

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

THE SPEAKER: We are going to start now. I'm going to call this body to order. Please take a seat. Thank you.

Before we start, I'd just like to remind everyone that the senators have priority in speaking and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote, and there's likely to be voting today.

Also, I'd like to ask you to identify yourself and your department when you do speak, and make sure to wait for the microphone. And in a previous meeting, I had a couple people that said they had a hard time hearing, so make sure that you don't put the microphone too close to your mouth or too far away, but just kind of in that sweet spot in the middle. That way, everybody can hear you.

Yes, point it at your mouth, okay. All right, good to know. And finally, we're going to try to stick to a maximum speaking time of two minutes, so everybody can participate. I'll be sitting back there with a big iPad, and I'll hold it, so everybody can see the clock. After two minutes is up, I'll just stand up. That's the signal maybe you went over. And then, if we get into the four-minute or something, then I'll vocally say okay, your time's up. Please let someone else speak, or something like that.

We're trying not to be too authoritarian and dictatorial in our enforcement. I would point out that Mark is our parliamentarian today and will be running around with the microphone, as well as other people.

Without further ado, I'd like to call Charlie Van Loan, the Dean of Faculty.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Let's do some announcements. There are a couple. Friday is the close of the tobacco survey. Kind of interesting results. The online thing, where

you write a paragraph or two, of which there are about 360, is kind of running two to one against. But I heard through the UA that their Qualtrics survey is sort of in the other direction, so good luck figuring that out.

Next month, Steve Carvell, the new vice provost for external education strategy, will be here, mostly probably to talk about eCornell. If you are like me, you don't know too much about eCornell, so we have to get a certain amount of knowledge so we can intelligently participate in discussions, as it unfolds in the new regime.

Just quickly, it's online and they offer certificate programs. They do other things, but this is probably the main one. There are about 15 or so different areas. Each area has a couple of certificate programs, and each certificate program has a couple of courses.

So here's one I just tracked out through Data Science. And those five courses, three weeks, one after the other, and you finish those and you get a certificate. For this particular one, it was \$5,400. So there's money, there's who's at the board paying attention. We have to figure out how to do that in a low-overhead way. So you'll get some data from me in advance of Steve's visit, so that we can engage him in a constructive fashion next month.

We had a late Yom Kippur this year, and it collided with a Tuesday evening prelim, so I received concerns about that. I promised that I'd look into it. And this has led to a chitchat about opening up Monday and Wednesday for prelims in a careful way. And careful might mean the big STEM courses.

So I have engaged chemistry, physics, CS and math about this, the people who do the scheduling, just to see if it was kind of an interest, and I supplied them with some data that I got from the registrar. You can't read it, but the key thing is, there are freshmen and sophomores in the STEM course areas who do take Monday/Wednesday classes, so you have to be worried

about collisions; but it is a small number. Again, heads up. Let's look at it. Maybe it's impossible, but maybe we can open up Monday and Wednesday to get a little more flexibility.

Let me pause. Are there any questions about those three announcements? They are all kind of heads-up.

Okay, let me present a resolution that is concerned with emeritus status for RTE faculty. So I'll present the outline of it. It is going to sit around probably for one or two months. It involves other entities approving it, but let me just outline it for you now and, of course, handle some questions, if you have them.

So the proposal is this, and it is coming out of an ad hoc committee we have running this year on RTE issues, and you will be getting several recommendations from them. This is the first one. The proposal here is for this group of title-holders, they would be eligible for emeritus status. So you see the usual gang of suspects there.

Okay, the process is pretty much exactly the same as we established two years ago, when we revised all this for professors and associate professors. Again, you have to retire, you have to have been in that position for ten or more years. There has to be some indication of meritorious service.

And the act of going through this is, having a C.V., you write a letter to your chair or equivalent -- and we have to say equivalent because there are RTE faculty who sit in some of the big labs with no department in sight, so to speak. The chair gets that, and then there's some kind of a vote, and we have some comments on that. And then the chair takes the vote, the C.V., writes a cover letter, it goes to the dean. This almost always runs totally smooth. So it's a look-alike of the policy on the books right now for professors and associate professors.

As I mentioned, it's not just us weighing in on this. The provost has to also approve this, and the deans and the chairs have to weigh in on it. This will all go on over the next couple of

weeks. It is a trustee thing, because the trustees keep track of titles and the modifiers of them. Senior lecturer is a title. Emeritus is a modifier. So we have to show up. Once we get approval on campus here, we have to show up with the trustees and make this proposal.

I want to be very clear about something. This has nothing to do with fringe benefits or perks. If you look on our website for the perks and opportunities for emeritus professors and associate professors, there's a whole page; library, parking, you go down the list. This has to be visited very carefully.

It's actually ambiguous for professors and associate professors. There are things that are more at the discretion of the department, depending on their space and resources and so on. Anyway, we have to visit that, but this has nothing to do with that. It is simply the recognition of a person who's made contributions, who is retiring and is an RTE faculty member.

A little about environmental impact. There are roughly 1,200 full professors and associate professors, and roughly about 50 a year apply for and get emeritus status. The RTE pool we are talking about is about 400. It's a different demographic, but let's just say we are talking about 10 or 15 people a year across campus. Again, why do this? There's several reasons, but one of them is it's a reminder of just how important the RTE faculty is to the overall operations of the place.

Having said that, any questions about this proposal? Any aspects of it that you think we ought to pay more attention to, between now and the next time we talk about it?

Okay, Social Science review.

MIKE KOTLIKOFF: I see John here, Melissa, Chris Wildeman. You guys want to come up and -- so I'm not here by myself? Thanks. I think it is the fourth time I've spoken to the senate about this general issue, but I see a number of new faces and it's been several years ago, but

this is an opportunity to update the senate on where we are. And maybe I'll ask the chair, the committee to identify themselves.

MELISSA FERGUSON: Melissa Ferguson, in Psychology.

JOHN SILICIANO: John Siliciano, Deputy Provost.

CHRIS WILDEMAN: Chris Wildeman, PAM.

MIKE KOTLIKOFF: So I'm just going to say a few words, then we're going to open it for questions, but I start with why I think it's so important to address why we're doing this, and end this issue of policy.

