

**A MEETING  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2018**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Speaker Charlie Walcott: “I would remind the body that senators have priority in speaking, and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote. I would ask you, please, please, please identify yourself and your department before you speak, and wait for the microphone; because otherwise, it becomes very difficult to transcribe what it is you said into the minutes of the meeting. And so please wait for the microphone.

“And I suggest a speaking time of two minutes or so would be appropriate. So with that, the dean of the faculty, Charlie van Loan.”

**2. OVERVIEW OF ISSUES – DEAN CHARLIE VAN LOAN (SLIDES)**

Dean Van Loan: “Okay, so you see the other assemblies have voted in the last week or so, and this is unofficial. They, like us, have until Friday to submit stuff. Here we are again, speaking on behalf of our committee that is trying to draft or propose improvements to our consensual relationships policy.

“I want to talk about how times change. In the '50s, no one cared about smokers' health. But then in 1970, the surgeon general gets involved and suddenly yeah, it is a health issue, and we have the well-known warnings. Maybe 20 years later, it is realized it's not just about the smoker. There is an environment around the smoker, and that matters, and then you do something about it. So on campus here, you have all the no smoking within 50 feet of the building.

“I am sure you can relabel these for other issues and you can relabel these for boxes; the Greek system, equal opportunity. But for us, this is what the four boxes look like.

“Once upon a time, there was conduct, from our standpoint, was unacceptable on campus. Student-faculty behavior was looked at in a different way 20, 30 years ago. Then, in the '80s, you see the first CRP policy out there, and they focus on the pair, the student-faculty pair. And then later, it's realized that it's not just about the two people; that there's an environment around those two people that might be affected negatively by the romance in the workplace.

“So this is where we are. What are we going to do about it? So this is why this is a hard problem. We have all realized this in the week or two or last year; so on the one hand, don't get involved in the private lives of students, faculty and staff. No one wants to do that.

“But on the other hand, students and postgraduates; i.e., post-docs, must be able to realize their academic ambitions in a climate that is devoid of favoritism and the potential for coercion. We have to balance things all the time.

“We are all lovers of the 1st Amendment, but you know, on election day, you can't campaign within 100 feet of the polling place. There is a circle where something is so important that you have to put aside your affection for the 1st Amendment. We have to balance things.

“The AAUP has an excellent couple of paragraphs on consensual relationship policy. It is 23 years old, but it has three bullet points. And all this you may or may not believe, so the things you see mentioned in this argument space is that there's the potential for exploitation, that what looks like voluntary consent may not be consent, and that there's a potential for later allegations of sexual harassment.

“We have on the table or we're playing with three prohibitions. The first one you see in every single policy, more or less: If there is direct authority, you are in my class, forget it. Then you have what we call the undergrad ban. All faculty-undergraduate relationships prohibited.

“Then we have a ban at the graduate level. Not the whole campus, but if the two people are in the same field or affiliated with the same degree program. That is prohibition P3. So we are interested in these three things. That is why we have this ballot.

“And I should say, it's not just the box you check. It is also the attending comment. If you just say I don't like any of this stuff, period, that is not helpful. You could say I am against both bans, but I know you are trying to solve a larger problem and here's how I would go about doing it.

“Remember, all those responses go to the -- in our final report to the president, so those paragraphs are incredibly important. This is not about 51-49, my side wins. It is all about what collectively, those paragraphs say; not just from us, but from all the assemblies.

"Let us look at just the bare bones thing and -- think about do we need an undergraduate ban. People often say look, I am in a distant corner of the university. That should be okay; but consider this picture. So yeah, I am far away from the student, but I have a close colleague who is an academic authority to that student.

"We ask these questions. If you do not want to have an undergraduate ban, you need answers to these questions: What is distant? Who decides? What if the Undergrad Cyan falls in love with that whole other area? Can this scene be managed via recusal and, if so, who does it?

"So you have to answer those questions if you want to not have an ugrad ban. And should we worry about the potential of coercion that Professor Red could exercise on the student through Professor Green? So this leads, then, to the ugrad ban. Perhaps we can't solve this problem. Maybe you think you can.

"We would love to hear from you, but that leads you to this, which is what we call CRP B, the classical disclosure scene, illustrated with a graduate student and a faculty member in the same field. The recusal plan blocks the authority from being involved in important discussions that relate to the student's academic progress.

"And the 6.X office, which is absolutely central to our proposal -- more later -- is an office that receives, for example, disclosures, and then processes them. That office would work, for example, with the faculty member and the DGS to rig up a recusal system that protects the student and the environment.

"You can also have more obscure kinds of influence through indirect authority. So here we have two fields, but I'm in the same department as Professor Green, who is a minor advisor of the student. So there is, again, an occasion where I can exercise perhaps indirect authority over the student.

"And again, the 6.X office would be required -- would work with all the players to come up with a recusal plan, to protect the environment and the well-being of the subordinate.

"We really thank the resolution that will be discussed in a few minutes for sharpening the discussion about the disclosure mechanism, because it has to be good if it's going to be effective. Here is the tension: Nobody wants a love police force. On the other hand, if you have a workplace romance, it has to be

managed, it has to be disclosed. There has to be a recusal plan. People have to be informed.

“Three points behind our approach to this: First, again, you need an entity outside of departments, fields, colleges, it has to be outside, and that's what we call the 6.X office. It is a resource for students, a resource for faculty, and does things like recusal plans and whatever.

“The procedures have to respect privacy. And one way you do that is you minimize the radius of disclosure. You make it as small as possible, subject to the constraint that you are protecting the environment, the academic environment, and the student and the authority.

“Finally, you need a mechanism that prevents looking the other way or sweeping stuff under the rug. If you look at the many instances, many of the problems that we are trying to address here, those things really do happen.

“Let me step through the 1, 2, 3, 4 behind our disclosure process. A little bit of an aside; we wanted to give you enough details to inspire confidence in our proposal, and also to educate you, so that when the lawyers and HR really write the proposal or the policy, that we can chime in with authority, that we'll know what we are talking about, so let's go through this.

