

A MEETING OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
Wednesday, April 17, 2019

SPEAKER NELSON: All right. We're going to start.

I would remind everybody to make sure you sign in because we have to keep kind of a close count to make sure we have quorums because there's going to be some voting. And it would be a shame that we actually had quorum but we didn't know it because you didn't sign in. So if you haven't signed in, please do.

Just a couple quick things. I want to remind everyone that senators have priority in speaking and that only senators and their designated alternates may vote.

Also -- and this has been our practice, when you speak, it would be great if you could identify yourself and also tell us what department you come from.

And finally, I'd like to suggest that we have a maximum speaking time of two minutes. We have a lot to get done; however, if there is something really pressing, we can perhaps let you speak for three minutes. But we really are not in a situation where we can let you speak an unlimited amount of time.

So without further ado, I would like to introduce Charlie Van Loan, the Dean of Faculty.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. So some quick announcements. So you know that the RTE referendum passed, and now the work begins. We want to make this a success. So aside from the senate membership things, I would like to form this ad hoc committee that really looks at all the hard issues that are associated with those faculty; so, you know, recruitment, the criteria for promotion, switching ranks, emeritus status, improving access to external funding. There's a host of things to do here, which is very important. What I would like to do is pretty much form this committee in May, and then hit the ground running in September, some kind of line-up like this. Okay. So people from all the different titles, including in purple there -- remember, we had quite a bit of discussion about voting rights for lecturers, extension associates and research associates but they should be part of

this scene and can contribute quite a bit. So if you are interested in this or know of people, just email us and we'll take it from there.

Are there any questions or thoughts about that at this point?

Okay. Just a quick step through about all these different seats. So the rules are in effect now, but of course we're really talking about 2019-'20. And we e-mailed all the chairs that run two-seat departments because the second seat can be an RTE member.

And this thing about secret ballots, that's actually not new; that's actually in the bylaws, has been. And we've kind of ignored it, but it's actually very important from the standpoint of diversifying and broadening engagement. Rather than the chair going down the hall and picking somebody, we really want this to be a department effort. And it's not hard. It's not a big overhead, but it's sort of a key feature there.

We've talked to every single college and have a contact in each of the colleges who will receive e-mails from -- or who can be contacted by faculty who want to serve in that college RTE capacity. So we have that line-up. There's still going to be bumps in the road here, people not knowing exactly what to do, but in any case, those contacts are established and we can start doing that.

At the University level, we have these nine seats. Three are vacant, okay, which are up for grabs; then, we will make those RTE University at-large seats. And the mechanism there is just to contact our office.

A couple of practical things. You know, a quorum, we always skin along at these quorums, just barely over quorum if we're lucky. But we have this new feature now where we can -- to make sure business gets done, we can go into electronic voting. But we don't want to make that too easy, because then people will be discouraged from coming and it will devalue the debate quality of the senate.

So, you know, everybody will be given a chance. But like, for example, if we don't get through today, then in May, so we can wrap up the year, we would go into some kind of electronic voting just to get things done.

And that is on alternates, as well. You know, if you can't make it, you can have a designated alternate come; and if we did that systematically, we wouldn't have any quorum issue. So just be mindful of that. It's not a big deal.

Also, we have this sort of issue where you become senators and you take a -- you're on sabbatical and don't tell anybody or whatever, and then that senate seat just sits vacant. This actually happens. So if you're going to be away for a year, tell your chair and get a replacement because that hurts the quorum business.

Quick thing on what might happen in May. We have a lot of things that will come to conclusion then. We will have some recommendations about meeting times. This has been an ongoing thing that I've been involved with the registrar's office. Part of that includes the discussion of the 4:30 to 7:30 zone, so we'll probably have some resolutions on that.

A lot of work has been done on student accommodations. I hope that can get crystallized on a couple of resolutions that have been passed.

And then there are issues about retroactive issuance of grade changes. You don't know anything about this now, but it's something I'm spending quite a bit of time on. We'll inform you about that, and there might also be some extra lines that we put in the faculty handbook to make things correct. All this will be posted one week in advance of the May meeting which, incidentally, is just three weeks away.

Okay. Any questions on any of that?

Okay. Chris Schaffer is out of town, so I have to sort of do the sense of the senate things. So there are four of them, and these live off of comments that were made in the March meeting. Okay. So I will sort of give you a rundown of them. And we'll do show of hands; if it's close, we will then count votes.

The first one, it was the core values. Mary came and gave a presentation on that, and we had some interesting suggestions from the floor about -- suggestions about what those core values should be. There is a website. There is a place where you can go and register your thoughts about this. But these were things that came up in the senate last month that we feel are very important and somehow should show up in the final line-up of core value. So academic freedom

-- well, you can read the list there -- things that are perhaps particularly important to the faculty.

Any questions about that line-up you see there?

Okay. So the idea here, then, is just by show of hands, do you support -- we would send this to Mary, who is sitting right over here. Just so that it's in the hopper -- you know, you got probably around a hundred comments there on the web page, but we've put this in the hopper there to make sure that it's duly considered.

Everyone in favor of that, please raise your hand.

Anyone have a hesitation or abstain?

Okay, great. Unanimous.

The second one, you know, we were talking about the admissions scandal, and the discussion with Martha segued into, you know, the essay on the -- that shows up in the applications.

This is a gesture. It's obviously not enforceable. But if you had a line on that application that basically, you know, asking you to testify that that essay is yours, at least you know that people are paying attention to that. Anyway, it was a suggestion to be made about this.

Yeah. Oh, we need a microphone.

So a comment on this idea to perhaps increase in some way the reliability of what you read when you read an admissions --

CARL FRANCK: My name's Carl Franck. I'm from physics, but I'm speaking more as a father. Frankly, I thought it was a bit hypocritical. I mean, if my kid brought me an essay to edit or give suggestions on, I'm going to do it. And I -- so I want to -- I know there were some statements that were made to the effect of, Oh, I would never do a thing like that; well, then you -- I have a hard time wrapping my mind around that. So I think we should be a little careful of that. And I think -- I seen this handled in the past through our admissions office in a very good way. Our admissions officers have spoken at Ithaca High on this thing, and it's been

handled in a very positively brilliant way. So I think we should be a little careful about, you know, being too pure here. I have to say, some of those comments struck me as entirely hypocritical.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Other -- do you recommend that we go back to the drawing boards, or is the intent here something that you can see is salvageable, or do you feel we shouldn't do this?

