

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2020

THE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you all for being here this afternoon. We are going to call the meeting to order.

As usual, what we would like you all to be able to do when you are speaking, wait for the microphone to get there first and speak clearly into the microphone, since this is being recorded. We would like you, because of the busy schedule that we do have today, to limit your comments to at least no more than two minutes. That is under two minutes, please.

And, also, to let you know that we may have a reporter in here from the Daily Sun, since we did have last time, but no one's been identified, but just to cover our basis, let's do that.

So if we are all set, ready to go and have clear voices, let's start the meeting off.

Dean Charlie Van Loan.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Elections, my position will be vacant as of the summer, and just want to say it's a great position, if you want to meet people, so we are looking for people to be interested. It's an interesting job. I'm happy to come to your office and tell you all about it, but we have to have an election this spring.

University Faculty Committee, we need five tenured or tenure track people to serve in there. This committee meets regularly with the provost and the president, also talks about what should show up in the senate and things like that. Nominations and Elections oversees just that. They are involved in putting together slates for all these

positions. If you have experience in the University, know a lot of people, it is a great place to exercise some discretion and whatever.

Senator-at-large, they come in different flavors. We have one open for RTE faculty and five others that are going to be open. What's nice about this is you basically don't have to report to anybody. You just come and vote.

So please pay attention. This is really important. We are aiming to have an election just after spring break, so we'd like to actually use part of the March meeting to introduce candidates and stuff like that.

Very quick resolution stated here, and we vote on it next month or the month after. So no crisis is simply that we want to be very clear in these situations when you have a student in a course taught by a family member. Does that happen? Well, you can do the math. So I did a little research with colleagues, and we found out there are 265 undergrads right now who are on the Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship. That means you have either a parent who is either a staff or a faculty person. Say half of those are faculty. What's the chance the kid's taking a course? It is a small number, but it does happen, so let's just be totally clear about what should be done there.

You have to have a recusal plan. You have to take steps and document those steps that the grading will be objective and unbiased. We are adding a couple sentences to our conflict of interest policy. But the line is saying avoid this. It is usually avoidable, so that's the recommendation. That's it.

Are there any questions about either this or the elections?

Yeah.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I was reading this, and I noticed that on the Web page -- I don't know who. It wasn't me -- had posted a comment that it struck them that this situation was analogous to the consensual relationships policy and questioned whether the student should be in the course at all. And I'm curious to hear your thoughts on that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: All right, yeah. So, originally, when I was working on this with a colleague, that was our recommendation, just totally off-limits. But suppose it's a very large STEM course, TAs, you want to have a possibility of doing it, but that's something to be disputed or challenged. It's similar to consensual, because only that there's recusal stuff in that policy. And that is a question we should think about over the next month, say, is re -- would that solve the problem? So that is the challenge.

I think in a small class, you definitely have problems. In a large one, you begin to say well, you know, maybe it's manageable, but it's something we should pay attention to. We have to uphold the highest-possible standards.

BOB HOWARTH: Thank you. I'm here to present the resolution on behalf of divestment from fossil fuels. We have twelve senators who have sponsored this, and we'll be voting on it hopefully in the next meeting. Our resolution, very briefly, has these five whereases. I won't go through them in detail.

We simply document that the planet is warming, that the damage from warming is much more apparent than even a few years ago, that unlike other divestment causes, fossil fuels run the very high risk of doing serious damage to our planet; and, therefore, this is different from other issues.

We point out that Cornell is a leader in sustainability and that to maintain our leadership in sustainability, we should show leadership in divestment.

In 2015, the trustees turned down the request from the senate and other assemblies to divest, and they laid out three criteria under which we could bring it forward again, and we then go on to point out that these criteria, we believe, are now satisfied.

The three criteria the trustees laid out are that we would divest from a company, only if their actions or inactions are morally reprehensible, only if divestment has some meaningful impact in correcting the harm that is done, and that the harm in question one so grave as to be inconsistent with Cornell's mission. And we believe that each of those is true.

Again, the context is that we truly are in a climate emergency at this point. More than 11,000 scientists signed on to a statement last fall saying the world is in a climate emergency. The European Union declared a climate emergency.

The case for moral reprehensibility, it is simply that many of the leading fossil fuel companies have long known that their emissions -- the fuels that they produce create emissions which are highly damaging to the planet and cause massive climate disruption. They have, for decades, engaged in efforts to confuse and mislead on that. They continue to do so, and we find that morally reprehensible.

Others find it morally reprehensible. Desmond Tutu, obviously an expert on when to use divestment, leader in apartheid divestment, says that this issue of climate

is another issue where the world should come together and divest. A comparable issue, in his mind.

The case for injurious impact, Number 2 of the trustees' issues. If we are to keep the planet habitable and societal functions intact, we really need to reduce carbon emissions very quickly. We need to go largely carbon-free worldwide by 2050, the industrial nations by 2035.

If we look at the fossil fuel reserves that the oil and gas and coal industries now recognize as already known and developable at economic levels, if they use those, we will blow through those targets and make the planet one of a serious case of damage. And, yet, the fossil fuel companies, majority of them -- all the big oil companies, even now, are continuing to explore adding to those reserves and committing to use all those fossil fuels, so that's injurious impact.

Would divestment have a meaningful impact? Well, first, fossil fuel investments have not performed well over the last decade and, particularly, not over the last five years. They have consistently underperformed any other aspect of our society.

And, secondly, businesses, including the oil and gas companies, like to maintain a strong public reputation. They work hard on that, and they take seriously the worry that institutions, such as Cornell, would cast aspersions on that through issues such as divestment. Our actions do matter in the public perception.

We believe that the possibility for harm is inconsistent with the goals and principles of this university, one that believes in sustainability and free study. And to

quote Bill McKibben: "It's ethically indefensible an institution dedicated to the proposition of the renewal of civilization would simultaneously invest in its destruction."

Now, if we are to divest, we will not be the first institution. There are hundreds of institutions that have divested now. And, notably, University of California system fully divested as of last summer, and also Georgetown University divested as of last week, or made an announcement they are starting to divest as of last week. We can talk a little more about that, if people are interested.

I want to add that sustainability is a critical part of the identity of our university. Many of us like to say we are the greenest of the Ivy League universities, and I think we still have an opportunity for being a first-mover advantage, if we are the first of the Ivies. We will not be the first university to divest, but we can still be the first of the Ivy Leagues. And if we want to maintain our reputation in sustainability, I think it is important to do so.

And I would point out, other Ivy Leagues are taking divestment seriously at this point. Harvard faculty last week voted by 9-1 margin for divestment, and I understand their trustees are seriously considering that.