“We insist that the disclosure be made to the 6.X office. Let say for simplicity, it is Professor Red. We have a dotted line to my office, because part of my job is to help faculty navigate the complexities of their job. Strictly optional. One advantage of this, then, is that, at the discretion of the professionals in the 6.X office, they may want to contact the subordinate. And that is a critical first step, before anyone inside the box gets involved, you perhaps want to talk to the subordinate, who has privacy concerns.

“Then, in consultation with the authority, you work up a recusal plan. Central is who has to know about it. Who in that workplace has to know about it? Then, follow up with the subordinate to inform them about the disclosure and all the resources that are available to the subordinate.

“Now, this doesn't say that you're in a harassment situation, doesn't say you're headed for one. It is simply saying here are some resources. And then, the question is who enforces this. That is also something that the recusal plan would have to address. And you don't want to have one person in charge. Some

combination to be worked out between some obvious local authority, like the DGS, like the chair, but also in coordinating with the 6.X office.

“If you do not have that -- you know, these are difficult social situations. And if you are a chair or DGS not usually trained in this stuff, you want to have close collaboration with a trustworthy entity in the 6.X office.

“Let me step through the resolution, as I understand it. There are options. One of them is that you get to choose who you disclose to. That first target becomes all-important. For example, I could disclose to the DGS. Ask yourself this question: Does this protect the subordinate? For example, suppose it's an LGBT student, for example. Does it protect that student from the field? Does it guard against looking the other way?

“I am Professor Red. I am big-time player in the department or the field. You think the DGS is going to think twice about doing something? And again, about training, you want the 6.X office involved from the start.

“Radius of disclosure. Why go to the dean? What's the point? There is nothing wrong. Deans are very busy, and you might think well, tough luck. But let me tell you a related story. I know of chairs who tell assistant professors don't bother with academic integrity. It's a time sink. Look the other way.

“You pile more and more stuff onto administrators, they'll look the other way. They'll hope it goes away. You don't want to do this. Only until something gets bad, then you have to involve the dean; but why increase, for no reason at all, the radius of disclosure? Why does the dean have to know about this?

“Enforcement. Again, this is a possible diagram of what could be realized through the proposal. It is an in-house enforcer, who was selected by the authority. Is that a safe way of doing business?

“Okay, so disclosure. It is tough all around. Chairs and DGSs have enough to do. When do you disclose? Bad actors tend not to disclose, and uncertain boundaries create angst and chill the environment and complicate the pursuit of academic goals.

“There is something to be said for clarity, for absolutely clarity. You have a professor, a young professor come in, who maybe is a grad student, had a certain lifestyle which just doesn't carry over to when you're a professor. How likely is

the chair to have a chat with that professor, if maybe you exercise authority over this student in the field or not. There is that question mark. Whereas if you had a field ban, it is crystal clear.

“These are things that we all have to think about. CPR A has that third prohibition. We thought about where you can draw that line. It is very hard. The field seems to be a reasonable place. We know about this is unfair to big fields, we know about the professional schools. Nevertheless, there is the argument that can be made here.

“In the committee, we're all in favor of P1 and P2. Not all. It is a very clear majority. We are more divided on this. I don't even know whether it's 8-7, but all I know is it is sufficiently divided, that we wanted to have this three-way thing out there, so we get a reading, a reading from not just faculty, because remember, we don't own this issue. The students and –it is everybody's business, so that is why we have this three-way thing.

“I want to end by thanking my colleagues. Everything I learned about this really is from our many, many meetings, and I want to thank them, and especially Anna, who is sitting over there.”

3. [RESOLUTION ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONS POLICY](#) –  
INTRODUCED BY [SENATOR RICHARD MILLER](#) ([SLIDES](#))

[Senator Richard Miller](#): “This isn't self-criticism. I am near-sighted and -- does everyone have the copy of the resolution? Good. Well, this resolution endorses final proposal B on consensual relations, with a revision concerning recusal and disclosure. It is not just about recusal and disclosure. It asks you to endorse Policy B, with a revision.

“In sponsoring it, Professors [Bensel](#), [Birman](#), [Cheyfitz](#), [Delchamps](#) and I are united in three judgments. We think that Proposal B is better than Proposal A, with its absolute prohibition of romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and graduate students in the same department or field.

“We think that the treatment of recusal and disclosure in B, which was first released on April 16, is worse than in the rough public draft that the senate discussed on March 14 because, unlike the draft, it invests exclusive authority in the 6.X office; identified only as a section within human resources and provides no examples of recusal guidelines.

"Finally, we all support senate deliberation over a resolution on consensual relationships policy, with its opportunities for amendment or substitution ending in a vote, as a chance to forge a senate consensus, helping the senate to live up to its role as the independent voice of the faculty. That is a different role from being the population of a survey, though we welcome the ballot questionnaire.

"I mentioned respect, in which I think the resolution departs from a suggestion, perhaps unintentional, of the dean of faculty. Let me know, before getting to its features in detail, some other ways in which, unintentionally, the dean of the faculty may have created a false impression of what we are proposing.

"It was said that the disclosure and recusal procedure would force an increase of the circle in which intimate life was disclosed. It does not. The route that we describe via disclosure initially to the department chair is one of two routes. And the route that starts with Office 6.X might certainly be preferred on the grounds that the dean of the faculty recommended.

"We were also told that it was a concern that enforcement would be taken away from Office 6.X and lodged in somebody close to the faculty member with a romantic or sexual relation, but that is not true. The only part of Proposal B that we seek to change is the part that is headed "disclosure.

"There is a totally different part on enforcement procedures. In that part, Office 6.X plays the leading role and has the initiative, and we support that, for the reasons that the dean of the faculty suggested, though I think he was suggesting that we ignore the perils that he described.

"Now, Proposals A and B have vitally important common elements, which the resolution endorses between faculty and undergraduates' romantic or sexual relations -- from now on, I will abbreviate this as romantic relationships -- are prohibited. I will say no more about this undergraduate feature.

"In addition, a romantic relationship, as in A and B and under our resolution, is prohibited, with a few exceptions, between a current graduate student and a faculty member exercising academic or professional authority over that student. For example, this is a course instructor or a member of his or her special committee.

"So the questions arise: Why go this far? And why not go further and prohibit all such relationships within a department or field? Here, my answers, in turn,

as someone regards B is not just better than the prohibited A, but downright good, as amended.