CARL FRANCK: So I think the student has to be responsible. I'm going to call Ken Gabberd (phonetic) who says: When we get these things, we know that three generations have had their hands on it. Okay?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right.

CARL FRANCK: So I think the student should sign off. And I think that part of the scandal here is what these parents did to their kids when they didn't tell them that they were -- somebody was taking a test for them, or something like that.

So I think that that was a -- you know, they're going to live with that for the rest of their lives. But I think the student should be entirely responsible for it.

Also, I was the one in the senate who was responsible for the "we won't accept as a check from Cornell for the deposit for your tuition, unless you sign on to our academic code." Okay. So I, in the past, felt very strongly about statements of the sort. But I would say the student -- they sign off on it. Okay.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So I guess you don't favor this?

CARL FRANCK: Yeah, I'm -- it doesn't -- yeah. I would -- I would be called out on it, so I would be a hypocrite.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Yes? State your name and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) in philosophy. I wonder if this sort of problem couldn't to some extent be helped by asking the student to attest to authorship. Because it's one thing to -- I mean, there can be an author and an editor. If a student gets editing help from someone, that student can still be correctly characterized as the author of the essay. So attesting to authorship in no way implies that you haven't gotten some editing help.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right, right.

Joanie?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski in English. Before I would support something like this, I would want to take a look at our -- at the application and what -- you know, what are the instructions for the essay. If it's -- if the instructions are, Write an essay, you know, Write your application, your admission essay, then I think it's layers of write it and now attest that you wrote it and now swear on a Bible that you wrote it.

These levels of trying to prevent cheating and -- just say it once, you know, Write the essay.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Back row, then Ken.

ANTHONY HAY: Anthony Hay, microbiology. Didn't we determine in the University committee that this is already on the common app, that a similar requirement to attest to their own work is on the common app already? In which case, this would be moot.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I've forgotten, quite honestly. But it sounds like maybe we ought to not vote on this but have more of a -- perhaps get some people from admissions, do some homework on the applications, and then bring this up in the May meeting. Does that sound like a reasonable thing?

Yeah.

(Off mic)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I guess I would like to know if anyone would disagree with that approach?

JOHN WEISS: John Weiss, history department. I would just ask if I knew someone in Ithaca, but not necessarily with Cornell, whose job it was to be hired by educational institutions to detect whether or not those applications were written by the students themselves. Now, it would be interesting -- I think it would be useful for the committee or the admission people to know if that is done by Cornell. Do they hire people?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: One more comment and then we'll -- yeah, Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, computer science. Charlie, before I had my hand up because I was going to suggest what you just suggested; instead, I want to second it and say this is premature perhaps.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Yeah. So we'll do some homework. And just how it shows up in the May meeting, whether we actually have some people here or not, we'll be -- we'll let you know. But I think it's a very important topic but a complicated one. And I think we should spend a little more time on it. Okay, so that's going to be deferred.

You can -- in general, staff are underappreciated, and you can't do enough to change that. And one device that's been created is this appreciation portal, as a way of expressing your appreciation when someone on the staff has done something outstanding for you. So the only thing that we're saying here is that we encourage the faculty to use this, as one of the several ways that you can express your appreciation for staff.

Any comments on this, people who maybe have used it or have thoughts about it?

Okay. Show of hands, we just want to encourage the use of this. Okay. Anyone have -- okay.

The last one here is President Pollack indicated that there is going to be a review of eCornell, and we think that's a really good idea. But we really want to have faculty and all the correct senate committees involved in this from the very start so it's not something that shows up late with too little chance for input and so on.

So, again, we support the serious review of eCornell, and we want faculty -- the proper levels of faculty involved all along the way. Any comments on that?

Okay. So a show of hands again.

Okay. Well, thank you very much. Any concerns?

Okay. So three of the four things are closely unanimous or unanimous, and we'll get back to work on SOS-2.

The next topic here is something that started in October when there was a group that worked on procedures that hang off of Policy 6.4, which is concerned with bias and sexual misconduct. A number of concerns were raised at that point. And then at that -- then, early in December, the drafting group, together with several faculty and students and employees, revisited things. They stepped through the whole business again, produced a revised draft.

Cynthia Bowman was sort of the faculty lead on this. She's on leave, but she wanted this passage to be displayed, that's online as well. It basically says that the end result is something that she supports. You know, she was -- sort of took the lead or was one of the people who looked at the original draft, raised concerns and -- but then did something about it, helped form this second round of review.

And here to talk about it is Deputy Provost Siliciano and Mary Opperman from vice president, human resources.

DEPUTY PROVOST SILICIANO: Thanks, Charlie.

So let me -- Charlie gave some of the background. But for people joining the show now, let me just go over it a bit again.

The University has been in a process of looking at a number of our policies and procedures that are potentially outdated, in consistent with each other, in conflict with new legislation, have been the subject of concern from internal stakeholders or just could benefit from fresh eyes in thinking about whether they represent best practices in a contemporary sense. You've seen some of these. They've included the romantic relations policy, which the senate considered and revised last year. There are others underway. The research policy, the general ethics policy, those are all part of this backdrop. President Pollack has asked for a thorough review for a number of these.

The one we're currently talking about is, as Charlie said, Policy 6.4. As you probably recall, by 2016, we completed a two-year review of the student provisions for 6.4. And by "student," I mean cases in which the student is a respondent in a claim of sexual misconduct of various kinds.

We broke out the student procedures to do them first, that's where the vast number of these cases are appearing and it seemed important to do that. There



was a two-year process. It was vetted through all the governance groups, and it's been in place since 2016. These procedures were a very substantial change from a series of fairly underfunctioning procedures then, and they've been work quite well. They brought a lot of clarity, openness, procedural protection to the parties.

Following that, the focus turned on the part we hadn't dealt with, which was faculty and staff. There were two sets of procedures that were essentially parallel, one for faculty, one for staff. We were asked to look at that.

We prepared -- as Charlie said, a draft was prepared for vetting with the various constituencies, and it came to this assembly last fall. Most of the changes in the draft were met with approval or didn't raise significant concerns. I'll get to the ones that did in a second.