So the resolution is short. It simply says, we divest from all investments in fossil fuels, and we do so in an orderly manner and as quickly as possible, trusting in the trustees for developing a plan for how that is best done.

So resolution is short, to the point. If we are to take it to the trustees, which we hope to do in March, it has to be approved by all five of the assemblies, this senate, but the other five assemblies too.

There's a very powerful white paper in support of this resolution. It is available there. Caroline Levine largely wrote this. It's an excellent job. If you haven't read it, please do.

This is the schedule we're on for the other assemblies. The senate is scheduled to vote on it at our next meeting, March 11th. The University Assembly and Employee Assembly will vote Monday and Tuesday of next week. The Graduate and Professional Student Assembly passed the resolution unanimously two days ago, and the Undergraduate Student Assembly is scheduled to vote on March 12th.

So we believe we can get it to all the assemblies, with the help of the senate. And, if so, it will come to the trustees on March 19th.

So I want to leave some time to get your feedback. Obviously, there are many issues to debate and discuss. This is a list of frequently asked questions in the white paper. You could take a look at those. We think we've done a good job of answering a lot of logical questions.

The University Assembly Special Committee on Finances and Endowment has also developed a list of questions on the financial aspects, and they are developing answers to those, but those will be available.

We'd like to see if there are other issues for us to debate on March 11th before we vote.

How am I doing on time, Charlie? Way ahead of schedule.

Let me show you one more slide, then we'll open it up. I just want to point out that although the resolution leads to the trustees as to what divestment would look like,

what the time frame would be, we trust in their ability to having made the commitment, to carry through in the way that's best possible for the University.

But I would point out that Georgetown might offer an example of what we might want to do. And, again, they announced just last week that they are divesting 100% from fossil fuels, putting, as of last week, an immediate freeze on any future investments in any fossil fuel activities or industries. They intend to fully divest from all of the public stocks and securities within five years. And then the more complicated thing is the private investments they hold, which would be the more complicated thing for Cornell as well, and they are going to take ten years to devolve those and try to move on.

Again, this isn't formally part of our resolution, but it's one model which we hope the trustees would consider.

So with that, I think I've got another 11, 12 minutes for feedback and for questions that should be considered before we have further debate and vote next month.

So thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

HAROLD HODES: Harold Hodes, Philosophy. Well, petroleum isn't used only as a fuel, but also as a raw material for certain sorts of manufacturing. How would such uses figure in the resolution as it's worded now?

BOB HOWARTH: That would not be included in the resolution as current written. It is the use of fossil fuels as fuels and the emissions which occur from this. So it is a good point, but I think we're hitting the major use of the fossil fuels.

JOHN ZINDA (?): Hi. [John Zinda], Development Sociology -- or Global Development now. So I just wanted to ask a question about process.

My understanding is that for this to go directly to trustees, it has to go with the exact same wording through every assembly, such that if we made any amendments, the process would change. And I'm wondering is that right. And, if so, how would the process change if people proposed or accepted amendments?

BOB HOWARTH: The guidance that came from the trustees in 2016 was that, for any divestment issue which were to come to them would not come to them directly, unless it comes by majority vote of all five assemblies, including the senate. They don't actually specify where the language has to be exactly correct or not. If less than five assemblies pass something, then it goes to the president. And the president has the capability of taking those to the trustees anyway, but it's implicit when she does so that she might be at least partially endorsing the resolution. So the only way to get completely to the trustees directly, without putting our president in the awkward position of saying whether she endorses it or not, is for all five assemblies to do so. And the best way to do that without ambiguity is to make sure that the resolutions are all the same.

So we've actually been working together, leaders from each of the assemblies, since October. And the language, which is proposed in resolutions already voted by the

GPSA and the one proposed here and the other assemblies, is identical. If the senate felt it was critical to amend it, that's within the right of the senate to do so. It would hope not.

We purposefully went for a resolution that is extraordinarily short and, therefore, not that much to debate. You either think it's reasonable or not, and that's in order to maintain that intact language across the assemblies.

BUZ BARSTO: Buz Barsto, Biological and Environmental Engineering. I'd love to pose a question to sort of spur our collective imagination.

I really appreciated your point about sort of maintaining searching our leadership in the sustainability space. Beyond just divesting, I'd like to -- the question is to sort of spur our collective imaginations, what can we do beyond that? Either can we use this opportunity not just to sort of rid ourselves of our fossil fuel assets, but also take our endowment and then use that to invest in the technologies of the future as well that are going to replace fossil fuels.

BOB HOWARTH: I think that's an excellent question. It's not part of the resolution as we've put it forward clearly. It is part of what Georgetown said they are going to do. They have said that the money they are divesting, they will invest specifically in technologies that will make it different for the climate. We have not proposed that. Again, we are leaving it up to the trustees, hopefully, to accept the basic idea and then act on it. But I think it's a logical idea, if they accept the basic idea, I would think -- I actually think our trustees are well-meaning, intelligent people. And we can encourage them and perhaps work with them towards that sort of a goal.

And beyond our investments, what else as a campus can we do? The University's pledge to be carbon-neutral by 2035, that's great; but there's a lot more we can do to make that happen more quickly and more creatively than I think is happening now.

I'd love to see the entire faculty engaged in that. But again, it is not part of the resolution at the moment.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I agree with the sentiment that was just expressed by the questioner, and I would go further. It seems, to me, that encouraging investment in clean energy is a very sensible suggestion, but disengagement from the main energy source in the world closes our eyes to reality. We know that if fossil fuels evaporated tomorrow, the only option would be nuclear, which is worse in many ways. Better, clean nuclear would be an example of something we could conceivably invest in.

But it strikes me that disinvesting from the companies that are producing fossil fuel without attention to the reason that those have a market is just a pointless gesture, whereas the proactive and positive thing is to simply say that we should invest to create a clean energy future; we should invest in the research required to do that.

The fossil fuel market would vanish if we had cost-effective options for utilizing other types of fuel at the scale needed. So I don't understand the connection between this proposal and the problem.

I'm as concerned about climate change as anyone, and I don't understand how selling Exxon stock accomplishes any practical goal.

BOB HOWARTH: Well, I clearly disagree with you, as to those others who put the resolution forward, but I would argue that the University has made a commitment to be carbon-free by 2035.

The State of New York, by statute now, said we will reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 40% within ten years and by 85% within 30 years. The rest of the world's moving that way. We have to move that way.

I think there are a variety of technologies which can take the place of fossil fuels and do so on those time frames. I think the continued subsidies of the fossil fuel industries get in the way of our doing that; and, quite frankly, again, the misinformation campaigns, which are funded by the fossil fuel industries confuse and lead to inaction.

So I think making a statement as a community that we cannot support industries that such engage in misinformation is a powerful statement that will help move the transition which I fully believe is possible.