“When one of the two people has academic authority over the other, certain dangers of distortion of authority by romance or romance by authority are acute. For example, it becomes hard to separate the degrees of enthusiasm that are all-important in letters of recommendation from irrelevant feelings of affection.

“On the student's part, hard questions of whether to deepen, weaken or end the romantic relationship are clouded, by knowledge of the inevitable potential for effects on the academic relationship.

“Now, if only these two people were affected, these could be seen as special problems that they should be left to solve, without regulation by Cornell; but the combination of authority and romance has serious risks for others and for the teaching relationship at Cornell.

“For example, friendly, informal interpersonal engagement is important to graduate education, which involves mentoring, not just information flow. Faculty should encourage it. But if faculty are known to have romantic relationships with those whom they supervise, such initiatives are rightly sources of apprehension.

“The academic job market is highly competitive. Trust between graduate students and faculty is bound to be fractured, when there is reason to believe that crucial recommendations are influenced by romantic relationships. Why not, then, impose the A proposal ban?

“After all, faculty seek friendly relationships, friendly relations with colleagues throughout their department and throughout their discipline, as departmentally defined; say, in my case, among the nation's and the world's philosophy professors.

“A professor in the specific area, political philosophy, romantically attached to a graduate student working on Aristotle's metaphysics, but not, of course, a member of her special committee, could help her in job competition, by seeking out friends who are in the history of ancient Greek philosophy at the American Philosophical Association convention, extravagantly praising her intellect, without disclosing their relationship.

"But a responsible or a prudent person will not do this. The impact of this bad conduct is much less than a recommendation from her special committee, and the mere potential for such irresponsibility is not apt to subvert student-faculty trust. Should the danger nonetheless be eliminated, so far as regulation can, by the A proposal ban? After all, what is the significant cost to anyone of this further ban?

"There are such costs. For example, Ithaca is a small city, in which extremely busy, unattached junior faculty find it hard to develop emotional attachments with those who share their intellectual interests, broadly defined. Also, it is a real cost, if this spontaneous development of strong mutual emotional attachment must be extinguished or pursued furtively and in violation of university rules.

"These costs must be balanced against costs to the academic environment. It is not the case that the latter costs are overriding whenever attachment is intra-departmental, though they are when authority is exercised, or so I have argued.

"Still, without the exercise of individual authority, participation in the collective life of a department can involve allocations of scarce resources, in which romantic attachments can play a distorting role or threaten trust. Here, recusal plans setting limits appropriate to the life of that department are vital, and here we take proposal B to be defective in two ways: Steps back from the rough draft.

"B gives a section of Human Resources' exclusive authority as recipient of disclosure and designer of recusal plans. This authority should be one option. Disclosure of one's intimate life to those whom one does not know and does not routinely encounter can be more comfortable and more protective of privacy.

"On the other hand, someone may rightly prefer to work with a department chair who knows him or her and has rich knowledge of the nature and demands of graduate education in that particular department. The resolution reopens both routes. Reopens them and, I should mention, does not, in any way, disable the 6.X Office from acquiring knowledge of all disclosures and all recusal plans.

"Quite to the contrary, it's explicit in our resolution that all disclosures with recusal plans, wherever they originate, eventually go to the 6.X Office. And it is very much a part of our plan that collaboration with 6.X, as well as the dean, should play a role.

"Our deans, they are busy. Are they really that busy? I mean, they have associate deans to help them in these matters. Are they that busy? It would seem to me that if there are occasional problems of this kind, they will keep the dean busy. If they are rife in his or her college, the dean had better be busy in dealing with them.

"In addition, there is a need for guidelines for recusal plans. We hope a comprehensive set will be developed. Meanwhile, we take the guidelines in the rough draft to be cogent in themselves and helpful in the design of others. We restore them.

"The resolution does not revise the enforcement procedure section. To better integrate with that section, in which the 6.X Office plays the leading role, I would, myself, support this amendment to the resolution. The amendment would read in item 3, change and enforced by the recipient of the disclosure to and enforced by the 6.X Office and the recipient, as described in enforcement procedures.

"That is all I have to say, Charlie. I do not know. I have some minutes left in the 15, or did I blab on?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): "You have a couple of minutes. How about a question or two?"

[Senator Miller](#): "Yes, if they are clarifying questions."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Yes."

[Senator Sherry Colb](#), Law School: "So this is a very straightforward question, but can we have -- when we have our vote, I don't think we should have it be a three-way vote like this, because then it would be simple to see where you'd have a majority of people who want to regulate and select A or B; but the third option is going to be bigger than once you have split the first two.

"So it seems to me you would want to first vote up or down, regulate versus don't. You could say A or B versus neither. And then, if the first wins, you can then vote between the two. And the way to do that simply would be to have people pick between the first two versus the third, and then order the first two 1, 2 or 2, 1, on the assumption that if that wins over the third, then you pick which ever gets the higher of the --."

[Senator Miller](#): “Well, here's the procedure that -- I think the procedure that the meeting -- the speaker can correct me, if I'm wrong -- it really has two parts. In the first place, we think it is very important to have a debate, under Robert's rules, on the resolution.

“And one reason is this, and I saw this in my department's meeting that lasted over an hour earlier today: Amendments and their discussion can do a lot to shape what people ultimately, on the whole, not unanimously, but on the whole, regard as the best response to this issue.

“So that is, I believe, what's on the agenda. Deliberations, in which amendments are in order, leading to an up/down vote, but there will also be a ballot -- the dean of faculty showed us this ballot, along the lines that you described. So we hope this is a way of having it both ways.

“The senate exercises its independent voice in forging a consensus and, also because of the complexities that you've described, there is room in the questionnaire ballot for people to support alternatives?”

[Senator Michael Thonney](#), Animal Science: “So far, Robert's Rules have not been used in this meeting. It is a travesty, Robert's Rules of Order -- Mike Thonney from Animal Science. This meeting is not being conducted using Robert's rules of order. It has been a very confusing presentation, and I would like the chair to begin using Robert's Rules of Order, please. Thank you.”

[Senator Miller](#): “If my time is up, then we're on to Robert's Rules.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): “General discussion. I don't know if this microphone's working. Okay, I would like to proceed by asking that there are some people here who need to leave early, and so I would like to call on anybody that has to leave early to begin with a question or discussion.