The ones that didn't raise concern, that were thought to be positive, were an integration of the faculty and staff procedures. There's one place where they vary; but, otherwise, they're integrated. That made sense. Faculty are -- we're all -- they're all employees. Procedures were parallel and unnecessarily different from each other. So they're integrated into a single set of procedures, which you've seen on the website. There was a very significant importation of the procedures that had been developed on the student side because they proved to be very successful. They're much more detailed, much clearer, much more transparent. They provide very clear process rights for the parties. They've been working very, very well. I'm on the final appeals panel for student complaints. Prior to the 2016 revision, there were constant claims within the University and to the Office of Civil Rights by both sides of the parties that our procedures weren't working appropriately. Now, there's a general sense that we have the right set of procedures in these cases of sexual and related misconduct. So we borrowed those extensively in the current set of procedures for faculty and staff.

Another component of the revision is that we provided -- this isn't in the students. This applies only to faculty. This is where the faculty and staff varies. It provides a very clear preemptive determination if there is a complaint against a faculty member and the faculty member says that the conduct in question was covered by academic freedom. The purpose here is to decide that early so that we don't drag the faculty member or the student -- or the complainant can be another faculty member, another student or staff. We don't go through the whole process delaying adjudication of what would be a legitimate academic freedom

case. So that's moved up front in these procedures. It's determined -- I will talk about that in a minute. So that was a second provision.

We had to adopt the definitions of misconduct from the student procedure so that they're uniform across all of the 6.4 procedures. Some of this is dictated now by federal and state legislation, so the language about the different forms of misconduct covered is the same.

And then we -- the new procedures extended the statute of limitations on bringing complaints. The prior statute under the old procedures was one year. There's a strong sentiment that that was simply too short, particularly given the context of graduate education.

As Charlie noted, however, there were elements of the draft procedures that caused significant concern. These are raised by members of the law, faculty, and others; and in particular, the absence of a hearing provision for adjudication of complaints against faculty and staff under the new procedures.

There is a hearing provision under the student procedures, and so the obvious question is why that wasn't applicable to faculty. There was a reason; it turned out not to have been a great reason, but there was a reason that the original draft did not have it. It was because there was available hearing much -- in a separate grievance procedure. There's a grievance procedure that's the default procedure for complaints against faculty when the dean imposes a punishment. In that case, there is a possibility of a hearing subsequent to that. And so the idea was to avoid redundant hearings, and so there was not embedded in the 6.4 procedures a hearing on the ground that subsequently if there was a sanction, the faculty member could seek a hearing at that point.

Very strong sentiment, I agree with it, that that is too little and too late. And so the revision subsequent to the conversation we had in the fall have moved the hearing up into the 6.4 procedures themselves. The hearing is essentially the same, very detailed, robust hearing that's available on the student side.

As Charlie mentioned, when we -- after we brought this first to the faculty senate, Charlie formed a committee led by Professor Bowman of the law school; had a representative of academic freedom and professional status of the faculty committee, several graduate students, Mary and I, University counsel were on it,

employee assembly, and Chris Schaffer as well. So it's gone through multiple revisions within the committee, and this is what's before you now.

Several details of it. It enhances the opportunity for alternate resolutions. Many parties entering the process really don't want to go through full bore adjudication. There were limits, complicated limits about the ability of these procedures, government limits about the ability of these procedures to have alternate resolutions that shifted a bit. And so we're working -- and as you'll notice, the draft calls out for additional development of alternate resolution mechanisms for these kind of situations.

The statute of limitations has been changed from the original one year to a three-year statute of limitations. There was a request, particularly from the graduate students, for an unrestricted statute of limitations for the obvious reasons that faculty can continue to be evolved. The graduate students have a long-term relationship with the faculty, and the ability to bring complaints safely is impaired by too short of a statute of limitations.

The committee ultimately resolved to set a three-year statute of limitations but has an escape clause for situations where it's determined under specific facts that a longer statute of limitations is justified in terms of a particular complainant bringing a complaint.

The hearing procedures, as noted, were brought in from -- equivalent from the student side and moved into 6.4 itself, instead of allow using the default much subsequent grievance mechanism. The hearing in this case would be conducted by a trained panel of hearing members. This would be a standing cohort of trained people, faculty and staff; and out of that, there would be a group selected for each particular case. If it's a case involving faculty, the majority of the hearing panel is faculty; if it's staff, the majority would be staff. But in all cases, they would come out of a standing body of trained faculty and staff.

A hearing would result in a finding, responsible/non-responsible. If there is a finding of responsible, the hearing panel would recommend a proposed sanction. At that point, the recommendation goes, if it's a faculty member, to the relevant dean; if it's a staff member, to the relevant unit head who will make a determination about accepting or not the recommendation and the sanction. That determination itself is appealable now to a three-person panel; this parallels

the student side, as well, which would represent the president or her representative; the provost or his representative; the head of human resources; and the head of student/campus life, again, paralleling the three constituencies.

The one remaining thing to call your attention to is that, as I noted, academic freedom is moved very up early into this. The member of Professor Bowman's committee who is from the academic freedom and professional staff expressed a concern about whether the definition of academic freedom that's embedded in the procedures is a strong workable one. We don't address that. That's really for the faculty, senate, and the committee to address. I would note, though, that the definition there is from 1960, so it's almost 60 years old. It may be absolutely the right one. The language is potentially hard to work with or may not represent contemporary thinking. It may not be refined enough. The draft just adopts it and incorporates it, but it does call out the committee's suggestion that this body, or one of its subcommittees, probably AFPS, looks at that language to see if it should be altered in any general way.

VICE PRESIDENT MARY OPPERMAN: And if it's altered, we'll bring in the new -- we'll replace what we have in --

DEPUTY PROVOST SILICIANO: Right, right.

So that's a summary. You have the full document in the attachments Charlie sent. I'm happy to answer any questions.

VICE PRESIDENT MARY OPPERMAN: I should also say I've been to the other assemblies, so they've had a chance to ask their questions; and they're comfortable with the revisions. And I guess personally, if I may, I'd just like to thank Professor Bowman. She led a really thoughtful, careful review and made sure that everyone's voices were heard.

DEPUTY PROVOST SILICIANO: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: (Off mic) it will show up in the May meeting with a sense of the senate as to hard walk to crystalize our thinking about it.

Before I get to the next session, we have these sign-in sheets. If you came in late, we want to make sure you've signed it. If you -- we'll circulate them if you

haven't. Please raise your hand if you haven't signed in because we want to base our quorum count on these.

SPEAKER NELSON: We're very close, so it's very important that everybody signs it that's an eligible voter.

So the next group is going to discuss social science review. Can I have the Provost, the Deputy Provost, Professor Ferguson and Professor Wildeman come forward?

