

MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

[SPEAKER SAM NELSON](#): Okay, we are going to start. Please take a seat. One thing that I wanted to point out, that unlike in previous years where you sign in in the front, this year we are passing around a sheet for you to sign in. Where is that sheet? There's several sheets going around, so if you could please sign that sooner, as opposed to later. Maybe just a quick show of hands, if you haven't signed the sheet yet. Have not. There's quite a few people. Thanks.

Okay, I'll officially start the meeting now. There's a few consent items. The May minutes from our last meeting need to be approved. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes from last meeting? Thank you. Is there a second? All those in favor of approving the minutes. All those in favor, say aye.

(Ayes.)

All those opposed? Okay.

I just want to remind the senators that they have priority in speaking, and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote. I don't think there's any voting plan for today, but it's a good thing to keep in mind.

Also, if you speak, there's going to be a discussion, wait for the microphone. And then, before you start speaking about whatever you want to speak about, make sure you identify yourself and your department so we know who you are and where you're from.

I would like to suggest a maximum speaking time of about two minutes, so more people can speak; however, I'm not going to be that strict on the enforcement of the two minutes. I'll hold up an iPad here with a large clock on it. We'll let you know that your two minutes is up. At the end of the two minutes, I'll stand up. At the end of three minutes, I'll probably do a little dance or something, but the idea is please don't spend too much time, so that others can have opportunity to speak as well.

I think that's it. At this point, I would like to introduce Charlie Van Loan, the Dean of Faculty, to make a few announcements. Let's hear it for Charlie.

(APPLAUSE)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): These are announcements, but just sort of where we are with a number of things. There was ongoing business at the end of last year, and just want to give you a quick update what you can expect this coming year.

In the May meeting, we had a discussion about freshman admissions, prompted by the scandal or whatever, and we had visitors from the various college admissions office. There's ongoing stuff, and we have a new vice provost for enrollment, Jonathan Burdick, and we look forward to working with him on this.

One idea that was sort of floated was to have some kind of informal advisory committee, much like the FPC. The FPC deals with confidential financial stuff and provides advice and whatever, and relays things to us, and maybe have something analogous to that. Details have to be worked out. Both the UFC and the FPC separately will be meeting with Jonathan, and expect us to come back with some proposal, so the faculty can be more closely coupled to the admissions process, which is so important.

We had a thing about grade changes last year, and we have a resolution. The long and short of it is no change of grade can take place without the instructor actually seeing it. I met with all the college registrars back in June to talk about this. It's always more complicated than you think, but we'll be working with them to make this as smooth operations. There are many different ways grade changes can happen, and we'll take steps to make sure the message is out there and that this runs smoothly.

Student accommodations. My summer was kind of hijacked by some other business, and I meant to have this all ready for us to vote on today, but it's going to slide into October. The idea is to get a unified treatment of all the different accommodations, and we have a resolution. It's posted, and you will get some prompts about that very soon, so that we could perhaps vote on this very difficult, but important topic in October.

Sort of related to that, sometimes things happen on the outside, and you might have to make an adjustment to your attendance policy, if you have an attendance policy. For example, this Friday, there is a climate change strike, and you might find students not coming to your class. It's the instructor's call here on how to handle this, but two things you should just keep in mind for all this: One is what is the educational value of that event that's drawing the student away, and then let's keep in mind fairness; that's all. As long as those two things cross your mind, things would work out to my way of thinking.

We did all this RTE stuff last year, having to do with voting rights and who can be in the senate and whatever, but that was just Part 1. Part 2 is to look at all the many different RTE issues that are around. So we have a committee, we've already met. We are starting to work on all this stuff, and the idea is not to get uniformity across the ten colleges, but just to make people more aware of what the issues are.

For example, maybe you're going to be hired as a lecturer. Well, here are ten things you should think about when you talk to the department. So we're going to have lots of advice like this. There will be things coming here, hard resolutions, for example, if you want to have a framework for granting emeritus status to a long-serving senior lecturer, for example. So expect to see stuff coming out of this committee, not all at once, but over the year. And we'd like to put some of this into the faculty handbook, so these guidelines are well-understood and visible to all concerned.

There's a revision of the campus code going on. That's the business of the University Assembly, but there are parts of that that touch faculty directly; for example, various free speech components and whether or not the code itself should apply to faculty. We'll be talking about these things over especially the fall semester, but probably into the spring as well.

All last year, the Committee On Academic Freedom and the Professional Status of the Faculty, which is charged to oversee and monitor the tenure process -- so that's the right committee. It's a standing committee -- we are looking at everything along that path. And over the last year, we have developed tons of check lists and things.

Again, for example, here are ten things you should think about in reasoning about the number of external letters and where they should come from. Again, not looking for uniformity, but more clarity in the procedures and good advice for people to follow and pay attention to. Again, you will be getting some things from us over the semester.

There's tons of other stuff. So web accessibility is a very big thing. You might not have even heard about it, but the university and others are being sued because the way we portray stuff on the web is not suitable for people with certain disabilities. We're looking at that and trying to get the easily understood guidelines we can all follow to clean up that act.

The senate committee structure, let's think about perhaps streamlining it. Do we need so many people on these committees. Again, it is hard to get people to serve. Is this a venue where less can be more?

The social science review, it is not a review anymore. Stuff is happening. We'll be getting reports from them periodically over the year. And then an item that we'll talk about next month was Learn Where You Live courses and how they are approved and so on. The list could go on and on, of course.

A new development, I have a new colleague. We elected Neema Kudva for Associate Dean, and I have asked her to just come up here and say a few words. Neema, as you can see there, has very broad experience and will bring a lot to our discussions and so on.

[NEEMA KUDVA](#): Thank you, all of you, for voting for me, I guess, and having me stand here in this almost empty auditorium. Before I say anything, I say thanks to you, but I also wanted to thank the anonymous person who nominated me to be here, and Charlie and Chris Schaffer, who was the Associate Dean before me, for talking me into it.

And I think most of all, I need to thank my dissertation advisor at UC Berkeley, Mike Teets, who, along with two other faculty that I worked with at Berkeley, became chairs of the academic senate at Berkeley, which is, as for those of you who know about the University of California, a rather formidable and powerful body. And it was Mike and the other two who really impressed on me the importance of shared governance at universities and the importance of participating, I think, in the life of the institutions and the communities that we are part of.

So I'm here in that spirit, to listen and to learn with Charlie and to help lead our faculty senate and to make it reflective of the diversity of interests and positions and experiences of all of us as a whole. So tending to our institution, someone saw me at Wegmans the other day in front of the sushi counter, talking about why I am doing this.

And it reminded me that tending to institutions at this point in time, keeping them relevant, it feels particularly important when our body politic and our global climate, everything seems to be getting destructed, and so I am here to serve in that spirit, so thank you again for voting. Thank you, Charlie, for giving me two minutes, and I hope to see all of you at every faculty senate meeting from now on.

(APPLAUSE)

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): I should have mentioned -- I breezed through things that will be coming our way this year. Are there any comments or questions you would like to pose in that regard? Yes.

And state your name and department before you start speaking.

[CARL FRANCK](#): Carl Franck, from Physics. And when we talk about web accessibility, the only one I can think of right now might be captioning of videos. Is there anything more interesting than that?

