A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2019

THE SPEAKER: If I could have everybody's attention, we'll get started. We'll start our meeting. As always, a couple of little housekeeping things. When we call upon you and you want to make some statements, please wait until the person with the microphone arrives. And when they do, hold the microphone right up to your mouth and make sure you state your name and your department, then we'll give you two minutes for your oral comments. So let me introduce Charlie Van Loan to get things kicked off.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot. Just one slide, which is in the spring, we have major elections. All I'm saying now is start thinking about people. So there's my position, we have faculty trustee, which is a four-year stint, we have seats on the University Faculty Committee, which oversees the senate and so on, Nominations and Elections take care of those things, and a couple of senator-at-large seats.

So more details will be forthcoming, and we'll probably send out the synopsis later this week, more details about that, but I guess the high point here is think about people, including yourself. Any questions about that?

We have our first-ever Zoom presentation in the senate, and we have Professor Avery August, who's vice provost for academic affairs, and Angela Winfield, who is the vice president for inclusion and diversity in the workplace.

Avery, why don't you start. Angela is right here, then we'll do Q&A and so on.

AVERY AUGUST: Can you hear me?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yes.

AVERY AUGUST: Good afternoon, everyone. It is a pleasure to meet you or to interact with you electronically. I wish I was there to talk about the Belonging at Cornell campaign. What I thought I'd do is just give you three slides that tell you a bit about what the campaign is.

So I'm Avery August, one of the presidential advisors for diversity and equity. Angela Winfield is my co-presidential advisor, sitting in the room, and I think Victoria White, who works with us is also in the room. Who is not in the room is Vijay Pendakur, the dean of students. He had to travel.

What you see here is our logo for Belonging at Cornell campaign. This was developed -- it came out of a number of different initiatives, but predominantly Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate, as well as the provost's Task Force on Equity and Diversity pushed us to rethink how we think about diversity and inclusion here at Cornell.

We have retired the Toward New Destinations that some of you may be aware of, and this Belonging at Cornell campaign is one that's replacing it. This campaign is a reenergized D&I framework that allows us to take advantage of the strengths of the Toward New Destinations, in terms of all the great activity in the colleges and units, but add on to it an accountability piece, such that we all have common objectives, we are measuring and tracking how we are doing in this area, and we are engaging with the community in a much more robust way.

To do this, we have developed a strategy, starting two phases. The first phase is faculty and staff. That's why we are here, having this conversation today, as part of our rollout for the faculty and staff, with the second phase to come for students.

So for the faculty and staff, we've developed five metrics that we will be monitoring as part of our tracking and accountability structure, two on compositional metrics, which is just turnover rates and proportion of hiring, then the other three on climate metrics, which we will

collect using a survey that we are developing that would be rolled out to all faculty and staff starting the early part of the year.

I just wanted to give that sort of brief overview of what the Belonging at Cornell campaign is. I'm happy, and Angela and Victoria, are happy to answer questions, but really wanted to have more of a conversation with you on what we could be doing to work with the faculty senate to make this a much more successful initiative across the faculty.

So I'll stop my presentation, so that you can see me, and maybe I will pose a question for discussion first; we'd like to understand how we can work with the faculty senate to significantly broaden participation across the campus from all parts of the campus with regards to making the faculty senate more diverse.

ANGELA WINFIELD: Before we get into that question, I would just like to add something about the shift from Toward New Destinations to this model of Belonging at Cornell, and part of the reason why we are doing this and part of the reason why we have selected these five key metrics, climate-based and compositional-based, is because they are a proxy for the climate that is from the task force, Presidential Task Force, as well as just feedback that we've gotten from the community of what they want to see as an inclusive, welcoming environment.

These are not the only metrics. There's a number more that have been tracked by IRP, but these are the five key metrics that will give us a sense of where we are and the experience that folks are having on campus. As Avery said, the first phase is faculty and staff, so these metrics are really aimed at not only are we doing things or do we have initiatives, activities and programs that are in place, but are they effective. How is it affecting faculty on the individual level, as well as staff, but faculty on the individual level of their experience of their departments, of their colleges, et cetera. So that's a little bit more context about why we've made this shift.

The other context that might be helpful to understand is the shift from Toward New Destinations to Belonging at Cornell is one about accountability. So how do we engage senior leaders, faculty at all levels in creating a culture change across all colleges and across the university at large. So that's a little bit more context.

And with that in mind, I will pose Avery's question again: How can we work with the senate to have this take hold and have real and true meaning.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: When I first started talking to Avery and Angela about this, one thing that came to mind is how we pick senators. This came up a little bit last year, when we were doing the RTE stuff, and maybe some of you might want to comment on the mechanisms that you see in your own unit and whether or not we can improve those. I think that's a pretty important step.

It's in the senate bylaws that there should be elections for that, rather than the chair walking down the hall and picking somebody; so comments about that, how we set up our operations here, would be real useful to hear, because it resonates exactly with the topic that's being discussed.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government Department. I don't know about that, Charlie, but I have another question. Four or five years ago, there was a questionnaire that was sent out a little bit like this, a questionnaire that was sent out to all faculty, and one of the questions was do you have confidence in the central administration. A plurality of the responses to that question were none or not very much. In the climate questionnaire, my suggestion would be that we have a question that addresses that issue, because we know from the past that this has been an important part of the Cornell climate.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Question up there at the top. Can we get the gentleman a microphone?

JACK ZINDA: I'm Jack Zinda, in Development Sociology, and I'm thinking about this question about representation in the senate. Seemed like there was a question about what the senate could do to help with inclusion and belonging efforts more broadly, as well as one specifically about representation in the senate.

And this gets into the toughest issue. Over on the one hand, we want broader, more diverse representation of people in bodies like the senate, but we also know that people of color and people more broadly, who represent various areas that are underrepresented, get called on disproportionately for service of all kinds. And I think the faculty senate membership might be a helpful place in that because, relative to some other service options, its time demands can be smaller; but I think that either way, it's hard to ask the question about the senate outside of a broader consideration of service overall.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Yeah, we'd like you to belong to the senate, but I can't because for various other reasons, is the classic problem you see not just in the senate, committee service, running for these positions that I spoke about at the beginning.