One of the things that I became aware of as becoming provost was the repeated reviews of the social sciences or aspects of the social sciences at Cornell that preceded me and the number of recommendations that had been made about Cornell, to Cornell to advance the social sciences at our institution. And those had been both internal reviews and external reviews of the social sciences. And I'll talk a little bit about the results of those reviews, but I think it also bears stating that virtually every challenge we face today has a human component -- component of human behavior, and one of the reasons why it's important to get this right for the institution.

In addition to that, policy is something that has been part of that social sciences review repeatedly, and that was most recently a faculty committee that recommended form a separate school of policy at Cornell. That recommendation came to a previous provost. That was not acted upon. That's also sitting in the provost's office.

And part of the importance related to the fact that we are an institution that has prided ourselves on the impact we have on the state and, indeed, the world and the fact that virtually every impact requires some policy element bringing the results of science, translating that into

policy, and then analyzing the effect of policy and seeing what needs to be done. That is something that at Cornell is departmental or spread around several areas of the campus.

One of these reviews revealed to us, first of all, that many of our faculty, despite the fact that we have extraordinarily distinguished faculty and distinguished elements of social sciences throughout the institution, the fact that they are distributed so much leads to an under-recognition. And that's been pointed out repeatedly in external reviews.

We have social sciences dispersed across the campus in somewhat unconnected groups. We lack a comprehensive data center that some other institutions have that brings the social sciences together. We have a policy department, PAM, that ends up in some ways competing with policy colleges or policy schools at peer institutions. We have a graduate program in public affairs, CIPA, that has had some challenges over the last decade. And then finally, what it was noted in this last review and has been noted previously is the fact that we have mixed incentives associated with policy or social sciences faculty at different places in the institution.

So that led us to a process that really started in 2016, shortly after I became provost, and decided that we needed a review of the social sciences and a fulsome discussion with the faculty about social sciences. We formed an internal committee that reviewed the social sciences, it led to an external committee. The internal committee reported. We had an external site visit. That committee reported.

We had a long period of discussion with faculty around that report. That led to the formation of three more faculty committees. Those were formed as a part of these recommendations. More discussions with faculty, more presentations to the faculty senate, then reports of these committees, organizational ideas and infrastructure committees meeting with faculty in colleges around those reports. A committee was formed to decide on the best options from that report. That led to more discussions.

And then, finally, recommendations and decisions by the president and provost that we've had last spring. Then implementation committee formed, chaired by my colleagues here; further committee discussions, and then a report that came out earlier this month, which was an update, which will be followed by a report, as I'll show you in a minute.

At the same time, I've had a number of meetings during this period of time. I have reported to the faculty senate. We have had a number of discussions, discussed this at the UFC, had meetings with faculty and departments over this period of time, meetings with advisory councils. We met with the advisory councils of the major colleges involved, presented to the trustees a number of times on this topic, then met with the committee chairs a number of times, and with the deans.

I lay this out, because this has been a long and consultative process with faculty over the past three years. This is a list of the meetings. Just this semester, the committee has had over 120 meetings of the committee group over this semester.

So what have we decided to do and where are we with what we haven't yet decided to do? So we've made two real decisions. First of all, we've decided to create and have, in fact, created a center for social sciences. A division of that center is to be, first of all, a data center for social sciences for the campus to encompass the good work that's been done by the ISS heretofore. It will also and has started to incentivize faculty to come together, to put together programmatic initiatives that are larger than individual units and also to mount extramural proposals.

We've decided -- and this was part of the statement from Martha and me -- to create a policy entity at Cornell, and we've asked the committee now to opine on whether that occurs through the formation of a school that sits between colleges or whether we create policy

through a reframing of the College of Human Ecology, which has the biggest policy component of our faculty.

Then thirdly, to unify disciplines through super-departments, committees made up of economists, so economics in sociology and in psychology. We have committees that are formed that represent all of the elements. The idea there, to consider creating a super-department model similar to what we have in several other areas of the institution, where a department is made up of faculty from more than one college, which already exists, to a certain extent, in economics between ILR and Arts and Sciences. The idea would be to extend that and do a similar thing or discuss a similar thing in sociology and psychology.

With that, maybe I turn to you, Melissa, to talk about what's next. Is that all right?

MELISSA FERGUSON: Sure. Let me read what you have here first. Yes, the interim report, we are going to be sending around an update in the coming weeks, and this is going to be an update on what the committee is thinking so far about a policy entity. So that should be, let's say, mid-November, somewhere around mid-November, since we are in early November now. Then we'll seek additional consultation with this group potentially in December, in addition to -- sorry. See, I should have read this before I started. You did hand that off to me.

Okay, so the respective departments, like Mike said, have gotten these initial subcommittee reports on the super-departments, and they are talking about them. Now we are here on November 13th to talk about the policy vision that was sent out a few weeks ago. We have a whole bunch of listening sessions set up for next week to get more feedback, and then basically a final report at the end of this semester.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: So with that, I would open this up to questions, either about where we are, what we're planning in the future or the process heretofore.

Thomas Björkman: The concept of a policy institute looks quite attractive. But I don't understand the specific proposal to convert the College of Human Ecology. That college has excellent non-policy faculty who do textiles and nutrition and human development. How do they fit into this?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: One of the things that the committee is now considering with both of these options -- so maybe I'd turn it to any takers here.

MELISSA FERGUSON: This is clearly one of the central issues to think about in terms of the college options. So we have been aware of that from the very beginning. We're talking to CHE units to get feedback on their thoughts of what it would mean to go into an entity like that. And part of this, I think, is dependent on what is meant by policy. So part of the reason we sent around this vision for what policy at Cornell could mean is exactly to provide a little bit more detail and context that's required, I think, for that kind of consideration, so we're thinking about that and it's clearly very important.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just to add to that, when we talk about the option of focusing CHE and policy, that raises the inevitable question, which you did, about other faculty or departments within the college that don't see themselves as policy. And part of the implicit mandate that we have taken on, the provost, is there are no sort of second-favored children.

We do this in order to emphasize Cornell's strength and policy because it is critical in terms of our mission of outreach and impact, but we are also committed to making sure all faculty, both within the college and then those affected by the possible super-departments, still have a very robust, satisfying intellectual home. The same for students within CHE.

So this is a very complicated design process. And whatever direction it takes is going to unfold over a number of years, with a lot of careful considerations. This isn't something that we can push send on at the end, so it's very careful, but it's not like we have forgotten about these

faculty. They wouldn't let us forget anyway, but we are trying to think about how we do policy and think about options for transition depending on it.