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Yes, there's actually a lot more. So for example, HTML is preferred to PDFs. There's things about heading size, there are things about if you have a long web page, you should have a little index at the top, so you can jump way down here and don't have to scroll through. So what we are trying to do is come up with a short list of things that really improve the site. And this would apply to your own personal website, people in departments who maybe manage it, but it's a full-time preoccupation. It's a pretty serious thing that's going on.

Back row, Richard.

[RICHARD BENSEL](#): Richard Bensel, Department of Government. Charlie, I guess a query and a request. The grade change thing is really important. I think we should have a thorough discussion of what has happened with that and an elaboration. And I think this is a right, an elaboration perhaps part of a bigger discussion of faculty autonomy, rights, privileges, the status of faculty within the university.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Yes, we are in charge of giving grades, but there are rare exceptions when you can be overridden, if there's a Title IX thing, for example. So yes, we should bring more clarity to that. I'm going to be interacting with the college registrars more. This will maybe concern some data and other nuances to the issue, but I agree. The act of giving grades is pretty central to our business, and we have to be extremely careful about the regulations that surround that.

Risa. We're short of microphone runners, so just be patient.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): Could be like the U.S. Open.

Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Could you put the slide back up about what the Academic Freedom Committee's doing on tenure issues?

Okay, yeah, yeah. It's not on the list, and I want to just make sure, is the committee looking at all at the appeals process?

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): It's A, then B. This isn't exactly low-hanging fruit, but we wanted to do this first, just to establish our process and to make sure everyone is confident we are doing things the right way. On the agenda this year, maybe starting later in the fall is the appeals process and to look more carefully at how that is structured.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): I see. Could you talk a little bit more about the purpose of this review? Because from what you described, it sounded more like you said, best practices clarification, sort of how-to's, but that's a bit different from the possibility of real substantive change, so could you describe a little bit more about what's happening and also what will be the role of the senate in terms of approving, et cetera?

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Okay. In no particular order -- so again, we don't own this. So the senate would weigh in and it would be extremely important, but you have department chairs, the deans and so on, so it's a group ownership thing. Just like in the consensual thing, everybody is involved. We don't own that.

Well, I said low-hanging fruit. These things are not trivial. I have seen cases really go bad because of lack of clarity. Even things like oh, A should send B a letter, but who should be CC'ed? Stuff is at that level; you could actually have major problems.

The idea here is not to impose uniformity across the colleges and departments, because we all have different ways of doing things, but we really need more detail on all these sorts of matters. How do you reason about external letters? The importance of these are group decisions, the importance of having everyone on a tenured faculty at the meetings can't be minimized. So there's lots of stuff there. It's not exactly routine, and it's pretty central, so you'll see all this stuff.

If there's consensus about boy, we really have to do business this way, then we'll make a recommendation saying this should be part of the new world order, for example; but a lot of it is more clarity. Lack of clarity causes angst all around. We have to make sure people are doing the right thing at every one of those dots.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): Just to follow up, I agree with you that procedural issues are very important, so when I say substantive, I'm not contrasting that with procedural. I'm talking about whether this would actually be making changes in who approves it and where does it go, that sort of thing. It could include something like making things more open in ways that would be

very positive for the person being considered, for example. Just trying to get a sense of who weighs in when and what does this body do and that sort of thing.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Again, I think once we start presenting these things, this will be clarified. But again, it's surprising -- there's 70 departments out there. It's surprising how some of them do business. And I think we have to understand this variation and just think hard about it. The approval is a combined thing. Senate, the chairs have something to say about it because of their central role, the deans, and so does the provost. So it is a combined thing that we have to work on.

DISCUSSION: Prevention of device-enabled cheating during exams

Let's get on with the next topic here. This is a resolution that hopefully we'll vote on in October, and it's kind of a flip senate here. This could have grown up from the committees or whatever, but we'll send it to committees, the EPC and so on, but this is something we all kind of know about. So beginning this way, having a general discussion will be useful.

Here's the basic problem. The problem is it is getting easier to cheat. For example, if you go on Amazon and say exam cheating watches, you will get things coming up that are openly advertised that way. You could put PDFs on a smart watch. There's special pens that have displays on them. These things come with panic buttons, so if the proctor comes around suddenly, looks like a regular pen. And earpieces. So it's kind of an arms race, and the point here is to do something about it.

If you look at the high schools, look at some of the standardized test things, so you can't walk in and take an SAT without having to put -- you are not allowed to have electronic devices in the room. They have taken steps, there's policy out there already. Ditto for ACT: You may not handle or access a cell phone or electronic device, blah, blah, blah.

What does the resolution look like in brief? So this is up there right now. As I mentioned, you can comment on it. We have already gotten three or four really good comments about the pointed deficiencies in this. This is mimicked after the ACT regulations, but gives the instructor some measure -- some discretion. It's basically no electronic devices allowed, period.

Then at the proctor's discretion, for example, as I mentioned, some of these cheating watches look regular. So you might, just for simplicity's sake, all watches on the floor or hidden, provided there's a clock somewhere, or we supply the writing instruments, because I can't take a chance that you have a smart pencil or something like that.

We have to keep in mind making it easy for the proctor/instructor to pull this off, but also discretion. As I mentioned, we already got good comments on this. So one of them was from a student, because I'm running this by the Student Assembly, and their EPC was about watches. She had a recommendation about what the proctor might do so that you could use an ordinary watch at your seat and so on.

Sometimes you want to give an exam when you want the student to use a calculator or go online. So clearly, we have to put a phrase in there saying unless explicitly -- unless an exception is explicitly stated by the instructor, blah, blah, blah.

Anyway, that's the lay of the land. Our EPC will weigh in on this. The students have an EPC. They, too, will weigh in on it. We have ten different academic integrity hearing boards. Those are people who get to see things up close and have valuable opinions. Over the next three weeks, say, we will be gathering this information and refining the resolution so that it is more effective and makes sense, but what I wanted to do right now is see what you have to say about this.

[CARL FRANCK](#): Carl Franck, Physics. Before I came here, I was in Charlottesville, Virginia, UVA. When professors or instructors gave exams, they would go into a room, they would pass out the exam, they would write out where their office is on the blackboard and leave the room.

I can't tell you how much of our teaching life is spent in physics rewriting things, doing electronic things, doing all this stuff. It's unbelievable how much effort we put into this, and we get paid a lot more than we should to do it. We disrespect our students, we treat them like they're -- this is insane, and we are doing it and we are wasting our time.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): The mere existence of a policy doesn't mean you are guilty. We have researched misconduct policies. That doesn't mean that we think every faculty member's up to no good. If we have a policy like this, yeah, it may stop some things, but we are making a statement. I guess the point here is there's a trend out there that other testing units are doing this, to try to make it low overhead. As you mentioned, having to make multiple copies of an exam is extremely time-consuming, but what you are saying, then, is that the act of doing this creates a problem and disrespects students. Do we have a comment on that? Yeah.

[DAVID LEE](#): David Lee, Dyson School. I agree in principle with my colleague, but the reality is, for those of us that teach very large classes, in my case about 250 students, I think we need something like this, I regret to say. You characterized it as an arms race. I think it's totally appropriate. I have seen just about everything. Not quite everything, given what you just said, but almost.