KEN BIRMAN: Let me just make an observation, which is that when Germany abruptly disinvested, in their case, in nuclear, all that happened was they created an enormous amount of pollution in places like Croatia and Serbia by displacing their surge demand to other countries. Furthermore, they destabilized their power grid.

There are things that just can't happen faster than the speed of light.

BOB HOWARTH: One more question. I won't respond to that, in the interest of another question. You want to --

PAUL GINSPARG: Paul Ginsparg from Info -- first like to affirm there are lots of things that can't happen faster than the speed of light, in my role as a physicist. But I had more or less the same question as was raised by the previous two people.

Completely in favor, terribly concerned, it is the biggest problem we're facing and all that, but I found that your slide regarding the impact was just not compelling, again, just because there was no connection between this and the search for alternate fuels.

My question's actually slightly different, though. If these funds are underperforming to the extent that you say, then I don't understand why divestment isn't just spontaneous as a matter of astute funds management.

BOB HOWARTH: Well, that's an excellent point. Of course, we don't know whether divestment is happening spontaneously for economic reasons. Anyway, the University does not divulge where our funds are invested, and so I would be surprised if we are not already moving towards divestment, and probably fairly quickly, but, of course, we don't know.

So the issue here is one of making a public statement on our value system and our willingness, our eagerness to remain in a position of sustainability and leadership in that sphere. That's really what it is about.

I will add, the slides weren't meant to be completely compelling. I was given ten minutes. I took eight to make the case. There's a very powerful white paper, again, largely written by Caroline Levine, who's right there. I would urge you to look at this. If

you don't find that compelling, you need more information, then let's talk and come to agreement before we vote on March 11.

I hope the senate will support the resolution.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: So, at this time, I'd like to invite Madam President Martha Pollack to the stage.

MARTHA POLLACK: Good to see you all. I'm going to -- since I came in right after Bob, I'm going to shift the order in which I was going to talk about things, because I do want to give a quick update on sustainability and on where the University -- where I see the trustees are. I can't speak for the trustees, but what I'm seeing in their response investment. So I'll talk about that, then go back to the other issues, with one exception.

Because I now have pledged, I think it's really important as a university that we always remember how wonderful our academics are. And in so many meetings, we are talking about such important things, but I think we tend to forget about the academics. So I have a new pledge that I was going to start with a little bit of good news and academics.

I want you to know, there have been a number of really major awards given out to some of our faculty members. We have two new members of the National Academy of Medicine, Deborah Estrin and Rainu Kaushal.

The NAE and the AES have their season this spring, so we don't know about that yet, but we have seven new NSF faculty career awards.

Class of '19 graduate, Nina Acharya, was just named one of 32 Rhodes scholars.

Susan Choi, who got her MFA in '95 from our wonderful creative writing program, just won the National Book Award. It's for a book called Trust Exercise. If you haven't read it -- I read it -- it is a great book. Don't start it and say, I don't want to read another book about a high school. It's a really good book.

Benjamin Garcia, who got his MFA with us in '11, just received the National Poetry Series award.

And we have one more, Thelma Shawn-maker, class of '61, just received a nomination for film editing. She didn't win it, but she's now tied for the most nominated film editor in Oscar history for her work on the Irishman. If you have a spare three hours or so this weekend, it's streaming on Netflix.

So let me turn to sustainability. I came in in the middle, so I apologize if I'm repeating some of what Bob said. But I want to talk with you a little bit about how I think about sustainability broadly here, and I think about it as having several components.

I didn't catch -- what's your name? I didn't catch Professor Barsto's name.

But to say what else are we doing. So I do think, first of all, that it is really important to recognize what we're doing in teaching and in research and engagement. We have faculty -- a huge number of faculty, 558 faculty fellows of the Atkinson center who are teaching in this field, who are doing research in everything from climate change to sustainable agriculture, to renewable energy, to conservation. This is really

important work, and we are investing it, not through the endowment. We are investing it through our operating funds here on campus.

And many of those faculty members are also very heavily engaged in outreach, Bob being just one example. He is on the committee that's going to make real the New York State promise have 40% less carbon emissions in ten years. That's the first area.

The second area is campus operations. Again, we can do more; we can always do more. But I think it's important to remember that we've been interested in this for decades.

Our first conservation initiative was in 1985. We were the first university to sign the Kyoto Protocol in 2001. And we've really been emphasizing sustainable campus operations since then, really redoubling our work since we announced the goal of being carbon-neutral by 2035.

So in the last decade, we've reduced our emissions by 37%, and we are investing both in very innovative technologies, like Earth-source heating and in older technologies, but things like advanced light bulbs that really make a difference in what we do.

And then the third component, which is what you have all been talking about, is the endowment. I want to start by sort of reiterating what the board has said of the endowment, but then I want to talk about sort of practically where we are today.

So it is really important to remember that the practical purpose of the endowment -- I'm going to read this -- is to provide income for the advancement of the important educational and mission-related objectives to which the University is

dedicated. And the first responsibility of the board of trustees is to ensure that the funds are managed properly and used for the educational and programmatic purposes for which they were donated.

So the board, like university boards everywhere, feels very strongly that they cannot politicize the endowment; they cannot use the endowment for purely symbolicals. That would be a breach of their fiduciary responsibility.

Now, that being said, when it is consistent with those goals, the board does strive to invest in ways that align with our campus values. And you can see that, for example, over the past decade, there's been an enormous change in the way in which our funds are invested; it's important to know.

So there's a board of trustees and then there's investment committee. They delegate responsibility to the investment committee. The investment committee sets the strategy. And then our Office of University Investment, headed by Kenmore Rand of the chief investment officer, implement that strategy, and they hire outside managers to manage their funds. So they don't go out and buy stocks and bonds. They hire outside managers who do all of that work.

And over the past decade -- actually, just the past five years, we have seen enormous growth in the number of managers who have been hired, who are signatories to what are called ESG policies, environmental social and governance policies.

There's one particular one you may have heard of, UNPRI, the United Nations Principles of Responsible Investing. The proportion of our endowment that is currently under management by ESG signatories has gone up in four years, from December of

2015 to December of 2019, from 57.5% to 70.8%. And there's another, roughly, 8% for which this just isn't meaningful.

So when we have cash, we invest in U.S. Treasury notes. There's no ESG component to that.

So we've got about 80% of the endowment with managers who are trying to be responsible in areas of the environment, social areas, governance areas. That's important, because what that says is it's not incompatible. It's not always incompatible to honor the purpose of the endowment and to invest it in ways that align with your values.

I will say -- because we're trying to get an FAQ out on this in a day or two, so we do have this number -- of our stock and bond holdings, about 1% is in fossil fuels -- I'm sorry. 1% is in the carbon 100, and another 0.3% is in the -- it will be out. I want to make sure I'm saying exactly the right thing, so you will see this in an FAQ that we're trying to get out today or tomorrow.

