note: The power of non-voting members to vote on a particular question has never been requested or granted, since the relevant legislation was adopted (1940).

2. Kinds and numbers of persons concerned (as of October 1, 1955)

Medical College: 38
School of Nursing: 6
S. Y. S. Agricultural Experiment Station: 68
Extension staff (Agric., Home Econ., & I. & L. R.): 95

3. Previous history of proposal

a. Raised by Geneva Station (April 1953)
b. Medical College, Nursing School see no need for change (May, June
c. Policy Committee votes no change (January 1954)
d. Question raised again by Geneva (November 1955)
e. Geneva staff formally requests voting privileges (carried unanimously with 15 present) (December 1955)
f. Policy Committee establishes sub-committee to study and report (March 1956)
g. Policy Committee refers question to Committee on Faculty Procedures (November 1956)

B. Some Arguments in Favor

1. Some non-voting members of the faculty are members of college faculties (Geneva staff - in Agriculture; Extension staff - in Agriculture, Home Economics, or I. & L. R.)

2. Some participate in Graduate School activities.

(See reverse side of sheet for continuation.)
3. The change has been unanimously requested by the Geneva staff (see A. 3f above).

4. Undesirable to create distinctions between different classes of faculty.

C. Some Arguments Against

1. Difficulty of attendance.

2. Difficulties in communicating with persons off campus

3. Lack of participation in educational activities at Ithaca.

4. Most questions discussed by the faculty not of concern to present non-voting members (cf. note to A.1 above, also A.3b).

D. Action Needed

If the faculty votes to extend the privilege of voting, a recommendation to that effect would need to be sent to the Trustees for their action.

Note:

1. Any member of the faculty desiring further information concerning the above is invited to communicate with the undersigned.

2. Any member of the faculty unable to attend the meeting at which the question will be discussed may have his views presented to the meeting by communicating with the undersigned.

Max Black, Chairman
Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures
The meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of February 13, a condensation of which had been distributed with the notice of the meeting, were approved.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, its Chairman, Professor Black, stated briefly the nature of the major proposals which the committee expects to make, and invited suggestions from the Faculty before the final report of the Committee is drafted.

The ensuing discussion was focused on the proposal to create a Faculty Council.

Following the discussion of his informal report, Professor Black, on behalf of the Special Committee, moved the adoption of the following resolution, copies of which had been distributed with the call for the meeting:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty approve the following procedure for the selection of the Dean of the Faculty:

At least three months prior to the deanship becoming vacant by expiration of term, resignation, or otherwise (or as promptly as possible if the office should become vacant without three months' notice), the Committee on University Policy shall appoint an ad hoc committee of five members, chosen from the University Faculty, to consult with the President, in order to select three candidates for the deanship, willing to serve, and acceptable to both the committee and the President.

The committee so appointed shall be free to adopt its own methods and procedures. It may solicit nominations and canvass Faculty opinion, if it so desires, in any manner it sees fit.
The ad hoc committee shall then conduct a preferential mail ballot on the three candidates nominated by that committee, and shall report the results of the ballot to the President and the Faculty.

The President shall select his nominee from the three candidates, announce his name to the Faculty at a regular or special meeting, and then place it in nomination before the Board of Trustees in accordance with the provisions of the By-Laws.

The mail ballot previously taken will be deemed to satisfy the provision of the By-Laws requiring the President to ascertain the opinion of the Faculty on his nominee. The motion was seconded.

Speaking in support of the motion, Professor Black said that the resolution had the approval of the Committee on University Policy and of the Dean as well as of the Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, and that the President was prepared to act in accordance with the resolution if it were passed. A lively discussion of the motion followed.

The Professor of International Law, Professor Briggs, moved to amend the resolution by deleting the last five lines and by revising the remainder of the fifth paragraph to read as follows:

The President shall select his nominee from the three candidates and present his name to the Faculty at a regular or special meeting for its opinion.

The motion was seconded. After considerable discussion the question was called for and when put to a voice vote, the motion to amend the resolution was defeated.

The original motion, to adopt the resolution concerning the procedure for selection of the Dean of the Faculty, was put to a voice vote and carried.
Professor Black then suggested that consideration of the proposal to grant the right to vote to members of the Faculty at the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva be deferred until the next meeting, and that the Faculty adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of March 13, a condensation of which had been distributed with the notice of the meeting, were approved.

The President announced the death of Carl Edward Frederick Guterman, Professor of Plant Pathology, on March 27, 1957. The Faculty rose in tribute to his memory.

The President commented on the grant by the Ford Foundation of twenty-five million dollars to extend the Woodrow Wilson fellowship program. This will increase the amount of each fellowship and will remove the necessity of the participation which the University has heretofore extended.

The President noted that salary increases had been provided for all personnel in the state supported units of the University, effective April 1.

The Dean reported the receipt of a communication from the President announcing the following committee appointments: B. F. Willcox to fill the unexpired term of R. I. Fricke on the Committee on Calendar; R. S. Pasley to fill the unexpired term of R. I. Fricke on the Committee on Registration and Schedules; and a committee composed of R. A. Beck, F. H. Randolph and H. B. Meek, Chairman, to prepare a memorial article concerning Professor Emeritus John Courtney.

As a special order, the chairman of the Committee on Nominations presented, on behalf of the Committee, the following slate of nominations to fill vacancies on committees and boards:
For Faculty Trustee
M. G. Fincher    J. R. Moynihan
J. G. B. Hutchins  K. L. Turk
F. A. Long        B. F. Willcox

For the Committee on University Policy
H. E. Guerlac and A. M. Srb

For the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
Mario Einaudi and M. W. Sampson

For the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing
Kathleen Cutlar and D. F. Dowd

For the Committee on Nominations
H. H. Dukes and M. R. Konvitz
J. O. Jeffrey and F. H. Stutz
J. W. Reps and P. F. Van Riper

For the Board of Physical Education and Athletics
Two year term: G. W. Lattin and F. M. Wells
Three year term: H. D. Albright and W. A. Campbell

For the Board on Student Health and Hygiene
Mary Ford and M. D. Glock

As nominations for each vacancy were presented, the President called for nominations from the floor. There being none, Professor Loberg moved that the slate of nominations be approved and referred to the Committee on Elections. The motion was seconded and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Under unfinished business, on behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Boynton moved the adoption of the following resolution, the text of which had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the March meeting:

Whereas the members of the Faculty of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva are voting members of the College of Agriculture and non-voting members of the
University Faculty, and

Whereas the Geneva Faculty have requested the right to be voting members of the University Faculty, and

Whereas members of the Geneva Faculty hold advanced academic degrees, conduct research, teach graduate students, and have duties and interests comparable with those of voting members of the University Faculty,

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty approve the request of the members of the Faculty of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, now non-voting members of the University Faculty, that they be granted the right to vote, and authorize the Special Committee on Faculty Procedures and Organization to prepare the appropriate amendment of Article XIII of the By-Laws for submission to the Faculty.

The motion was seconded. Speaking in favor of the motion, Professor Boynton said that the proposal should be considered solely on its own merits. If passed, it should not create a precedent in view of the fact that under the proposed organization and procedures of the Faculty, a new Standing Committee on the Membership of the University Faculty will scrutinize requests for additions to the voting membership of the Faculty.

After some further discussion, the motion was put to a voice vote and carried.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, its Chairman, Professor Black, moved adoption of the following resolutions:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty establish a standing committee to be known as the Faculty Council and subject to the following regulations:

1. The Faculty Council shall replace the Committee on University Policy.

2. Except as changed by present or subsequent legislation, all existing legislation concerning the Policy Committee shall apply to the Faculty Council.
3. The functions of the Faculty Council shall be (i) to initiate investigation of questions of general educational policy and of any other questions falling within the jurisdiction of the University Faculty, (ii) to examine and discuss proposals for policies and actions on such questions, brought to it by the University Faculty, by individual members of the Faculty, by College faculties, by committees of the University Faculty, or by the administration, (iii) to adopt specific proposals for policies and actions on such questions, (iv) to bring recommendations to the University Faculty for action, (v) to represent the University Faculty in discussion and negotiations with College faculties, the Administration and the Trustees.