PROVOST MIKE KOTLIKOFF: I guess we're all standing up here. No, you're standing up here, too.

Good afternoon, everybody. So let me -- I'll just start this off. We're here to really consult and have a conversation about where we are in the social sciences review. You'll recall that a couple of years ago now we initiated an internal review of the social sciences followed by an external review of the social sciences. A number of recommendations were made during that external review. This followed a number of previous external reviews, a 2012 report by the faculty calling for a school of public policy. Following that review -- before that review, I came and consulted with the senate. After that review, we had a committee of faculty that made recommendations about organizational structures. We came back and consulted with the faculty senate again. Then we've had a period of time where over the last, about six months, Melissa Ferguson and Chris Wildeman have been consulting with faculty. And we've had two other faculty reports, a report and ideas committee report and a report on infrastructure in the social sciences. And then Chris and Melissa have also summarized their meetings with faculty and departments in the social sciences.

That has led to a document -- a statement from the President and from me about our aspirations in the social sciences coming out of this that was sent to faculty. Those aspirations are basically three. One is that we create a center for the social sciences that is a University-wide center that oversees some core facilities, similar to some of our physical sciences and life sciences centers that also houses the institute for the social sciences and that reports to the Vice Provost for research as a mechanism to try and promote impactful research in social sciences at Cornell. And there will be, as part of that, some investment in programs that try

and bring faculty together in a collaborative way to do some big things in the social sciences.

The two other recommendations were to, one, create an entity in policies similar to the 2012, but not as specific about how we would do that. And that, Chris, Melissa, and John are now going to spend the balance of this semester, into the fall, talking about how exactly we do that. And the aspiration here is to create a world class public policy entity and number of ways to do that, and we want to do that in a thoughtful, collaborative way that occurs over time. And that will occur over the next, as I say, six months or so.

The second component of that is an effort to connect faculty and similar disciplines through super departments. The faculty senate is certainly aware of the fact that we have a number of super departments at Cornell in biology, neurobiology, earth and atmospheric sciences. These serve to connect faculty that have PhDs in the same discipline. In the social sciences, we tend not to have those, and that has led to some issues that have been raised over and over again in external reviews about connecting the faculty. So the effort here -- and, of course, we were -- we took one step towards that a number of years ago in economics where we extended economics beyond arts and sciences into labor economics within ILR and connected faculty in that way. The effort here is to think about doing that in sociology, psychology, and to further extend economics.

So with that introduction, I'd ask if there are any other comments? And then open it up for consultation of the faculty senate.

DEPUTY JOHN SILICIANO: I would only add that Chris, Melissa, and I, it's not us that are chairing the committee.

DEPUTY PROVOST MIKE KOTLIKOFF: Oh, sorry. Yes.

VICE PROVOST JOHN SILICIANO: So the committee has been announced. I don't know if you want to expand on that, Melissa?

MELISSA FERGUSON: (Off mic)

DEPUTY JOHN SILICIANO: Yeah, go ahead.

MELISSA FERGUSON: Yeah. I think the list of faculty, that was sent around in an email that you should have gotten on March 28th, I think, from the President and the Provost. But we have the members here on my iPad. I can read them out, if you're interested; but you should also have that information. There are eight people in addition to these that chairs.

DEPUTY JOHN SILICIANO: Please.

THOMAS BJÖRKMAN: Thomas Björkman, horticulture. In the middle of the social science process, I got the sense that there was a polarization developing between if we don't get all the social scientists together, nobody will know how great we are, versus what makes Cornell great is having social scientists everywhere in the University; and those were kind of pulling in opposite directions.

Now, what I've read sounds like you have managed to get good things from both of those ends. I wonder if you could describe a little bit of the dynamic of bringing that back together again.

MELISSA FERGUSON: Yes. I mean, I think that was part of the goal, to increase the disciplinary strength, as Mike was talking about with those three core disciplines, but also to continue to respect the interdisciplinary space that is kind of characteristic of Cornell and something we really value. So the hope is that the things that we're going to be thinking about over the next some number of months, many months, six to eight months, is how to kind of respect and address those two goals. So hopefully we can do that. But, yes, those things are very much in mind for us and for faculty who provided feedback.

SHARON TENNYSON: Hi. Sharon Tennyson from PAM and from public affairs. I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about the process you're thinking about using going forward. The email that we got on March 28th simply said you would be meeting over the summer and report back in the fall; but sounded like also that by the end of the fall, you kind of had hoped to have solved all these problems.

So what is the -- what is the plan for faculty engagement beyond this very small committee?

MELISSA FERGUSON: Yeah. So, I mean, feel free to jump in.

But we are -- we are thinking that there will be kind of a mid process check-in point, so something like the end of the summer, early fall, we hope to have a tentative update on what the committee has been talking about and what the potential recommendations are going to be. And so we will continue to be available. So all faculty will be encouraged to come to us if you have ideas or questions, but we'll also be providing this kind of mid-process update hopefully at the end of the summer sometime kind of to a broader audience.

And we're still working on figuring out exactly what the plan of action will be, so we're in the middle of figuring out strategy for the committee going forward over the next couple of months.

JOHN CAWLEY: Hi there. John Cawley, policy analysis and management in economics. So thanks very much for all the work you've done on this. I'm very much supportive of building around public policy, so I was really happy to hear that that's going to be an issue going forward. As far as the super departments go, I think that's neither sort of necessary, nor sufficient. Like, it could work out great, but it could also be just a shuffling. And so, to me, the building around public policy part was much more exciting than, you know, necessarily reorganization.

And so because you guys are going to be continuing to lead the effort, I just wanted to kind of give you the feedback. So we had lots of those meetings around departments, around disciplines, around topics, and I felt like the report that came out of that was pretty thin and superficial. And I wouldn't -- you guys are super nice people, so I'm not trying to criticize you. But since you are continuing to lead this effort going forward, I just wanted to give you that feedback that I kind of expected there would be a lot more substance about the feedback that you got in those meetings about some really specific topics. Because I think the details matter, right, in terms of getting this right and making sure that it's not just a reshuffling but actually is about making Cornell stronger towards building public policy.