There is a process. When the board considered fossil fuel divestment before I got here -- it was in the fall of 2015 and the winter of 2016 -- they put in place a process and also a set of standards. And as Bob says, the process is the following: Either they get five resolutions from all the assemblies -- they don't have to be exactly the -- they aren't going to check that. I mean, if they are wildly different, that would be a problem - or they get one and I forward it to them. It is much better for the process if they get the five. The board is in a much better position to understand where the campus stands.

And I understand that all five of the assemblies -- GPSA, I know passed their resolution on Monday. And all of the other assemblies are looking at that. I cannot speak for the board, and I do not know what the board will do; but I am very, very confident that if they get these resolutions, they will engage in them in a very thoughtful and careful way.

We had a sort of preliminary informal discussion, and I'm not authorized -- I'm not the board. I can't stand here and say absolutely they're going to discuss it. I can't say absolutely they're going to make a change, but I do know that they are listening. And if they come in, they will discuss them.

I have other topics, important topics to talk about, so maybe I could take a few questions, and then you could cut the questions off to make sure -- because I want to talk about the campus code, and I want to talk about the snow day and give you a couple of good news updates.

Chris. I'm sorry. Not supposed to call on you.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering Department. President Pollack, would you be willing to comment on your personal views on whether or not Cornell should divest from fossil fuels.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah. I think it's an incredibly complicated decision, and I am trying to work it out for myself. I think there are a lot of nuances to it. I understand what motivates it. I think it could potentially have a strong symbolic power. I do worry, however, both about whether it's purely symbolic, whether all that's going to happen is other companies will come in.

And one thing I worry about also is if you believe that the big five -- the big oil companies are the ones who ultimately will invest, will become the big energy companies, if you lose your proxy vote, if the people who really care can't proxy vote, you're disengaged; you lose your ability to influence them.

That's not saying I'm opposed to it. I am spending a lot of time reading and thinking about this, and I don't have a yes or no.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Would you commit to publicly declaring what your support or lack of support for this is at the point --

MARTHA POLLACK: No. I will talk about this with the board first. I think it is much more -- I think my making a declaration of something that is not my decision -- it's not my decision; it is the board decision -- is not helpful.

By the time the board meeting comes around, I will be discussing it with them and making my recommendation to them, but I am not willing to commit publicly to -- on something that is not my decision to make.

All right. So a couple of other things. I want to sort of issue an apology and explain what happened with the snow day. I know it was a problem for a lot of people. It was declared late. We do apologize for that.

I do want to remind people that we had four snow days in the last three years, which is more than we had in the previous 25, so the -- there were three in the previous 25. We are trying to work this out, we are trying to get it right. It is very difficult.

Last year, when we closed in March of '18, there was a lot of criticism because the storm didn't happen and we closed.

This time, as late as 5:00 a.m. on Friday morning, it still looked like the snow was going to be coming in at a pace that roads would be able to stay open. It changed quickly. There was a mistake made. The people who were supposed to convene the working group failed to do that early enough. By the time they did it to make the decision, it was too late.

So I am sorry for -- I know it caused a lot of inconvenience for a lot of people.

And I asked for a sort of postmortem of the group to make sure that, in the future, the group that's supposed to be making the decision gets convened earlier and hopefully we can get a decision.

I can't promise we are always going to get it right. Because even doing that, you know what the weather is like up here. But we did screw up, and we're going to try and correct that.

Is the Daily Sun here? Please don't quote me on saying we did make a mistake.

I also want to give you an update on the campus code of conduct. As I've said before to a lot of groups -- so probably to this group -- when I arrived in April of '17, it was one of the first things that students, in particular, complained to me about. And I continued, for the past two-and-a-half years, to have people say you've got to fix the campus code of conduct. It is hard to read; it's inconsistent. We know it's inconsistent. We run into inconsistencies trying to implement it.

The way it works is that it is the responsibility of the University Assembly, who will delegate to the CJC, who brings something back to the University Assembly to

develop a code of conduct, to make changes to the code of conduct. And then parts of it go to me and parts of it go to the board for final authorization.

Last year, for various reasons that I don't need to repeat here, nothing happened. Unfortunately, one of the members of the UA went to the board -- because the board is also very interested in this. It's currently a significant risk for us, in the shape it's in. Went to the board and said, oh, we're almost done.

So when nothing happened, the board was not happy, to say the least. I convinced the board to give us another year, and it is now in the UA. The CJC did a lot of work. They worked really hard, under the direction of a second-year law student in the fall.

But what we were submitted in the end of December was very incomplete, still quite problematic. It had definitions that weren't consistent with other campus definitions, and still a lot of comments. It wasn't far along. And we have to have this done by the end of this academic year. There is just no question. The board is not going to let this go any further.

So I had, what I thought was a very productive meeting, first with the chair of the CJC. Now, she's unfortunately had to resign for time reasons. But I then met with the CJC, and what we agreed was that general counsel was going to take the work they did - - I have one caveat I have to add -- was going to take the work they did, edit it as little as possible to come up with something that I could sign onto, because it has to be shared. We all have to be able to live with it. And then also give them a draft.

So what they wrote was the prohibited conduct section, and then give them a draft of the procedures section that they could work from, that they could get started on, so that we have any hope of having this done by the end of the semester.

There's one other really important thing to note, and that is that there are new regulations coming out from the federal government on free speech, and so it is really, really -- look, if we just wanted to be legalistic, what we would do is have no free speech statement at all. We aren't going to do that. That would be just completely at odds with everything we believe in. But it's really important that we have a simple, clear, precise free speech statement that applies to the whole university, not the student code of conduct -- the whole university, that's strong, but that really focuses on the principle, and somewhere separate has details about things like what hours you're allowed to use speakers on Ho Plaza and things like that that are mixed in. We need to do that quickly so that we are protected when the Feds put this new regulation in space. So that's also being worked on. There's a draft to that. That's also going back to CJC to take a look at.

Finally, I wanted to give you a couple sort of good news updates, because it's winter; everybody needs a little good news.

The first, I know that faculty care deeply about student mental health, as do I. It's a critical issue. We hear about it all the time. I want to remind you that we have a comprehensive review underway. There was an internal review last year and then an external team came in this October. The final report will be out this spring. It will be made public.

But in the meantime, CAPS and Cornell Health has made enormous changes to the ways students schedule their appointments and the ways appointments are distributed. Students have more opportunity to get appointments; they have more opportunity to choose their care-giver.

And I just want to give you some numbers. Year over year, last fall to this fall, the number of individuals who saw a counselor at CAPS is up 28%, and the number of appointments is up 37%. So think of that in terms of the students you teach.