4. Ex officio members of the Council shall be the Dean of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, and the Ithaca Faculty Trustees.

5. In addition to the ex officio members, there shall be twelve elected members. The elected members shall be elected by the University Faculty by mail ballot, from slates provided by the Committee on Nominations.

6. The present members of the Faculty Committee shall become members of the Council, to serve until the expiration of their present terms.

7. Elected members of the Council shall serve for staggered terms of three years. They may serve more than one term, but not consecutively.

8. When the Council has been established, it shall adopt rules of organization and procedure covering its operations and report these rules to the University Faculty for approval.

9. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be the secretary of the Council. Minutes shall be kept and shall be available for inspection by members of the University Faculty upon request.

10. The Dean of the Faculty shall be the Chairman of the Council.

11. The Council shall have power to appoint standing or ad hoc committees, either from its own membership, or from other members of the University Faculty, or both.

12. The following committees shall report in the first instance to the Council: (i) the present Committee on Inter-Faculty Relations, (ii) the present Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, (iii) a new committee on long-range planning, (iv) a new committee on academic freedom.
and tenure, (v) a new committee on membership of the University Faculty.

13. The membership of the Council shall be broadly representative of the Faculty at large, being composed of persons from a variety of schools and colleges, and having varying lengths of service at Cornell.

The motion being seconded, Professor Black commented that this proposal is the heart of the plan for organization and procedures of the Faculty which is being presented by the Special Committee. He discussed briefly some alternatives which had been considered by the committee, noted the ways in which the proposed Faculty Council would differ from the present Committee on University Policy, and stressed the fact that although the Faculty Council is expected to be more active the Special Committee had no idea of delegating to the Council any of the responsibilities of the Faculty.

With regard to the proposed number of members of the Council, Professor Black commented that if, after the Council has been in operation for a time, some larger number of members appears to be more appropriate, the Council might come to the Faculty with a recommendation for change in membership.

Further discussion was invited, but as there was none, the question was put to a voice vote and passed without dissent.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Black then moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty adopt the following regulations concerning the office of the Secretary of the Faculty:

1. The Secretary of the University Faculty shall be elected by that faculty, from among its own members, by a mail ballot on a slate of candidates provided by the Committee on Nominations.
2. The Secretary shall serve for a term of three years, with the possibility of reappointment for one further term of three years.

3. The Secretary shall also serve as secretary and an ex officio voting member of the Faculty Council.

4. The duties of the Secretary shall be (i) to keep minutes of meetings of the University Faculty and of the Faculty Council, (ii) to keep records of actions of the University Faculty, (iii) to assist the Dean of the Faculty at the Dean's discretion.

The motion was seconded, and after brief discussion, was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The special meeting was called to order by the Provost at 4:30 p.m.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Pasley moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty establish a standing committee to be known as the Standing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and subject to the following regulations:

1. The functions of the committee shall be to consider, investigate, and report upon any questions of academic freedom or tenure referred to it, including such as concern (i) terms and conditions of appointment or promotion of faculty members, (ii) terms and conditions governing leaves, retirement, and dismissal of faculty members, (iii) complaints brought against any faculty member that might adversely affect his professional reputation or lead to his dismissal, (iv) actions interfering or tending to interfere with the freedom of faculty members in their teaching, research, publication, or other educational activities. The committee shall also from time to time formulate policies and procedures governing such questions of academic freedom or tenure, and present them to the Faculty Council and the University Faculty for adoption.

2. General or specific questions falling within the committee's jurisdiction may be referred to it at any time by the University Faculty or members thereof, by its committees, by college faculties, by the administration, or by the trustees.

3. Such questions shall be in writing, and shall be accompanied by a statement of the relevant facts and a statement of the action desired.

4. Upon receiving a question falling within its jurisdiction, the committee shall decide what action, if any, it contemplates. If the committee decides that no action on its part is called for, it shall so report.

5. The committee's report shall take the form of a written opinion, addressed to the Faculty Council. The report may be designated as confidential, if the committee
so desires, but copies of the full report must in any case be sent to the person or persons originally raising the question, and to any person or persons whose activities are brought into question.

6. The committee's activities shall be advisory and not judicial or legislative. The committee's procedures shall not conflict with or supersede any procedures concerning questions of academic freedom or tenure specified in the University By-Laws or in Faculty or Trustee legislation.

7. The committee shall consist of the Dean of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty ex officio, and eight elected members.

8. The elected members shall be elected by the University Faculty by mail ballot, from slates provided by the Committee on Nominations.

9. Elected members of the committee shall serve for staggered terms of four years. They may serve for more than one term, but not consecutively.

10. The committee shall elect its own chairman annually.

11. The committee shall be responsible to the University Faculty, and shall report to that Faculty at least once in every academic year.

The motion was seconded.

Speaking in support of the resolution, Professor Pasley noted that legislation adopted by the Board of Trustees provides for notice and hearing in certain cases of proposed dismissal of any Professor, Associate Professor or Assistant Professor. He commented that these procedures do not cover all of the problems which would be of concern to the proposed standing committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Certain other situations which might or might not lead to dismissal would come within the purview of this committee, as would also cases of faculty members who are not of professorial rank. The Committee would also be able to formulate policies, on a continuing basis, on problems of academic
freedom or tenure. The Committee would have no legislative or judicial powers. It would supplement, not supplant, existing procedures. Thus no conflict exists between the resolution and existing provisions in the University By-Laws or in Faculty or Trustee Legislation. Professor Pasley expressed the hope that the proposed Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure would have a minimum of business, but that even if it should be inactive for a year, it would be continued as a standing committee, in view of the importance of its functions.

When put to a voice vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor S. M. Brown, Jr., moved that the Dean transmit to the President the respectful request of the Faculty that he report this action and the accompanying speech to the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded. The Professor of Child Development and Family Relationships, Professor Bronfenbrenner, asked if the hope could be expressed that the Board of Trustees would find such a committee useful in the event that they wish to make an inquiry regarding a faculty member. This suggestion was accepted by the mover and seconder of the motion. Professor Pasley commented that provision was made, under item 2 in the resolution, for reference of questions to the committee by the Trustees.

When put to a voice vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Sampson moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty establish a standing committee to be known as the Standing Committee on Long Range Planning and subject to the following regulations:
1. The functions of the committee shall be to study major problems of general educational policy that need not require immediate action, to initiate investigations concerning such questions, and to make recommendations for policies and actions concerning them to the Faculty Council and the University Faculty.

2. The committee shall consist of the Dean of the Faculty ex officio and eight members appointed by the Faculty Council.

3. The appointed members shall serve for staggered terms of four years. They may serve for more than one term, but not consecutively.

4. The committee shall appoint its own chairman annually.

5. The committee shall be responsible to the University Faculty, and shall report to that Faculty at least once in every academic year.

The motion was seconded.

The Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Loberg, moved to delete "that need not require immediate action" from item 1. The motion was seconded, and after some discussion, was put to a voice vote and lost.

The motion to adopt the resolution was then put to a voice vote and carried unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Aronson moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty establish a standing committee to be known as the Standing Committee on the Membership of the University Faculty and subject to the following regulations:

1. The functions of the committee shall be (i) to establish and keep up to date a correct list of all the voting and non-voting members of the University Faculty, (ii) to scrutinize request for additions to the voting or non-voting membership of the University Faculty not already covered by Faculty or Trustee legislation, and
to recommend action on such requests to the Faculty Council and the University Faculty, (iii) to formulate from time to time policies and procedures concerning membership of the University Faculty, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Faculty Council and the University Faculty.