Risa, did you have your hand up?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. A couple thoughts. One is in terms of participation in the senate, as the other organizations. I think people participate when they believe that the issues that are addressed are meaningful. And so I think that the question for the senate is what are the issues that we're addressing and are they meaningful to all faculty, all participants. Are they addressing questions that are in particular important to inclusion, exclusion, to actually addressing policy issues at the university that would be improving the experience for all faculty? Do we address budgets in a way that matter in terms of resource allocation, et cetera?

So I think that question goes into an underlying question that we return to again and again, which is does the senate have the sort of power to participate in governance and university decision-making in a way that's meaningful to people and where they feel their coming is worth their while, because we'll have real discussions and try to take action to make changes.

And related to that, but not specifically with regard to the senate, is with regard to the way that decisions are made in this university. I think a lot of times people who are not included in the smaller core decision-making groups feel -- and a phrase I heard someone else use, democratically excluded. We are being told that there are all these kind of democratic ways in which we make choices to include people.

But in fact, when you look at who's making core decisions, it oftentimes comes down to people who are in the mainstream defined in various ways. So I think it's also making sure that those core decisions are transparent, that we have less confidentiality, that there's an openness in decision-making and that it includes a wide diversity of people. And then that, of course, goes back to governance, because the more transparent and open it is, the more we can have those discussions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Other comments? One thing we can do is when the survey comes out in February, is to impress upon our colleagues the importance of taking it. That's an obvious thing we should do.

ANGELA WINFIELD: Right. And the survey itself is a very short, but targeted survey. So there's about 25 items on it, and some of them get at these issues that you're raising, allocation of resources, ability to have your voice be heard by leadership, fairness in decision-making, those are some of the things addressed in the survey that we hope to get a better sense of,

where folks are at with that and how they're feeling about it, so then we can make really strategic recommendations as to how to address some of these, if we do see issues.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any other comments for Avery or Angela? There's one up there, Anthony.

ANTHONY HAY: Anthony Hay, Microbiology. I think one thing we could do, just be more forthright with the stats of the senate and the makeup of the senate, and make sure that when departments are electing senators, they know what the existing makeup is; it's old, white and established, whatever, so that if there's an opportunity for that discussion to be had in the department, that can help those that might want to change the face of that, put themselves forward for nomination or at least begin some of the discussion at the departmental level.

ANGELA WINFIELD: I think that's a great point. One thing I will say with this, and I'll probably leave it, is compositional diversity and beginning to shift, that is really important. The other thing that you may want to consider, as you have conversations or think about how the senate might be involved is how do you welcome diversity into the space. So it's great to have diversity represented, but if they are not being heard or accepted or treated in the same way -- not to say they wouldn't be, but these are things to think about, that compositional diversity only gets us but so far. It's when that diversity feels that they can contribute and are appreciated for what they bring that we can really benefit from that sort of diversity. So there may be things that you want to do structurally or systemically before you start bringing in diversity, so there's not a backlash and you can actually value from that diversity.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have time for one more question.

BRYCE CORRIGAN: Bryce Corrigan, Government. I was wondering whether the survey questions themselves will be available prior to fielding of the survey. Just from this conversation, I can hear maybe two possible open-ended questions that could be really useful,

something like what activities or service most contributes to an atmosphere of belonging -- or what activities or service for you most contributes to an atmosphere of belonging and why.

Another might be did you ever feel you were disproportionately burdened with efforts at inclusion at Cornell in your area. So anyway, I think there are probably, in this room, dozens of other suggestions we might be able to give, if we were able to see the specific survey. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, very good. Let's thank Avery and Angela for bringing this topic to our attention.

(APPLAUSE)

AVERY AUGUST: Thank you.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: For our next presentation, I would like to invite Professor Steve Carvell to talk about eCornell.

STEVE CARVELL: Hi, everybody. Happy to be here. Steve Carvell. I'm a professor here. Been here for 34 years, so I'm happy to have an opportunity to talk to you. My position is a brand new position that was created in August. By my own disclaimer, I was already on a heavy teaching load for the fall, so I'm only 50% in that position, because that's all I could afford of my time right now. So we've come so far, and I thought I would just fill you in -- I should say Charlie asked me to fill you in a little bit about what we have been doing.

The first part of this term for me, from August until probably into October, and it's ongoing, has been spent in the process of moving eCornell from a for-profit, but wholly owned part of Cornell. I mean, it is owned by the endowment, but it's a for-profit corporation up on South Hill, if you've ever been in that complex, so an integral part of Cornell University.

And for the organization of eCornell, you can be not surprised about, it's a pretty big culture shift, because they have to now deal with HR here at the university and accounting and

everything. So some of that was just structurally moving that company into the university structure, and that will take place officially on January 1, as the tax year kind of rolls over. All their employees will become employees of Cornell University. They are being restructured into a band here at the university, so that was the first part of my job.

As I said, somewhere around October, and I haven't quite finished yet, but I've been traveling around to the different schools. I'm part of the Johnson College of Business, so of course I interact with the dean there, but also at Engineering and CIS and ILR and Law. And I have a meeting coming up with Ray and so on. So I have been traveling around, met with Rachel and her team already up in CHE, so I have a couple more to do.

Those meetings pretty much are just to give people at those different schools a sense of what I think the mission of my job is and to hear from them, how they may see participating in external education. External education is defined as eCornell, which is online learning, which kind of is the primary thing that Charlie asked me to come speak about, but also executive education. So we do, across the university, quite a bit of that. Some of that is professional credit. That happens at the Law School, for instance; and some of it is more corporate-based training, face-to-face corporate-based training.

Then we have blended programs that we run with corporations, where they take some online courses and some face-to-face. So that gives you a little sense of the domain of my job. I'm not saying it's yet been defined as all-inclusive, but that's the first stage of it.

I would say, in terms of the last part of my title here, which says external education strategy, I think that is because if you look at the nature of eCornell, what it's done so far, the vast majority of the courses that eCornell has are either within the Johnson College of Business and ILR. Those are the two big places. And my job, and I think it is a mission of mine, is to spread that domain into the larger university, so that more colleges have more courses.

eCornell distance learning has a lot of great attributes associated with it. The people at eCornell, I think, are leaders in their industry, in terms of what they do and how they do it and the level of professional standards. So if you've never seen one, I'm sure you could always get a guest account so that you can see a course, if you ever wanted to see one.