MELISSA FERGUSON: Yeah. I mean, I appreciate that feedback. I will say we also got feedback that, Oh my God, that was a lot of -- that was a comprehensive summary. So it could vary depending on kind of perspective. We were trying to balance, you know, the possibility of relaying all of the many minutes of meetings and kind of informal conversations that we had both kind of with departments



and smaller groups, so, you know, just an overload of information, some of which was somewhat confidential. So if we had smaller groups or informal conversations with just a few people who did not want to go on the record with something, obviously that would also be something that we wouldn't be able to share widely.

But balancing kind of providing as much of that information as possible but also giving a sense of the themes that emerged from all of that feedback. So we tried to balance those two things; and it may not have been enough for some people and way too much for others, but we're also happy to elaborate. So if you had a specific question on something in the summary, we could -- you know, we could -- any one of us would be happy to kind of elaborate on that.

CHRIS WILDEMAN: So I appreciate the comment, John. And I'm on this group. I'm joining the entourage here late. And my role really, as I see my role, is just as sort of the mechanic to help deal with all of those details. The substance is going to be driven by the committee with input from Mary, but actually doing this and making it work is very challenging. And so I have worked on a number of these things, integration of the plant sciences in SIPS, early work on the economics department, on making the college of business actually viable. There's a tremendous amount of detail in terms of how faculty are aligned, what the lines are, how the tenure and promotion, hiring processes occur, all of those are -- you know, the effort -- we can sketch out sort of the theoretical gains, but actually getting it to work is sort of the stuff under the hood. And there wasn't that at that point. This really does require a lot of detail.

So the next phase, I mean, it's termed the implementation committee for a reason, is that actually getting it to run on the ground is part of the task, and that's the part I'm focusing on and just assisting in terms of making the substance work.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, computer science. I'm not -- (off mic)

(Technical difficulties)

-- he also put out lists of questions he was hearing frequently and what the two sides were, not attributed actually, summaries. And I thought that was very effective in his process (off mic). So I wanted to suggest that you think a little bit about using a similar process.

And in a similar vein, if I think back to the business school, there was a lot of confusion about the budget impact that changes would have. And there hasn't been a real presentation on that topic (off mic). So, again, I would just suggest that you put that out there upfront and -- to the degree that you can, and talk through the budget impacts, positive and negative, just to anticipate those types of questions.

(Off mic)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to make a quick announcement. If you speak into the mic, be careful that you don't hold it too low because you actually block the transmitter and then we don't get it over here. So hold it towards the top.

LINDY WILLIAMS: Hi. Lindy Williams in development sociology. I arrived on campus in 1993. Ever since then, the lack of disciplinary community has been a huge frustration for me, so I really appreciate these efforts and I just hope they won't stop where they currently seem to have stopped because our department remains largely invisible; and that, I just wanted to make clear, is not due to a stubbornness on our part. So thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I just -- I contrast that. I mean, you know, we hear from faculty that are very excited about policy; we also hear from faculty that evoke a similar frustration about lack of connection with their disciplinary colleagues. That's one of the reasons that both of these recommendations were forwarded.

ANTHONY HAY: Anthony Hay, microbiology. I have several collaborators that are social scientists and so I'm just wondering -- I haven't read the report, but what provisions are you envisioning for connections between social sciences and life sciences, for example, that strengthen the things that we think of as being Cornell's strengths across disciplinary relationships?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now I'm self-conscious about how I'm holding this.

(Off mic)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great. All right.

So, I mean, I guess sort of the thing that -- or the way I think about this, I have been thinking about this and the process is, the hope is that by uniting infrastructure spending and programmatic spending in the center for the social sciences and sort of making a broader umbrella there that we can increase collaborations both within social science disciplines but also between the social sciences, the life sciences, the physical sciences and engineering and also the humanities.

And so I guess the way I've been thinking about it is the specific policy piece may be important for broader collaborations across campus, the sort of super departments piece almost certainly isn't; but the center for the social sciences guarantees that we're already moving in that way to maintain and strengthen those sorts of connections. You look like you have a follow-up already.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So if you build it, they will come, sort of Field of Dreams?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think potentially a little bit. I mean, I think, you know, one of the things I'm -- I'm the associate vice provost for the social sciences, and so Emmanuel and I have been talking a lot already about improving sort of infrastructure spending in the social sciences. And one of the things that's been interesting is even just starting that exercise has helped us think about connections in terms of infrastructures that should be strengthened in terms of statistical consulting or computing or these other sorts of venues.

I think one thing, too -- and we've been sort of thin on specifics about the center for the social sciences. But one thing I can say from conversations with Emmanuel is that there's been a desire to think about budgets that aren't sort of set in the way that they have been with the ISS but that actually are tailored to the ambition of the project and how large we think the University level impact of those projects could be. And I think that's something that will facilitate a lot more connections, especially with the life sciences and physical sciences.

ALEJANDRA GANDOLFO: Thank you. Alejandra Gandolfo of plant biology. And I was wondering how you are -- if the departments will be maintaining their unity and their personalities, or they will be all under an umbrella and then the faculty renewal process will be under that umbrella or each department will have their own faculty renewal process?

MELISSA FERGUSON: So do you mean with the super departments or --

ALEJANDRA GANDOLFO: Well, when we fuse -- when SIPS was formed, the process on getting faculty renewal or new hires was totally changed from departmental to the whole SIPS. So I was wondering if that process will be the same in the center? Because that really affects your budget, and then you are adding more administration to all those different departments. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. I think the best answer is "still to be determined." You know, if I think about economics, that that has a component that is still ILR labor economists and arts and sciences economists. I think that's evolving in terms of those things that create a community, a departmental community, and those things that are really important to maintain as the mission of the individual original units.

I can say that, to me, the most important thing here is that we're in a position not next year or the year after, but ten years from now, in which we've recruited faculty that feel part of a whole. So we're not recruiting faculty over here and recruiting faculty over here and not having these people feel like they're part of their discipline where they got their PhD or these people over here feeling like they're part of their community; and that if these two groups participate in selecting and recruiting new faculty, that we will build together that community. So that's the aspiration. I think the details, how you get there, you know, whether it's like SIPS or whether it's a little bit more localized, I think that's to be determined.

I see one in the back.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this on? I'm (indiscernible) in development sociology, reflecting on both the last two comments. I'm a much more recent arrival than Lindy Williams. My degree is in sociology, and I share her concerns sometimes about wishing that I had more connections with people in my discipline, though I've been delighted that we've had some new ones.