As Number 6 indicates, the purpose of our committee is to sort of opine on a structure that advances policy, but then we hand that off to the president, the provost, the CHE, stakeholders and others to think about the sort of uber-calculus beyond that.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: You mentioned textiles. There is a parallel discussion that is going on around design, between the dean of Human Ecology, the two departments, Fiber Science and Apparel Design, and Design and Environmental Analysis, and the dean of Architecture, Art and Planning and a faculty member in Architecture, around a potential design department that would also create kind of synergies that don't currently exist.

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Christine Leuenberger, from the department of S&TS. I have a question concerning the formation of a policy school. So we already have quite a presence in Washington, D.C. through Cornell in Washington, as well as through our federal relations office on the Hill, and I was wondering what sort of role those entities will play in the policy school, because they could really serve us well, if they would take on a more central role.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, great point. I think we have lots of assets, and I should say whatever option is determined here, one of the goals that I've set for the committee in terms of thinking about what our best direction would be is how to harness all the elements, all the assets that the university has.

For example, if a college of public policy is created that is a redirected Human Ecology, we would have to, to create a best policy program, involve individuals from government, from law, from other areas, so there are discussions about how to explicitly do that.

And you raised Cornell in Washington, about which there are discussions currently, but I think it's a larger question about how to do this in a way in which we're most inclusive and create the strongest possible policy entity.

HARRY DE GORTER: Harry de Gorter, Dyson School. I wanted to follow up on your very last point about other policy faculty outside of PAM, like a lot of international development, environment, agriculture, and you said law and even government, I assume. I don't know what they do in policy.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: They do policy.

HARRY DE GORTER: The other question I have, I don't quite understand the decision points on social sciences and the public policy school. Seems to me they are kind of like going side by side, but they're different decision points, at some point; so I don't understand the process in that also. Just curious about that.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, let me answer the part, Harry, about social sciences in policy, because I do think that coming out of the committee on organizational structures and ideas, there were a number of recommendations, and those were synthesized into these three decisions.

And you're right in the sense that independent of policy, the recommendation was and accepted to create a robust center for the social sciences that pulls faculty together, catalyzes stronger research, more effective research connections between faculty and brings the kind of data resources into that that are the analog, if you will, of our Fiscal Sciences Center, where we have centers like the social sciences center reporting up to the vice provost of research, that really are about catalyzing and bringing together faculty and resources, infrastructure, core facilities, that sort of thing. So that was one decision.

Now, at the same time, there were linked decisions around policy and super-departments, and maybe I'll hand it off about sort of the concept of why those two things are somewhat linked. Who wants to take that?

John Siliciano: It's a very good question, Harry. In theory, we could do either or both, that you could think -- so Mike talked about the research center. We could have also been and we can be focusing on creating an entity around policy and thinking about how to do that best with a school that sits between units with refocusing Human Ecology because of the sort of massive policy scholars there.

That's, in some sense, a goal -- I mean, it is a goal in and of itself. Separate, but linked, and I'll get to that in a second, is taking these multiple departments, we have Human Development and Psychology, having very similar disciplines, actually competing with each other over hires. We have sociologists scattered, we have economists somewhat integrated, but not fully. So those could be in our, in some sense, separate efforts is to unify departments in a more cross-college way, as we have done many, many times at Cornell.

So Division of Nutritional Sciences is spread between CHE and CALS. There's three departments in art that exist with CALS, so we have done these cross-college departments in many cases to create a more robust -- university needs to constantly update its structure to follow where disciplines are going, where they are tracking, so that's a sort of separate thing.

What this committee is trying to work through is those two have a lot of complicated resonance with them in that a number of these merged university-level departments, parts of them sit within CHE, which is also the college where many policy scholars sit, so we're trying to sort of figure out this sort of very complicated resonance of those, as we think through this design phase; but they are, by themselves, separate goals. But they are also enmeshed in this particular circumstance.

CHRISTINE OLSON: I'm the CAPE alternate senator, as well as professor emeritus from the division of nutritional sciences. As probably many people know, we're a relatively large academic unit, life sciences-oriented, in the College of Human Ecology and Ag and Life Sciences.

And you mentioned plans for some departments that are in the College of Human Ecology that don't really fit in policy, but you didn't mention us. We are one of those departments that doesn't really fit -- we are Life Sciences, biological sciences scholars that wouldn't fit necessarily in a policy college, so I wonder what preliminary conversations you had with people, as you mentioned previously, related to those other departments.

And then my second question is whether there will actually be a vote by the faculty in the College of Human Ecology about -- if that's the option that's selected, if there would be a vote of the faculty about that.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, so let me take your first question around Nutritional Sciences. I do think there are and have a number of colleagues that have worked on nutritional policy for many, many years in Nutritional Sciences, I think you would agree. Whether that's the identity or not is another question, but I do think there is an issue here around -- you know, our goal is to create excellence in the area of policy. This has been a recommendation, a discussion, and what we're now talking about is how best to do that.

That question, we're now looking to find out about -- what I'm looking to hear is how we can do that best, how we create the best policy entity, and then we're going to be thinking about what the impact is on other departments and components either of human ecology or if, for example, a school of public policy is recommended and the PAM Department is the principal component of that school, what impact that has on Human Ecology.

I don't think at the end of the day there is going to be a vote by the faculty in one college or another, and I'll give you an example of why I think we've been sort of stuck in neutral

for some period of time. Rosemary Avery chaired a committee probably six years ago that suggested we create a new college of public policy, we take PAM out, we form that, we pull faculty out of some other places, we form a brand new college and invest more resources in that college.

A previous provost looked at that and said well, how do we do this without damaging the College of Human Ecology, by pulling out the largest department in the college. That has led us to the notion of either we can't do this without impacting somebody else or we figure out how we create excellence and do no harm on the other areas.

And this gets back to, I think, Harry's question about the linkage between super-departments or multi-college departments and the idea of policy, because -- so Nutritional Sciences is already, if you will, a super-department, but if we create a policy college, one of the things that faculty have said, and many faculty have desired a policy college and articulated that desire, one of the things they will still need is a disciplinary home. So those policy individuals will be psychologists, sociologists, economists. Those individuals need to have a disciplinary home, which is why that is linked to that option.

But I think that's really the -- I don't know that we are far enough along to really answer your question, but I would push back a little bit to say that Nutrition has nothing to do with policy.