I'm not going to say that the mission is to spread it equally, because that's not my job. It's up to the deans and the faculty within those colleges to think about how they would explore eCornell online opportunities, but it is a thing that I think I would like to do. I would like to provide more resources. Those of you who ever go by, you can see there's a big construction project up at north campus, to add more students to the student body. I mean, that is a way for the university to expand its resources; but this is a different way, I think, that's quite efficient and can be really helpful for a lot of departments in terms of providing resources for their faculty and their facilities and student and research opportunities.

They have received, I guess, that spreadsheet; is that right? We were putting one together, but also Charlie was able to do it, I guess, with the people at his office. You probably received this sheet. I should say when we talk about courses at eCornell, they're not three-credit courses. They're six-hour, eight-hour courses. They're quite focused.

I've had a set of courses in eCornell for 16 years; and there's, I think, eight of them. They are used broadly across a wide range of types of individuals, but let me -- there's some questions, then I'll be open to hear.

Suppose I, as a faculty member, wanted to set up an online certificate program that has, say, five courses and that I teach every one of them. Can you provide details?

Well, if you teach all those courses, that's great. And I just want to say a certificate program doesn't have to be five courses. A certificate program is just developed by -- it's not a

professional certificate like you would get if you were continue ed in law. It's just designed as a group of courses that fit together, but let's say you had five.

The proposal in the past has come from idiosyncratic contact between eCornell and individual faculty, and that's not how it's going to be developed any longer. Now it's going to be a much more organic process inside of your college and department. Part of that has to do with the resources, part of that has to do with the culture of the different departments.

So let me just say that if your college and department, and through that you were identified as a resource to develop courses, that's how that would work. It's not per se like an RFP, which goes out and we just get a bunch of people to answer it. So the proposal comes organically through that process. There would have to be some discussion about how the individual faculty member was getting release time or not and how that payment would work; and that is a thing that is, again, endogenous to the individual college and department.

We've tried to develop a one-sized budget model -- which there's another question about that later on -- about the pie that gets shared. And we're just about ready to finish up with that, so that the pie of resources -- and the pie of resources is royalty coming from the online course -- is actually sent through the dean and departments. And how that gets shared among that is dependent on the culture of the organization.

It says how the cost of the certificate is determined. Certainly not by me. I mean, eCornell is still going to function largely as a profit-oriented individual organization, so my generic economist hat would say whatever the market would bear is what they're going to charge. I would say that just so that you know, there's retail pricing.

I could go there as an individual and buy a course that's quite expensive. Large corporations buy thousands and thousands of course seats for their organization; and then

obviously, the price gets much lower per course seat. So that's just to give you a sense that it's still market-determined and quantity-determined. There's quantity discounts.

Does my department get a share of the revenues? Yes, a very large share of the revenues. The exact number isn't yet cashed out among all the deans, but let's just say it's in the neighborhood of 25% of the total revenues that come in from the royalties get pushed back out.

In the past, individuals signed contracts with eCornell and the college, and that was a three-party agreement. Mostly, we'll be having more like two-party agreements, and then there will be some share that goes out to the faculty through the department and the college.

And if a course is delivered during the fall or spring semesters, how do I, my chair, reason about the balance between my eCornell teaching and my research?

And I guess I would just put that in a different context. It's like writing a book. When the book is getting sold and it's already done, your contribution -- I mean, I guess if you're going to go on a book tour or something, that's different, but your contribution is already pretty much done and the revenue stream comes in.

So really, this would be about the development phase of the eCornell course. And that can be quite extensive, and that really depends if you are really doing all five. That's really a lot of work to do on your own. It's more typical to have groups of faculty that work within a field combine and create a set of courses for a certification together. But it would be not really teaching during. It's more about how my teaching is adjusted during the development phase of the course, and that really just depends on how many of them you're doing and to what extent it takes.

So say you would get a teaching release that semester. Maybe it takes a year, so maybe it's a two-course teaching release over the course of a year. That would have to be determined

between yourself and how many of these small courses that you were developing and what effort it took.

So that answers those questions. I'm open to any other questions, to the best of my ability.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: I think we have time for about two questions.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hello. Chris Schaffer, from the Biomedical Engineering Department. I had two questions kind of about the scope you're talking about. So first, I'm curious why there would not be a broad RFA that went out to faculty who were interested in using this as an approach to teach a course.

And building on that, I'm wondering why you seem focused on corporate clients, almost to the exclusion of the ideas of courses that might be valuable for people in other contexts. Why not use this as something more than corporate professional education?

STEVE CARVELL: Let me back up. There's still CTI that exists. I, myself, use my own introduction to finance --

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I'm asking specifically about eCornell. Why not use eCornell for a broad platform for faculty which could reach constituencies outside of our classroom, and not just focus on corporate education?

STEVE CARVELL: Which constituency do you want to reach? Just trying to understand that. Is it just individuals interested in learning about a topic?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Exactly.

STEVE CARVELL: I think we would consider that more of a MOOC-type course, because I don't think we're really selling it in the traditional sense. There may be a $50 fee or something like that, and that's still run right now through CTI.

If you asked me, I would like to integrate more of those resources that we have up at eCornell in terms of production facilities to provide those opportunities, but to develop those kind of courses through the resources of eCornell, but that's a bit different. So I think we would see that as being launched through CTI, launched through your department, and then distributed in a broad way in a different environment. It's not as if they're mutually exclusive, but yeah.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, in English. There are many aspects of this that I can imagine proposing a course or a certificate. Nonetheless, at the same time, the rolling out and encouraging more academic departments to make use of eCornell does strike me as an issue of educational policy, and this never was, say, brought to the faculty senate as something to consider, whether or not we wish to do that.

Although I see many advantages to doing this, my enthusiasm is dampened or held in check by the fact that we have not had a conversation as faculty as a whole of do we want this, how does this affect our educational policy, how does that affect our education, what we are offering to students. And I think that conversation should happen.

STEVE CARVELL: Again, my job is mostly about external education. That's why the title is structured the way it is. I don't disagree with you in the sense that the questions how we would use it internally -- as I said, I use my course as a resource. I have a group of courses through eCornell and it's like a textbook in my class, and I think my students really benefit from it.

They don't pay for it in that environment at all. There's no charge for Cornell students for any eCornell course that's developed by anybody at the university. If they are used for any for-credit environment, there's no revenue stream, other than if there's executive master's programs, because there are like professional master's programs. But for residential students

here on campus, there's no charge if you incorporate a course. And my course is being used in other people's courses, and I don't get a royalty from that.