I have collaborated with a list of people that includes anthropologists, geographers, urban planners, conservation biologists and a budding collaboration with a crop geneticist. And I bring this up because I've come to the earlier meetings, and when the discussion of the super department came together, came out, there was a lot of talk about how the sociology department didn't have a big

enough core sociology place and that a super department would enable it to be more competitive as a core sociology department; and that's an important thing to advance the discipline.

But another thing that's important for advancing the discipline is the people who are working with people really in other disciplines and stretching the boundaries and making the conversation that can often be very internal to sociology relevant to broader conversations.

And a big question about a super department is whether -- you know, like, I hear the comment that if we could form a community where people who are working beyond but also who are in the core working together with conversations. But it tends to be that the people who are working more on the margins are a smaller number, a much smaller number, than the people who are working in the core and often are not going to be essential to the organization of that. And so I would encourage that there be some institutional safeguards put in that can encourage hiring and other decisions that build the core but also maintain and build a reach to the fringes -- not to the fringes, but reaching across, filling in what sociologists call structural holes in networks. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I just come -- I hear you, and I think it comes back to Tom's original comments about what we're trying to achieve here, which is that balance. And I certainly recognize the concern.

The idea here is not to obliterate any translational or interdisciplinary efforts on the part of faculty that have a PhD in a certain discipline; that's not at all the goal here. But the goal is to provide that connection that many faculty -- perhaps you don't as much as others -- miss that connection but many, many do. And it is also to do the first thing that you mentioned, which is that we do, frankly, have small disciplinary departments. Part of that is because they -- there have been areas of those disciplines that have been carved out in the different departments. So if you take, you know, developmental psychology, we have a department that is developmental psychology so we don't have developmental psychology and psychology. And if you take labor economics and economics, the same thing existed before we extended the department.

So we're trying to achieve that and elevate the status of those departments, which is, of course, important for us to recruit the best faculty we can possibly recruit and create the best environment that we can.

CORINNA LOECKENHOFF: This is Corinna Loeckenhoff. I'm from human development. I would just like to clarify that it's not development psychology but actually human development and we understand ourselves as integrated developmental scientists.

And so I would like to echo some of the points that were raised earlier about the importance. As a gerontologist, my work is inherently interdisciplinary, even though I certainly have some interdisciplinary components. And so maintaining the ability to hire within those inherently interdisciplinary spaces continues to be an important issue. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know the rules, Sharon.

SHARON TENNYSON: One follow-up. Thank you. Sharon Tennyson, again, policy analysis and management and public affairs. And this comment is from the perspective specifically of public affairs. I know you've probably heard this from people in the government department, but I also wanted to raise it from somebody -- from the perspective of somebody not in the government department, which is, I understand the reason for the focus on economics, sociology and psychology specifically in the social scientists review. But especially when you start talking about creating a structure or an entity for public policy at Cornell, from a public affairs perspective, there's real concerns that our government or political science faculty is too small. And I hope that there will be some consideration of expanding resources towards that field, rather than simply saying, Okay, we have these three big groups of social scientists, and that's what we need to focus on. If we are going to create something around public policy, then that really needs to be an important core of that. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, thank you very much for your comments, very thoughtful and very valuable.

MELISSA FERGUSON: Thanks.

(Applause)

SPEAKER NELSON: So at this point -- it's great that we have some time and we also have quorum that we can actually deal with some of the consent items. Specifically, we need to approve the minutes from December, February and March, which I'm probably the person most responsible for those not being approved before.

So would someone make -- we can do them all at one time -- make a motion that those minutes be approved?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So moved.

SPEAKER NELSON: And did someone second them?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay. All those in favor of approving the minutes?

Okay. All those opposed?

Okay. Great. That technicality has been taken care of.

And now we have a little discussion and some voting. Charlie Van Loan again.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. So the two items up for discussion and votes, I think they should be pretty routine but whatever.

So as you know, we have numerous titles, transferring up the topic again. So one of them is research professors, one of the RTE titles, right? And arts and sciences would like to be able to offer this title.

So here are some of the reasons, and you see these same kind of reasons for all these sorts of efforts. One is like -- we have, actually, some titles for researchers: Research scientists and senior scientists. But people on the outside don't understand them. Okay. They do understand research professor because that's widely used across the country. And this is very important, right, because these individuals are researchers and they will be dealing with external funding.

We have -- in Ithaca, in our isolation, we have very intense dual career issues; and having the opportunity to offer a title such as research professor helps us with this very difficult situation that we face. No surprise that this is something that is

-- this whole effort here for research professor is driven and most concerned with the science departments.

Here's a little score card that I felt would be kind of interesting to show. So here's how it worked. Like in the early 2000s, there was enabling legislation that basically said those three purple titles are legal and available; however, it's up to the colleges to create them. So when a college decides to or wants to use one of these titles, they have to, you know, send in a four- or five-pager saying, here are the reasons, here's how we're going to do it, and so on.

And so you can see over the years -- there are about 80 of them now. It sort of goes 10, 40, 20 there, or whatever, if you add up those columns. And that's where we are right now.

So arts and sciences already has "professor," the practice would like to have research professor in their repertoire of available titles. And everything is online. You can go look at the full report.

So it was approved in the college by a very substantial margin. Here are some high points from the proposal. First of all, the amount of vetting when you hire someone in this capacity, the process looks like as if you're hiring a tenure track faculty member. The appointments typically are five years and can be renewed ad infinitum.

And then part of the deal in all of these things is in the enabling legislation is that there is some kind of control over the numbers, and it usually is framed in terms of a percent of the number of tenure track faculty in the actual unit in someone. So, for example, clinical in both the law school and in the vet is 25 percent. Here, the recommendation, the upper bound is 10 percent. Okay? So that's a feature that you would see in these proposals and exists in this one. And then there's language about, you know, can you vote in this event type of election.

So are there any questions about -- Professor Chernoff from astronomy is here should there be any questions to -- if you have any concerns or thoughts about this.

Okay. So I think we're ready for a vote. So this one, we have to actually count hands. Okay. So let's vote. Everyone in favor of this, please raise your hand -- actually, let's do it the other way because we know there are 57 people here.



How many are -- want to abstain or are opposed? Are there any hands like that? Okay. So one abstention? Okay.

SPEAKER NELSON: Let's make it clear. All those against, please raise your hand. All those abstained. One.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: No, two. There is two.

SPEAKER NELSON: Two, okay. All those in favor?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Thank you.