Yeah, I don't think you stated that, but yeah, I just wanted to make that point.

MIKE LOVENHEIM: Mike Lovenheim, the chair of the Econ Department. I also have faculty appointments in ILR and PAM. I just wanted to not really ask a question, but maybe underscore some of the points that were made and expand on them for just a couple minutes, because I think they're very important, thinking about why we would want to do something like this.

As kind of been raised by several people, there are fantastic policy scholars throughout the university, and the policy imprint of our faculty is very hard to notice from the outside, because we are so dispersed. There is not a coherent face of policy scholarship at Cornell. And it's just so dispersed that, even if we hired no other people, which I don't think would happen, it's still just bringing us all together in one place, I think, would have huge benefits to the imprint and the outward face of policy at Cornell and would make it not just about economics and sociology, but would also bring in a lot of these other areas like nutrition and political science, which belong, I think, in a real policy school.

As well, we have great disciplinary scholars throughout the university. We have the same problem in the social science disciplines, that we're all over the place. The fact that I have appointments in three colleges should -- I mean, it's crazy, right. So we don't put forward as strong an outward face in these areas as I think we could if we were all together making joint decisions, collaborating, making social sciences on campus as strong as they can be.

I think this is a really important development and one that I'm -- speaking as a faculty member, not as the chair of the department, but one that I'm strongly in favor of, and I think we need to do. This is a really, I think, exciting way to make social sciences and policy more coherent, more outward-facing, to invest in those in meaningful ways.

I've been frustrated, as I think a lot of my colleagues have been, in my decade here, that Cornell tends to play small ball often in the social sciences, for whatever reason. I think part of it is that our dispersed nature. I think this is a way for us to really kind of play in the big leagues and do exciting, innovative and things that will advance the social sciences in really important ways that I have not heard discussed in a meaningful way since I've been here.

So I think the devil's always in the details on these things. And that's, I think, important to discuss the details. And I'm not trying to denigrate anyone's concerns about the specifics, but

I do think broadly in terms of the vision in what we are trying to do here, what they are trying to do here is important. And I think if we don't do it, we're really not going to allow the social sciences at Cornell to reach their potential. I think that would be a real mistake. Thanks.

JOHN SILICIANO: So I just wanted to follow up briefly on Mike's point. So part of this process, we have had an enormous number of conversations, and many more to follow. And it's very natural that that's what shades these conversations are the kind of concerns that are most proximate to sort of your daily life. And so what tends to come up, totally understandably, is worrying about what the consequences of change are. And we tend to root ourselves in sort of our historical posture as the norm, and this is just normal, and this is how we act.

What we are trying to do is take all that data in, account for it, flag it as really valid concerns that need to be considered in any possible transition. But what we're also trying to do, and this was really clear from the charge from the president and the provost, is we should think about life ten years down the road in what it might look like, because in all these changes, and they are anxiety-producing in many ways, there's also just unbelievable promise.

And so if you think about the discussion Mike raised about a cross-university department of design that spans AAP and spans the two design departments that reside in CHE, if you think about what -- it has tremendous promise. There's complexity, there's all sorts of details, and it is disruptive, but that's how the university can evolve. So ten years from now, if this happens and we do the design right, we'll look back and think that was a tremendously important move in the evolution of the university.

When we looked at the history of the current super-departments or cross-college departments -- and again, there's many of those -- you can look back at the history. Some are ten years old. Econ is a relatively recent one, but we can find ones 20, 30, 40 years old, and you can see complicated transition periods; but then you can talk to the current faculty and they say

I can't believe we were ever separate faculty, that we were made up of three little departments and now we're functioning as a different group.

So part of our goal is to sort of keep our eyes not only in the sort of proximate issues and concerns, but the sort of long-run prize in some of these moves. And I think Mike's referring to the one that sits around policy.

ALEJANDRA GANDOLFO: Alejandra Gandolfo from Plant Biology, SIPS. I'm wondering how this will affect the purchase of the different departments, and also if you have any plan for the renewal faculty. And the other thing I want to, if you can clarify, obviously, these centers of school will bring more administration. Obviously, that's something that happens, so how are you approaching that, where the money's coming from and how the purchase for those department would be affected. Thank you.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Great question. So one of the things that I didn't say is that, along with asking for a review of the social sciences, I did not mount an effort to invest in the social sciences. And I have spoken to the faculty senate in the past about the initiatives that the provost tries to foster that are cross-departmental, cross-college.

I feel very strongly that it's important that we have some ability at the center of the institution to make institutional investments. You can overdo that. The provost can sort of consume all the oxygen. We don't want to do that; but having no oxygen, having nothing there at the center is also, I think, a mistake. So we've made critical investments in the physical sciences, humanities and the arts, in the biological sciences.

We have these radical collaborations. We've done nothing in the social sciences. And that was explicit, that was purposeful to say we need a plan in which we can then invest. So there will be central resources, there will be faculty investment, there will be hires that are

associated with this, but we need to really have a plan that leads to excellence, and that's what I'm waiting for.

We will, as in all things -- and I can hear from your question -- minimize the administration, try and do this in a way in which we achieve efficiencies -- and I can tell you that, as an example, having three departments where you might have one is not the most efficient organization.

And the example that I often raise that illustrates what John just said is 20 years ago, before I came to Cornell, we had biology -- we had Genetics in CALS and we had Cell Biology and Genetics in Arts and Sciences. We formed a department Molecular Biology and Genetics that spans CALS and Arts and Sciences. There was a lot of difficulty or unease initially. You look now; you can't tell who's a CALS faculty, who's an arts faculty. The department itself has created excellence, and I can't imagine a world today where we would still have competing essentially plant genetics and mammalian genetics, for example.

MIKE DARRE: Mike Darre, Animal Science. I have two questions. One is, what do you mean by creating excellence. And the second is, can you give one or two concrete examples about how this join of social sciences into one group would make a difference?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, let me answer your second question first. I will give you one example, which is the primary example I think we should all worry about, which is hiring of new faculty. How do we get the best faculty to come to Cornell? I don't think it's by saying you're in a group that is part of a small group and not a larger effort.

I think we've seen that in Economics. I have been told by economists that we've hired people that we could not hire previously when, for example, all the labor economists were in ILR and they had no connection to an economics department, and we're hiring labor economists, but saying you're not part of an economics department. So to me, back to John's point, if you

look forward five, ten years and you think about who we're hiring and how we achieve strength in the future, I think this sets us up in a better way. To me, that's the primary argument for doing it.