We are using it. As far as whether or not we should do that, how we should do that -- I have an 11-year-old daughter, and she learns on YouTube. So I think we do have to understand that 10, 20 years from now, students are going to be learning in a more blended environment somehow. I agree that we should probably talk about how we structure that environment so that we all think it's accretive.

To the point of why not just allow an open request for proposals or whatever, the only thing I'll respond to that is that part of that is we want to make sure that, as those proposals come forward, the faculty who are generating them are supported by their organization before they go down the path of thinking about the courses.

So the way that we are looking at it is to push it back that way, so if you have a course you want to do and you're in English or you're in Government or Policy, then maybe six or seven faculty members on this campus in that same space. And I think it's better to operate in a collaborative way than in a competitive way.

WALKER WHITE [Computer Science]: As a disclaimer, I have actually made an eCornell course, so I'm curious as to what bringing them underneath the fold is going to do in terms of changing some policy. The course that I made, I was actually reluctant, I did not actually want to make; but we knew that eCornell was, if I didn't make this course, was actually going to go out to a third party.

And the discussion I had with my dean at the time was we did not want something underneath the Cornell brand that we did not have control over. So I felt like, even though I didn't want to make the course, that I had to preemptively. Now that they're under Cornell, can we say things like well, no, we just don't want to offer this course?

STEVE CARVELL: Let me put it differently. I would say that kind of experience is part of the reason why my job was created. At the same time, I think from the standpoint of looking at a company like eCornell that wants to be in the marketplace, we also recognize that MIT or Stanford are producing those courses, and us not doing it might have implications in terms of our ability to maintain our presentation in the marketplace. It should never be the case that you're -- whatever you want to call it --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just want to remind people, you can post questions off the agenda web page, and we can factor those in when we think about what we do next.

STEVE CARVELL: I'm in 444 Statler. I'm there all the time. But you're welcome, anyone wants to come by and talk about issues that they have, I'm always -- not always there, but I'm often there, and my door is always open.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: Or online, I guess. So for our next presentation, Professor Kevin Clermont and Professor Sherry Colb and Gabrielle Kantor. If the three of you would like to come up, that's fine.

SHERRY COLB: Hi. We're here to talk about Policy 6.4, which is essentially Cornell's approach to Title IX, and we have a few things we'd like to see changed or edited in the way things are done. We'll answer people's questions afterwards, but one of the answers that we'll probably end up giving is that we can't answer that question.

And that's actually one of the problems that we want addressed, because we think there's too much confidentiality which we regard as really bad for all concerned on different occasions. One of the reasons it's not a good thing is that we can't really have a conversation about what's wrong with something when we don't know what's going on.

One of the things that we'd like -- this is more about the policy itself -- is to have it be clear about what is and what is not prohibited because, at the moment, when someone thinks

something bad has happened, they can come in and it's unclear exactly what the scope is of what might be permitted and might be prohibited, so we think it's useful to address that.

Do I now turn it over to you?

KEVIN CLERMONT: So there are the substantive questions that are worth facing; but in order to give you a flavor of what's going on, we have a bunch of recommendations of how 6.4 should be changed. I thought today I'd discuss four of them, but because of time pressure here, we're going to talk just about two. And the first, I'm going to call on Gabrielle Kantor, who is the university's judicial codes counselor and also a law student, and she'll talk about Suggestion 1 here.

GABRIELLE KANTOR: The first suggestion is to make mediation possible. Under the current system, complaints are only resolved through either a formal hearing process or an alternate resolution. Alternate resolution is very secretive, it doesn't allow for really any engagement between the two parties; and so mediation would at least allow that opportunity, where it's appropriate, for the complainant and the respondent to have a face-to-face meeting that's mediated and, in some ways, that would better address the harm that occurred and create a more productive dialogue than a year-long investigation, where neither party is happy at the end.

SHERRY COLB: I'm going to talk about evidence, because I'm an evidence professor. The rules of evidence that you would ordinarily, I guess, see in a courtroom, but also on TV a lot of the time, do not apply here. And we are not quarreling with that. We think it makes sense not to have formal rules of evidence, but there are things that are just a part of logic and how you want to think about things.

For example, rumors are not evidence. My thinking on rumors is that if there's a rumor going around, that's a good reason to investigate and see what's happening. It is not evidence

that you hand over to hearing panelists, who are supposed to then weigh how much that rumor is worth as evidence. People just aren't in a position to do that.

So our view is there should be what we would call a first-hand knowledge requirement. That means not that hearsay would be impermissible, but that everybody has to be able to kind of trace back to somebody who saw or heard or otherwise directly observed what happened.

So if somebody says X crossed the street, and the question then comes how do you know that, can say I saw it or my friend such and so told me because he saw it, or something, rather than just X crossed the street. How do you know? I don't know, then people were saying that. That's not evidence. That should be crossed out if that comes out during an interview, because it's not worth anything and it does give rise to people who want to invoke it, for whatever purpose, to be able to do that.

And relevancy, obviously, is also an important rule that's just about logic. Our basic plea is that we change the rules so that we cannot admit evidence that's irrelevant to the case before people, and also that they be able to trace what they are saying to some foundation and personal first-hand knowledge.

KEVIN CLERMONT: Everybody's being so well-behaved here that we're making good time. So perhaps I'll just mention quickly this one. There is a rule that says if a complaint is made, a degree cannot be awarded. And in the last few years, there have been several occasions in which a complaint is filed on literally the eve of graduation and, as a result, the student -- the accused can't graduate. And particularly if they have a job or something, it becomes a big, big problem.

All the rest of 6.4, for interim relief, requires some discretion. You look at the situation, what the harms are, what the situation is, and they decide whether or not to give it. This is

mandatory. And apparently, the reason is the university is fearful of losing jurisdiction. The kid gets the degree, and that's it.

So it strikes us that a good solution would be that you can award the degree when appropriate, with an agreement from the accused to preserve the university's jurisdiction and also to authorize the revocation of the degree when the time comes. This strikes me as a no-brainer, and we suggest some language up there in red that would achieve that.