But we've been able to do two things by better allocation of time. One is the number of outside referrals to counselors in the community has dropped from 21% to 6%, and most of that is because a student has asked specifically to see a different kind of counselor than we have or something like that. And the typical wait time. So last year, in an emergency, it was less than 24 hours. For a so-called urgent visit, it was 19 days, and routine visit, it was 31 days.

Today, if it's urgent or you just request, if you are a student and you call up and request an appointment, you are in within 28 hours. Most of the time, the same day. If you call at 3:30 in the afternoon, it might be the next day. And routine appointments are now essentially two-week, 16 days, versus 31 days.

Any of you that tried to get a doctor's appointment, 16 days is pretty good. So I'm happy about that.

And, finally, I wanted to give an update on immigration. The immigration issues, of course, continues to be extraordinarily difficult for our faculty, for our students, for our staff. But I am delighted to be able to share one positive development.

Back in August 2018, so a year-and-a-half ago, the USCIS, the United States Citizen and Immigration Services, issued an updated policy on what's called unlawful presence. This was a policy that would have said, if you're a F1, a J1, or M1 visa-holder, which is most of our students and postdocs, that your presence, your unlawful presence starts on the day at which the government says they decide you are out of status. And that put at risk an enormous number of students to be barred for weeks, months, maybe even permanently from the United States, for sort of innocent mistakes or typos, things like that.

Obviously, that was going to have a huge impact on us, and we joined with a group of institutions to file an amicus brief in support of a lawsuit that countered this. And very recently, a federal court issued a permanent injunction blocking the government from enforcing that August '18 policy.

Now, it may be appealed, but for the moment, we are in a good place, and we continue to join in amici briefs for other similar sorts of things.

I'm done.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski in English. Thank you for the update about the code and free speech issues. I think that's a good, simple statement about the complex issues. Free speech is a complex thing to wish for. And I was briefly on the CJC, and the discussion of wanting something clear versus trying to address the nuance of the situation seemed to be a point where conversations would break down.

MARTHA POLLACK: Obviously, the documents that get produced by CJC will go out for public comment. But that is the goal, because the new federal regulations are

going to hold us. So if the government views us as in violation of our own policies, they can hold us liable and withhold funding and use sanctions. That's why we really need a clear statement of principles.

And we don't want the government coming in and saying, you said you could have a shroud speaker on Ho Plaza until 1:30, and the fluent was there at 1:45, you know.

We are trying to get something that's clear and simple, says what needs to be said, but doesn't have a whole lot of extra stuff in there that we could be attacked on.

MARK WYSOCKI: Mark Wysocki, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. So if I could just borrow a phrase from Kermit the frog: It's not easy to be a meteorologist in central New York.

So we try to do the best we can in trying to get the information out as best as possible because it does have a huge impact. I helped them with this kind of decision-making. It does have a huge impact on the operations and the responsibilities we have to the students in terms of food service and everything like this.

Again, things like this are going to happen, and I'm glad you said that we've had four now. That's climate change.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah. And it is important to note -- this is really important to know, we don't want to do things when it's dangerous, but it is totally in the University's interest to stay open whenever it can. It's not like closing a coffee shop; it's like closing a city, and you can never really close. You have to feed the students. You

have to have public safety. You have to have people plowing. You have to have people at student health. It's a very complicated thing to close a university.

Four times in three years is problematic. The four in three is a little climate change. Three in 25 is a shift in policy.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: If we can do the check on the quorum and so forth.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have quorum.

Minutes.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: Amendments or questions about the minutes? Corrections? If not, do I hear a motion to accept?

Second?

Okay, all those in favor? If we can do this by simply raising your hand, that would be great.

Okay, is there anybody that's opposed? Anybody that wants to abstain?

It's passed. Thank you.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I'll cut to the chase. Last May, Charlie told us about something that most of us had never heard about, which was that under some circumstances, college authorities, meaning committees on academic actions, associate deans, et cetera, had the practice of occasionally going to a student's transcript after an instructor has given a grade in a class and changing that transcript from the grade to a W, or perhaps even expunging the entry entirely. And I think I was kind of taken aback

when I heard that, and I think a lot of other people were as well. Under what circumstances does this happen? Is it the Wild West? Are registrars changing grades willy-nilly, et cetera?

So the senate passed this kind of thing last May, which essentially assured faculty members that they would at least be informed that this was happening to the transcript of a student in a course they had instructed. But we thought -- we all decided we needed a lot more information and we should engage with the authorities who are doing this and with the associate deans and come up with something better.

So over the course of the last nine months, we've done that. Essentially, what we came up with was there are two kinds of what I'll call retro Ws, that's covering retro expungements and retro Ws. One kind is of this kind, where the issue that necessitates the retro W involves one of these sacrosanct offices: The Office of University Counsel, Cornell Health or Title IX.

In those cases, faculty members have really strong limits on what they are allowed to know. They can't even hear, for example, what office mandated that a student have a retro W.

However, we thought -- and we put in this resolution -- that it is important for the faculty; A, to be informed that this is happening before it happens; and, B, to be assured by some other faculty member and the associate dean, college associate dean for academic affairs, or equivalent position as that other faculty member that due process was followed in coming to this conclusion, that the student deserves a retro W.

So this is a really rare occurrence among the retro Ws. The retro Ws themselves are rare. How rare? Well, we're talking tens university-wide over the course of every semester. Maybe 40, 50. Is that the number you came up with? Yeah. And among those, these are a tiny percentage.

So these are serious things that the instructor of record isn't entitled to a lot of information about.

However, there are other kind of retro Ws, these so-called lesser circumstances, where something happens where the student forgets to drop or the college misrecords or doesn't process a drop form correctly, something like that, and it's discovered later that the student failed the class that they didn't even know they were in it. That's kind of been an innocent sort of thing, and there are those that happen.

In this case, we came up with an agreement that the instructor must not only be informed that the change is going to happen before it happens, but approve the change. So resolution has two parts, that in these special cases involving the three sacrosanct offices, instructor of record gets full information -- or doesn't get full information, but gets information the change is going to be made, assurance that due process was followed in coming to that conclusion, and that's for those cases of the -- and for these cases, the instructor has to approve it.

And this resolution comes from the UFC. It's a resolution of the senate's UFC. However, the people who cobbled it together are me, along with this group here and the folks in red, especially Lisa Nishii, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and Carol Grumbach, Associate Vice Provost, were instrumental in coming up -- helping us

come up with this. And Mike Thompson, among the associate deans, contributed heavily to moving it forward.