“Yes, sir. We are discussing a proposed resolution.”

[Senator Thonney](#): “What we are discussing.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): “We are discussing the resolution that has been proposed by the former speaker.”

[Senator Thonney](#): “Is that an amendment to the main resolution of the meeting?”

[Speaker Walcott](#): "I believe it is."

[Senator Thonney](#): "I don't need -- well, then, let's have somebody move to amend the main resolution."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay. Dick, you want to move to amend the main resolution?"

[Senator Miller](#): "I am sorry. This is a whole resolution."

[Senator Thonney](#): "What is on the floor, Mr. Chairman? I am talking to the chair of the meeting. What resolution is on the floor?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): "The resolution that has been proposed."

[Senator Thonney](#): "So we're not talking about the main, overall resolution."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "No, we are not. We are talking about an amendment to the --."

[Senator Thonney](#): "How can we talk about an amendment, if the main resolution hasn't been proposed? I am sorry. I will quit now."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay. Yes, sir. Right there."

[Senator Ted Clark](#), Microbiology and Immunology: "I guess I'm confused about the same thing; but even then, I am not sure about. So by voting in the affirmative on this resolution, are we -- as a senate, are we endorsing CRP B? "Well, it says we are endorsing CRP B with the following resolution. That means we are endorsing."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "The green ballot is for everybody in the senate, like all the others, to check one of those three boxes. And it is the original proposals. You have seen them, they are online. That is something -- this is completely separate. This is a comment on a certain part of these -- so what goes to the president, what goes in our report is the results of the green ballot vote and anything the senate wants to inform their point of view."

[Senator Clark](#): "So why aren't we voting to revise CRP B, then? But that is not what this says. It says we are endorsing it."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay, one at a time, please. I am sorry. Right over there."

[Senator Dan Brown, Animal Science](#). "I found this whole process the last couple months kind of confusing. As far as I can tell, there has never been a resolution moved and seconded, anything else to do with any of this. We've had some committee propose that we vote this in packets of these three prohibitions.

"It is just incredibly confusing, much more complicated. I would like to ask, point of information, as the parliamentarian or you, or whoever cares, why can't we just vote up and down on the three prohibitions? We like that one? Yes or no. Second one, yes or no. Third one, yes or no.

"Packaging it like this is very distorting. The president and anybody else that reads it is going to have a great deal of difficulty interpreting what the heck the opinion of this senate is. There could be a lot of reasons people would vote do nothing.

"They might favor there's no way, in the way this is set up, that you can vote for one prohibition. And I have spoken to a lot of people, favor just one. They cannot vote for it, given this thing. It is a mess.

"So I guess what I would like to ask the parliamentarian, or the chair is at what point -- there is no resolution on the floor, seconded to amend. And there is no amendment that's been made or seconded, if we are doing this whole Robert Rules thing, but what I'd like to find out is at what point, if they ever do move and second any of this stuff, so it's actually officially on the floor, at what point would -- could I offer an amendment, in which we switch from this package deal to actually up and down votes on each of the three prohibitions? Because as I said, we are open for any kind of amendments.

"I do not think that ballot is going to give the president much information. I think the -- but I would like to know when do we move, second and vote on that amendment?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Down in front, the lady, please."

[Professor Durba Ghosh](#): "Department of History, also the director of Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies, also a member of the University Faculty Committee, who decided on this agenda.

"I think the thing I will say is to all these questions that are about point of information and about procedure and process, which I think are really, really important, is that this is a committee that has done a really fantastic job of bringing together a pretty big diversity of opinions, as we heard from the last faculty senate meeting.

"I would also direct you all to the website that I know Charlie and Anna have been working on, and there is a kind of one-page summary that explains what some of the terms of the recommendations are, and also some of the frequently asked questions that have been raised, because a lot of this has been addressed on that website.

"I think I would just start by saying I polled my faculty in Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies, and what I was quite struck by was something similar to what Dan said, which was there was a range of opinions. I would say equal numbers of my colleagues in Feminist Studies felt a ban on any kind of relationship prevents our students from having the autonomy or right to choose to have a relationship with a faculty member.

"An equal number felt very strongly that relationships between faculty and student are so deeply shaped by power, and that the idea of preference for one student over another violated the terms of pedagogical engagement. So one of the things I would say is I am not sure that there is a good position here or one -- and we can have a diversity of opinion, and I think at some level, we are going to have to agree to dis not think is an option is to not have a policy, and I think we do need to have a policy, and I think that policy has to come with some strong sense of what we consider appropriate conduct for faculty.

"I think that in the presentation that the dean of the faculty gave, he said -- and I think he is right, and I think this came up in the meetings with FGSS as well, is that there's always going to be somebody who is going to violate the terms of what is being recommended here. That is not what we are trying to prevent. We are trying to prevent coercive relationships. We are trying to make a strong commitment that coercive relationships in the workplace are not appropriate. And I don't think that that is a very hard ask.

"So I am not very much invested in whether it's CRP A or CRP B, but I do think we have to agree to have some kind of policy. I have heard a lot about student autonomy and agency, and I will just address that one thing, which hasn't come up yet. I respect that we have 18-year-old students, who have the right to

consent or enter into any kind of relationship they want. This policy doesn't actually ban the students from anything. It bans the faculty. And many faculty will carry on having relationships. We know that, but it's really important to have a recusal mechanism.

"I would also say that this resolution -- I mean, I think one of the things, and I don't know if that's the intention of the people who posed it, is what it does is it invests some authority in the faculty in the mechanism of recusal. And maybe that's what I'm to understand by the resolution.

"And I think that's a very important feature of it, in the sense that we need to be responsible for our colleagues and we need to be responsible for our pedagogical environments, whether we are in relationships with our students or not; that we're all responsible for this environment, and we shouldn't be thinking about well, I'm a young faculty member and I don't have anyone to meet on a Thursday night. That is not who we're defending here. We are defending a pedagogical environment, which is what the faculty does.

"So I'll just end there. I am one of the people that has to leave early, so I'm sorry about that."

[Senator Clark](#): "So am I correct in saying that if we vote in the affirmative on this resolution, what we're voting for is that when we vote, it's going to be this version of B."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "That is my understanding of what is being proposed. Am I correct?"