But the big issue today is confidentiality. The past Title IX coordinators interpreted the confidentiality requirement as a total ban on disclosure. If you disclosed anything, it was a retaliation and a violation of 6.4 itself. And that interpretation was that no one involved in the process, even indirectly, could reveal anything that they learned through involvement in the process, no matter how general or policy-based or anything else.

So consequently, everybody that works in the system, such as myself and Gabrielle and Sherry, too, cannot talk about the system. In fact, right now, we're violating Title IX. The result is that you, as university members, have no idea of what's going on in Title IX. I mean, it's a very important policy. Our governing bodies know nothing about what's going on. Here comes Sherry to contradict me.

SHERRY COLB: No, not contradict you. Often, when we talk about confidentiality and the problems with it, the response is that this is there to protect complainants, so I just wanted to at least describe a scenario where it is obvious that it does not help the complainant at all.

Imagine that a particular school, School A, has a Title IX proceeding that results in an expulsion of a respondent. And this is a very rare thing, but it sometimes happens. And then the respondent goes to another school and says here I am at this new school, and they ask the respondent, oh, tell us about any kind of Title IX proceeding.

They say, okay, well, I was expelled because of this, but I want you to know that here's what really happened: So you know, we were dating, and she had some emotional problems and I was trying to be supportive, but in retrospect, I should have been more concerned about protecting myself, and so on.

There's nothing to contradict that, nothing. And so that is plausible. It sounds believable. Especially if it's a very intelligent person, that person can present something that sounds plausible. And you want to have two sides to everything, and that means both sides of this; but you can't because, if you were to contact the particular university and say can we see what exactly was said, can we see the evidence, they would have to say no, we can only tell you the outcome.

So that is not in anybody's interest. I mean, it is in the interest of a convicted respondent on occasion, but it is certainly not in the interest of a complainant. So to the extent it is thought to be helpful to complainants, I think that transparency is actually useful to everybody concerned and to the truth.

KEVIN CLERMONT: And my basis is that it's important to you as policymakers to know what is being done in the name of Cornell. Interesting, there's the campus code, and then there's 6.4. The campus code has transparency, it has a system. Each year, there's an annual report that lists all the cases that were adjudicated with anonymous report of the facts and the holdings, including sort of legal holdings, so that precedents accumulate about how the code should be interpreted. 6.4, nothing, nothing comes out.

And so what we are recommending again is what appears in the red, sort of a suggestion of what the code should uncover. It should not be retaliation to discuss 6.4 as a policy, not revealing individuals or details, but as a policy, is this the kind of thing that we think

Cornell should be doing or is this the kind of thing that was not done that we think Cornell should do.

So that is a big change. I, myself, think that the campus code requirements for transparency should be carried over to 6.4. These are very sensitive issues. They should be kept secret, but not what Cornell is doing. So that's it.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: So we open the floor up to questions, then.

ESTELLE MCKEE: Estelle McKee, Law School. Kevin, what you said about adopting the confidentiality provisions of the campus code makes a lot of sense, but it wouldn't really address the scenario that Sherry raised. So my question is, can complainants waive confidentiality or partially waive confidentiality for a specific purpose?

KEVIN CLERMONT: Well, the complainant can reveal stuff, although probably not in the situation she gave. The whole thing is, it's not even covered in 6.4. There's a policy privacy statement that the university has released, and it basically says don't reveal anything. And if you do reveal anything, it can be considered retaliation.

Well, the complainant -- would be a 6.4 violation.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Number one, thank you for bringing the issues forward. And I have other concerns about the process. You are raising, I think, fundamental due process and fairness issues. I have other concerns, and I don't know the answer to this, but my guess is it's no. I don't think we have a senate faculty working group on these issues; is that correct? We don't have something like that?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So it seems to me that instead of just having had the one-time working group that the faculty finally was involved with about some changes to 6.4, what we should do is have an ongoing working group, so that we can continue to review and look at

these things. Because as Kevin pointed out, all these issues used to be in the campus code. So the Codes and Judicial Committee could do an ongoing review.

And Kevin and I both agreed that 6.4 should not have been taken out of the code. But that still is a question, whether it should be brought back into the code; but then there's the content issues. So I think what you're raising is really important. I think we need a senate working group to work on it and really drawing on people who are experts in this area, like myself, to talk about the choices that we make.

And let me just mention one other -- I mean, there's a standard of proof issue I think we need to look at, but the one which is not directly dealing with these processes that I've heard about all over the country when I talk about Title IX issues are faculty concerns with the overly broad definition of who is a so-called mandatory reporter, to include every employee at Cornell, which really undermines relationships between faculty and students and trust issues. So I think there's a list of issues that a working group should work on.

KEVIN CLERMONT: Let me just say quickly in response, we chose amendments that were kind of noncontroversial, but you are entirely right; that there are huge issues that aren't mentioned, and I think your idea is fantastic.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I want to support what Risa suggested, but also to suggest that this dialogue be expanded to include the new consensual relations policy.

I recently inquired about how that was going. I won't get into the details, because I'm realizing that perhaps an open discussion of the situation could violate some of these restrictions we've heard about, but I learned that there have been hundreds of complaints under that policy that are specious in one way or another. These come down to various forms of harassment and denunciations that use the consensual relations policy that we created just

two years ago as a vehicle to attack someone – as a tool that a disgruntled person can manipulate to attack an ex-spouse or an ex-partner. Moreover, out of hundreds of complaints, it seems that remarkably few cases involve meaningful violations.

It strikes me that there's a lot of evidence that these policies just aren't operating as intended. And if they're operating badly, but the problems are all occurring "in the dark," as Mr. Clermont puts it, there's just no awareness of what this mechanism we've created is being used for, and what kinds of unintended damage it might be doing. So I strongly support the kind of investigation that Risa is arguing for.

SHERRY COLB: Can I just respond? Obviously, I agree, because I also said that; but I think it's important also to be aware, just so it's clear, that this isn't a kind of covert position on 6.4 or Title IX, that there's plenty of shameful stuff going on in the other direction as well, where people say the most shocking things during deliberations on these things that really don't belong in this century and that are not subject to review of any kind either, because the people saying it are doing it within this kind of -- it's sort of comparable to the Catholic church in some respects, of having this kind of ugliness getting resolved in ways that are not always satisfactory to the complainant either.

So I just wanted to throw that in, because this is not a one-side position on this. We think transparency is beneficial to both sides and to justice.