Ultimately, remember, we are hurting the student. It's the student that suffers. It's the students that play fairly that suffer. It's not so much us; it's them. So in a sense, we are looking out for the best interest of those who play by the rules. So whatever the exact wording is, I think we need to go in this direction, I regret to say.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): I heard from the chair of the Undergraduates Educational Policy Committee, and she was okay with having -- again, the suggestion about logistics about smart watches, but we'll hear from them, Carl. So I think that will be extremely important, because we don't want to create a problem. I think we think there is some kind of problem out there that we have to address.

Right here.

[DENNIS MILLER](#): Dennis Miller from Food Science. I use iClickers to give quizzes in my class, and now iClicker has an app for -- called the iClicker Reef, so students can subscribe to it and use their iPhones instead of buying the little remote that they used to always use. Do you think maybe we ought to prohibit the use of these iClicker apps and require all students just to buy the remote?

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): All these things, I hope, come out in the next few weeks, hidden side effects like that. So that's a very important question and I think we should address it, yeah. Over here.

[THOMAS GOLDEN](#): Thomas Golden, ILR School, Yang Tan Institute. There's a delicate balance here. As we are approaching this type of policy, we need to remember some of our students with disabilities require electronic devices and tools as part of the accommodation process. So the degree to which that could be considered when we are writing the policy, as well as some secondary kind of firewalls on those systems that might minimize access to the Internet for them, might be helpful to think about.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Absolutely. Clearly, a student who needs electronic devices for disability reasons, clearly, a path is cleared for that. No question about that.

One of the articles perhaps cited mentions -- some of the devices might be \$1,000, so you get into who can afford it and who can afford that advantage, so it is a complicated issue.

Other comments on this?

Yeah, Risa?

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): I think Felicity Huffman can afford it.

(LAUGHTER)

Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I wanted to go back to what Carl Franck raised. Recognizing the problem, I don't think that this resolution actually addresses the underlying issue, which is what I heard Carl talking about, which is what are we doing as an institution that has moved very far away from any notion of an honor code.

On that, there was some halcyon moment where there was just great compliance with an honor code. Honestly, there never has been, but it's the underlying issue. Why are students feeling like this is something that they should engage in? And I think that's the kind of discussion that we should have, that we should have with students -- I'm not in love with this kind of resolution -- seems to me, to avoid this underlying issue.

Then one other thing is that I have thought about, as kind of a more direct way to actually help people take tests and help us to actually read them is to have software on computers. And I know the law school's used this for years, where -- I don't know how it works, but basically, you can't get onto the Internet when you're on the computer. It seems like that would be a much more direct way to deal with the issue and also avoid the pain of having to read people's handwriting.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): All good comments. I think we have time for one more question or -- okay, yeah.

[PAUL GINSPARG](#): Information Science. At your encouragement, I did look up and find cheating watches available on Amazon for \$95 in black or white. My own solution to this is I let students do whatever they want in the exam. It's open Internet, and with the warning that you will not find the answers in and you're likely to waste more time looking for them than you have in the exam, so I recommend you not do so. The bigger problem I have had is that of students communicating during exams, where I have a few instances of that, that was possible to detect by other electronic means.

I'm all for an honor code. Carl didn't mention that there were massive violations of this at UVA. They are very proud of it, but it's also problematic. I'm in complete agreement with people who feel we are disrespecting the students, but I also think the comment about doing a disservice to the students who are playing fair is an issue.

So I think it's important to have a policy just so that faculty members who, like me, were not even aware of the existence of smart watches, cheating watches and the problems that they cause have something to refer to, to know that it's within their purview to insist on certain restrictions on use of electronic devices.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Okay, very good. We are going to have to move on to the next --

Q&A with President Martha Pollack

[SPEAKER NELSON](#): At this time, I invite President Pollack to come up and give some Q&A.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Thank you.

And as is always the case, before we do Q&A, I'm going to take just a few minutes to give you some updates on what's going on. I want to welcome everybody back to the new year. I want to start, of course, by acknowledging the really, really tragic death of Greg Eells. I know that affected many, many people on campus. It was just a real tragedy, and I would ask you to keep an eye out on especially staff. There are a lot of staff who have taken this extremely hard.

And if you see staff who are struggling, give Mary Opperman a call, and she'll be happy to provide some guidance on this. It was a real tragedy for us.

Just a few updates. As always, I'm going to break them up into our four big areas of strategy, and the first is academic distinction. I don't need to tell this audience this, but I will. The faculty recognitions over the past year have been extraordinary.

Just over the past year, we have had a MacArthur fellow, a Guggenheim fellow, three Sloan fellows, two Simons Foundation fellows, two inductees into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, two to the National Academy of Sciences, one to the National Academy of Engineering, one to the National Academy of Inventors, ten recipients of NSF CAREER Awards and a recipient of the Windham-Campbell Prize in literature. So we're talking about science and the humanities and talking about senior faculty and junior faculty. And as always, it's just really remarkable what the Cornell faculty do.

Students have also received an extraordinary breadth of recognitions. Again, I'll just really quickly say in the past year, a Carnegie Endowment junior fellow, three Goldwater Scholars, a Knight-Hennessy Scholar, a Luce Scholar, two honorable mentions for Udall Scholar, three Fulbright professors and nine for 2019-2020, and six Fulbright-Hays fellows. So students, faculty, things are going really well.

At the institutional level, there are a number of things going on in the academic space I'm sure you are aware of, but let me remind you, there was departmental restructuring to create the departments of Computational Biology and of Statistics and Data Science. There is a new radical collaboration on digital agriculture, which to me just speaks to what Cornell is; brings together this extraordinary breadth of expertise, including our world-class Agriculture School and our world-class computer scientists.

We have a new Institute of Politics and Global Affairs in New York City, and of course the Center of Social Sciences is up and running. I also think all of you know that planning is now underway, there's a faculty committee that's been working for quite a while to think about how we bring to light a new public policy unit and thinking about whether we can build some super-departments in the social sciences. Those recommendations will be in to the provost by the end of the calendar year.

In funded research, there's lots of scholarship we do that isn't funded; but within those fields, where funded research matters, research expenditures are up 7% last year. In the Ithaca campus, what's really important to me is we're really diversifying the research portfolio, which, given all the uncertainty in Washington, is quite important. We have a 20% increase from the Department of Energy now. It is federal funding, but it is a branch of the federal funding mechanism that we haven't gone to that much, and we're up 13% in corporate support.

Turning to education, I don't know how many of you have been involved in the Active Learning Initiative, but that has really expanded this past year. It is moving into an additional 40 courses, which will touch 4,500 students. So there were nine awards made, totaling \$4.8 million, and there's a whole series now, a whole networking community of people who are involved in Active Learning, their weekly training and networking sessions. There's retreats, there's ongoing help with the departments for assessment, because we're not just doing this and then saying oh, gee, this was fun. We actually have faculty who are studying the impact on our students, and the preliminary evidence is quite remarkable.

Not only are students doing better in these courses and reporting that they enjoy it more, but the performance gap between students who are coming to us from under-resourced high schools and better-resourced high schools is closing, and that, I think, is a very good thing. There's going to be new award competition next fall, so keep your ears open for that.