The next item, this is again not a crisis but something that came my way, which has to do with nonacademic staff being the instructor-of-record in a course, that means you give the grade, okay. And there were some instances of this and concerns raised about it, so the thought was, Let's clean up the language in the faculty handbook so that we get some guidance about this.

So here are some facts. These were the whereases, but I'm just writing them sort of in plain English. So first of all, out there are nonacademic staff members who are experts in certain areas and would be great at the blackboard, no question about that kind of thing. Okay.

Let's see. Yeah, then there's sort of this expectation that who -- you know, the person at the blackboard -- I'm old-fashioned, so I still use the word "blackboard" -- the person at the blackboard, you know, has some kind of academic credentials, that they have -- they're academic titleholders, that's kind of an expectation.

And then when we think about, well, who can do what, you know, there is kind of a difference between undergrad and grad teaching. Basically at the grad level, you would be more flexible and relaxed about this kind of thing; at the undergrad level, probably not.

So this is the proposed language that would then show up in the faculty handbook. And the basic thing is, you can do this, you can have a staff member that would, without any fanfare, teach a course if it's grad level and basically not required. But for an undergrad course, no. And if it's a grad course that's a requirement in your field, no. Okay?

Now you might think, Hey, this is kind of restrictive. I just got done saying there's a lot of talent out there that, gee, wouldn't it be nice to be able to tap into that for courses? You know, often we don't have enough time to teach all the courses we want. If there's talent in our neighborhood, let's use it. But it's not a big deal. This is like a one-hour exercise. You appoint people to academic titles.

So I looked at all the things out there. We polled all the colleges, all the registrars, whatever, and lots of people don't realize these are academic titles. If you're a visiting instructor or instructor or an adjunct, those are academic titles. Okay. It's a very small deal to -- you know, here's a staff person, you can carve out some percent of their job description and say, For this semester, you're going to be a visiting lecturer or instructor or whatever. It's a very small thing. And you might think, Well, this is just the red tape. Maybe that is a cynical view of it but what it does say is that, you know, we pay attention to who is at the blackboard. We have these academic titles. People work hard to be lecturers and instructors, and we shouldn't take that lightly. All right.

So the legislation is not restrictive. I had to make about two or three phone calls to chairs who had some staff people teaching courses, and they're absolutely fine with this. This doesn't touch, you know, like freshman-writing seminars; grad students who are appointed in certain capacities; summer school, likewise. So it's not really going to have too much effect, but it's just like one of those little corners that I think we should clean up. And here's why, because teaching over time now is getting more and more varied, more and more out of the classroom, more innovative types of teaching. And we still have to pay attention, all right, and here's a very small way of doing that.

Are there any questions about this?

MARIA FITZPATRICK: Thanks. Maria Fitzpatrick, policy analysis and management and also director of the Cornell Institute for public affairs, which runs the master's program in public administration.

I wonder if you might think about amending this to consider a difference across professional types of graduate degree programs, rather than sort of traditional, doctoral, or academic degree programs. The reason being that sort of the qualifications that we think are, you know, sort of useful in many professional settings might not sort of directly -- they might not be quite the same as we think

about the qualifications, for example, in teaching other types of graduate students.

And so, for example, in my program -- in the program that I direct, we have several staff teaching courses, some of which are required and, you know, some of which are experiential in nature, others of which are more academic in nature but this would require changing their titles, and so on, as you've described. And maybe it's just a few people and maybe it's not that big of a deal, but when I talked with them about it, they -- they thought it was a big deal. In part, they raised concerns that they might have around job protections and other sorts of things. So they didn't really -- they sort of would prefer to keep things with status quo. And given that it's a professional degree program, I think it, you know, could make a lot of sense to sort of, like, make an exception for that; much in the same way that the graduate school code makes a lot of other exceptions around requirements, and so on, for professional degree granting programs.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: If I can ask a question? The colleagues you talked with thought that going through the motions of getting one of these kinds of appointments is complicated and a deterrent?

MARIA FITZPATRICK: Yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: And, again, their reason?

MARIA FITZPATRICK: Well, they expressed not wanting to do it. The reason that they cited to me was about around job protection and sort of they felt like they had more security around their positions as staff than they would if they added on these other titles. I'm not sure how realistic that is; but, you know, regardless, they've expressed this sentiment around sort of, you know, preferring --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. But the staff person would have a supervisor. I'm going to have to tell my supervisor that I'm going to spend 25 percent of my time --

MARIA FITZPATRICK: It's already part of their contract, even as staff. They regularly teach these courses and so on. So, you know, I get it that in some way it's just a change of title; but on the other hand, this is a group of people who have been with the University for a long time who have expressed a sentiment that they don't want to see this shift --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay.

MARIA FITZPATRICK: -- and so I'm just saying that there is a cost to at least some of the folks in these types of positions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Comments on that or anything else?

DAVE ZAX: Dave Zax, chemistry and chemical biology. I think that having gone through this in dealing with people in our master's program, there is an assumption that there's a coherence to the numbering system, which I don't think is realistic, and that identifying undergraduate versus graduate classes is really hard.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The number -- if you look at -- I didn't -- it wasn't on the slides. It was 5,000 or above is --

DAVE ZAX: I understand that. And we have -- our most popular, I believe, graduate class is a 4,000 level class in our department that has undergraduates in it, as well. We have 4,000 level classes with sophomores in them. So I don't think that the numbering system is actually that well attune to the differences.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Do you feel there is a difference between undergrad and grad teaching? Forget about the numbers aside, do you think there should be more flexibility with grad level courses, whatever the number?

DAVE ZAX: I would say, yeah. But I would say that -- you know, if you ask whether our seniors fit in well with courses with our graduate students, I'd say, yeah, that's pretty seamless in most of the cases.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any other comments? Yep, Sharon.

SHARON TENNYSON: I have a question. Sharon Tennyson, PAM and public affairs. I have a question, and this may be I'm not as familiar with the writings as I should be. You're stressing a lot the appointment and not the qualification. So in your discussion of this, you're emphasizing that, you know, someone with an academic appointment has certain skills or expectations. If you have staff who are teaching, is there somewhere in the code that applies the same requirements for academic credentialing of those people who are teaching, or are you really just concerned about the titles?

So just for example, to follow-up on what Maria said, in SIPA, there is someone who has a staff position but has a PhD in political science who does some teaching, right. So is -- what is the concern, is it the title or is it the credential?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, behind every one of those titles, you'll find a paragraph where they'll talk perhaps about degree requirements and whatever. I just see this as a way of paying attention.