And I just want to say before I close, that folks on the online comments have called for a further lengthy senate discussion of this. And I think that discussion would be useful, at least in the sense that it would explain to everyone why circumstances such as these do arise. Why are there circumstances where faculty members don't deserve full information about a change from a grade to a W for a student in their class after the fact?

However, the practice will continue. And right now, it has no rules. There's no faculty oversight.

And in terms of faculty oversight, the faculty oversight afforded by this resolution, in my humble opinion -- and I think Lisa and Carol would agree with me -- on others, is that the faculty oversight afforded by this resolution is as good as it's going to get.

So with that, I will close.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard BenseI, Department of Government. I raise a point of order that this is a new resolution, whose contents have never been discussed in the faculty senate, and thus it must lay over until the March meeting, in the same way and for the same reasons that the fossil fuel divestment resolution will lay over until the next meeting. This is our rules; this is our practice. That's the point of order.

A point of order is not a motion. Point of order is a point of order. It has to be ruled on by the chair.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: In light of the fact that this does seem to have a great deal of new information to it, I will allow that we will postpone this till the March meeting, okay? All right?

DAVID LEE: Good afternoon, everyone. To begin, I'd like to thank the Implementation Committee of the Social Science Review for their considerable work on behalf of enhancing the social sciences at Cornell. Although individuals may disagree on specifics, I think we all owe them a great debt of gratitude for their considerable time and effort, and also to the administration for highlighting the need to advance the social sciences at Cornell. That's already paid off in one concrete way, with the creation of the Center for Social Sciences, and we all look forward to further steps.

On behalf of the UFC, my job is to present three resolutions regarding the Social Science Implementation Committee's final report and their recommendations for your consideration and vote. And to do so, in the very brief as possible way, which is a challenge, but I will do so, just as a question.

Curious how many senators here were not at the January 22nd special meeting?
Just a rough idea. Okay. Thanks.

So I am told by our parliamentarian that I'm going to need a motion on each of these to enable discussion. So I'm just going to go through the three motions, then we'll open it up -- then I'll continue with my presentation, then we'll have general discussion.

The first resolution that you have hopefully all seen this on the Website and have read this on super-departments, be it resolved the faculty senate -- not going to read it. You can read it -- endorses the committee recommendation to pursue the creation of

three super-departments of economics, psychology and sociology. And then there's a further caveat, further qualification that there be additional conversations among the respective units in the spring -- that's the current semester -- commitment of resources to facilitate reorganization and continued attention to the issue of collocation.

So that is the motion. Could I have a second?

Thank you.

We'll go through discussion in a second. I'm just going to get to the resolutions. As I understand it, it will go -- okay. Resolutions 2 and 3 have to be considered together.

Resolution 2 is on the cross-college school model or the so-called school option, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the development of a cross-college school of public policy. And resolution -- excuse me. I need a second on that, to enable discussion. Somebody?

Thank you.

Resolution 3 -- and this is the so-called college option -- be it resolved that the Faculty Senate does not support the re-envisioning of a college of human ecology as a college of public policy. Note that this is framed as a resolution for your consideration and positive vote, at least that's where it's coming from the UFC. However, it's phrased as does not support that option.

Do I have a second to enable discussion?

Thank you.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: There's no motions on the floor at this time. There will be in a moment.

DAVID LEE: Thank you. Thanks, Mike.

So I'm just going to very briefly touch on and identify the pros and some of the cons of each of these. Obviously, I don't have any time for elaborate discussion.

Those of you at the January 22nd meeting know there was considerable discussion on -- particularly on the policy school resolutions and some on the super-departments.

So the resolution on the super-departments, to sum up, arguments in favor -- this is exclusively from the final report -- the major argument in favor is to improve disciplinary interaction, collaboration, diversity of scholarship, and synergies, significant benefit. Improve recruitment of faculty, increase national disciplinary profiles by expanding the membership of the departments to become these super-departments so-called. And a variety of benefits to teaching, graduate training, service responsibilities by splitting the service load across a greater number of faculty and so forth. And there are others. I'm just hitting on the highlights here.

Concerns expressed also in the final report, and largely the final report in this case, who decides who is in a super-department. That is a legitimate question. Who decides? So-called cultural differences across units, issues of department identity and focus have been raised, including by some speakers at the January 22nd meeting.

There's also language, though, in the report about the fact that differences could presumably be solved with time and continued interaction and governance. So that's a counter to that point.

Balance across sub-disciplinary areas, that has been raised in psychology, and in sociology in particular, less so in economics. That is the shifting the balance of the departments from the traditional department to a so-called super-department, which would shift the balance of expertise in that area -- in the department.

Then, finally, hiring and promotion practices would need to be equalized across colleges. And here the issue is the notion of combining statutory or contract college units with endowed college units. Again, language from the final report, presumably super-departments can consider relevant solutions and strategies used in successful existing super-departments on campus.

And here it should be noted, we do have the equivalent -- I guess they aren't called super-departments, but we have a history of cross-college collaboration largely in the sciences -- Atmospheric Science, Biology, Biological and Environmental Engineering, Nutrition and so forth, other examples as well.

The UFC balancing the pros and the cons, the benefits and the concerns is coming to you with the recommendation that we pass this, that we believe the benefits outweigh the concerns.

Now, the next two resolutions, again, they counter each other, so it's important to be thinking of them simultaneously. The first is a school option, as I mentioned; and the second is the so-called college option. The first is the notion of a cross-college policy school. The second is so-called re-envisioning Human Ecology as a policy school.

And here it is important to point out -- and this came up repeatedly at the January 22nd meeting -- that the committee was operating under a constrained

mandate, and that became an issue, I think, in two respects, at least judging by many of the comments that have come up before the UFC.

One was the committee was not charged with deciding which of these options were better overall for the University to pursue. Now, you might think that's sort of the bottom line here, but that was not part of their charge and they deferred on elaborating that point.

The second point, which elicited a lot of discussion at the last meeting, was it's beyond the mandate of the committee to address the collateral impacts any such organizational changes might have on the non-policy units within human ecology.

So those two points are off the table, and I think therein lies some of the issues that have come up.

Resolution 2, then. Arguments in favor. The two main arguments in favor, I think, are the following: First, is that a cross-college entity, a cross-college school of public policy would inherently have -- entail greater inclusivity of the full range of policy-oriented faculty at Cornell across the university.

There are many more policy faculty at Cornell outside of Human Ecology College than there are inside it, many more. Just in my unit, Dyson School, we have about -- equivalent number as are in Policy Analysis and Management, of about 30 faculty. And there are many more throughout the University. So I think that's a key point. And if we are going to have a policy school at Cornell or a policy unit at Cornell, it makes total sense, I think to many of us, that we would start from a position of taking the best of

what we have, making the best of what we already have across the university in terms of policy work.