When I came here last spring, I mentioned to all of you that we were working on a more coordinated approach to eCornell education to bringing together eCornell, our executive education programs, and various other, mostly nondegree programs, including programming for the new Verizon Executive Education Center that will open in New York City next spring.

The goal is to be more efficient and to be more effective; so for example, to allow for cross-marketing between programs, to allow for shared production support, to have incentives better aligned with the university incentives. That continues to go forward with a final proposal to be brought to the eCornell board and the board of trustees in October.

North campus, NCRE, I think by now, if you have been up there at all, you have seen there are shovels in the ground. The construction is underway. As a reminder, there are 800 beds opening up for sophomores. That is planned to open in the fall of 2021. There are 1,200 beds for freshmen and 75 staff and RA beds, planned to open for fall of 2022, and a new dining hall. There will be a relatively modest increase to enrollment associated with this going to a maximum of about 15,800 undergraduates, from our current number of 15,100.

Let me remind you of the goals of this. It's to relieve the pressures of our on-campus housing supply, to enable us -- we actually say that we guarantee housing for all freshmen and sophomores, either on campus or in affiliated housing, a co-op or fraternity or sorority. We can't do that right now. We will be able to do that. It will provide a surge space for some much-needed maintenance projects in some of our residence halls. It's going to let us have this slight expansion to the entering class, and we also hope that it will put some pressure on the Collegetown landlords to up their game.

Excavation has been done. Underground piping is underway. There's an old fraternity house there, and abatement and demolition is underway. And we have really worked hard and I think, from input from some of the people in this room, to ensure that this facility has high sustainability standards.

We're connecting it to our district energy systems, which are anchored, of course, by lakes first cooling and our very efficient cogeneration plant. We are not having to put in any new gas infrastructure. The buildings will be net carbon zero neutral. So as we figure out to do Earth-source heating, we'll be able to plug right into that. We've got solar panels going in that will provide about 30% of the building's power. And combined with the other energy-efficiency programs we have underway, by the time this is built, we'll be using even less energy than we are today, even with 700,000 net square feet of additional space.

I hope you all saw the message -- it went to students, but I hope you saw it -- from Kent Bullis about our increased mental health programs for students. As you know, this is the number one issue that students talked to me about, and not just here at Cornell. I mean, every meeting I go to of college administrators, it is the number one issue people talk about.

One of the most important things we hear from students is they want faster access. They don't want to have to wait to see a counselor. So we've now opened up, I think it's 100 slots a day. Basically, you can get in on the same day. I mean, if you call at 3:30 in the afternoon, you might have to wait till the next day; but essentially, same-day access for a 25-minute sort of quick triage meeting. You don't have to do a phone call first.

And then there are increased options for follow-up care; another short meeting, longer meetings, skills training, there's greater flexibility in selecting a counselor. There's increased support for medication management, to make it easier for students who come here on psychotropic drugs to get their prescriptions refilled and so on.

Also of relevance to this group, the Skorton Center for Health Initiatives has a new program called WISE, Well-being in Scholarly Environments. There's a faculty who formed the coalition on mental health, and they're going to do peer-to-peer education. They are going to

disseminate to other faculty best practices for supporting students who are facing mental health issues. It's in the pilot stage. We hope to expand that.

Finally, on this topic, there is a comprehensive assessment of all of our mental health services underway. There's both an internal review team and an external review team. Both those aspects of it are quite important. Report is due out this spring, and we will make it public.

Turning quickly to civic responsibility, I want to thank Faculty Senate and, frankly, all the assemblies for your input on the core values statement. It was incredibly helpful. They have now been distributed widely. People ask me all the time, what are you going to do with the core values. To me, there's two things you do with it: One is you make sure every new member of our community, every new faculty member, every new staff, every new student gets it and understands what our expectations are in this community.

The other, this is up to anyone who wants to do this, but when I have to make hard decisions, I always find it really helpful to go back to a core values statement and think about how does this decision that I'm about to make align with those values. I won't reread them to you. There's only six. I hope you have seen them all, and I hope it's useful to you and to your students, our students, to have them written down.

In the Law School, we started a new series, Civil Discourse, the Peter and Marilyn Coors Conversation Series. This is meant to bring in speakers from opposite ends of the political spectrum to model for our students respectful, but substantive discussions about difficult issues.

The first one was yesterday. I think it was on executive power. It featured Neal Katyal from Georgetown Law and George T. Conway, who's in the litigation department of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz. There will be more of these throughout the academic year.

Work on the campus code is underway by the University Assembly, collaborating closely with the general counsel on the initial drafting. Many thanks to Bob for his collaboration and partnership on this. One of the main things we have done -- they have done, really, is separate out the substantive part, the behavioral aspects, here's what you can and can't do from all the procedures for adjudicating cases when something goes wrong. And I think that, in itself, is going to be extremely helpful.

And then finally, under the heading of One Cornell, we have a number, a growing number of connections with our New York City campus. Some of these are overseen by the Office of Academic Integration. For example, we have a Friedman Center for Nutrition and Inflammation, which ties together our Weill Cornell faculty, who are experts in inflammation with our nutrition experts up here in Ithaca. We have a new center for immunology.

Some of these programs are hosted by the schools and colleges, and some of these programs come out of a pilot fund that my office provided, and I'll mention just two of them -- there's only three or four of them, but two that I think are particularly interesting. The Lab of O and Dyson are working on a problem on urban lights and biodiversity. So what happens to animals when they are in a city, big city, where there are lights on all night. They had done pilot studies with birds. This spans beyond birds to other kinds of animals.

And another one is on care and advocacy for immigrants and asylum seekers, which brings together faculty from the Law School and the Medical School to provide training on how you do forensic medicine and forensic law for people who are seeking asylum and seeking medical evidence of their need for asylum.

We are planning for a festival of ideas on -- we don't have a good name for it yet, but it will be on digital technology and society on Roosevelt Island in the fall of 2020, October 2020. Big-name speakers, panels, we'll bring students down there. There will be music, food. If you have ever been to a festival of ideas, that's what this is going to be like, and we hope to engage the broader New York City community.

And finally, our web site nyc.cornell.edu has been completely revamped. Many thanks to Joel Molina, who is here in the back, and his team. It's kind of one-stop shopping now. If you want to know what's going on with -- what Cornell is doing in New York City and how you can get there and where you can stay and what kind of services will be provided, that's now all available on that one site. So these are my updates, and I'm open for questions.

[ERIC CHEYFITZ](#): Hi, Martha. So I have a question about the Cornell values statement, specifically how it applies to our foreign entanglements, specifically in Qatar, where we have a medical school and where guest workers have been dying for lack of medical attention, specifically in Saudi Arabia, which is committing gross crimes all over the world, not only in Saudi Arabia; Israel and the Palestinians, and there was -- and China.

So we have a code here, which includes academic freedom and values of diversity, et cetera, et cetera, that you mentioned. And I wanted to know how it applies to these countries, where all these values are being transgressed.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Yeah, so look, I think there are countries all around the world that don't always live up to our values. Frankly, I think the country we live in, in many circumstances, doesn't live up to our values. I feel very strongly that the best thing we can do as a university is to continue to engage with people, not necessarily with the government, with whom we might have disagreements, but with people, with academics, with students.