MIKE DARRE: How about, how does this help to create excellence? How does that approach help to create excellence?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, I think creating excellence and sustaining excellence and creating more excellence is really around faculty recruitment and bringing faculty together to work on big problems. I come back to my answer around how we recruit the best faculty, how we create the future and make sure that we're setting ourselves up in the best possible way as a recruitment, where the best people can go to lots of places.

JOHN SILICIANO: Along those lines, sometimes in this effort, we've heard the concern that this is just a pursuit of visibility or rankings, that it's sort of an ego-driven way to get Cornell on a map we wish we were higher up upon. There is that language, but what we're thinking is much more substantive.

That's a sort of crude and inaccurate proxy for what Mike just described is actual impact, is that we're able at Cornell to bring the best scholars in to enrich a full discipline across the university, that we're better able to offer robust curriculum to our undergraduates, who instead are trying to piecemeal it together in one department or another; is that there's a broad spectrum here that we're able to recruit the best graduate students, we're able to have the best impact. Those things do tend to correlate when we're appropriately organized and appropriately scaled.

So the notion of visibility, all that is really just a proxy for the substantive benefits that we can gain by continuing, as the university's done for a century and a half, to continually evolve and optimize its structure. And we feel like, based on all these prior faculty reviews and

recommendations, we are at one of these major inflexion points where we can envision a whole series of changes that might be very good.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I have a question about this ugrad-related question and how you are using the word "school." So like School of Industrial and Labor Relations admits students, but the School of Electrical Engineering doesn't. So where are you in your thinking about I'm an undergraduate interested in policy; how do I show up here?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, it's a complicated question, Charlie. We have lots of versions of schools. And some versions, I think, or some implementations, a school is a department that's been named, that had an endowment and been named. I think that's true in some places. In other places, a school like ILR is a collection of faculty around an idea and, as you say, that separately admits students.

I would say that one of the things that we haven't talked about that we have to be very careful about as we go forward is our undergraduate programs. As we think about policy, we think about design, I think there are opportunities here to be more clear about -- for people interested in these ideas, about how you pursue them at Cornell.

But I also think we have to be very careful -- you know, we are talking about impacts on Human Ecology. There are great undergraduate programs in Human Ecology, lots of individuals interested in global health, lots of students, premed students, et cetera. So part of what the committee is working on is also how we conceptualize and think about that. And that will be a conversation as we go forward, absolutely.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I wonder if you could talk a little bit -- and I know, from reading the vision statement, that a lot of this is in the thought process, but the question of faculty and whether this would potentially lead to more joint appointments, or something that's not a joint appointment, but an affiliation.

One of the reasons I ask is because at least my experience over the years is that joint appointments can be very difficult on the person who's jointly appointed, because you are pleasing different places. And so is that something that you all have thought about? Has the committee addressed it?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, absolutely. Part of what makes these work and what we need to do is bring scholars together that are located in different parts of the university. So there's a group of scholars within the Government Department that are very policy-focused, and they would be very pertinent to be part of this.

We are avoiding conscripting anybody and sort of moving pieces around this board; but we are thinking that in some cases, joint appointments are the way to have people have both a foot in government and a foot in public policy, but we're also very attentive to sort of how many masters someone has to please.

As you say, we have this in realtime right now with existing joint appointments, so I often see this in terms of managing the tenure process. I vigorously discourage pre-tenured faculty from doing this. It's too difficult. If we think about these multiple units, we also have to worry about service obligations to a college and to a department, so that's been a constant set of conversations within the committee about are we realistically able to imagine faculty having this many hats and, if not, what can give.

So that's absolutely a core concern, but what I've seen over time is that we have ways to solve it. Sometimes we don't solve it well, and then there's a real problem, either somebody being overcommitted or being basically absentee in one of the roles and they're just taking up a title and really not part of that. And we've seen departments think about that, about whether they want 0% appointments or not. And there's lots of answers, but we do have situations we are actually able to manage great deals of complexity.

The example I give is that in the Jacobs Institute, which is shared between Cornell and Technion, you can be a faculty member in Jacobs in Computer Science, but you are also a member of Cornell Tech, but you are a member of the Computer Science Department here, which is shared between CIS and Engineering. So that's four different hats. And what you need to do is think about carefully when in Rome, what Rome you're paying. And we can work that out, if we pay attention. If we don't, we're going to get either sort of absentee appointments or faculty overloads.

MIKE KOTLIKOFF: I would just add, Risa, I think you are worried appropriately around the sort of dual commitment. There's a worry on the other side, which is you separate individuals. For example, when we create a policy entity, if we didn't have labor policy as part of that, if we didn't include individuals that were part of ILR, I don't think we would have as strong a policy entity as we could have. So we have to do that in all the ways that John said, but one of the geniuses of Cornell, I think, is having that ability to move across those barriers in ways that certainly move across colleges, in ways that I haven't seen at other institutions.

KEN BIRMAN: Ironically, it's not even a question. This is Ken Birman, Computer Science. I wanted to clarify something that John Siliciano commented on. Actually, with Jacobs, these people end up as Computer Science field members; but many years ago, Computer Science had quite a few people with joint appointments. As Risa pointed out and you point out, it got complicated.

At this point, we almost never, maybe never in realtime are considering joint appointments. People come and ask us about them, but the flexibility of the Cornell field structure turns out to be adequate, and it is an easier way to handle this, because then you have an unambiguous answer for tenure and for promotions and that aspect. I would hope you'd

learn from our experience, because we've been on both sides and we fairly gravitated towards using the field system.

JOHN SILICIANO: But it is true, Ken, if I can add, if you are a computer scientist in Jacobs or Cornell Tech, you are a member of the Computer Science Department. That is your home department. If you're an Information Science faculty, you're not separate Information Science at Cornell Tech. You are a member of the Information Science Department.

KEN BIRMAN: That's right, but if you are a Jacobs Technion faculty member, then Computer Science or Information Science field member.

JOHN SILICIANO: Fair enough. I just wanted to clarify. Thank you very much. Thank you for your attention.