[Senator Clark](#): "Okay. I got it."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay, Mr. Dean, what is your interpretation of this?"

[Dean Van Loan](#): "That is correct. Again, every department is going to vote on that green thing, and that is going to be part of our report. The senate can express itself any way it wants, through resolutions or whatever; for example, this one. And that is stapled onto the rest of the report. In other words, the senate believes that this is a positive change for B.

"Well, you have to talk to Dick."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Dick, you want to reply to that? In the microphone, please."

[Senator Miller](#): "I would suggest that we take advantage of the survey aspect of the questionnaire. It is the dean's property, as it were. He can override me. This is a basis to see if there is a specific resolution that the majority of us endorse. It is as simple as that. And that involves a kind of amendment procedure that I think can improve what is in B.

"The ballot has space for comments. My suggestion would be that your view of the best form of B, if you are for it, can be part of your comments on the ballot, and a comment: I am for B, as revised in the resolution, would be very clarifying. I, myself, don't know whether to vote yes or no on B, in the absence of this, so this would help me."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay. In back, you haven't had a chance to talk. It is coming behind you.

[Senator Michel Louge](#), Mechanical Engineering: "First, I would like to mention the rules of order have not been followed. This is not a resolution that comes from the committee, as far as I know; and as a result, it needs to be seconded. Be that as it may, assuming that it had been seconded, I would like to express my opposition to the resolution, not on the merit, but because it provides a clear path to approving B.

"If it did not approve B, I would be supporting the arguments that were put forth. Unfortunately, I am representing my department, and the majority of my department is voting for A. And consequently, I cannot regretfully support this resolution. So if this resolution had been put on the floor with the proper rules of order, which is a big if, then I would have to vote against it because it mentions B."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay. Down in front, please."

[Senator Cynthia Bowman](#), Law School. "I just want to say something on this point of procedure. Again, I think, agreeing with the previous speaker, my faculty has never seen this, what is on the board right now. And I am a member of the UFC, and I had never seen it before coming in here, so I object to being asked to reach some kind of resolution on this, or this absorbed into B.

"When we can get back to what we initially thought we were coming in here for, I do have some things to say on behalf of the Law School, but I object to this procedure."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Announcement for this meeting had the agenda, and it had a link to this resolution, so what was sent out on Monday. Everyone saw this on Monday."

[Senator Thonney](#): "Point of information and point of order. I would like the chair of the meeting to rule on whether or not this resolution is even in order or germane to the main topic."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "So how do we proceed? Do we take a vote on --."

[Senator Thonney](#): "It is not germane."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "You are saying it's not germane. Do we take -- shall we take a vote on --."

[Senator Thonney](#): "It is out of order."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "I don't think it is out of order, but -- I don't think it is out of order, and I rule that it was part of the agenda and it was distributed to everybody, and so I claim it is not out of order."

[Senator Thonney](#): "But it has not yet been seconded, Mr. Chairman."

[Senator Birman](#): "I will second, if that is an issue for people. I think the core issue that we should recognize here is that the dean of the faculty has given us a choice of A and B, but not in a form that we are allowed to amend. Therefore, we are forced to vote on A or B in the form given to us, and that forced it to follow the process he followed, which he started following some time ago. And the form in which this comes to the senate was determined by the dean of the faculty and the UFC, not by Dick."

"My department has asked me to vote for B, as amended. They haven't told me what to do if it's not amended. And I want to say that I, myself, am very troubled by A and B, without this amendment to B, and a little troubled by B, even as amended, although I think in the end, I'll do as my department asks."

“And the reason is that I think out of a sort of theoretical fear of bias, the departments, we are all being asked to violate privacy.

“There was a comment that the purpose of these policies is to prevent coercive behavior. However, in the previous meeting and in the documents, it stated explicitly the university already has a policy against coercion, against harassment, against other types of abuses, so this is actually not a policy about coercion.

“It is a policy about consensual relationships entered into by mature people, not at age 18 necessarily; could easily be talking about a graduate student or a post-doc at age 30, adults who enter into a consensual relationship. A wants to ban all such relationships. B demands disclosure, even in situations where individuals might prefer to keep things private. I find this very offensive.

“Now, having said that, if amended, I will do as my department asked me to do, and I'll vote for B. Non-amended, I absolutely cannot support either of these because of the intrusion into privacy.”

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): “I think it is unfortunate our discussion has sort of devolved into, you know, a lot of the procedural issues, which I think are very real, but we are not really able to get to the heart of the issues that many people want to discuss. So at this point, what I want to remind everybody of is that we actually have a policy in place regarding consensual relationships.

“And the discussion has moved, I think, to an assumption that without voting on either A or B or without voting for A or B, we will have no policy. The reality is we do have a policy. There is a link on the web site to it. Unfortunately, it seemed a little buried in there. Not saying that was intentionally done, but it was a little hard to find it, but just to remind everybody that there is a policy – I am not going to read it all out, but the policy recognizes the potential for conflicts of interest, even where you have consensual relationships.

“The heart of the policy that exists says that romantic or sexual relationships between students and persons in positions of authority compromise the relationship between students and the university. No member of the university community should simultaneously be romantically or sexually involved with a student whom he or she teaches, advises, coaches or supervises in any way. Individuals in such positions of authority must not allow these relationships to develop or continue.

"So we do have a policy in place that says where you have -- where you are in a position of authority with students, you are not supposed to have a relationship with them. It is very straightforward, and so I think it's very important for people to realize that if you see that there are flaws with A and B, which I see -- I think both A and B are overly broad and intrusive in terms of removing people's choices about relationships and then forcing them to disclose relationships which are private and consensual.

"I will vote for neither A or B, but I think when people are considering this, they should realize that in voting for neither A nor B, that you are actually leaving in place an existing policy."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "My distinguished colleague here, the parliamentarian, has suggested that we formally put this resolution on the floor. And so would somebody be willing to move it, and somebody else, if they felt so inclined, to second it?

"Dick, do you want to move it? Okay. It has been moved. Would somebody be willing to second it? [Ted Clark](#) will second it.