2. The committee shall consist of the Secretary of the Faculty, as ex officio chairman, and three members appointed by the Faculty Council.

3. The appointed members shall serve for staggered terms of three years. They may serve for more than one term, but not consecutively.

4. The committee shall be responsible to the University Faculty, and shall report to that Faculty at least once in every academic year.

The motion was seconded and when put to a voice vote, passed without dissent.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, its chairman, Professor Black, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved:

1. That the following committees shall be discontinued: the Committee on Inter-Faculty Relations, the Committee on Audio-Visual Aids, the Committee on Evaluation and Improvement of Instruction, the Subcommittee on Governmental Investigations.

2. That the chairman of any special committee of the University Faculty that has held no meetings for one academic year (July 1 through June 30) shall so report at the first regular faculty meeting thereafter. Unless the University Faculty votes to renew its tenure, any special committee that has been inactive throughout the whole of one academic year shall be discontinued.

3. That committees of the University Faculty shall follow the following procedures: (i) they shall keep records of their terms of reference, their functions and methods of operation, (ii) they shall keep outline minutes, including record of all actions and policy
decisions, (iii) copies of the outline minutes shall be regularly sent to the Dean of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty, (iv) on or before July 1 of each year the chairman shall send a written annual report on the committee's operations to the Dean of the Faculty and to the Secretary of the Faculty.

The motion was seconded, and after some discussion was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, Professor Black then moved that the Faculty adopt the Committee's Report on the functions of the Dean of the Faculty, dated April 4, 1957, a copy of which is appended to the minutes.

The motion was seconded, after which Professor Black elaborated on certain items in the report. There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
April 4, 1957

The Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures

Report on the functions of the Dean of the Faculty

The University Faculty voted at its meeting of January 23, 1957 "that the Special Committee to Study the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty be asked to study the Deanship, including, among other considerations, its powers, its status and its relation to both the President and the Faculty." The present statement formulates the conclusions of the study requested by the Faculty. We have relied mainly upon the relevant provisions of the University By-Laws, the implementing legislation of the Board of Trustees, and a report on the functions of the office of the Dean approved by the University Faculty on May 9, 1945. Copies of these statements are appended to the present report. We have found ourselves in general agreement with these statements, but have thought it desirable to elaborate the provisions they contain.

Our conception of the office of the Dean can be introduced by the following analysis of the chief duties of the holder of that office:

(1) The Dean should participate actively in initiating Faculty discussion and formulating Faculty judgment upon questions of educational policy.

Through his contacts with the President and the Trustees, his consequent knowledge of problems concerning the University and its colleges, and his prestige as a recognized leader of the Faculty, the Dean is in a unique position to promote active and judicious Faculty policies.

(2) The Dean should be thoroughly familiar with faculty organization, procedures, and legislation, and should be prepared to recommend appropriate changes.

An essential part of the procedures concerns the general meeting, for whose proper working the Dean has a special responsibility. It is his obligation to ensure that the proper forms for presentation of motions and orderly debate are followed, and that faculty action shall be precise and coherent.
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The Dean has an important share of the responsibility for the efficient and successful working of the standing and special committees of the University Faculty.

He has a special responsibility for the Faculty Council (formerly the Committee on University Policy), of which he is the ex officio chairman. His concern extends, however, to all committees of the University Faculty. Through wide acquaintance with faculty members in all the colleges, he should be able to advise in the selection of committee members. An important part of his work consists in trying to eliminate duplication of effort, resolving conflicts of interests, and ensuring that both the spirit and letter of Faculty legislation are observed in the work of the committees.

The Dean should be freely available to individual faculty members and to students for consultation and advice.

Past experience of the office shows that students and faculty members will naturally turn to the Dean, as the recognized leader of the Faculty, for advice on a large variety of problems that arise in connection with the educational activities of the University. The informality of such discussions is one of their most valuable features.

The Dean should be the Faculty's chief spokesman in negotiations with the President and, through him, with the Trustees.

The By-Laws stipulate that the President "shall be the medium of formal communication between the Board of Trustees and the respective faculties of the University" (Article VI, Section 2). The Faculty also has other forms of representation (e.g., by means of ad hoc committees for consultation with the Trustees, as provided in the By-Laws). It is inevitable and proper, given the Dean's position, that he should be regarded as speaking for the Faculty. However, this cannot infringe upon the President's responsibilities and privileges as "the chief educational officer of the University" (By-Laws, Article VI, Section 1). Nor should the Dean's special position be regarded as curtailing the privilege of members of the Faculty to consult directly with the President.

The Dean should be a trusted adviser of the President and the Trustees on all questions involving educational policy.

Trustee legislation stipulates that the Dean reports to the President and adds that this is "chiefly a liaison relationship". Unlike heads of colleges, the Dean is not responsible to the President for budgets or appointments, nor is he required to execute administration policies. He reports to the President mainly in the latter's capacity of chief educational officer of the University and chairman of the University Faculty. It is essential to the success of the "liaison relationship" that the Dean constantly represent Faculty viewpoints.
In the light of the foregoing analysis of the Dean's duties and responsibilities, it is plain that the office of the Dean is one of outstanding importance for the proper conduct of University affairs, in the formation of educational policy, and in maintaining flexible communication and mutual understanding between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees, the President and other administrative officers. Plainly, also, the office is a highly exacting one, calling for exceptional skill in administration and diplomacy. The peculiarities of the office arise mainly from the Dean's having responsibilities both to the President and to the Faculty. There need be no conflict between these responsibilities: they should not be artificially separated, nor should one be emphasized at the other's expense. As chief administrative officer of the Faculty, the Dean can effectively discharge his responsibility to report to the President only by enjoying the Faculty's full confidence and by being a recognized leader in the formation and execution of faculty policies. Equally important is it for him to enjoy the full confidence of the President and the Trustees, and to be encouraged by them to participate actively in all stages of policy making. We reaffirm the principle stated in the resolution adopted by the University Faculty at its meeting of January 23, 1957, that the Dean should possess as qualifications for his office reasonable academic seniority, wide experience in University affairs, scholarly distinction, and an acknowledged position of leadership on the Faculty.

We wish to add the following RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) In order that the Dean may remain an effective representative of the Faculty and spokesman for its point of view on matters of educational policy, it is most desirable that his duties be so apportioned that he will be able to continue to devote a substantial portion of his time to instruction, research, or other scholarly activity, as a regular member of the faculty.
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(2) Every effort should be made to minimize the routine activities of the Dean, so that he may devote himself to his major policy tasks.

(3) It is most desirable that the Dean should have close contact with the President and the Trustees, and participate fully in the discussion and formulation of all administration policies having educational implications.

(4) Accordingly, it would be highly desirable that the Dean should have a standing invitation to sit with the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee in all discussions on questions of educational policy.
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Report on Functions of the Dean

APPENDIX

Extracts from relevant legislation

Extracts from the By-Laws (as amended June 11, 1956)

1. Dean of the University Faculty: There shall be a Dean of the University Faculty who shall be elected by the Board upon the recommendation of the President and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board. In recommending a candidate for the deanship the President shall report to the Board the opinion of the University Faculty concerning such recommendation - such opinion shall be ascertained as that Faculty may determine.

The dean shall be the chief administrative officer of the University Faculty. - (Article XIII, Section 4)

1. The President shall be the chief executive and educational officer of the University.

He shall be ex officio a member of the Board of Trustees, the Executive Committee, and the Investment Committee. He shall be a member and also, except as he may otherwise designate or as these by-laws may otherwise provide, the chairman and presiding officer of every faculty and every separate academic department, division or center of the University.

2. The President shall be the medium of formal communication between the Board of Trustees and the respective faculties of the University.