First of all, I talked to various department managers about the paperwork here, and it's not -- it's not hard, okay, so it's not like a burden on the people who have to do that. It's simply we should pay attention who's at the board. And no one -- this is not a disparaging thing about staff who teach; it's simply saying, We have titles, let's use them. Okay. We had all the discussion in the last few months about titles, and I just feel that -- the UFC feels in our discussions that this is -- we just have to pay attention, and it's not a big deal in terms of...

So whether you call that title or what the title stands for, it's simply saying somebody is going to have to look -- someone who does this, the chair, say, is going to have to take a look at that and say, Yes, this is okay. That's all.

Any other -- okay. So let us vote on this. Okay. Yes. So all those in favor of this -- although there sounds like there may be some ambiguity here, so let's really do a count. So please raise your hand high and we'll count if you're in favor of this.

I got 37. Okay.

And all those opposed, high and keep them up. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Okay.

And abstained. Okay. One, two, three. Okay.

(Off mic)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. There's a good and welfare --

(Off mic)

SPEAKER NELSON: We can -- we can check to make sure that all the people that signed up are still here, if that's a concern. But --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay.

SPEAKER NELSON: Or we can do the vote again. I think what happened was people just didn't raise their hand in any of the three options.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, Richard, you have something?

RICHARD BENSEL: The correct way to do this is that, you know, if someone notices there's -- or suspects there's not a quorum, then you count quorum. And that's probably what we should do. I mean, we can fudge around this question but it's been raised, you know, in effect, so we probably should count quorum.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay. So everybody that's a voting senator, please raise your hand.

Michael, will you count this row? I'll count the middle. And will you count that last section there? We will add the three together.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What do we --

SPEAKER NELSON: Everybody that's a voting senator, please raise your hand.

I have 27.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I have 11.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Also 11.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, so that's 49. So people must have signed in and left.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's our quorum?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Fifty.

SPEAKER NELSON: We're one short.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. So I guess this means --

SPEAKER NELSON: Did someone not raise their hand? Let's make sure. We're so damn close. Let's count --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a quick question. What's the procedure as being considered an alternate? (Off mic)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. You sign the sheet with your name, and you just check on that. (Off mic)

SPEAKER NELSON: And did you raise your hand at all?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I did not raise my hand at all.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay. So that gives us quorum.

(Off mic)

(Applause)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. So having gotten past that crisis, let's go on to the next one.

As you know, anybody can apply to have good and welfare, you have floor time. Richard Bensele so requested.

RICHARD BENSEL: So my raising the issue about quorum was sort of denying myself an audience. So there -- there is -- there was a handout when you signed in, you might have picked it up. If not, you know, raise your hand and, you know, get one.

The handout has two things, two items in it. You know, one is an announcement of -- by the University that there will -- has been created an institute of politics and global affairs; and the second item in the handout is a sampling of the media engagement of that center. Now, what I'm doing today in this good and welfare is to describe the process through which the institute has been brought to Cornell and then at the end, I would like to talk about something else briefly.

So the institute was at Long Island University. The head is Steven Israel. It was agreed -- I think this is right, though it's unclear -- agreed in December 2018 that Cornell would bring the institute to Cornell and transfer it. So the problem was to find a home for the institute and to find an academic appointment for Steven Israel. So the provost and the vice provost for international, whatever it is,

Wendy Wolford, came to the department of government and made a presentation in late January. That presentation did not go well with my colleagues. It was objected to the process. The institute was already being brought, and it looked like there were a lot of presumptions about, you know, what it would be before we would even ask to look at it or consider it.

As you see in the first part of the handout, this part, the announcement of the creation of the institute, that appeared in the following week. We had not agreed, as a department, to anything; and, yet, reading it: IOPG Director Steve Israel will be appointed as a professor of -- should be just professor of practice -- at Cornell, and he will teach a regular class in the department of government on Ithaca campus beginning in fall 2016. The department of government did not agree to that then. We have not agreed to that since. It is two months into it. There are still ongoing negotiations; I could describe those, but that's not the point.

The point is the process through which an academic -- this would be an academic unit or at least in most of the divisions of it -- Steven Israel would be a professor of practice in the government department.

This was all announced in the form you see it. And, to my mind, this is a travesty. In fact, most of you have been around a bit in the faculty senate, this is a travesty of all the rights, all the privileges, all the responsibilities of us as an academic unit with responsibility to our programs and our curriculum and who belongs to us and so forth and so on.

That's the issue. I'm not asking the faculty senate to do anything today and perhaps never when we address this issue directly. But it is an issue. And it's come up before, and we need to do something about it.

Okay. So let me stop there for a moment because there is another issue I want to bring up. I'm not being timed, so I'm okay.

Are there any questions? I'm not that good.

(Off mic)

CARL FRANCK: Carl Frank, physics. You said it's come up before. Please say what -- give those examples.



RICHARD BENSEL: The college of business is probably the most relevant one, but it's also come up in other kinds of arrangements dealing with different departments. But the college of business is probably the most applicable. For those of you who remember it, it's -- college of business is still a problem, but...

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, computer science. It says that the director will be appointed as a professor of practice. Actually, Cornell allows an appointment under a dean, not necessarily in a department.

Then it does say that he'll teach a course in your department. Are you, in fact, certain that they're appointing him as a professor in government, as opposed to a --

RICHARD BENSEL: They have asked us to do that.

KEN BIRMAN: They asked you to --

RICHARD BENSEL: Oh, no. This is an on- -- let's see. Last Thursday, so less than a week ago, Steven Israel came to Cornell. This has been ongoing. We've had meetings and meetings. But he came to Cornell to meet, finally, with the faculty. And that was the issue. We discussed what kinds of courses he would potentially teach and what he knows and so forth and so on.

No, this -- they didn't put professor of practice in the government department, but that's what they meant. And when they said --

KEN BIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much for that. The clarification is useful.

RICHARD BENSEL: Anything else?

So, anyway, that's the news, and that's the primary reason I wanted to impose upon you in a good and welfare.

The other part of it is to bring your attention that we have now formed at Cornell a chapter, the American Association of University Professors, and we invite all of you, any of you, who are interested to join that chapter. This is one of the kinds of issues that we wish to collaborate on across departments and as a faculty and, basically, as I would put it, reclaiming our rights and responsibilities as a faculty. So thank you.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay. With no more good and welfare, I will adjourn the meeting. Thank you.