"Okay, so now the debate that we are having is on this resolution. Should this be an amendment to -- and it says up here to Policy B. And this is independent of whether you vote for A or B in the ballots. This is simply a question of this resolution, and that is what we would like discussion on.

"Eric, I think you are next."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "I think perhaps you cleared it up. I have signed on to this not because I am for B or A. I agree with Risa's analysis, actually, but simply to have an alternative to B. So I assume that is what we are voting on. We are not voting for Resolution B in this form. Okay? That's clear enough?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): Well, I think what you are doing is passing a resolution, which has an opinion, which is appropriate to Resolution B. And I think [Bob Thorne](#) is next in the back."

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "Can we have a friendly amendment, so it's clear we are not endorsing Resolution B with this change, but we are only endorsing the change to Resolution B, which will subsequently be voted on, along with Resolution A?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): "I think that does clarify things. I take that as an amendment. Is there a second to that amendment? Okay, there is a second to that amendment.

"Can we have anonymous consent? How about that? Mr. Parliamentarian, I -- okay, my expert says that I can accept that or not, and I suggest that we simply take a quick vote of hands of everybody in favor of -- my what?

"I am sorry, I am still not able to hear the critical word.

"If I can get unanimous consent, then we proceed. Yes, sir?"

[Senator Louge](#): "I would like to continue the discussion, if I may. I would like to agree with my colleague and propose a further amendment, which will read as follows: On the first sentence, I would say, "Be it resolved that the senate amends Policy A or B, with the following revision."

"And then, on the second to the last line of the first paragraph, I would have, "Unlike the current CPR B or A." And then anywhere that CPR B appears, I would put "or A." The idea behind this is not to tie us up in one or the other, but to recognize that there is a merit in this amendment and to recognize that this resolution, in fact, is an amendment to the main discussion, which I hope at some point we'll get to.

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Yeah. I guess that -- ask the question of the proposer of this resolution, whether you would accept that as a friendly amendment."

[Senator Miller](#): "Well, there are five senators who proposed this. Look, it is very frustrating that we haven't gotten to substance. By endorsing B, this was meant to present substance, but it is not working.

"I take it that an amendment has been proposed, in effect to say be it resolved -- this is the first one, which I would prefer -- be it resolved that the senate revises a Consensual Relationships Policy B as follows. If that's the sense of what was proposed -- yes, I'm disagreeing with you. Yes, I'm disagreeing with you.

"I mentioned the first proposal. I second the first proposal, just because it's first, has precedence, so I guess it's on the floor. Maybe we should quickly vote it, because gosh, this procedural stuff, uh."

[Speaker Walcott](#): “Okay, I think we have an amendment which says this would apply to A or B. The amendment has been seconded, I believe. No? Someone willing to second it? Okay. It has been seconded.

“So the question is, we have discussion on the amendment that this would apply to both A and B. Is there discussion on that? Anybody want to comment? Yes. You need a microphone. Hang on just a second. It is coming.”

[Senator Ellis Loew](#), Biomedical Sciences: “A prohibits relationships between faculty and graduate students. If this resolution becomes part of A, then what is the difference between A and B? Then there becomes no difference between A and B; because now, if you disclose under A, then to me, it looks like it becomes B. Am I reading this wrong? I am, okay.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): “[Rob Thorne](#), you've been trying to get in.”

[Senator Robert Thorne](#), Physics. “I think there's some interesting elements to this resolution, but I think it's an enormous distraction from what should be the primary focus of this discussion, which is a vote on -- a discussion of and vote on A, B or neither A nor B. This is an extremely complicated issue that is not going to be resolved by either of the proposals.

“There is going to be a long process after the vote, in which a full policy, a 6.X office, all these things have to be developed. What we're trying to do here is make some general statement of principle about what should happen, and I think the choices that have been presented between A and B are the choices that the other assemblies have considered, and they are the choices that we should consider.

“On the ballot, there's a very clear instruction, very clear place that you can write your comments. We all -- you can also email them in to the dean of the faculty. I think all of that, including all of the other comments that have accumulated on the web site, all of that needs to be considered, as the policies and protocols are developed going forward.

“I personally think some of the elements of this resolution have merit and should be incorporated, and I will make that statement in the email that I send to the dean of the faculty, but this has no business being discussed now. It could be discussed after, but it doesn't -- shouldn't be conflated with what our vote is about today.”

[Speaker Walcott:](#) "What is on the floor at the moment is an amendment, which says that this resolution applies to A and B both. That is the amendment that's on the floor. That is what we should be discussing.

"Well, it may not make sense, but that --."

[Senator Cheyfitz:](#) "You can say it simply by saying be it resolved the senate endorses the revision of Consensual Relationship Policy B.

"Be it resolved that the senate endorses the revision of Consensual Relationship Policy B. And that's a simple statement, and you don't need A or B. We want to amend Policy B, okay?"

[Speaker Walcott:](#) "I am sorry, but what is on the floor is an amendment, and I want to get that one resolved quickly, so -- thank you. All in favor of calling that question, hands up, please."

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** "What question?"

[Speaker Walcott:](#) "The question of whether this applies to A and B. Okay, I see a majority of hands for calling the question. So we now will take a hand vote on the proposed amendment that this resolution applies both to A and B. All in favor of that, please raise your hand. That is a rather dramatic --."

(LAUGHTER)

"Okay, all opposed. I say it is essentially unanimous. The amendment fails.

"Okay, so Mr. Parliamentarian, what next?"

[Senator Cheyfitz:](#) "Can I move another amendment?"

[Speaker Walcott:](#) "No. Dick, please."

[Senator Cheyfitz:](#) "Be it resolved the senate endorses the revision of consensual - what? I am adding two words. English Department, right? So we deal in this. Be it resolved that the senate endorses the revision of Consensual Relationship Policy B, with the following."

[Speaker Walcott:](#) "The question is would the mover of the -- he said no."

[Senator Miller](#): "It is not my property. An amendment's been proposed."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Must be somebody's property. I think that that personally makes a lot of sense, Eric, but --."

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER**: "I will second."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay, we've got it moved and seconded, and you can call the question, if you wish."

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER**: "Call the question."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "All in favor of calling the question? Okay. Good. So we've called the question. All in favor of Eric's proposal? Put your hand up, please."

"All opposed? Well, the majority clearly is in favor."