(APPLAUSE)

DAVID SHMOYS: My name is David Shmoys, and I'm here to give you a brief introduction to a new center that's just being set up this semester at Cornell, the Center for Data Science for Enterprise in Society. This is a product, or one of the products that grew out of other radical collaborations, the radical collaboration on Data Science. And this is the cast of characters that was part of that team that started about two years ago.

One of the people had seen the slides in advance, asked me well, could I define what Data Science is. I have to confess that the very first thing that task force did was to try to think about collectively what our own individual definitions were. It is an emerging field. It is in many ways transdisciplinary, in and of itself.

In fact, one of the task force members quipped back that it's changing too fast to be worthy of a good definition at this time; but more roughly speaking, it is a convergence of the fact that we have the ability to harvest data that's heterogeneous and it is scale, and develop methodological tools and computational tools to actually have impact on a range of different

application domains. So it's this interplay between methodology at its core and a range of disciplines that is sort of one of its defining features.

The task force was given a very broad charge. Clearly, I don't expect you to read this, but just to highlight that it is about research, about teaching, about infrastructure, really across all levels of the university. And a number of events have occurred since the issuing of that report, which was well more than a year ago.

Department of Statistical Science changed its name to Department of Statistics and Data Science. There was a creation of Department of Computational Biology to take on much of the research focus on the biological side. There were a number of curriculum initiatives, one in Arts and Sciences and one in CALS, promoting a number of changes.

Of course, one of the changes that already came into place, in conjunction with the overall undergraduate Arts and Science review, is every undergraduate science has, rather than the quantitative two-course requirement, one of those course requirements is going to be in data science; but what I'm here today to tell you about is a new cross-unit focal point that's the Center for Data Science for Enterprise in Society.

What is the intellectual scope of the center just being set up? In some sense, and this isn't a hard line, but if you sort of draw a rough line of thinking about the sources of data, think about data that has a connection to -- that's congenerated by human activity. So in particular, the connections to the computational social sciences and connections to the economic computer science interface are going to be among the pieces highlighted.

If you think about the connection to infrastructure for management and production on the data side, settings ranging from agriculture in the digital agriculture initiative to urban transport. That's just two points of focus, but many in between. Then there are many issues

that interplay with the methodological tools underlying data science that cross-cut areas; issues of privacy, of security and fairness, that sort of underlay the use of data in society today.

More generally, we have a mandate to be entrepreneurial and to look at where there are emerging new pockets of application and to think about how we can help cultivate activity on the campus. In many ways, this is intended to be a way of building a focal point for what is a very diverse activity spread across the campus, and in terms of, like many of the other radical collaborations, a key agenda piece is faculty renewal to cultivate and attract new star faculty.

In this case, the way the emphasis is being set up is a primary focus on the departments most associated with the core, what I'll call methodological underpinnings of the data science. So the searches are going to be focused on, but not limited to departments within CIS, economics, math, OR and EC in engineering.

As another piece to that, in part of building up the ecosystem for Data Science, we're sort of focusing on one of the relatively more recent kinds of faculty appointments, research assistant professorships, which are non-tenured track positions, which are going to be three-year positions. And each year, there will be a cohort of three such hires.

Whereas the mid-career faculty hiring is really focused on the methodological piece, these are going to be focused on interplay between the application domain and the methodological piece, so as to really span a very broad wingspan across the campus.

Another part of what it means to be building the ecosystem is that there will be a faculty proposal-driven cycle, in similar ways the Atkinson Center has done. One will be what I'm calling boot camps, but don't think of them as computational boot camps. Think of them as sort of synergy experiences for bringing together a group of faculty across campus with a common research goal, to have the opportunity to bring people from peer institutions and from NGOs and from industry to jump-start a particular research activity in a focused area.

And in coordination with that kind of activity, the center is aimed to be a coordination point for cross-unit-sponsored research and industry contact in what's really a burgeoning area of interest. And in terms of where is the line between research and teaching, of course one piece that spans across that is our doctoral programs, and then we'll play a coordinating facilitating role in the foundation of the graduate field of data science, initially focused on setting up a Ph.D. minor, because one of the experiences that many of the faculty know that students across a broad range of fields come to us trying to understand how do I augment sort of the traditional program they have with this data science component.

If we're talking about the organizational structure of the center, there's an executive committee, which will oversee the full range of the center's activities working in conjunction, consisting of Francesca Molinari from Economics, Thorsten Joachims from Computer Science and Information Science, and David Matteson from Statistical and Data Science.

So that's an executive committee. They all work together with an advisory council that is constituted of representatives from those seven key departments, as well as the cochairs of a broader committee, which will span really every unit kind of focus that will be spear-heading the recruitment and selection of the research assistant professorship cohort.

So that's the rough structure intellectually. And with that, I'm happy to take questions.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thanks for the presentation. I have one question and a concern. One of the things that I don't think is at all radical about this is when you actually look at the makeup of the group. There's not a diverse group here. It's kind of three women and maybe one person of color, so that's clearly something that I would think would be extremely important if we want to call something a radical collaboration, that we think about diversity in lots of ways.

And one concern I have in that way is the plan to have an increase of -- I take it nine people ultimately in non-tenure track positions. I don't think we should increase non-tenure track positions. I think we should increase tenure track positions, but if you're going to have non-tenure track positions, I don't think that's a desirable way to look at increasing diversity in terms of gender and race, because that actually just simply creates less diversity in regard to the full tenure track lines. So I wonder if you have some thoughts about that.

DAVID SHMOYS: Well, responding to the last part, it's not clear to me that the conclusions are accurate that in the sense that by building a better bridge to a tenure track line that the non-tenure track position -- the full expectation is that this is a cohort that will proceed on to tenure track positions, either at Cornell or at other places; that will really be a great opportunity for helping to cultivate a very diverse collection of individuals, in terms of who they are and what role they serve for the university.

I don't buy into the principle of that, and include, clearly, one thing that will be important, that as I build the selection committee and the recruitment committee for the research assistant professorships, we all know that diverse committees choose more diverse recipients, and that will definitely be something I'll be paying attention to.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So you have something formally adopted as a policy that the non-tenure track lines will be expected to shift to tenure track lines at Cornell?

DAVID SHMOYS: No, I distinctly did not say that. I said there's an expectation that the individuals will be using this as a stepping stone in their own careers, possibly at Cornell, but possibly elsewhere, to tenure track positions. Many may also go on to industry, but this is an area where we're having trouble recruiting faculty because of the strong industry connections across a wide range of industries, so it's not a policy decision. It is a question of how to cultivate a cohort that can serve a result in the overall academic process.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Let me just follow really quickly. My experience has not been that non-tenure track lines, that the people holding them are in a better position to get tenure track lines. I have real doubts about that.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard BenseL, Government. Just a very quick question. The research assistant professorships, are you eligible for reappointment?