3. All officers of the University, whether academic or administrative shall be subject to the administrative authority of the President as chief executive and educational officer. The President shall define the duties of all officers and other members of the staff whose duties are not prescribed by these by-laws or by action of the Board of Trustees. - (Article VI, Sections 1 - 3)

Extracts from Board Legislation to Implement Revised By-Laws (Revised to 9/30/55)

Under the By-Laws, the President as Chief Executive Officer, will have reporting to him the following with such duties as may be assigned by the President, except as otherwise determined by the By-laws or by Board Action:

(1) The Deans and Directors of the various separate faculties, except insofar as they are engaged in executing the academic policies and programs under the exclusive jurisdiction of the faculties themselves.

See reverse side of sheet for continuation of copy.
(2) The Dean of the University Faculty -- chiefly a liaison relationship as his duties consist largely of administering the Committee work which carries out those matters which lie within the jurisdiction of the University Faculty, to which he is responsible.--(Page 2, with reference to Article VI, section 3 of By-Laws)

Extracts from General Legislation of the University Faculty, 1944-1945

At the February session the President requested the Faculty to appoint or designate a committee to confer with him on the functions of the office of the Dean. The Faculty appointed as such a special committee the members of the standing Committee on University Policy, and the chairman of the Committee on Student Activities and Committee on Student Conduct. It was suggested that a report to the Faculty might be made by this committee. The report was presented at the meeting held in May, and approved as follows:

I. General Principles

1. Time of Dean to be divided between (a) teaching and research and (b) responsibilities in the Dean’s Office.

2. Place emphasis on leadership in developing University educational plans and policies.

3. Activate consideration of educational problems and participate in the work of University Faculty committees.

4. Minimize routine administrative duties.

II. Responsibilities of the Dean

1. Chairman University Policy Committee.
   a. Examine and appraise existing educational programs and policies and recommend revisions or modifications thereof.
   b. Propose new developments.
   c. Suggest studies to be made by special committees.
   d. Consider and advise on questions referred by Faculties.
   e. Review proposals for new programs of concern to more than one college.

2. Chairman of University Committee on Military Science and Physical Training (See III, 1 below)

3. Ex-officio member of standing committees of the University Faculty.

4. Non-voting member of educational policy committees of various schools and colleges.
5. Represent faculty in dealing with University administration. (Have access to transactions of Board of Trustees and of its Standing Committees.)

III. Reallocation of Administrative Functions

1. University requirements for graduation administered by the several schools and colleges with a University faculty committee (with Dean as Chairman), for coordination of administration and review of appeals (Military Science and Tactics, Physical Education, Hygiene, etc.).

2. Student Activities
   University Faculty Committee to function in policy making and major actions with Dean of Students as executive secretary.

3. Undergraduate scholarships (and student aids).
   University Faculty Committee to function in policy making and major actions with Dean of Students as executive secretary.

IV. Organization

1. Dean to devote about half of his time to the duties of the office; remainder to professorial duties.

2. Tenure - 5 year term with presumption against more than two terms.

3. Selection
   Nomination to be recommended to President by Faculty Committee (3 members) on nomination, selected by University Policy Committee, to make canvass (mail) of faculty, conduct mail ballot on one or more names and submit slate of one or more names to President with results of Faculty vote.

4. Adequate financial support for conduct of office.

   (G. L. & E, pages 1396-1398)
The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of April 10 and of the special meeting of April 21, condensations of which had been distributed with the notice of the meeting, were approved.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, a member, Professor Srb, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty adopts the report of its Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty concerning the functions of the University faculty, dated April 29, 1957, and endorses the principles stated in that report.

The report had been distributed to the Faculty with the call for the meeting, and a copy is appended to the minutes.

The motion was seconded and, when put to a voice vote, was carried unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, a member, Professor Turk, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty hereby adopts Robert's Rules of Order as the authority governing procedures at its meetings.

The motion was seconded, and when put to a voice vote, passed without dissent.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, its chairman, Professor Black, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty adopts the final report submitted by its Special Committee
on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty on April 29, 1957, and approves the recommendations contained therein.

The motion being seconded, Professor Black commented briefly on certain items in the report, which had been distributed with the notice of the meeting, and a copy of which is appended to the minutes. After brief discussion the motion was put to a voice vote and carried unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, a member, Professor Lucille Williamson, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the actions of the University Faculty on April 10, April 24, and May 8, 1957, concerning the organization and procedures of the faculty (viz., the establishment of the Faculty Council, changes in the office of the Secretary of the Faculty, establishment of new committees on Academic Freedom and Tenure, on Long Range Planning, and on Membership of the University Faculty, and general regulations affecting faculty committees and the conduct of the faculty meeting) shall come into effect on November 15, 1957.

The motion was seconded. In response to the suggestion of the Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Loberg, that the proposed date was too early for the necessary procedures of nomination and election to be carried out, Professor Williamson explained that the Committee had hoped to complete the plan in time so that all offices could be filled at the Spring election. Since this had not been feasible, the Committee was proposing the earliest date possible in order that the plan might get under way. She stated that whatever the effective date adopted, the Special Committee assumed that the terms of office of the persons concerned would be considered as if begun at the usual time, i.e. July 1.
The Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Professor Loberg, then moved to amend the resolution by substituting December 15, 1957 for November 15, 1957 as the effective date.

The motion to amend was seconded.

The Professor of Philosophy, Professor Black, asked if the mover of the amendment had considered the possibility of starting to receive informal suggestions at once. If this were done, the November 15 date, which was calculated to be after the November meeting of the Faculty, might be possible.

When put to a voice vote, the motion to amend was lost.

The main motion was then put to a voice vote and passed without dissent.

The President commented that the policies and procedures adopted by the Faculty had his approval and that of other administrative officers. He stated that the Chairman of the Committee had consulted with him at every point, and while most of the matters lay entirely within the province of the Faculty, he was very happy to have had the opportunity to cooperate and to be informed before final action was taken.

The Professor of English, Professor Minoka, moved that this Faculty record its thanks to the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty for its efficient and effective handling of the task assigned to it.

The Faculty made its favorable vote known by applause.

The Professor of Botany, Professor Steward, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the University Faculty, at meetings held on April 24 and May 8, 1957, has adopted reports by its Special
Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty concerning the office of the Deanship and the functions of the University Faculty, and has endorsed the principles stated in those reports,

Be It Resolved that the President be asked to transmit these reports to the members of the Board of Trustees for their information.

This motion was seconded and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The Dean then moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the University Faculty, at its meeting on April 24, 1957, has adopted the report of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty concerning the Functions of the Dean of the Faculty, and

Whereas the subject report has set forth the concern of the University Faculty in questions of educational policy and the consequent need for the Dean of the University Faculty to participate fully in the discussion and formulation of all administration policies having educational implications, therefore

Be It Resolved that the President be asked to present to the members of the Board of Trustees the expression of the Faculty that it would be highly desirable that the Dean be extended a standing invitation to sit with the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee in all discussions on questions of educational policy.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

The Professor in Administration of the Law, Professor B. F. Willcox, moved adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas the University Faculty has established a Faculty Council, adopted new procedures for the selection of the Dean of the Faculty, made changes in the office of the Secretary of the Faculty, and instituted new committees on Academic Freedom and Tenure, on Long Range Planning, and Membership of the Faculty,

Be It Resolved that the President be asked to transmit the final report of the Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, accompanied by copies of the relevant faculty resolutions, to the members of the Board of Trustees for their information.
This motion was seconded and when put to a voice vote, carried unanimously.