When we are in Qatar, we are educating doctors who are helping people become healthier. And that, to me, is an unmitigated good. Now, we try very hard, to the extent we can, and I'm not going to tell you it's always exactly the same as in Ithaca, but we try extremely hard to uphold our standards the best we can. You saw that we pulled out of Renmin a year ago because we felt that there wasn't sufficient academic freedom in that program.

At Qatar, all of our employees are subject so the same policies and rights as employees here, and all of the contract employees are subject to the Qatar law. And we check in with them and we have mechanisms for ensuring that. So I don't personally think that isolating ourselves is helpful. In fact, I think it's counter-productive, but I think we have to work to the best we can to ensure our principles are upheld.

[ERIC CHEYFITZ](#): Well, I appreciate your response. There seemed to me certain kind of contradictions. We wouldn't be in those places without working with the government, to some extent. We're not there freelancing; that's for sure. And places that have a particular -- I mean, you're right; all over the world, human rights are being violated. Here in the United States, they are being violated, we certainly agree.

But I think also we need to focus on programs, strong programs that we have at Cornell that are particularly involved in countries where these human rights violations are particularly egregious, and so I mentioned those four places.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Eric, I don't know what else I can tell you. My view is that we need to be in there, we need to be doing the very best we can. If we were to pull out of Qatar, that would help nothing. We're improving health there, as one example, and I think we just have to do the very best we can. I mean, in the same way that we would not want people around the world who disagreed with the current U.S. Government to pull out of the U.S. I don't think that makes sense for us.

Can you raise your hand?

[BRYCE CORRIGAN](#): Bryce Corrigan, Department of Government. Hi. In the Department of Government, we recently heard a presentation from the university HR office about the university's new consensual relationships policy 6.3. Had the current policy been in place when my partner of 15 years and I arrived eight years ago, one of us being a trailing partner, we would have had to register our relationship with the university's academic HR office.

As members of the LGBTQ community, we are grateful to Cornell for recognizing our relationship during the hiring process, when we had not chosen legal recognition, which anyway had just been enacted in New York State that summer under the Marriage Equality Act, yet we have been participants in many conversations about the importance of privacy and an individual's right to not only choose their gender and sexual identification or non-identification, but also to do so at the time of their choosing.

Yet, by disclosing a romantic relationship, employees are entrusting sensitive personal information about their relationship choices with a university HR office. We have heard repeatedly from Mary Opperman about the university's policies ensuring the protection of students' privacies consistent with FERPA, but Policy 6.3 affects relationships among Cornell employees, its faculty, including those classified as postgraduates.

So even more broadly, it involves very personal choices that all of us, I believe, should have a presumed right to privacy within the outlines of the policy, and not exclusive of the important protections it provides to students and postdocs.

So my question is this: Does the university retain or maintain a firewall around disclosures and complaints under Policy 6.3 in the same way that it protects sensitive information about benefits elections, such as medical information and compliance with HIPAA? Which administrators have access to this information, after it's disclosed? And does the university require HR administrators to keep this information confidential, even from higher administrators, as a matter of policy?

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Look, I'm not going to be able to give you the very detailed information about what the firewall is. You'll have to ask Mary Opperman that. What I will tell you is that the issue of consensual relations and the consensual relations policy was debated on this campus for a number of years, even before I got here.

It is, to my mind, absolutely essential. I fully respect what you're saying, and we do want to respect privacy of people, but it has also become absolutely essential in today's world to protect our students from predatory behavior.

When this was all debated, the issues you raised were raised. And our HR team in Central, which is extremely professional -- I think Mary is one of the best HR people in the country -- worked very hard to ensure that the kinds of respectful treatment of information that you're asking for are in place. But I'm not going to lie to you and -- I don't know details of that. I would invite you to email me, and I can get Mary to talk with you and give you more specific answers about how we do that.

[BRYCE CORRIGAN](#): Thank you. And just to be clear, we were faculty when we arrived, but the policy does include faculty in the policy. And we would have had to register our relationship. But anyway, I do --

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): If you would write to me -- I do appreciate what you're saying. And with all these tricky issues, it's a matter of balancing things. And what we need to do is balance very well-deserved privacy rights against very important protection rights for our students. And 6.3 is what that is attempting to do.

So do email me. President@cornell.edu. Most people in this room already know that, because you all write.

[VILMA SANTIAGO-IRIZARRY](#): I'm in Anthropology, and hello. And I want to ask also about our response as a university to the situation in China, which Eric Cheyfitz already mentioned. And I want to emphasize there is a new situation for which I think business as usual and engagement does not work as a response, but documentation shows it's now a full-scale genocide, it's a new situation.

And what is more is that U.S. companies are involved, U.S. and other companies have been shown, as well as universities in the U.S. and elsewhere, to be complacent in this. There are scholars, for example, at Yale and MIT that have been exposed aiding in these atrocities, including by helping the Chinese state develop its police state, including with biotechnology and other things.

So that's why I wonder why don't we suspend all China projects and investigate all of them, to make sure that we don't have anybody here that is doing something similar. And I think this would also be appropriate to signal solidarity with all the imprisoned academics and educators, such as the president of Xinjiang University, Tashpolat Tiyp, who is about to be executed by the Chinese government any day now. There's a global campaign on his behalf.

And I also want to pitch in and say that I also think that the values statement is not good enough; because it suggests engagement, and that is good, but it doesn't say anything about what we do with dictators and the mass murderers, such as in China, how we engage with them in such a way that we don't aid their project.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Again, I appreciate your perspective. I don't have a lot to add to what I said to Eric. I think that we do look at individual projects. I think we have an outstanding vice provost for international affairs, and everything gets run through, it gets vetted and checked. But I do not believe that the right solution is to suspend all our activity in China at this time.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Hi. So I wanted to go back to what you had talked about with regard to New York City and Cornell Tech, and specifically the Verizon Executive Education Center. I'm not very familiar with the Verizon Executive Education Center. Just read a little bit about it, but the name certainly grabs my attention.

And particularly, I'm interested in an issue that was raised at the very beginning of Cornell Tech, prior to your coming to Cornell, but which of course exists at other universities, which is the issue of conflicts of interest and the sort of money that comes from corporations and the kind of quid pro quo that exists in naming a Cornell center after a company, as opposed to a person, like the Alice Cook House; I'm all for that.

But it is a real concern, and I remember that David Skorton said yeah, this is a very real issue, and we have to make sure to deal with it. I haven't been in a meeting where that's been discussed for quite a while, and it seems to me it's worth some discussion.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Look, I can't comment on how the Verizon Executive Education Center came to be named -- the name, I can't say anything about that. It was here before I got here. What is going to occur at the Verizon Executive Education Center, I actually think is Cornell at its finest. So that is going to be a place where we can reach out into the New York community and, in the same way as we reach out into the upstate community, we can provide education.

For example, we have some of the world's experts in cyber security at Cornell Tech. Cyber security is incredibly important. It's not important just for companies; it's important for individuals, it's important for organizations. We can provide education there to the New York community that is consistent with our mission of engagement, our land grant mission.

I think you're absolutely right, absolutely right that we need to be extremely careful about the relationship with corporations and that we're -- there isn't a bad quid pro quo kind of situation, but I also think if you look back to the 1940s and the era of Vannevar Bush, where universities started getting research funding from the federal government.