DAVID SHMOYS: At this time, it wasn't anticipated to have that role.

RICHARD BENSEL: It will make a big difference in how the system operates, so I would encourage you to make that decision soon.

DAVID SHMOYS: Right. I mean, I would be hesitant in building a new construct like that to set a very hard line, but I can certainly say in terms of expectation, that's the absolute expectation.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, in English. Following up on Risa's concerns, did you consider calling the research assistant professorship a post-doc?

DAVID SHMOYS: Yes, but it serves a different role, because in the methodological areas, what one of the mechanisms that it serves is is actually a mechanism that a young faculty member can essentially have the life of an assistant professor and actually go into a second term of a three-year position, either at Cornell or a tenure track position, and it serves a very different mechanism.

It's a teaching-free appointment, so in terms of going into a setting where they have necessary infrastructure to help leverage and make the most of that, it changes the competitive environment. I'm not saying that a significant fraction of the appointments will be of that mold, but in terms of the multitude of roles that this can do.

I mean, one of the issues is that as you look across the range of disciplines that this is likely to do, there are different career tracks across the full range of those things, of what's true

in engineering is not true in the computational sciences, not true in the social science, is not true in policy.

The range of places in which data science is having impact have a number of professions, and they all have different expectations of what that label means. And by calling them research assistant professorship, it may be sort of giving it an upgrade for what many people will term and view as three-year post-docs, where we're sort of broadening the opportunities for what that could be used as a stepping stone to.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. I just wanted to weigh in on this debate about sort of research assistant professor versus extended post-doc. Before I came here, I had like a three-year appointment. It was a little like a research assistant professorship, and it was precarious.

It wasn't tenure track, but the flexibility and the freedom that it afforded me above what I had as a post-doc was probably the best thing that ever happened to me professionally, and I think that it sort of gives -- at least it gave me the opportunity to try out sort of high-risk ideas and sort of take them to a place where someplace like Cornell could pluck them, I guess. So I'm in favor of it, as long as we sort of treat these people with respect, I guess.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You know you've been around a long time when "do you have quorum" is the most exciting part of the senate meeting. The answer is yeah, and it's 86, which is really good. So now we can go to the voting part of the meeting.

SAM NELSON: Charlie, why don't you present the first resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have to do the October minutes.

SPEAKER NELSON: We have to basically approve the October meeting minutes. All those in favor, say aye.

(Ayes.)

All those opposed? No one opposed, so they are approved. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Last month, Vice Provost for Undergrad Education Alicia Nietzsche presented a resolution concerned with the Learning Where You Live courses, so today we're going to vote on that. The UFC was the sponsor of this resolution. In a nutshell, it basically simplifies and creates a more efficient course approval process that is university-wide.

The problem before, you would have to go through departments, and these courses didn't really square with exactly the kinds of courses they teach, so the idea is to streamline that with really serious and important oversight. The second thing has to do with creating a rubric LWYL, so students can find these courses more easily. In the last four weeks, there was some discussion between the proposers and the house things on west campus and the faculty and residents on north campus. And basically, a few lines were added just to emphasize the intellectual leadership, and this is coming from that group.

Having said that --

SPEAKER NELSON: We're just going to vote. And I'm hoping for a simple voice vote; but if there's any ambiguity, we'll just have a quick show of hands. All those in favor to approve this resolution, say aye.

(Ayes.)

All those opposed? Any abstentions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Abstain.

SPEAKER NELSON: One abstention. Doesn't seem like there's any ambiguity, so the resolution passes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. We had a discussion last month on a grade change policy, and Professor Richard BenseL -- it's a twelve-person or so sponsors, and Richard will take us through the next steps.

RICHARD BENSEL: This is going to be very brief, because we did discuss it for 25 minutes or so last time. In the resolution we proposed last month, we had that text and we included the resolved text. That text, this is after discussion with the cosponsors, and with some debate and revisions and so forth. Most of the cosponsors wanted to change the text of the resolution, an amendment.

So this part, the part in red then was dropped out, so we took that out and we added one whereas, because that was one of the issues that came up in the discussion was what do we do with those cases that are very egregious, with our suspension and so forth and so on, not allow a resolution of these cases. So we took out the suspension, we added this whereas, and then the resolution, the resolved part is now that the university administration work with the faculty senate to incorporate such changes into university grading policy.

That was the result of the deliberations of the cosponsors. That is the resolution that now we are presenting to you, and there's not really time for debate, but there might be time for, I guess, a question or two. Any questions?

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. Last time I recall there was a question about the nature of the sort of 50 or so grade changes that had been recorded. Did we ever get any clarity on that?

RICHARD BENSEL: No. That was one of the motives for offering the resolution, is that we have no information upon which to proceed to consider these things, so we have no additional information to offer.

ANTHONY HAY: Anthony Hay, Microbiology. I would submit the first two whereas clauses are factually inaccurate. The circumstances we've heard about were undertaken by -- in individual registrars, so there wasn't a university effort.

And secondly, whereas the grade -- this change in the grading policy, there was no policy to speak of. So I don't have an amendment to recommend, but I just think we need to work on that language, because they are factually inaccurate.

RICHARD BENSEL: I would respond that interpretation is incorrect, but we don't know. So when you say the university's been changing course grades without notifying the instructor of record, somebody's been changing the grades, and nobody knows. We wrote university, because that's a proxy for whoever did decide that. I don't know who that is.

That's one of the problems addressed by the resolution -- again, I'm repeating what we said last time. This is a fundamental right of the faculty and we don't know what's going on, and we could just make it very simple, come and tell us; but we tried to turn it into whereases. I'm very sympathetic with correcting those kinds of things as being factually wrong. Maybe they're factually right. We don't know. That'd be my response.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, in English. From my point of view, it's factually wrong, because I do not think that the university has been changing course grades, that an F is not so much -- if I give a student an F, this is the student's lack of effort in my class.