The Dean moved adoption of the following resolution:

RESOLVED that the University Faculty hereby requests the Board of Trustees of Cornell University to amend the second paragraph of section 1 of Article XIII of the By-Laws as indicated below, parentheses indicating deletions (except when used to bracket numbers) and underlining indicating insertions:

The non-voting members of the University Faculty shall consist of the professors, associate professors and assistant professors in (1) the Medical College, (2) the School of Nursing, (3) the Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, and (4) the extension services of the several colleges, schools, and departments of the University. The University Faculty may grant to any group of non-voting members the right to vote on any question deemed by the Faculty to be of interest to such group.

This motion was seconded, and when put to a voice vote, passed unanimously.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty, its chairman, Professor Black, moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Be It Resolved that the Special Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Faculty be discontinued as of June 30, 1957.

The motion was seconded and passed without dissent, by a voice vote.

On behalf of the Committee on the Hull Memorial Publication Fund, its chairman, Professor Moulton, presented the first annual report of the committee, a copy of which is appended to the minutes.

On behalf of the Committee on Elections, its chairman, the Dean presented the following report:

182 valid ballots were cast for nominees for the office of Faculty Trustee. The votes received by the several candidates were: 157 votes for the Professor
of Veterinary Medicine, Professor M. G. Fincher; 160 votes for the Professor of Business History and Transportation, Professor J. G. B. Hutchins; 238 votes for the Professor of Chemistry, Professor F. A. Long; 124 votes for the Professor of Engineering Mechanics and Materials, Professor J. R. Moynihan; 201 votes for the Professor of Animal Husbandry, Professor K. L. Turk; 260 votes for the McRoberts Professor in Administration of the Law, Professor B. F. Willcox.

The Committee on Elections has informed the President that Professors Long, Turk and Willcox are the Faculty's candidates, and has reported to him the number of votes received by each.

473 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on University Policy, of which 254, a majority, were cast for the Professor of History of Science, Professor H. E. Guerlac.

463 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, of which 233, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Industrial and Engineering Administration, Professor M. W. Sampson.

448 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Cooperative Purchasing, of which 211, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Institution Management, Professor Kathleen Cutlar.

470 ballots were cast for a member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 249, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Physiology, Professor H. H. Dukes.

458 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 261, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Rural Education, Professor F. H. Stutz.

429 ballots were cast for another member of the Committee on Nominations, of which 212, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Administration, Professor P. P. Van Riper.

428 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics, of which 217, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Speech and Drama, Professor H. D. Albright.

423 ballots were cast for another member of the Board on Physical Education and Athletics, of which
254, a majority, were cast for the Andrew Dickson White Professor of Architecture, Professor F. M. Wells.

434 ballots were cast for a member of the Board on Student Health and Hygiene, of which 255, a majority, were cast for the Professor of Child Development and Family Relationships, Professor Mary Ford.

On behalf of the Faculty of the Graduate School, its Dean, Professor J. W. McConnell, presented the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Whereas the Faculty in the Field of Music has proposed the establishment of the Doctor of Musical Arts degree, and

Whereas the Graduate Faculty has approved this proposal,

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty approve this proposal and recommend the establishment of this degree by the Board of Trustees to be granted to persons who have satisfactorily completed the program leading to this degree prescribed by the Faculty of the Field of Music, acting as a Division of the Graduate School for this purpose.

The motion was seconded. After brief discussion, it was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Hazel M. Hauck
Secretary
The Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures

Report on the functions of the University Faculty

In studying the organization and procedures of the University Faculty, we have found it necessary to formulate our conception of the functions of the University Faculty. The following statement of general principles may also be read as an attempt on our part to clarify the concept of "educational policy". Our conviction of the importance of an active University Faculty having "full legislative powers to discuss and decide university affairs" (White Autobiography, Vol. 1, p. 135) is well expressed in President J. G. Schurman's statement, that "No greater good could come to Cornell University than a quickening and deepening of the Faculty sense of responsibility for its welfare" (Annual Report, 1909-10, p. 16).

Functions of the University Faculty

A university accepts public responsibility for the satisfactory achievement of desirable standards of higher education. The University Faculty has always inquired into, and acted upon, matters affecting academic programs and levels of instruction (standards of admission, entrance and residence requirements, institution of new schools and new degrees, etc.). A major faculty concern has always been the maintenance of conditions in which learning, intellectual inquiry, artistic creativity, and a healthy community life can flourish. Faculty members perform many committee tasks essential to the University's welfare.* The extent and efficiency with which these activities are conducted are a good measure of the Faculty's concern with general university affairs.

* They adjudicate student problems and supervise student activities, schedule University events, and handle matters of common concern to the several schools and colleges involving such important educational auxiliaries as the library, the University Press, etc. Faculty committees invite visiting lecturers, conduct prize competitions, plan concert series, arrange the annual Festival of Contemporary Arts, and concern themselves with the Art Museum and the University Radio Station.
Coordination of these academic administrative tasks and the formulation of clear lines of policy are the constant concern of the University Faculty, meeting in general assembly. Questions of educational policy transcending the special problems of departments and colleges are here debated. Here is the only meeting ground where faculty and administrators speak as fellow members of a single body devoted to the success and improvement of the University.

Some aspects of University operations, such as business operations, investments, legal problems, etc., fall mainly or wholly outside the Faculty's jurisdiction. Elsewhere, as in the maintenance of the quality of the University degrees, the Faculty responsibility is paramount. There remain important areas in which the Administration and the Faculty are jointly responsible. In these matters -- perhaps a majority of those arising -- responsibility must be consciously shared, and wise solutions require independent judgment on both sides, frank interchange of views in advance of final action, and a background of confidence and mutual respect. Disagreement is to be expected in the democratic process, but whenever possible divergence of opinion should be anticipated and met by negotiation, compromise and suspension of action until agreement is reached. Good communications and mutual forbearance and trust are of the essence.

Cornell has had a unique reputation for the degree of freedom and responsibility of its teachers. This has helped to maintain the enthusiasm and morale of its Faculty and has drawn to that Faculty many persons who prefer its active and diversified Faculty life to the attractions of more impersonal and administratively dominated institutions. If Cornell's fine tradition in this respect were to be impaired, the University would become progressively less attractive to the outstanding scientists and scholars it wishes to appoint and retain.
General principles

1. Vigorous and effective operation of the University Faculty is of paramount importance for the welfare of the University.

2. The functions of the University Faculty should be construed positively, as arising from the educational aspects of the University as a whole, and the proper interrelations of its parts. The University Faculty does not merely supplement or complement the various college faculties.

3. The University Faculty has a responsibility for initiating, considering, and making recommendations on questions of educational policy or problems arising therefrom, whether concerning (i) current operations of the University, or (ii) long-range policy (such as admission policies, proposals for new degrees, establishment of new educational and research units, the size of the University, auxiliary cultural agencies, and questions concerning the status and privileges of the Faculty).

4. A question is one of educational policy to the extent that it bears upon (i) specific conditions facilitating instruction, study, research, publication, and other scholarly or cultural activities of faculty members and students or (ii) the general welfare of the academic community in which these scholarly and cultural activities are pursued. Consequently, any aspect of the University's operations may raise questions of educational policy that concern the University Faculty. The administration and the faculty have joint responsibility in settling many such questions.

5. Responsibilities of the University Faculty include, but are not limited to, the following:

   (a) Examination and appraisal of existing programs and policies, and recommendations for their revision or modification;

   (b) Proposals for new developments;
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(c) Initiation of studies to be made by special committees;
(d) Review of proposals for new programs of concern to more than one college, school, or other separate academic unit.

6. Questions may be brought to the whole Faculty by its own members or committees, by college faculties, or by the administration. Proposals should be so presented as to provide ample opportunity for discussion. Administration views on such matters should be made available to the committees and the general Faculty.

7. Committees of the University Faculty represent the faculty at large, and committee members should consider themselves as spokesmen for the entire faculty.

8. While much preliminary discussion and investigation of questions before the faculty will normally be undertaken by the Faculty Council and other committees of the University Faculty, final responsibility for decisions resides in the University Faculty as a whole, acting in general assembly.

The Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures
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The Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures was established by the University Faculty on October 10, 1956. The terms of reference were:

"To examine the procedures now used by the University Faculty, whether in general assembly or through its committees, for considering and acting upon questions of academic policy, and to make specific recommendations to the Faculty for continuing or modifying the present organization and procedures."

In addition, the committee considered a request from the faculty members of the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, for voting privileges in the University Faculty, referred to it by the Committee on University Policy (November 27, 1956).

The University Faculty also asked the committee (January 23, 1957) to study the office of the Deanship (including its powers, status, and relation to the President and the Faculty) and the procedures for selecting holders of that office.

Formal proposals to the University Faculty concerning these matters have been submitted to the University Faculty. The present report summarizes these proposals, discusses some of the reasons for them, and lists some further informal recommendations.

The work of the committee

We took as our starting point the extensive set of suggestions made by members of the University Faculty in response to a questionnaire circulated in May 1956 by seven members of the faculty. Many further suggestions have been received from faculty members and members of the administration. Special investigations were conducted by subcommittees on faculty organization at other universities, on proposals for a senate, on relations between the various college faculties at Cornell, on faculty-administration relations, on the functions of the University Faculty, and on the nature of the Deanship and possible modes of selection of candidates for that office. Reports from these subcommittees have been incorporated into the formal proposals submitted to the faculty. We have worked in close collaboration with the Committee on University Policy; a number of conferences were arranged with the President, the Dean of the Faculty and members of the administration.

Summary of proposals and recommendations

1. Creation of a Faculty Council, to replace the Committee on University Policy.

2-4. Creation of new standing committees, on Academic Freedom and Tenure, on Long Range Planning, and on Membership of the University Faculty.

5. Changes in the office of the Secretary of the Faculty.
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6. Proposals concerning the method of selection of the Dean of the Faculty.
7. Principles governing the office of the Dean of the Faculty.
8. Principles governing the functions of the University Faculty.
10. Recommendations concerning the conduct of the faculty meeting.
11. Proposal to admit the Geneva staff as voting members of the University Faculty.
12. Additional suggestions for improving the conduct of faculty business.

Scope of the proposals

The committee interpreted its terms of reference broadly, regarding itself as authorized to study any aspects of the organization and procedures of the University Faculty that might call for improvement. On the whole, however, the final proposals have been confined to those calling for faculty approval alone, without revision of the By-Laws. (A separate faculty committee has been investigating By-Law revisions.) This was done in the belief that valuable changes can be made in this way; but it should not be inferred that improvements in the By-Laws are undesirable. Among the relevant subjects not investigated, we may mention the relation of the faculty trustees to the faculty. In general, we have not tried to prepare recommendations on every aspect of faculty organization and procedure; and omission of any topic from the proposals does not necessarily imply a judgment as to its relevance or importance.

General remarks on the proposals

Difficulties arising in connection with the organization and procedures of the University Faculty are partly due to Cornell's increasing size and complexity. This partly explains the heterogeneity of the faculty, and consequent difficulties in reaching understanding and agreement. Increasing variety of the faculty's pursuits and interests might conceivably lead to a situation in which Cornell would be no more than a loose association of schools and colleges. Any tendency to seek unity by strengthening the administration at the expense of full faculty participation in university affairs would be detrimental to the welfare of the University; no university can be a great one without an active and informed faculty, vigorously interesting itself in university affairs. No changes in the faculty organization and procedures can bring this about, but we hope our proposals will make it easier to achieve.

Supplementary remarks

1. (Faculty Council) We considered at some length, but finally rejected, proposals for instituting a representative Senate. Information concerning the experience of similar bodies at comparable universities led us to fear that creation of a Senate would diminish faculty participation in university affairs. The committee's proposals do not exclude the possibility of establishing a Senate in the future. But before any such drastic change is made, it would seem desirable to explore other devices for strengthening faculty organization. At one stage in our inquiry, we prepared a plan according to which departments might be
informally represented at the faculty meeting by elected "Faculty Representatives." It was urged that this, too, might diminish the degree of general faculty participation in university affairs. Our proposal for a "Faculty Council" to replace the present Committee on University Policy is the chief step proposed for strengthening the organization of the University Faculty.

The Faculty Council is intended to be broadly representative of the faculty, but it is most important that its members consider themselves as spokesmen for the faculty at large. It is to be hoped that the Council will place emphasis upon initiation of faculty policies, and provide ample opportunity for full discussion by Council members of all questions of faculty concern. In this way, a considerable number of faculty members actively involved in policy making will be well informed about current issues before they reach the general faculty. Individual faculty members should feel free to communicate with the Council and to present their views to it in person. The Council will need to maintain close relations with the standing committees of the University Faculty, which should regularly communicate with the Council, without abrogating their responsibility to report to the general faculty. The Council should not be regarded as having any powers of veto over the faculty committees. If the Council is to be active and influential, service upon it should be regarded as a substantial and time-consuming duty, normally entailing temporary exemption from committee duties elsewhere in the University.

The size adopted for the Council (17 members) should be regarded as provisional. If desirable, the Council should seek faculty permission for an increase in its size.

2. (Committee on Academic Freedom) Trustee legislation provides elaborate and orderly procedures for investigating any formal charges against a faculty member that might eventually lead to his dismissal. Experience has shown, however, that some questions concerning academic freedom and tenure are not easily handled within the framework of the formal procedures for investigating specific complaints against individuals. A standing committee is needed to which faculty members (including those not on tenure) and members of the administration can turn for advice, even in situations in which there may be no prospect of any formal charges of "misfeasance or nonfeasance" against the person or persons concerned. It is our hope that once the standing committee on academic freedom and tenure has been established, the trustees as well as the faculty will normally consult with it on all questions falling within the committee's jurisdiction. It will be noticed that the committee's operations have been carefully circumscribed with appropriate safeguards, intended to protect the rights of all persons whose activities may be queried. The committee is explicitly restricted to formulating an opinion: its actions may not supersede or conflict with procedures already specified in the By-Laws and Faculty or Trustee legislation.

We believe the creation of this committee to be an important step. It should remain in existence, even if specific questions are seldom brought before it.

3. (Committee on Long Range Planning) This committee is an important part of our plan for a vigorous Faculty Council. In the past, the Policy Committee has been too much occupied with questions requiring prompt decision to be able to devote extensive attention to long range issues of educational policy. The new committee, working in close cooperation with the administration, should be able to give leisurely and thorough study to a selected number of broad questions of general educational policy. We believe faculty initiative in formulating policies

(See other side)
on such broad questions would be welcomed by the administration, and could be of great benefit to the harmonious development of the university. Since the work of this new committee will be closely related to the work of the Faculty Council, it is appropriate for the members of this committee to be appointed by the Council. The committee would naturally maintain close relations with the Council, and report to it, but like all committees of the University Faculty, it is ultimately responsible to the general faculty, to whom it is required to report at regular intervals.

4. (Committee on Membership of the University Faculty) On a number of recent occasions, the faculty has been asked to admit as voting members persons whose rights in this regard are not already established by the By-Laws. The recent request by the Geneva staff for the voting privilege has shown that present admissions procedures entail considerable delay and duplication of effort. Since further requests of this nature will arise in the future, there should be a standing committee to deal expeditiously with such requests in accordance with clearly formulated policies. The committee will also be charged with maintaining an accurate roster of the membership of the faculty. The new committee will be asked to handle a request placed before our committee for voting privileges for members of the extension staff.