The second point, and the one that generated a lot of discussion on January 22nd, is the unclear impact and potential disenfranchisement -- and that is the committee's word, not mine -- of non-policy faculty, students and programs comprising 75% of Human Ecology. So this isn't a small part of Human Ecology. This is three-quarters of the faculty, three-quarters or so of the students. So, as I'm sure you all know, this has become very much of an issue.

Again, like the first point, this -- addressing this was off the table. It was not part of their mandate. And so although there is acknowledgment that this is an issue, it's not really pursued how actually would you address the needs of the 75% of Human Ecology that remains. It's not really addressed in any detail; although, it is acknowledged. And it's explained that it will be addressed, but it's not addressed.

There are a number of other points. Just going to mention them, not explain them. We have a lot of best work, most highly rated work, national rankings, and so forth in policies actually done outside of Human Ecology. It's an international work. A variety of our programs in international development, a globally ranked program, food policy, nutrition policy, and so forth. One would think that that would be included from the get-go in a policy school, a cross-college policy school, and that would be greatly facilitated by starting with a cross-college policy school.

We have a long history of successful collaboration, as I mentioned before, across academic units, across colleges at Cornell.

So, yes, management challenges would exist under either option, but we've dealt with that and Cornell's dealt historically with that very successfully.

There's a phrase about greater coherence and singularity of focus of the cross-college school option. And the problem here is that -- or the issue here is that the report says that an extreme version of the college option, namely pulling everything that's not policy out of the picture, that that would not be pursued, that a reinforced, strengthened policy program plus the non-policy elements of Human Ecology would still be simultaneously pursued in Human Ecology. But then that raises the issue of the hybrid nature and diffused mission of the college option. And that, again, is the language of the report, not my language. That is, if you are simultaneously trying to strengthen policy and doing it in a very effective way, very outward-reaching way, promoting the policy program, then what happens with the rest of the school, with the rest of the college. And the significant tension and uncertainty, again, quote, unquote, that might result.

Then, finally -- and when I say finally, there are other reasons. I'm just going to hit on six here. What is the value added of the two of four academic concentrations that are given in the report which are already strong programs at Cornell? Two of the four programs, sustainability, data science and policy are already things we do very well. We have strong national rankings. So the question is: What's the value added of a policy school in this area?

There's wording about starting to hire new faculty without, again, pursuing in detail the role of affiliated faculty; that is, the many faculty at Cornell that already do

these types of things. So those are the arguments in favor of the cross-college policy school.

Now I'm skipping to Resolution 3. Remember, this is the college option. This is the re-envisioning of Human Ecology as a college of public policy. I know I keep reminding you of the terminology here because I don't want to lose the train of thought here.

So arguments in favor of the college option, this was the option that was recommended by the committee. There are two that are asserted in the report. One is that it would be a cleaner, more autonomous organizational structure. And, secondly, the ability to recruit highest-caliber dean candidates.

Yeah, I mean, those would be -- could be viewed as advantages. However, I'd like to respond to both of those points.

One is that the benefits of cross-college structures are cited as key justifications of the super-department resolution or super-department recommendation. But when we get to the policy school, that same element is cited as a disadvantage. So there's an inconsistency here in the report. Either cross-college structures presumably are beneficial or they're not beneficial. You can't pick and choose. And here we have inconsistency in the report. And I think, again, those of us that have been here a while and seen how thriving many of the cross-college units are would recognize that great strength of Cornell; and, presumably, we can do in policy what we do in the sciences.

Secondly, regarding the dean candidates, I'm not in a position to judge, but one would think that, quote, a new venture unique to Cornell and also highly influential and impactful in public policy should be very attractive in attracting a new dean; that is,

someone that would really like to make sure mark -- start with a new institution and make their mark in the policy arena.

So just two thoughts for your thinking.

Last thing I would like to say is you've probably seen on the Website, there are eleven clarifications of the final report posted on the senate website. There's no time for detailed comment on them, but I'd like to make just two points.

One is, as they acknowledge these clarifications were made by only a thread of eleven committee members, the committee was clearly deeply split on this whole issue and the clarifications, as they acknowledged, do not reflect the full range of thinking on the committee. The committee's been disbanded, so they couldn't really do that anyway.

Secondly, the clarifications -- not going to go over them one by one, but they repeatedly make the point that there is, quote, nothing inherently limiting to prevent Outcomes X, Y, or Z, various outcomes, or that X, Y, or Z could occur under either option. And that's true. Lots of things could occur. But in my view, asserting hypotheticals like not preventing an outcome is not a substitute for making an effective evidence-based proactive case for an outcome or result.

And in too many instances in the report, as lengthy as they are, there's simply too little detail and too little substance on fundamental questions. For example, the notion of new organizational structures in Human Ecology -- that's repeated several times. What new organizational structures to serve the non-policy faculty? How would that work? What would they do, et cetera, et cetera?

So these limitations, I think, are due, at least in part, again, to the restricted mandate the committee was operating under. As a result, I think the clarifications really just sort of kicked the can down the road in terms of deferring elaboration, deferring detail on many of the key impacts of what they're proposing, especially the impacts on the non-policy elements of Human Ecology.

Last point, final note, the vote of the Implementation Committee was 6-4 in favor of the so-called college option. Again, doesn't require a lot of analysis to recognize that's one person. And, typically, you recommend policy based on consensus, not one person's view. And so I think it's a very weak consensus indeed that emerged from the committee on this point.

Secondly, of 22 senators and faculty speaking at the January 22nd special meeting, not one voiced support for the college option.

Thanks.

These are the three resolutions. I'm just putting them up there word for word, and I'll let the parliamentarians proceed.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: If we take it one at a time, there was a motion, a second. Now there's open for debate for the first resolution, and that would be -- go ahead.

DAVID LEE: Number 1, on super-departments, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the committee recommendation to pursue the creation of super-departments in economics, psychology, and sociology. Be it further resolved that there is strong agreement with the committee's wish, as noted in the final report, that will be, quote, additional conversations among the respective units in the spring 2020 semester,

a commitment of resources to facilitate reorganization and continued attention to the issue of collocation.

TAMAR KUSHNIR: Tamar Kushnir from Department of Human Development. I have written it, so I'll be short.

I'm here with an appeal that we have more time to review the details of the committee and subcommittee reports before voting on the issue of super-departments.

My request is based on the existence of factual errors in the super-department section of the committee report and inconsistencies between the committee and subcommittee reports, which the faculty have not had time to preview, review, or respond to. Here are just a few examples.

The super-department section of the committee report states that, quote, in a super-department, there would be 25 out of 43 faculty doing developmental work, which would represent an extremely heavy developmental emphasis in a psychology department.