There was a lot of thought then that we couldn't possibly do this, we couldn't possibly maintain our independence, academic independence and take government money. And there was good reason to be worried about that, but we managed -- I don't mean Cornell, I mean

university, higher education managed to figure out how to do that. And that has become, not always, but a lot of times a win-win situation for us and for the nation.

I think we've got to figure out how to do the same thing, working closely with industries. We need to protect -- number one, we need to protect our grad students. For me, that's like front and center, and I think we have good policies in place at Cornell Tech. I think we need to be thinking more broadly about that, but I think the future is going to be one in which there are more interactions between higher education and industry, and we can either sort of wait around or we can be a leader in figuring out to do that with just the kind of protections that you're seeking.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): In terms of the naming, when I heard the Verizon Education Center, if I didn't know that we were talking about it in relation to Cornell, I would say oh, Verizon has an executive education center; how nice. That I find alarming. So it may be something that for the senate agenda to actually say should we look closely at what are we doing with regard to disclosures, and just investigating the kinds of issues that are necessarily part of these relationships.

[MICHAEL TOMLAN](#): Hi, Martha. I'm Michael Tomlan from City Regional Planning.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Yeah, yeah, now I see you.

[MICHAEL TOMLAN](#): We met a number of months ago.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): It's dark in the back. It's hard to see?

[MICHAEL TOMLAN](#): I'll step out here in the light. You have very nicely come to explain to us the eCornell and the external programs. You did that last spring, as you mentioned. And now there is an update where, in effect, there's going to be a report going to the board of trustees. Is there an opportunity for the faculty senate to see this before it goes to the board of trustees?

And my point more specifically is, those of us who have been around a while have noticed that these offshore programs many times draw resources from our colleges. The reality is that the coordination rests on the back of the faculty to essentially synthesize what it is we are doing on campus and off campus. Just wondering if we could have an opportunity to look at the proposal before it becomes law, so to speak.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Yeah, I think you may not be thinking of the same thing that we're talking about. What we're really talking about are two things. We're talking about eCornell and we're talking about executive education mostly in the Johnson School, a little bit in ILR, a little bit in Engineering. I'm not talking about -- so faculty who are doing that are electing to do that, and they are getting compensated for doing it.

What we are talking about doing is bringing that together more closely, bringing in, coordinating, cross-marketing, shared production. The proposal, we don't actually have the proposal written. What I've told the board of trustees is the same sort of things that I've described to you.

It is to bring it in to the university. There is not time before the October board meeting, but I can certainly -- when the proposal is written, we can get it to Charlie for distribution, but we've promised this -- as I said last spring, we promised this to the board in October, which is just a few weeks away.

Anything else?

Hi.

[RICHARD BENSEL](#): Hi Martha. Richard Bense, Government. I wanted to thank you for coming to see us, and the Q&A and being on the stage to answer our questions. My concern is this: As you know, the faculty Senate is responsible for education policy and to be consulted in the educational mission of the university generally. There is nothing, in my mind, or maybe

there's something more central than grading. And we became aware at the end of the spring semester that grades were being changed by the central administration without the consent of the instructor.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): I have to stop you here. I don't know anything about this. This is the --

[RICHARD BENSEL](#): Well, you should. Then we should make you aware of it. This policy is something that transgresses the mission of the faculty senate. It should have come to the faculty senate for discussion and consultation before it was implemented, and it is of great concern to at least some of us that it wasn't.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Okay, Richard, I don't know anything about this at all. Your statement is the first I've heard of this. So obviously, I can't give you an intelligent reply. All I can do is say I'll find out more about it. I just don't have an answer for you, because I don't know -- I don't even know what you're talking about.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Just a point of information, grading -- it's college registrars that handle everything. It has nothing to do with the central administration. It's in the colleges. The registrars there control the grades.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Okay, so I will talk with Charlie back at Day Hall, because I don't have anything to say because I don't know anything about this.

Okay. One more question?

Hi, Chris.

[CHRIS SCHAFFER](#): Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. I guess I just wanted to kind of throw out the issue of undergraduate admissions and ask you to respond a bit about not just the things we've heard at UFC, but sort of the continuing national discussion. And I know we have some new senior leadership around admissions, but I'd just be interested to hear your thoughts and your plans.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): Thank you. I think that's a really, really important question. I appreciate that. To my mind, there are actually three questions tied up here. The first, which is in a way the easiest, is what are we doing and what can we do to minimize fraud.

We did not have -- it's now months later and still nothing has surfaced, so as far as I know, we were not caught up in Varsity Blue. We did a very careful check of all our athletes. Is it possible that somewhere in our freshman class there is someone who cheated on their test? Yeah, it's possible. It's probably probable, but to the best of our knowledge, we were not caught up in that.

But we've got to do everything we can to prevent against fraud, and we are doing a lot of that. We have enhanced screen of -- what happened in Varsity Blue, the student athletes came and they were only on the team -- we have tightened up our policies around when you can solicit gifts from donors. You can't solicit a gift during the period in which an offspring might be a candidate and so on. That in a way, although incredibly important, that's sort of the easy stuff.

The second two questions, which are related, but they don't -- you don't always come out the same on them, the second is what can we do to improve the perception of unfairness, which is out there.

And then the third is, what can we do to increase the socioeconomic diversity of our student body. And sometimes what you might think would work for one may not work for the others, so I'll give you an example. There's a hot debate about whether you should do away with standardized testing.

Some people believe -- and it's true; richer students, students from wealthier backgrounds can take it more often, they can get tutoring, they do better. But there are some

experts in education who will say nonetheless, you've got to sort of account for that. But nonetheless, that actually is sort of the fairest metric, because essay students can cheat on, average grades tend to be higher in wealthier schools and so on. So you got to be careful that you don't just clean up the perception and not clean up the rest.

Shortly after all that happened, I pulled together a small working group. It was pretty small; eight people. There was some faculty, Mike Lovenheim from Economics was on it. I can't remember who else right now. There were one or two trustees, there were the head of admissions in Engineering, so a very small group, just to look at a really -- everything they could think of, every idea they could think of for addressing those two questions.

And then sort of not say we should do this or we should do that, but talk about the pros and cons of each of them, so that when we come -- instead of just going out to the faculty and saying okay, here's 160 things we can do, we can come back to the faculty and say look, here are some things that we might consider.

And we're just now in the process of sorting that out. Some of them are complete no-brainers, like we ought to be recruiting more in rural regions throughout the country, where we're not attracting enough students, or we ought to be doing more, once we admit students, to convert students, to get students from lower socioeconomic groups to come. Those are easy.

Some of them are much more controversial, like we ought to stop considering anything having to do with family ties, what's called legacy admissions. We ought to stop considering any connections to faculty, staff and students. We ought to stop having athletics preferences. Those are all incredibly controversial, and they have pluses and they have minuses, and it's not even clear for all of them -- they might clean up the perception, but not the fairness, so we are in the process -- I'm taking this very seriously.

Sorting that all out, and we'll come back to you with ideas, the last thing I want to talk about is cost. I personally firmly believe that for us to live up to being the university for any person, we need to have greater socioeconomic diversity among our undergraduate student body. It's also extraordinarily expensive.