5. (Changes in the office of the Secretary of the Faculty) This part of our proposals arose partly from a conviction that the work of the Dean of the Faculty needed simplification and reorganization, if the holder of the post were to be able to concentrate upon his policy tasks. It is to be hoped that the Secretary of the Faculty, working under the new regulations, will be able to assist the Dean materially in the performance of his duties, e.g. by deputizing for him on committees, helping to make arrangements for faculty meetings, and participating in policy discussions. We conceive of the office of the Secretary, as now strengthened, as second in importance only to that of the Deanship. The Secretary will need to be a faculty member of wide experience, enjoying the full confidence of the faculty as one of their chief officers.

6. (Method of selection of the Dean of the Faculty) Given the current conception of the nature of the Deanship, we consider that the new regulations adopted by the faculty provide equitable safeguards for the interests of the administration and of the faculty in this key appointment. Success of the new method of selection will depend largely upon the skill with which the ad hoc nominating committee discharges its task. When such a committee is established, it should be provided with explicit instructions by the Faculty Council. In our judgment, many of the difficulties that have arisen in the past over the selection of the Dean can be traced to deficiencies in the previous regulations concerning the method of selection. The new regulations have been designed to remove some ambiguities, but necessarily leave scope for the exercise of individual judgment. The new procedures will prove satisfactory only if they facilitate the selection of men of outstanding distinction, enjoying the faculty's full confidence, and able to work in close and harmonious relations with the President.

7. (The nature of the Deanship) We have set forth our views on this matter in a separate report, previously submitted to the University Faculty.

8. (Functions of the University Faculty) We have set forth our views on this matter in a separate report, previously submitted to the University Faculty.
9. (Proposals concerning committees) So much of the work of the University Faculty is performed in committee, that further thought should be given to measures for improving the efficiency of committee work and diminishing the amount of time and energy it now consumes. We have found it possible to propose discontinuing several committees, but urge that renewed attempts be made to simplify the committee structure, by consolidating committees or in other ways.

Our proposals for keeping of outline minutes, and for regular reports to the Dean were offered as devices for improving the efficiency of committee work. Some members of our committee feel that it should be a general practice to announce the closing as well as the opening times of all committee meetings. Such devices can be no substitute, however, for the determination of committee members to achieve a high degree of efficiency.

The success of the committee system depends largely upon the wisdom of the appointments and elections of committee members. Accordingly, the work of the Committee on Nominations is of basic importance to the entire faculty structure. No pains should be spared to improve the procedures now employed for the selection of candidates for faculty posts on committees. We have made no formal proposals under this heading, but recommend the matter to the attention of the Dean of the Faculty and the Committee on Nominations. We draw attention, also, to Item F in the list of "suggestions" at the end of this report.

10. (Conduct of the Faculty meeting) The general meeting of the Faculty is, and should continue to be, the most important aspect of the organization of faculty discussion and decision. We deprecate any inclination to compare average attendance at the general meeting with the number of faculty having the privilege of voting, or to draw hasty inferences concerning the degree of interest of the faculty in questions of educational policy. Attendance at faculty meetings and participation in elections compare favorably with similar figures for other legislative bodies, and it should be remembered that motions are discussed by large numbers of persons, in college and department meetings, and in less formal ways.

In an important sense, the actions taken by those present at the general meeting are taken by and for the whole faculty: Questionnaires or mail ballots can be no substitute for face-to-face debate on the floor of the general assembly. Accordingly, everything possible should be done to maintain the quality of debate in the faculty meeting. We regret tendencies, noticeable in recent years, to deviate from the well-tested procedures of parliamentary debate and consider a certain degree of formality essential to the proper conduct of business in meetings as large as those of the Cornell faculty.

We have therefore proposed that Roberts' Rules of Order be recognized as governing procedures in the faculty meeting. We would also like to emphasize the importance, in our judgment, of providing faculty members with ample notice of motions coming before the meeting, and with sufficient prior information for reasoned opinions to be formed upon the matters presented for decision at the meeting. When new business is raised in a given meeting, action upon it should be postponed until the subsequent meeting. There should be a general understanding that speeches on a given motion be brief: Some members of the committee would like to require any speaker who has had the floor for fifteen minutes to obtain consent of the meeting before proceeding. We have made no formal proposals on this point, but would suggest that the Dean and the Council give further consideration to the framing of rules governing the conduct of the general meeting.
11. (Geneva staff's request for voting privileges) Affirmative action was taken on this matter by the University Faculty on April 10, 1957. It is to be noticed that this matter was peripheral to the committee's proposals and formed no part of its original agenda.

12. Additional suggestions

There follow a number of informal suggestions. Most of them concern devices for helping members of the University Faculty to receive information about questions falling within that faculty's jurisdiction.

A. We hope it will be possible to institute the practice of an annual report from the President to the members of the University Faculty. If the plan proposed is adopted, the report will take the form of a written statement, supplemented by an address to the general meeting. Members of the faculty should freely avail themselves of the privilege of raising questions on the report, either in writing, or from the floor of the meeting.

B. It would be useful, also, if the Dean of the Faculty were to make a parallel formal report on faculty affairs, once in every academic year. Such a report could incorporate materials submitted to him by the chairmen of faculty committees, and should include a summary of the work of the Faculty Council. Opportunity should be provided, as in the case of the President's report, for both written and oral questions to be submitted by members of the faculty.

C. Although the Faculty Trustees serve as individuals, and not as direct representatives of the University Faculty, there is no reason why these trustees should not occasionally report informally on their work to the faculty. We believe such reports would be both interesting and instructive.

D. We suggest that the Dean of the Faculty prepare, for the benefit of newcomers to the University Faculty, a document summarizing the privileges and responsibilities of members of that faculty. We would like to see such a document sent to all members of the faculty who become entitled to attend meetings of the University Faculty and to serve on its committees.

E. It would be highly desirable that an attempt be made to codify faculty legislation, now dispersed in the faculty's records. This project has been pursued by several past Deans of the Faculty. We suggest that the present Dean of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty make renewed efforts to complete the project, and to publish the resulting code of faculty legislation for the use of members of the University Faculty.

F. It is recommended that, whenever appropriate, committees shall make informal progress reports to the University Faculty, and hold meetings at which specific proposals contemplated by the committees may be discussed by the faculty, prior to final drafting.

G. The effect of the measures proposed by the present committee, and adopted by the faculty, should be reviewed within, say, three years' time. We suggest that this be undertaken by the Faculty Council, which might also continue
investigation of measures to improve the efficiency of faculty procedures and organization that we have been unable to undertake.

The Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures

R. L. Aronson
Damon Boynton
C. G. Murdock
R. S. Pasley
M. W. Sampson
A. M. Srb
K. L. Turk
Lucille Williamson
Max Black, Chairman
To the President, Cornell University;
and
To the University Faculty, Cornell University

I have the honor to submit herewith the first annual report of the Committee on the Hull Memorial Publication Fund, as required by legislation of the Board of Trustees dated June 10-11, 1956.

In her will, the late Mary Josephine Hull (died 1953), carrying out the wishes of her brother, the late Professor Charles H. Hull (died 1936), generously bequeathed to Cornell University a sum of money to be known as the Hull Memorial Publication Fund. The will stipulates that the income from the Fund is to be used "to pay not more than 80% of the cost of printing and publishing books or articles written by members of the University, of such character as shall be likely to advance its scholarly reputation in the field of liberal studies: history and political science, philosophy, languages and literature". By legislation of the Trustees of Cornell University at their June, 1956, meeting, "the income from the Fund shall be appropriated by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of a standing committee of the University Faculty to be entitled 'Committee on the Hull Memorial Publication Fund'". The Committee consists of: (a) the University Publisher, ex officio; (b) those members of the Board of Editors of the Cornell University Press who represent the fields of the "liberal studies," ex officio; and (c) five additional members in these fields appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

When the Committee began to function in July of 1956, its first task was that of formulating policies and procedures, and of making them known to all University Faculty members interested. Some of the very first communications received posed an initial problem: was it the duty of the Committee to help authors obtain publishers for their works, or should it limit itself to considering works which had already been accepted for publication? After considerable discussion, the Committee agreed unanimously that it should properly limit itself to this latter function--considering works which had already been accepted for publication.