KORA VON WITTELSBACH: Kora von Wittelsbach, Romance Studies. I would like to support Risa Lieberwitz's motion that we form a group on this issue. I was exposed to discussion with a Title IX coordinator in the context of a freshman advising seminar, where the Title IX coordinator came to speak to a group of incensed faculty. And we were told that even if a student begs us for privacy, we have to report the so-called incident. And to us, it simply broke any line of communication between us, as a group, and the Title IX coordinator. Thanks.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: Okay, thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

For our next presentation, Professor Carolyn Levine will talk to us about fossil fuels. Welcome.

CAROLYN LEVINE: Hi. Thanks so much for having me here today. I'm talking in this moment that 11,000 scientists have called a climate emergency. We're getting close to tipping points for extreme and irreversible warming, with consequences, as you probably know, that include things like mass species extinction, uninhabitable temperatures, rising oceans, increasingly severe droughts and wildfires. Unless we make major changes quickly, we're likely to see unprecedented suffering soon, almost certainly in our students' lifetimes, some of it in our own.

So what should we do? These kind of scary scenarios often terrify people to inaction. It always terrifies me in the opposite direction, trying to figure out how to take action. And through a year and a half on the Campus Infrastructure Committee, thinking about, talking about, doing research into divestment, I've come to see divestment from fossil fuels as one of several meaningful actions that Cornell can and should take in this moment. So I'm hoping that the faculty senate will consider this question again.

When the trustees last considered divestment in 2016, they said no to divesting from fossil fuels; but they didn't say no, never, no, absolutely no. They actually wrestled with the question of what would justify divestment, and they came up with several specific criteria. And so it was those criteria that we considered on the Campus Infrastructure Committee, and we thought that yes, indeed, fossil fuels met all of the criteria that the trustees set forward.

I'll just give you a quick summary of what the trustees said. They said divestment should be considered only when a company's actions or inactions are morally reprehensible, deserving

of condemnation because of the injurious impact that the actions or inactions are found to have. And there's more to that, but we focused on moral reprehensibility and injurious impact.

And the trustees added that divestment should only be considered when the divestment will have a meaningful impact toward correcting the specified harm and will not result in disproportionate offsetting negative societal consequences, or the company in question contributes to harm so grave that it would be inconsistent with the goals and principles of the university.

And we found "and;" that is, fossil fuels meet all of these criteria. So I want to give you -- we put this together in our white paper that has been circulated as background for this meeting, so you can see more detail, but we're persuaded that fossil fuel companies very clearly meet all of these criteria.

So first, we found a case for moral reprehensibility, especially in the fact that the fossil fuel companies have known about the connection between carbon emissions and global warming, and engaged in a deliberate campaign of doubt and misinformation, as long ago as the 1970s.

For example, Exxon Mobil warned -- their own scientists warned that fossil fuels would cause irreversible and catastrophic effects. And the company's response was to spend literally millions of dollars on a campaign to cast doubt on the link between fossil fuels and climate change. Our report found that all of the major fossil fuel companies had this information and hid it, and many are continuing to hide it through groups like the American Petroleum Institute that they fund and that continue to circulate this misinformation.

The case for injurious action, injurious impact also seemed very clear to us. Most importantly, in order to keep the planet from warming to uninhabitable levels, we learned from the IPCC report from 2015 we need to reduce carbon emissions quickly worldwide. And one of

the things that the IPCC report made really clear is that just using up our current fossil fuel reserves would mean exceeding the global carbon budget. But fossil fuel companies even now are insisting on expanding production of oil and gas, so continuing to mine and drill, even at a moment when we know that if we use up what we have right now, we're in trouble, very serious trouble.

So Shell and Exxon Mobil are planning to produce 35% more oil by 2030, and spending millions of dollars each year, lobbying governments for new rights to mine and drill, and there's some headlines about that. In assessing injurious impact, it also seemed important for us to point out just how important fossil fuels are to global warming. Not everybody is up on the exact kind of significance of their role in global warming.

So they're responsible for 70% of worldwide carbon-equivalent emissions. 90 corporations are responsible for 66% of all greenhouse gas emissions, and just eight energy companies account for 20% of world carbon emissions. And those include the big oil companies, British Petroleum, Exxon Mobil, Royal Dutch Shell and Chevron.

But you will ask -- and I'm sure you have many questions about this -- does divestment make a difference. We might agree on all the facts so far, but should we go ahead and divest? The two biggest discoveries for me were, first of all, that returns on investments in fossil fuel companies have been really poor for a decade, and fossil-free portfolios are outperforming them every single year for the last ten years.

So when the University of California system divested just recently, they said we're divesting, but not for moral reasons, just purely for financial reasons. It's actually sensible. It is a bad investment. But the other fact that I have wrestled with quite a lot, and I suspect a number of you who I have talked to about this have wrestled with also, is what does it matter if

Cornell specifically divests. Do we have a lot of money in fossil fuels? Do we have a small amount of money in fossil fuels? Is it so little that it won't make a difference?

The fact is, we don't know. Cornell does not have to divulge how much money is invested in fossil fuel companies. But what we do know is that businesses work to build and maintain strong reputations and, when a great and well-respected university like Cornell sends the message that fossil fuel companies are disreputable actors, this message does often have a meaningful impact on the public view of these companies.

And I just show an image of Shell. They have a web site dedicated to their sustainability efforts, which are in fact not very impressive, but that's how they build their global reputation. And so saying Cornell refuses to recognize that is, in fact, a powerful statement.

Finally, the case for harm so grave that it's inconsistent with the goals and the principles of this university, this feels incredibly important to me personally. And I ask you, as colleagues, fellow faculty, to think with me for a moment about this. We have two really precious fundamental missions here at Cornell: Teaching and research. And both of them are right at the heart of the question of whether we should invest in fossil fuels.

So we work every single day to educate young people so they can lead fulfilling and productive lives. We're investing our best time and energy in this young generation, but our investments in fossil fuels are wreaking havoc with their futures, leading us down a path to global food shortages, catastrophic flooding and violent unrest. The military says global warming is the single largest threat to our future. So every one of them will be affected.