"Okay, so now the wording has changed slightly. Would you give it once more, Eric, for us?"

[Senator Cheyfitz](#): "Yeah, be it resolved that the senate endorses the revision of Consensual Relationship Policy B, with the following revision. So it just endorses the revision, okay. Well, with the following change. Yeah, with the following language, of the following change."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Fine. Okay, so now we are open for discussion on that."

**Anna Waymack**, Medieval Studies: "So I obviously haven't had a chance to consult with my co-chair on this yet. Sorry, Charlie. I am Anna, the co-chair of the Relationship Policy Committee. There is clearly enough discussion on this and enough difference of opinion on how disclosure should be handled that I am going to suggest, with Charlie's assent, hopefully, that we will include this resolution in our final report to the president, regardless of whether or not it passes, as substantial and thoughtful feedback from the community."

"So it will at least be there, if you wish to reference it in your votes in the paragraph you append, whether or not it passes this body. Thank you."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay, further discussion?"

[Senator Brown](#): "I don't know what kind of point this is. I would like to hear discussion of each of the proposed prohibitions, substantive discussion about the"

content of those prohibitions at this point, and then I personally would like to see not using this green ballot, and then have a ballot which includes each of these prohibitions. And you can assemble an A, a B, whatever from those prohibitions, which were favored. This is pretty much -- well, anyway, I would to hear the specifics discussed."

[Senator Rhonda Gilmore](#), Design and Environmental Analysis: "I was a member of the Consensual Relations Committee. The reason why many of us felt that this was not an appropriate recusal plan was that it involves people who are not trained, not professionals and not objective. There is no dean or chair at this university who has had any training in this very sensitive topic, and so I do not endorse this revision."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Thank you. Further discussion? In the very back.

"Just a second. Need a mic?"

[Senator Brian Kirby](#), Mechanical Engineering. "I call the question."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "The question has been called. All in favor of calling the question? The question that is being called is on this resolution, as modified. So the question has been called, and the question is all in favor of calling the question, please raise your hand.

"All opposed to raising the question?

"I would say it clearly carries, so we have come to a vote on this resolution, as amended. And I would ask all in favor of this resolution, as amended, to raise your hand. Ten in favor.

"Opposed?

"30 opposed, so the motion fails, and that is all the material that I have for today, and so I suggest adjournment."

(LAUGHTER)

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** "If time permits, there would be additional discussion, and that's the item we're on now."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Thank you."

[Senator Bowman](#): "I would like to speak in support of -- what is it called? CRP A. The Law School faculty supports that version of this policy. I have spent my entire adult career studying issues in sexual harassment, sexual abuse and problems of power in intimate relationships, and I very strongly support CRP A.

"And in doing so, I'd like to emphasize who we are kind of legally and ethically. We are fiduciaries. A fiduciary is someone who is in a legal and ethical relationship of trust, to look out for the welfare of the beneficiary. Those are our students. Other fiduciaries are doctors to their clients, lawyers to their clients, psychologists, psychiatrists, priests, even accountants.

"And what these relationships share is the trust placed by the client, the harm that can be done by abuse of that trust, and a power imbalance between the parties. All those professions have banned sexual relationships with their clients. The reasons that have led these professions to bar consensual relationships are present here, but in even more aggravated form.

"The lawyer-client relationship is often very short in duration. The supervisor-graduate student relationship is years long. The lawyer-client relationship is usually between two mature adults. The teacher, especially to undergrad relationship, is not.

"Undergraduates often do not have concrete plans or ambitions. They have only a vague sense of their place in the world, and they're dependent, to some extent, upon their teachers, upon us, to help them become grounded. That's part of our mission.

"And in teaching, as in other professions, a sexual relationship destroys the objectivity that is required and depends upon some degree of distance. In education, this lack of objectivity is very risky, and it can spill over into perceived lack of objectivity with other students as well.

"We are also uniquely vulnerable to temptation, in a way, because we deal with a client population that contains, by definition, large numbers of young and attractive students, so we need to put barriers on ourselves. That is what we're talking about, putting a professional barrier on ourselves. A bright-line rule, I contend, is the only one that will work to ban this. And if we do so, this will

align us with all those other professions and with most other universities at this point as well.”

[Senator Carl Franck](#), Physics: “So my department does not have a coherent voice on this subject, but I think some really important points have been raised. There has been very strong support for A. The point of education is very important here. We all like P1. We also appreciate the Policy 6 office and what it would offer.

“But also, there's a potential -- a problematic thing here, and particularly where the Policy 6 office operations might collide with internal workings of our own department; in particular, in terms of promotions. We really see clearly how information that would be vital to the department might be not available because of Policy 6 operations.

“Okay, so then a principle has been advocated, and I think Risa said it quite eloquently -- very positive for me to be able to quote her -- this principle was also advocated that very much relationships are outside of our -- no business to us, in our -- these are human relationships that we have no business with.

“So the other point -- last two points I want to make is the exclusion rules are very poorly written. And I appreciate it was written that lawyers -- in order to enact this, it's so broadly written that it would be ineffectual.

“The last point I want to make is we feel very strongly in our own department, Physics, that we are professionals. And again, I go back to what Risa said, in that we want to be the primary, if you will, enforcers of this.

“And the last thing I want to say is also, on a personal note, I've been here long enough; there's a clear situation where P3 is wrong, just simply wrong because of relationships that we knew about. And I can just show you, as an example, would simply be, in my own opinion, a tragedy, had that been enforced. Thank you.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): “Other comments? Yes.”

[Senator Richard Bensel](#), Government. “Very brief, there are two things that bother me about these -- or trouble me about these proposals. Our department is split, though I think probably a majority of our department -- it's an informal

poll, but it looks like they would favor one of those proposals; but I, myself, am quite disturbed by it.

"First thing that bothers me is Office 6.X, which could be a repository of accusations by disappointed graduate students and others, who would then accuse -- getting an adverse decision in their department, accuse a couple, of a relationship, and that becomes an intrusive investigation. It would have to be an intrusive investigation. That is part of the trouble -- the trouble that I see in this thing.

"But the other thing that bothers me, all through this, it says romantic and sexual relationships, and that language -- I think Risa's right about this. I went back and looked at existing policy, and it looks like it covers this already, and it does it in a way that has practices and so forth that are already in place.