Some of that we can handle through philanthropy. So just recently, we got two gifts to create -- they are called the Gross scholars and the Paul scholars, which will help us bring in a handful more. We do need blind admissions, but support. If we do more recruiting, we'll have more students, we can pay for more of them. But to do it on a large scale is incredibly expensive, and we're going to have to think about how we fund it. Hopefully that's helpful.

[CHRIS SCHAFFER](#): Thank you for those comments, and I appreciate the willingness to take a hard look at many aspects of admissions. I want to just quickly give a little anecdote, and I want to preface it by saying I don't mean this to suggest that I'm not supportive of recruiting athletes for varsity sports, because I think it is a good thing, but a few years ago, I had a high school student who worked in my lab for a period of time and was exceptionally talented in laboratory research.

To the point, I was very much looking forward to recruiting this student to continue working in my lab during their undergraduate career. I reached out to admissions, I wrote a letter on their behalf, but this student was, I don't know, half a standard deviation, maybe a standard deviation below Cornell's typical GPA and SATs and things like that. And the student wasn't admitted.

But it felt to me like that's kind of odd, like coaches are able to develop relationships with high school students, find people who are talented in the thing that they are doing here at the university, and there's some latitude in recruiting people who bring that kind of exceptional talent. Here's a case where that same kind of latitude wasn't afforded to a faculty member looking to recruit somebody. I think we need to look at things in that context.

[MARTHA POLLACK](#): I think that's a really interesting point, Chris, how -- and I actually don't know the answer, how we use specific faculty input. We do, as you mentioned, we have a brand new -- what? Well, I don't know. I mean, I don't know. We do have a 12% admissions rate, but we do have a brand new vice provost for enrollment management who brings a lot of nuance thinking around this. So to me, it's one of my handful of top issues that I'm spending my time on.

Thank you all.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): We have to move on to the next agenda. Let's thank --
(APPLAUSE)

DISCUSSION: Campus-wide smoking/vaping ban

[SPEAKER NELSON](#): The next person is Charlie Van Loan to discuss a couple of issues.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Put away your smart watches and your e-cigarettes. So this is a very important health-related topic, and I'll just say a few things. And then Dave Hiner, who's chair of the relevant committee, will be up here also to answer questions. So what do we have now? You can't smoke in buildings, nor 25 feet from an entrance to a building. It's a policy. You can read about it. It's also basically New York State law.

So the idea of having a campus-wide ban has been around for a number of years. It's the province of the university assembly. There's been a history of attempting to do something, but never really catching fire. All last year, the relevant committee produced or developed a survey, which hopefully will be released soon. So looks like something might actually happen, so the idea here is a heads up and let's get ready for this and let's start thinking about it in the right way.

Here's what a campus ban might look like, and this is actually modified from University of Pennsylvania, that has like a two-paragraph policy. I changed some of the words like Locust Walk to Lib Slope, stuff like that, but it would look something like this.

The first part in black is what we have now. The red prose has something to do about outside and where you cannot smoke. It would look something like that. And we set up a web page, where we want to find out how people think in free-form responses. A survey is coming down the pike that will give us really good data to make an intelligent decision, but there are -- the three teaser questions on that web page, just to get people to think about this issue.

The first one is: What do you think of the current policy on smoking and vaping? Is it good enough? Are there enforcement issues? Is your own private corner of the campus, what it looks like from that vantage point. And then, what do you think about having a campus-wide policy. So certainly, it makes a statement, but do you think it solves some problem? And what is that problem?

Now, the big tension out there, and they're both health-related, there's the second-hand smoke thing, then there's the addiction thing. And we have to come to grips with that tension and think about it in an intelligent way. Therefore, that's number three here. If we do this, what kind of cessation services should there be, to help people who are addicted?

Now, there already are cessation services offered by Cornell Health and the wellness program, but the question is, do we do more and whatever.

So Dave, if you would like to come up here, and either of us -- Dave, well, you tell us all about yourself.

[DAVID HINER](#): As Charlie said before, I think the talk of a survey has been going on for about three years, and we have spent last year developing a survey. And Cornell Health and I believe someone from IRP, Institutional Research Planning, through the Kitchen Sink had a survey which ended up being like 35 questions.

We spent all of last year revamping that survey to get down to about 11 questions, which ask: Do you smoke? Have you smoked in the last 30 days? Are you exposed to second-hand smoke? Do you see smoking happening on campus? And then what are your feelings if Cornell did adopt a smoke-free campus policy?

I think we have come a long way. We are currently in the process of refining some of the questions, just to make them more succinct and also creating kind of an introduction so that people understand why we're asking this. And hopefully, we will have a survey to the campus around the middle of October.

With that, I'll open it up to questions.

[WENDY WILCOX](#): Wendy Wilcox, from the library. When you give this survey, are you going to track the responses according to status? I'm a little worried that this may inadvertently hit different communities, and that perception of this campus-wide ban could be problematic.

[DAVID HINER](#): Yeah, that's a very good question. One of questions in the survey I didn't mention is what population you are, whether or not you're an undergrad, graduate student, staff, faculty, union representation, temp employee, those kinds of things. And yes, it's a very good metric to be able to determine where smoking populations happen.

[CHRIS SCHAFFER](#): Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. One of the hats I wear, I'm the faculty in residence over in Mary Donlon Hall, so I live and work on Cornell's campus. I haven't done a -- I would say my personal experience is that most of the times where I've sort of been annoyed by outdoor second-hand smoke have been in cases where people are very clearly not abiding by the 25-foot rule from smoking away from entrances, and also where people are throwing cigarette butts around instead of disposing of them well. I'm just curious what kinds of efforts have been put in place to sort of provide more education, provide more enforcement, provide more places to drop cigarettes, like how far has the effort gone sort of maybe in parallel or independent of the banning effort?

[DAVID HINER](#): That's a good question, and I honestly don't have an answer for that. I think that would be something that CUPD would try to --

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Cornell Health has a pretty extensive, whole website full of information and whatever, and the question is whether that's good enough. But then who has access to these cessation services, if you are working from 7 till 3 and so on.

Yeah.

[BRUCE LEWENSTEIN](#): Bruce Lewenstein, Communication. I'm wondering whether -- you mentioned modeling a potential policy on Penn's policy, and I'm wondering whether we have any data from them about the effectiveness of the policy in various ways. And part of why I'm thinking about that is the question here about is it a good or a bad idea.

We've already had discussion today at this meeting about other things that we do that have symbolic meanings, and I'm sort of curious where in the conversation we talk about yeah, we can have a policy. It says it's a symbolic thing. What kind of effects does it actually have on the ground, who is it affecting, things like that.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): I guess for both these things we are doing, the electronic device thing and this has a symbolic thing. I think below the surface are these very important questions about what will be their effect, and I think that deserves attention and I hope we get enough feedback from campus on that.

[ROBERT TRAVERS](#): Robert Travers from History. I wanted to ask about the conception going into the survey of how the survey will play into our decision-making. Is the idea that this is a kind of government by consent model and we're interested in the preferences of the campus in assessing that and making a decision, or are we going, as Charlie suggested, to be balancing different principles, different priorities when we make the decision.