But then also research. We are pouring our talents and energies into producing rigorous knowledge for the public good, but at the same time we're pouring money into companies that have undermined that very science. And our misinforming the public about hard-won research right here, and in fact smearing individual scientists right here, making it harder for us to do that

work. So I quote the president of Unity College, who says it is ethically indefensible that an institution dedicated to the proposition of the renewal of civilization would simultaneously invest in its destruction.

If we divested, we would not be reinventing the wheel. These are just some of the colleges and universities around the world that have fully divested from fossil fuels already or committed to full divestment. There's also many churches, medical institutions, all kind of other -- 1,000 institutions and counting. So there are many blueprints for how to go about doing this.

As we've discussed in the Campus Infrastructure Committee, we're famous as an institution, as a leader in sustainability. We'd be the first in the Ivy League to divest, and we probably do not want to be the last. I'm happy to take questions in whatever time is left.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There's a lot of activity on campus about divestment. A resolution will come our way in the spring, and I just simply asked Caroline to come here, give us a heads up, give us the white paper, so we can study it and are ready to go when things come our way in the spring. But there's time for one, if someone would like to say something.

NICK ADMUSSEN: I'm the faculty representative from Asian Studies, along with Meejeong Song, who is sitting here, and we are cosponsors for this future bill that's coming up. I want to encourage you guys to poll your faculty. My faculty is not highly engaged in faculty senate business, but I found that they were unanimous, insistent, they sent me links.

The depth of energy towards -- and part of that is we're a part of sort of Cornell's global footprint, and we have two survivors of dengue fever and I've been in two typhoons, so we see this in my department. But I think many of your departments, we see the impacts are present now, and your faculty know this. So if you don't usually poll your faculty, poll them about this, because it's something that I think most of us care about. Thank you very much.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. I loved this, and I'm fully in support of this idea of divestment. A question I'd love for you to consider, for everybody to consider is if we de-invest in fossil fuels, what do we invest in? Like what's the best way to invest to sort of secure that future that we want?

CAROLINE LEVINE: Sure. We have a lot of knowledge here on this campus about exactly that, including a lot of great stuff about fossil-free portfolios that are doing very well and renewable energies that are doing really remarkably well, just in pure stock market terms. The trustees, I think, like to feel that they know a lot about investing, so they might not like the faculty to tell them exactly what to do, but I think there are a lot of good options out there that are not going to destroy us.

BUZ BARSTO: Thank you very much.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: So if you have further questions, there's the web site for you to submit them.

CAROLINE LEVINE: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We call it the sense of the senate idea, which someone gives a presentation, we digest what they say, and then follow up with a sense of the senate resolution in the next meeting. It simply forces the presenters to pay more attention to what we are saying, and just to have maybe closure or just some action to come from the visit.

So last time, we had a presentation by the Social Science Implementation Committee, and there's a long history here. They have been in operation since April, and they have been giving us several snapshots of their work. You can check them all out. Five days after our senate meeting, they released the interim report.

And to set the stage, there are two possible structures. There's the create a college or re-purpose Human Ecology, or have a school. I cut and pasted their report, so that you can go online and look at ten different settings, the side-by-side comparisons, and we all have to become educated about this.

This resolution is not about what we prefer. It's simply about a timeline. So what we really want to do is insert those red lines. So tomorrow is the last, to my knowledge, listening tour presentation. And earlier this week, the provisions were made for people to comment on things, totally anonymously if you want. The committee is scheduled to release its final report, I'm guessing next week. We're running out of time here in December, but that was part of the original plan, and no change in that.

What we want to do, however, and this is a classical -- the committee produces a report, we should look at it and discuss it before any kind of action happens. So inserted here in January, I'd like to have a special meeting that would be devoted to this -- and maybe other topics; it depends. And we would then deliberate in any way, shape or form.

So if people wanted to put together a resolution that we would debate at that time, fine. It could take any shape. It's in our control. So that would be a January 22 meeting. Sometime after that, the president, the provost will digest everything and make a decision. So this is simply saying that this is how we'd like to proceed, what we'd like the timeline to look at, and that's what the vote is about. Before we get on with that, we certainly can talk a little bit just about this timeline and if you think it's worthy of adopting.

CHRISTINE OLSON: Hi. My name is Christine Olson, and I'm the senator representing CAPE, Cornell Academic Professors Emeritus, but I'm also a retired faculty member from the Division of Nutritional Sciences, which is a joint unit between the College of Human Ecology and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

I am very supportive of more discussion of this, and I did go online and look at the resolution. And in particular, I think the two issues that are really, really important for there to be faculty input about are policy researchers that are outside the Departments of Policy Analysis and Management and Government and how they might be involved in either one of these entities, either the school or the college.

And then what is the impact, as a faculty member in DNS, which is one of the largest units in the College of Human Ecology, that only about 10% of our faculty are involved in policy, what's going to happen to us and the other departments in the College of Human Ecology that have a few faculty members interested in policy, but aren't policy departments? And it would be really nice if some of the work of the Implementation Committee address some of those issues. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah.

JACK ZINDA: Jack Zinda, from Development Sociology. I'm, in general, in support of this, but I imagine most departments are not going to be having meetings between now and January 22nd. I know there are other ways we can communicate with faculty members. I also know that extending the timeline even further could be even more challenging, but wondering if there's an option for considering giving us more time to communicate with our departments.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Fair question. We could decide that at that meeting. In other words, we can say that we want more time, go into the February meeting, but I would say A, then B. There's a lot of homework to be done. We have to read these two proposals and understand it point by point.

Let's see how well we do with that, what comes up in the January meeting, and then make a judgment that would take your concern into consideration. In general, there's no optimal time for anything. The first six weeks, just getting started in the semester. The last six

weeks, oh, wrapping things up. There's two weeks there in the middle, and then there's a snow day or something. Let's get -- any other -- okay, Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. First, I think it's an excellent idea to have the senate meet and focus in a special meeting or more than one special meeting on this issue, because we're always running to try to finish everything.

And I think that in the past, when we've had meetings that really focused heavily and for enough time on issues, one thing that's worked well is to have presentations, having people kind of assigned in a certain way, depending on their positions, to address the kinds of issues like Christine was raising, to say these are concerns I have. Someone is supportive of it, saying why they are supportive, to shape the discussion in a certain way, so that we can really have a debate. So I would recommend something like that.