And so if the Academic Records Committee or the senior associate dean, who is the committee or the individual who makes these decisions to expunge the F or to convert it to a W, that my assessment of the student's participation in my class has not been altered, it's not been made better. No one is saying that the student did better in my class. The student did. They're just taking that mark of really the lack of participation and erasing it, so I do not see this as a change in grade. My assessment of the student remains the same.

The student is not going to be coming to me and asking for a letter of recommendation based on that W I gave in my class, no. I gave the student an F, and it stands like that. This resolution, I can't get behind it because I do not see basically certifying a student's failure as having a part in our educational mission.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you for that. The problem is, from faculty's point of view, in a class, no grade is just an individual dialogue with a student. It's also a relationship to the other students in the class. So if someone gets a D because they did poor work, you're judging them and you're rewarding them within the context of the class. You are weakening, in other words, the judgment, you are talking about you are weakening the judgment and evaluation for all the students in the class when a grade is changed.

TIM DEVOOGD: Tim DeVoogd, Psychology. For me, at least, the resolution seems premature, with not knowing whether what we're talking about is just the thing that Joanie mentioned, an F being turned to a W or knowing whether letter grades are being changed from one letter to another or, in fact, knowing how often this happens. And so for me, I would see it needing that information to know whether any resolution is actually needed.

RICHARD BENSEL: I'm sympathetic with that. I don't know any other way to get that information, except to draw it out of the university, and I don't know that the university is particularly forthcoming.

MARK WYSOCKI: So based on what we had discussion last month, I did go to some of the registrars, and here's the issue: The registrars look at it as not a change of grade, but a change of status for the student. So it's not a grade change, in their mind. In their mind, the status is the student has been withdrawn from the class, not that a grade has been changed.

So I think we're kind of arguing or talking about two different perspectives of what the faculty perceive as a grade change and what the registrars perceive as a change in status of the

student in the course. And also, this is only to a W, not a B to an A or anything like this. That does not occur.

So this is only dealing with the W part for the student, and that's where you have this resolution about what probably Charlie's going to talk about, of getting other people involved as to what is the issue why that status was changed.

RICHARD BENSEL: We do need more information. One of the issues that came up was whether or not changing a grade to a W was a grade change. I think semantically, I don't think -- and there's no doubt in my mind, an unchanged grade is an unchanged grade. If it's an F, it's an F that's unchanged. If it's something else, then it's been changed. So I don't think this is a matter of semantics. I don't think it's a matter of doubt. The faculty handbook, I don't think, is ambiguous on this issue. It is what it is.

SPEAKER NELSON: We are out of time.

You want to put forward a motion and call for a vote? So if you support the proposed resolution, I'm just going to do it like we've been doing it, you say aye. If you don't, you say nay, then we'll do the hand vote, if it's ambiguous at all. All those in support of the motion, say aye.

(Ayes.)

All those opposed to the motion, say nay.

(Nays.)

So that's ambiguous. So we'll do a hand vote. Mark, will you count the center? I'll count the middle, and Charlie, you count this. We'll add them all together. Okay, all those in favor, please raise your hand.

All those opposed?

And all those abstaining, please raise your hand.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: 38 yes, 23 no, and 10 abstain, so it passes.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Quick follow-up here. First, let me answer some questions that came. First of all, the two exaggerations here, one is as if the 50 were somehow wrong. It could be that you forgot to drop a course or whatever, so don't assume that it's 50.

Yeah, Buz?

BUZ BARSTO: In principle, philosophically, I agree with Richard's position. Thank you so much for the mic. The reason I bring up the 50 and the lack of data is because Chris Schaffer brought up this concern last time, and I know there's an amendment to the resolution. I just wasn't convinced that it sort of completely resolved that concern Chris had. We're coming back to the 50. That was just a number I remember hearing last time.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The 50 is data. That is the number, on average, over the last ten semesters, I got it from the registrar. If you want data such as how many of those are because some student had a mental illness concern that we went back and changed it, we aren't ever going to get that data. And that number is extremely small.

The other exaggeration is not a registrar who makes it. Every college has some academic actions committee, and -- the registrar may push the button, but it's always upon the instruction of a faculty committee. That doesn't change. So I want to be clear about that.

In May, we passed a resolution that basically said any change whatsoever, the faculty member has to know. Most of the time, the faculty member is the one who institutes it, should be a B instead of a C or something like that, but that's hard-wired now in the faculty handbook. At that point, there were concerns, more data, more clarity, how do we inspire confidence in the system.

So I met with all the registrars in June, collectively. And then in the last month, I met every single college registrar except Vet and Law, because they have a minimum number of

undergrad situations. Anyway, when I visited them, I said, how would that square with your job, because we have to be mindful of people's workload and so on.

Here's the gist of this resolution. The faculty member has the right to query the college who does the grade change about the protocols that they followed. If, in fact, it involves Cornell Health or the Title IX office or the university counsel, you can engage the college to make sure that they followed those procedures. You can't go to the Title IX office and demand facts. That's not going to happen. And this is a proposal. We aren't voting on it today. That's our considered judgment, but what we can do. It's, in my mind, the strongest possible thing we can ask for.

The resolution, the modified one we just passed, has a great final line: Engage with the university administration. So based on concerns that I think came out of the senate, the VPUE created a working group that's looking at this very issue. And they will, in some form or another, come back and will talk about what they recommend.

I wanted this on the floor so that they react to it, rather than us reacting to something that they may propose. So I think we're all set for a healthy wrap-up discussion. I'm not sure when it will be; maybe December, might be February, but what this, then, does is responds to Richard's resolution, which is simply let's, together with all the players, reach some kind of agreement.

This whole thing runs on trust, and you have to respect all the different players in this. Yeah, we have rights and so on, responsibilities, but there are other things going on as well; so unfolding in the next couple of meetings or hopefully one meeting, to get to some agreed-upon language that works. We have a minute or two, if there are any questions about that.

Yeah, Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. As a point of grammar, it strikes me that there's a problem with the wording of the second line on this thing that you've shown us, the second line being a paragraph long, basically. Could someone please try to work -- in particular, it's not clear to me that resulted is correct in this usage, but in any case, this is almost impossible to parse.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, so we'll work on the blue. But again, just to clarify, if there's a grade change and you have some concerns about it, going to your college --

RICHARD BENSEL: Just objecting to the choice of wording on which --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Why don't we talk after we adjourn, and you can point to the -- any other questions on this? Okay, I guess that's the end of the meeting, so thanks.

SPEAKER NELSON: Meeting's adjourned.