A second problem dealt with the question of whether or not an author might receive royalties from a work which had been subsidized by the Hull Fund. The Hull will stipulates that any net profits to the University shall be offset by proportional payments to the principal of the Fund; but it makes no specific statement about profits to an author in the form of royalties. After lengthy discussion, the Committee obtained from the University Counsel an opinion that nothing in the Hull will prevents an author from receiving such royalties.
During the fall of 1956, copies of a statement of the policies and procedures of the Committee were sent to the chairmen of all departments in the fields of the "liberal studies," for distribution to their colleagues; and in March of 1957, copies of a slightly revised statement were sent to all individual faculty members in these fields. During the year, communications were received concerning thirteen different works by members of the University. Six of these dealt with works which had already been accepted by a publisher, and in each case the Committee approved a subsidy. These works, together with the date of the action and the amount committed, were as follows:

Expendable balance 30 Jun 56 $12,146.26

1 Jul 56, Harry Caplan and Henry H. King, PULPIT ELOQUENCE, to appear in SPEECH MONOGRAPHS $1,500
10 Aug 56, G. W. Skinner, CHINESE SOCIETY IN THAILAND: AN ANALYTICAL HISTORY, Cornell Univ. Press 4,000
29 Oct 56, David Brion Davis, HOMICIDE IN AMERICAN FICTION, Cornell Univ. Press 1,400

In addition to the above, the Committee received an oral report from the Cornell University Press concerning plans to publish a volume of collected writings by Dexter Perkins for which approximately $1,800.00 would be requested. If the written request for this amount is received and approved by 30 Jun 57, the Committee's available funds for the year would be just about exhausted—a happy result for the first year's operations.

(Note. The above figures represent commitments only. Actual payments requested to date amount to $1,936.48--$500.00 for the work by J.-J. Demorest, and $1,164.48 for that by Harry Caplan and Henry H. King.)

In closing this brief report, I think I may speak for all members of the Committee in saying that we have welcomed this opportunity to serve other members of the University and to carry out the generous wishes of Professor and Miss Hull.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) William G. Moulton

William G. Moulton, Chairman Committee on the Hull Memorial Publication Fund

Incl.: Copy of "Policies and Procedures"
In her will, the late Mary Josephine Hull (died 1953), carrying out the wishes of her brother the late Professor Charles H. Hull (died 1936), generously bequeathed to Cornell University a sum of money to be known as the Hull Memorial Publication Fund. The will stipulates that the income from the Fund is to be used "to pay not more than 80% of the cost of printing and publishing books or articles written by members of the University, of such character as shall be likely to advance its scholarly reputation in the field of liberal studies: history and political science, philosophy, languages and literature". (The full section of the will establishing the Fund is reproduced on the reverse of this sheet.) By legislation of the Trustees of Cornell University at their June 1956 meeting, "the income from the Fund shall be appropriated by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of a standing committee of the University Faculty to be entitled 'Committee on the Hull Memorial Publication Fund'". The Committee consists of: (a) the university Publisher, ex officio; (b) those members of the Board of Editors of the Cornell University Press who represent the fields of the "liberal studies," ex officio; and (c) five additional members in these fields appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Members of the University are invited to communicate with the Committee if they desire financial aid toward the publication of a work in the fields of the "liberal studies." The following remarks indicate briefly the procedures to be followed.

A prospective applicant should first have his manuscript accepted by a recognized press or publishing house. If Fund support is desired, the publisher should inform the Chairman of the Committee of (1) the total estimated publication costs and (2) the amount of subsidy needed and the reasons for this need. The Committee will also appreciate it if the publisher will include copies of the reports of readers who have judged the manuscript. With this information in hand, the Committee will consider whether the work meets the requirements of the Hull will, will review the request for financial support, and can then take final action on the application.

The members of the Committee welcome this opportunity to serve other members of the University and to carry out the generous wishes of the late Charles H. and Mary Josephine Hull. Although they cannot formally consider any application until the steps outlined in the preceding paragraph have been completed, they will be glad to give at any time whatever informal assistance they can.

Communications may be addressed to any member of the Committee. The members for 1956-57 are: Morris Bishop, Mario Einaudi, James Hutton, Norman Malcolm, Dexter Perkins, Victor Reynolds, Marc Szeftel, and William G. Moulton, Chairman.

11 February, 1957.
FOURTEENTH: All the rest, residue and remainder of my property, real and personal, of every kind and wherever situated, I give, devise and bequeath to Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, to be added to and become a part of the Hull Publication Memorial Fund. This Fund to be administered as follows: It is my wish that no part of this publication fund shall ever be used to establish a printing office or bindery, or to acquire or pay for any machinery or mechanical appliances for the production of books, but the income of the fund shall be used from time to time to pay not more than 80% of the cost of printing and publishing books or articles written by members of the University, of such character as shall be likely to advance its scholarly reputation in the field of liberal studies; history and political science, philosophy, languages and literature; upon the further condition that if and whenever there shall result to the University a net profit from the sale of any work subsidized by the said publication fund, there shall be added to the principal sum of the fund such a proportion of said net profit as the subsidy afforded such book bore to the whole cost of publishing it. My desire is that the income of this fund be applied solely toward meeting the cost of printing and publishing such scholarly works and never to pay any person directly or indirectly for writing them, or to add to his salary, or to provide a personal payment of any sort to him or for his use or benefit.
INDEX
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Term of Office, Faculty Committees, 2822
Trustees, Actions reported, 2751
Report on Economic Status, 2687
Spring Day, 2687
Bylaws, 2687
Faculty Representation Status, 2702, A1-2706, 2784, 2829, A1-2832
Discrimination, 2783
Faculty Representation, 2783, A0-2788
Bylaws changes, 2783, A1-2806
Faculty Trustees, Legislative approval, 2824, A1-2848

University Broadcasting, Committee on, 2668

University Development, 2790

University Faculty Meetings
8 Oct 1952, 2668
12 Nov 1952, 2676
10 Dec 1952, 2679
14 Jan 1953 2684
11 Feb 1953, 2687
11 Mar 1953, 2690
18 Mar 1953 (special), 2694
15 Apr 1953, 2697
13 May 1953, 2699
30 Sep 1953, 2707
14 Oct 1953, 2711
11 Nov 1953, 2714
9 Dec 1953, 2719
10 Feb 1954, 2727
14 Apr 1954, 2730
12 May 1954, 2734
26 May 1954, 2738
28 Sep 1954, 2741
13 Oct 1954, 2746
10 Nov 1954, 2751
8 Dec 1954, 2755
12 Jan 1955, 2758
9 Feb 1955, 2762
9 Mar 1955, 2765
13 April 1955, 2768
11 May 1955, 2771
8 Jun 1955, 2774
12 Oct 1955, 2789
9 Nov 1955, 2798
14 Dec 1955, 2807
11 Jan 1956, 2811
25 Jan 1956, 2815
14 Mar 1956, 2821
9 May 1956, 2824
26 Sep 1956, 2827
10 Oct 1956, 2833
14 Nov 1956, 2835
12 Dec 1956, 2837
23 Jan 1957, 2840
13 Feb 1957, 2847
13 Mar 1957, 2849
10 Apr 1957, 2852
24 Apr 1957, 2858 (special)
8 May 1957, 2864

University Faculty Procedures, 2834
University Faculty, Standing Committee on the Membership of the, 2861
University-Corporate Relations, 2791, A1-2797

University Faculty meetings
  Auditors: Dir Women’s Physical Educ and Supervisor of Men’s Physical Education, 2868
  Geneva faculty, 2848, A1-2848, 2853, 2868

Women students
  Sororities and dormitory residency, 2772, A1-2773