But I also think that Jack's point is a really important one, that we have perhaps, as you said, Charlie, more than one meeting to do that. And it seems to me that the president and the provost should be willing to commit to waiting enough time so that we can actually have that kind of full discussion and perhaps some kind of vote from the senate.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: First of all, there is a history here of this A versus B structure. There's been a long history of that. In terms of shaping the February meeting, the January meeting, we depend on you to step forward. It's not like I'm going to say you take this stand and you take that -- you have to come forward, and if we are doing resolutions, they have to be in our hands, say, a week before the meeting. So it's up to the senators to step forward with their own ideas, I'd like to speak for ten minutes on X or on Y. So we're counting on you to do that.

Again, the timeline -- I understand that and I appreciate that, but I want to say this has been on the table for quite some time. I think we've been waiting for some kind of report.

There's been a sequence of them. If you could read -- click on each of those months, you'll get the current state of thinking of the committee at that time.

So there's some history here. It's not like -- it's very different than the College of Business, which was a 24-hour thing. This is actually quite a history here of visiting units and getting opinions. So that has to be factored into the picture. But again, let's see what we can do in the January meeting. We're going to hold it in the Statler ballroom and have a reception afterwards. Anyway, so I know it's a very busy time of year, but we'll figure it out.

So I think the main message here is try to find some time to read through these. Some of the key sections are like undergraduate education, master's, impact on human ecology, impact on Arts and Science. We have to get well-versed in that.

I guess we have to do this thing. So how many are in favor of this? Raise your hand, please. I don't think we have to count.

Anyone opposed or abstain?

So we'll show that we're all in favor of this timeline and putting together something interesting in January.

So this was a topic that was raised in the November meeting, and I'd just like to step through it; ad hoc committee that is looking at RTE issues. We're doing lots of things on title descriptions and surrounding best practices and so on, but this is a much more specific thing. It's about which titles, when you retire, would you be eligible to have emeritus status.

And there's the list. It's pretty much the same list as who can be in the senate and vote, with a few exceptions; but basically, that would be the list of titles. That's your title and -- then you are eligible. That's the key thing. We have modifiers, visiting, adjunct, courtesy, emeritus, and then you have titles.

And the question is what's a legal pairing, and we're now saying that it's -- we want it to be legal to pair emeritus with any of these titles. The criteria is exactly the same for professors as is for professors and associate professors. The ten years meritorious service, to be determined by whatever. And then the candidate writes a letter to the chair, here's the C.V. There's a vote, and we spell out who votes and this sort of thing, if you look at some of the supporting documents.

Then the chair sends the vote tally and a cover letter to the dean. The dean then sends a cover letter to the provost. There's often the same cover letter. These things are quite routine and run quite smoothly. So that's the process. Nothing new here, just when you look at meritorious service, it's title-specific, so you would not expect to see lecturer to have a long research record.

This is pretty important: This is nothing to do about fringe benefits or perks. So free parking, all that kind of stuff, very important, but later. So there's a decoupling here. If you vote for this, you are sort of saying I believe in giving emeritus status to a senior lecturer and hope that the fringe benefits or the benefits, the perks play out nicely, but we can't -- there's a decoupling here.

Environmental impact. There are about 1,200 full professors, associate professors out there. About 50 a year retire. A large fraction seek emeritus status. This population is about a third of that, so you can do the obvious division. The demographics is a little bit -- is different, but you can sort of expect, in general, maybe 10, 15 people a year retiring from these positions.

An important detail that has to be worked out after this becomes enacted, if it does, is some kind of retroactive plan. So I retired last year. What about me, so to speak. There's a little bit of trickiness in there, but that's something, it is an HR sort of issue. We'll figure that out in time. So it's not just us who calls the shot here. The provost, in consultation with the deans,

who in turn consult with their chairs or whatever, have to approve this. Why? Because Mike has to write a letter to the trustees, saying change the bylaws.

So working backwards, I met with the deans and the provost yesterday and presented this, and they're in favor of it. However, they feel that before they, quote, sign off on it, they'd like some concrete summary of the fringe benefits. And we're working on that right now. For example, parking. We're talking to Transportation, to see what would be involved if we now suddenly have, say, 20% more emeriti looking for free parking.

The others are no-brainers. The library's relaxed. As long as you're retired, it's fine. So we are going through that. We should have this sort of ready in January, and then can go back to the deans and the provost and say this is what the scene looks like. Any questions about any of that, that you'd like to raise?

Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi. Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering. I guess just a question; is this practice common at peer institutions?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We do more for RTE faculty than the average place, as a result of last year's work. So mostly, you would see things like for senior lecturers, we have a broader definition of the people we're paying attention to. You see things like senior lecturer emeritus.

For example, you go online, look at a department's web page, you'll see that, but not everybody has extension associates. The professors of practice kind of thing is kind of recent, so it's not a whole lot of people coming out the end of the pipeline here from these more recent types of titles. But I think it's a healthy thing.

And even when we did the emeritus stuff like two years ago, you're talking about careers, and it's important to be able to talk about careers. And one of the debates I had with faculty was should assistant professors vote. I say yeah, they should see what a career looks like

and to talk positively about an individual's contribution over, say, 20, 30 or 40, 50 years or whatever. So the bottom line is, we haven't done a scientific study. You see much more on the senior lecturer, and we'd be a little bit broader than that, but there are a lot of positives here, I think.

BRYCE CORRIGAN: Bryce Corrigan, Government. Can there be multiple modifiers?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There are rules -- like you can't be a visiting adjunct professor. It doesn't make sense.

BRYCE CORRIGAN: What about with emeritus, though?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, you have to go back to our list here. There are the titles. It's very clear.

BRYCE CORRIGAN: Just these. Okay.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So visiting critic is not on that list, lecturer is not on that list. Assistant professor of the practice is not on that list.

Okay, if there are no more questions, let's go here. Basically, if you support this resolution, what you're saying is that we want to make it possible for retired faculty with those titles to be eligible for emeritus status, and it says nothing about the fringe benefits of that.

But simply, fringe benefits are very important, but the act of simply saying emeritus, looking at a career and saying you really contributed to this place and we thank you for it, that's a huge message and an important one, I think. So anyway, here we go. All those in favor of this, please raise your hand.

The reverse, then. Anyone not in favor of it?

And anyone interested in abstaining?

Okay, another landslide. So thanks a lot, and I guess that's the end of the meeting. Have a great holiday. We'll see you in January, and you'll get details about that over the break.