"But look at that language: Romantic or sexual relationship. Okay, so what is romance, without sex? It's friendship. And friendship is actually -- friendship, mutual advice, nurturing, nurturing advice to graduate students, that's part of what we do. So this is -- either this is all about sex, or we're after friendship as well.

"The thing that bothers me secondly about that is that's not where I see the problems in these kinds of decisions. More directly, more commonly, I see often decisions made by jealousy, antipathy, intellectual disagreements. We negotiate those on a daily basis. We can negotiate this too. And the idea that we would set up an Office 6.X that says we cannot do that, I think, is just a mistake. It is wrong."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Other comments?"

[Senator Lieberwitz](#): "I would like to follow up on what Richard Bensel just said, which is that our choices between those kind of bright-line rules, as if we -- which I think assume that everybody's sort of a predator in waiting, as opposed to a more situationally sensitive kind of approach to the reality of relationships between people that develop.

"And I think that the situationally sensitive approach is the one that we should hold ourselves to, as professionals. I mean, [Cynthia Bowman](#) said we're in a fiduciary relationship. We are not in a real fiduciary relationship. I think you

are drawing an analogy, and I think that should be clear, but I do not think we are -- we are not in loco parentis.

"We do have adults who are our students at various stages, and I think that the nature of the relationships we've developed, we develop with them should be sensitive to all the things that we believe in about consent, about respect, and that the current policy enables us to do that.

"I would also add something, which is that we're an educational institution. I know people know that, but I think we should remind ourselves of that, in relation to how we are dealing with these issues, because we can keep the policy in place that we already have.

"And perhaps what we should really think about is, as educators, how should we supplement our current policy with our ability to have increased education, have classes, workshops, support discussions that are very real about sex and sexuality, about relationships that we have in a world that's extremely unequal in many ways, and about how people can make conscious decisions that they are feeling comfortable with, as opposed to telling them no, you can make a conscious decision and you can't carry it out, because we know better than you do.

"I think we serve our students best by doing what we do best, which is educate and to apply our knowledge and our ability to join with our students and have these kind of discussions in ways that raise people's consciousness about their choices, rather than making their choices for them."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Yes. Microphone. We have about five minutes left."

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER**, Law School: "So I think it's worth noting, when we're talking about treating the students as adults and their agency, that all of the students who are on the committee to study this matter concluded we should have a ban on undergraduate-faculty relationships. So to the extent that we are taking them seriously, we should be taking seriously their desire for a ban.

"They don't want sexual access to faculty, and I think we should respect that. Having the possibility of sex with the faculty alters the atmosphere in a classroom in a way that I think is not in anyone's best interest.

"Also, I would take issue with this notion that if we have a policy like this, students are going to invent relationships in order to contest their grades. And that is the sort of oldest kind of rape myth in the book, and I would prefer that not be part of the conversation here, that we not bring that in. It is objectionable and it's incorrect.

"So anyway, I would just go back to the idea that if we're treating them as adults, we should take their request to us seriously."

[Senator William Sonnenstuhl](#), ILR: "I just want to follow up on Risa's comments, because I think they're really important. One of the things that I've realized, as we have been talking about this and we have been talking with our own faculty, is how often our faculty and our students don't realize we have a current policy. The current policy has not really been implemented very well.

"Over 20 years -- and I recall when that policy was passed. I cannot recall actually being at a faculty meeting where we've actually discussed it. I cannot recall actually when we've hired new faculty and they come in, in the fall, that that policy actually exists. I can't recall a time when we've had an incoming class of students and we told them that this policy actually exists.

"So I would submit that one of the problems of our current policy is that, like so much in the loosely coupled organization that we live in called a university, very few of our policies has actually been implement. And that happens to be a sociological and organizational fact. That's the kind of organization we live in, so we've got to think more about how do we implement this current policy.

"Because what happens in these loosely coupled organizations, is we say oh, it's not working. Let's create a new structure. It's a ritual that's supposed to make us feel better that we solve the problem, but it comes back because we don't implement the new policy. So maybe we need to take a step back and ask how do we implement the original policy that was passed in 1996, because I'm not convinced that it's actually been implemented very well."

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Yes, go ahead."

[Senator Miller](#): "In addition to turning in ballots, can we at least have a show of hand vote on the alternative, so we sort of right away know what people think? No?"

[Speaker Walcott](#): “No.

“Yes.”

[Senator Clark](#): “I totally agree with the previous speaker, but the conclusion I reach is that the policies failed and, hence, the discussion and the need for a vote on these, on A or B.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): “We have one minute. Is there -- yes, Marty, you haven't had a chance to say anything.”

[Emeritus Professor Martin Hatch](#): “I am actually retired, so I have some distance from some of the aspects of the policy and, in that sense, maybe my opinion isn't -- but I did take a poll of our members, and there's some interest in music.

“Of course, we have lots of close relationships with students in teaching and ensembles and so forth, and there's a lot of emotion that's generated. That's what good music has in it. There's a lot of emotional interchanges between people. I think the problem here I'm trying to point out, as somebody brought the question of what's romantic; well, it's friendship without sex.

“You know, that may be a little far to say, but it is true that emotions and deep concentration and so forth is, you know, dangerously going in the direction of what somebody might call romantic. I guess I want to raise that question, because I think there's a lot more discussion that has to go on to talk about the specifics of the great problems that are had, that we are having in the face of the current policy, and if there are great problems.

“And that's something that's useful to document and think seriously about and discuss at some more length than instituting a new policy, which then sets up a new extravagant kind of monitoring.

“And in that regard, I want to say one small thing; who is choosing 6.4 Office? Who are the people who whom 6.X are reporting? In the case of 6.4, it's essential administration. It's an independent body, and I would suggest that's very dangerous, especially because 6.4 ain't working so well, ain't working so well.

“Let us think about that. If we get a 6.X, how much more will it not work well, okay? If we can get to some way of implementing the current policy in a more vigorous, responsible way, I think we have a better thing going.”

[Speaker Walcott](#): "Okay, that brings us to 5:00, which is our time for adjournment. And you have ballots, which you should fill out and put in the boxes. Meeting is adjourned."