I guess I'm thinking of examples where surveys apparently reflect preferences, but what they actually do is generate preferences, the way questions are asked, who answers the survey. So is the goal of the survey to have some kind of representative make a decision on the basis of government by consent or representative decision-making, or is the goal of the survey some other kind of goal?

[DAVID HINER](#): From my perspective, the goal of the survey is to be able to make a quantifiable decision on how to move forward with this, not just doing the survey for show and then the university assembly coming with a resolution without involving the data from the survey.

[ERIC CHEYFITZ](#): Eric Cheyfitz, American Indian and Indigenous Studies Program. I taught at Penn for ten years before I came. It's a much different campus, it is an urban campus. Much easier to get off campus, if you want to smoke, that sort of thing; whereas here, of course, that's not the case. So it seems to me Penn is not a great model for this.

I should also say I'm a nonsmoker, so this is -- not looking for space to smoke, but I think this campus impacts those people who do smoke differently than it impacts people --

[DAVID HINER](#): That is a good point, and a lot of people have brought up that concern, that it's not really -- Cornell is a vast campus, whereas UPenn is small, and able to move around. Charlie, to your left.

[THOMAS BJÖRKMAN](#): Thomas Björkman, Horticulture. One of the new things in the vaping arena of course is the CBD or THC capsules. Apparently, they're relatively odorless. Haven't been around them, so I don't know myself, but that seems to be something that people might engage in on campus.

[DAVID HINER](#): That is true. That is part of the survey, is to gauge what people's usage is of nicotine-based devices, and that would also be part of -- if there is a tobacco ban, that would be part of it.

[NEEMA KUDVA](#): I think of smoking as a very class-based issue in the U.S. and, like Chris, I'm a house professor, a faculty in residence on west campus. And the people I see smoking, the vapers tend to be the students, but the smokers tend to be our staff and our building care staff. And in the winter, they're sitting all huddled up on a table, freezing, smoking, and there's an addiction issue here. And so I was very curious when you said oh, we're going to be creating this policy based on the responses we get. Not clear to me that we're going to be able to reach that very population I'm thinking about.

[DAVID HINER](#): That is a very real concern, and a lot of staff have brought that up. We have thrown out some ideas of -- as you know, campus dining and custodial staff may not have access to a computer during the day. They might not just be able to get an e-mail and say hey, there's a survey, let me take it.

So we are trying to throw out some ideas about strategic flyers around the university, things that have QR codes that anybody can go and just scan it and be directed right to the survey, so they could take it at their lunch break or while smoking a cigarette, so to speak. Yeah, we do recognize that is a big issue.

[NEEMA KUDVA](#): Also, Cornell's been removing computer labs from residential buildings, so their computer lab in my building was removed. And the computer labs were not used as much by students, but they were used by staff. And so I think there's really serious issues there about reaching staff, so we thank you for thinking about it.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Time for one last question. I guess Paul.

[PAUL GINSPARG](#): Paul Ginsparg, Info Sci. As someone else mentioned, I'm a nonsmoker. And actually knowingly so, I wouldn't mind if we made it an undergraduate

admissions criterion. And I'm responsible for all of the signs put out on the back side of gates and getting that enforced, because it was a real problem.

Nonetheless, I mention that because I have the obvious concern that the results of this survey will be completely correlated with smoker status. And given that smokers are already clearly a minority on campus, we already know the signal that's going to come out of this. There's going to be a vast majority in favor of it, but as other people have expressed, it is a class issue and we have to wonder whether that's really going to be fair.

[DAVID HINER](#): Yeah, I recognize that and I'm suspecting that that will happen, when we do the survey and review the results.

[CHARLIE VAN LOAN](#): Okay, thank you, David, for coming by. There will be opportunities to comment on this in the coming weeks.

We have a Good and Welfare today from Professor Lieberwitz, and she'll tell us all about it, and it involves an event right after this meeting, in this room. Risa.

[RISA LIEBERWITZ](#): Great. Hi. Thank you for the time. Behind me is the first slide that I have for you. As you can see, it deals with the AAUP. For those of you who aren't familiar with the AAUP, it is the American Association of University Professors. Been around since 1915, so I think it's here to stay.

We have recently reinvigorated our Cornell chapter of the AAUP. It is a national organization, and I am the proud new president of the local chapter, the Cornell chapter of AAUP. We had elections, we have -- I'm the president. We have had several meetings. The other officers are TJ Hinrichs, who's vice president. Darlene Evans is secretary/treasurer. We have an executive committee made up of the officers plus two executive committee members, Richard Bensel, who's here, as well as David Levitsky.

And we thought it was important to get the AAUP chapter going again so that faculty could come together from across the university to share experiences and concerns with each other and to act together and to establish an active voice of the AAUP chapter at Cornell on issues that include the kinds of things we've been talking about today.

But in terms of AAUP, it's known particularly for its setting standards and the standards of the profession for academic freedom and tenure and the economic security of faculty and to support shared governance -- what just happened? This is restarting. Is there a tech person who can get this back up? All right, I'm not going to take it personally.

So let me just tell you what was up there, and then I have another event to tell you about, and you can go onto the website and see these slides, which are on the website for the senate meeting today.

At any rate, the AAUP stands for shared governance, the kind of thing that we're doing here today, in terms of faculty senate work and the things that we do all over the university for shared governance issues, so we thought that the AAUP was also important for us to have a chapter that's really devoted to strengthening shared governance.

What I want to also point out is that this is not in opposition to the senate. This is an idea of having an AAUP chapter in a way that can help put in effect strong shared governance and to work with the faculty senate, as well as to do things independently from the senate on issues of interest that affect the faculty. The reason I'm here today is to tell you about that, but more specifically to tell you that we thought it would be good to try out different things for meeting times.

As you know, finding meeting times is almost impossible, and one of the things we are trying is to say after a senate meeting, and this is our first try for it, if there are people who would like to hang around and kind of debrief -- we covered a lot of really interesting issues, like with President Pollack today, and talk about what happened and the sorts of issues that we

might want to work on more through the senate or in other ways for the AAUP to get involved with, we're going to be here today for an informal discussion and experiment and see how it works after a senate meeting. Perhaps we'll try it again next month to see how that works as well. Please do hang around, if you are interested.

Also, there's one other very special event next Tuesday, September 24th, at 4:30 in Ives Hall, 217, and it is an AAUP kind of kickoff event for the semester. It's entitled Why We Need the AAUP at Cornell. We have a special guest coming from the national AAUP.

He's really quite fascinating, knows a lot about the history of the AAUP, and he's going to speak on tenure as a right and not a privilege, historical note, basically addressing issues of how the AAUP, since its start, has been over the decades devoted to expanding rights of tenure and job security for all faculty, not only for a select segment of the faculty.

He'll be talking about that. I will also talk, as the chapter president, more about the local chapter, the AAUP Cornell chapter and why I think it's important and why you might want to join. So please do come next Tuesday as well, 4:30 to 6:00, Ives 217. We will have refreshments, and we also have a lot of time for talking, both during the actual program and also during our reception afterwards.

I guess that's it. Thanks a lot, and hope that you can maybe stay around for a few minutes or however long. Thanks.

(APPLAUSE)

[SPEAKER NELSON](#): Thank you, and the meeting is adjourned.