This is incorrect. I am a developmental psychology. Traditional developmental psychology areas in psychology departments focus on the study of child and adolescent development. I study child development, so I know. It's my primary research area. If I were in a traditional psychology department, I would be in the developmental area. By my count, there are six of us, including myself, that fall into this category. That's six out of -- if you add the one from the psychology department who falls into this category, that's 7 out of 43 faculty. That is a small minority. I believe this error needs to be corrected.

The committee report also states that when a large group of faculty exists in multiple units, it can introduce redundancy with respect to undergraduate offerings. I think this is incorrect. There are checks in place at the college and university level to assure non-redundancy. For example, proposals of new undergraduate and graduate courses in CHE contain a section to justify that the course is not being taught elsewhere in the university. Not in the college, in the university. And the university registrar checks our courses after college approval to finally approve them.

I know, because I have tried, as a psychologist, to propose courses that share content with a psychology department, and I have been told they cannot overlap or they will be denied.

Finally, the committee report, in several places, mentions the outstanding issues that are, quote, discussed in detail in each subcommittee report. I believe the subcommittee reports to be drafts that do not incorporate feedback from relevant stakeholders.

For example, we submitted feedback in human development to the committee. A meeting was scheduled for our faculty to meet with the co-chairs to discuss and update the draft to the final version. It never happened. The senate does not have access to any feedback that we submitted, and no meeting has since been convened.

So I'm asking the faculty present here and anyone else who's listening and the leadership of this body to please just give us more time.

Thank you.

RICHARD BENDEL: Richard Bense, Department of Government. As I understand the last speaker's sentiments, that would be a motion to postpone until the March 11th meeting further discussion -- we can discuss today, but further discussion and voting on this resolution. So with your permission, I will move that postponement, and we need a second.

DAVID LEE: Since we are open for discussion, do you believe your concerns are sufficient to outweigh the big picture here? I hear what you're saying; and, honestly, those committees did an awful lot of work, lengthy reports full of data and so forth. I'm not surprised there are some issues and questions and maybe some errors. But do you think your concerns outweigh the totality of what we're talking about here?

TAMAR KUSHNIR: I actually think many of the concerns in the committee's report are reflected in better ways and sort of addressed in the subcommittee reports. The issue is I believe those aren't complete. They haven't been imposed with the same process the committee reports and the listening sessions and the revisions have gone through with those main reports.

So the subcommittee reports are -- to my understanding, they are also available on the Internet and people can see them, but I don't think they're fine. I think they're drafts. So the issue is just to have more time. This is not, to me, for or against the big picture. The big picture is not the issue yet. I think it's just a procedural issue for me, and I would be very happy to have extra time and to hear people's feedback.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski in English. I'm noticing there's several comments on the Faculty Senate Website asking for more discussion of the super-department issue.

PETE WOLCZANSKI: Pete Wolczanski, Chemistry and Chemical Biology. I think the resolutions and the problems we are having with these are emblematic of this university being a dinosaur that looks like a 1950s university in the 21st Century. I think there should be -- all of this should be scrapped. I think we should really sit down and try and think about what we should be doing in the 21st Century. How many departments we have in Arts and Sciences? 40? Some outrageous number of departments. We should have a school of science, school of humanities, school of languages. We would have our super-departments, if the university was built along modern lines like, say, Carnegie Mellon or some of these other schools that never used to compete with the Ivies. Hell, Quinnipiac competes with us now. Who the hell were they 30 years ago? I didn't even know Quinnipiac was a university 30 years ago. Now they compete with us on a student-per-student basis because they have a modern curriculum and we don't. Brown University scrapped all its regulations. Man, that's the number one school my daughter been lined to try and get into when she was applying to colleges, so she could develop her own curriculum.

All this stuff we have been doing for the last few years is just a joke, you know. BU competes with us now. They never used to compete with us. Our competitors, Northeastern, BU, Quinnipiac, these schools never were in our marketplace and now they are. They're competing with us because they have modernized their curriculum,

and they had to do that to survivor. And we're going to end up being the BUs of the future, unless we don't restructure this university.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: We are talking about a motion to delay this. So if you can keep that to that, I would appreciate it.

DAVID LEE: To delay all three or --

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: No. Just the first one. Any more discussion on the delay? One more up there, then that will be it. We have to move on.

JANE WANG: Jane Wang, Physics. I have heard mostly feedback from faculty in Human Ecology, but haven't heard anything from Psychology itself. I wonder why.

DAVID LEE: I don't have an answer for that.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: For the time commitment that we are under and what is remaining, let's call the vote. The motion is to delay voting on this motion.

All those in favor?

All those opposed?

And anyone abstain?

Motion passes to postpone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What was the vote?

JILL SHORT: I have 33 passed, 17 oppose, and 10 abstain.

DAVID LEE: To Resolution 2, this is the so-called school option, the cross-college recommendation to the provost and president for a cross-college school of public policy, the so-called school option. Be it resolved the Faculty Senate supports the development of a cross-college school of public policy.

HAROLD HODES: Hodes, Philosophy. This is a question of information. How would a cross-college school differ from a super-department? And if they are different, why aren't we considering a super-department of public policy?

DAVID LEE: I think my own answer would be a simple one, which is policy's interdisciplinary and the super-departments are disciplinary, and so a policy school would draw from social sciences, humanities, physical sciences. If you think about we just got done talking about climate change, where's the expertise of climate change at Cornell? It's at Earth and Atmospheric Sciences and CALS and Engineering and so forth, so it's cross-disciplinary, I think, at its base.

SHARON TENNYSON: Sharon Tennyson from Policy Analysis and Management. Thank you for your comments and your presentation.

I'm curious, though, about the way you presented Resolutions 2 and 3 in your discussion and comments, because you seem to be suggesting that this body should support the cross-college school model because it should not support the college model. And that's a constraint that was put on the committee to choose between one or the other, but this body is under no such constraint to choose. I don't see that a case has been made in your discussion for why this body should support particular proposal of a cross-college school model that was put forward. So just a question about why you feel these two are linked for this body, because it's not clear, to me, that they should be. This body could support either one or support neither, rather than choose between.

DAVID LEE: Well, that's an excellent question. And, again, I was constrained to ten minutes. I was just hitting on the high points. I wasn't going into a long elaboration

of everything. But the key point here, I think, again, the way I would look at it, this is not a perfect world. I think in a perfect world, we would have a choice of a true -- call it a true university-wide school of public policy. Those were not the options that the committee was dealt with, that they were dealing with, that they were choosing between.

Of the two, this cross-college model or this school option more closely approximate what I think many of us would consider the ideal. And I would fully expect, based on the language in the reports and just knowing Cornell over 30 years, that's what would happen is that those two colleges, Human Ecology and Arts and Sciences, particularly the PAM Department and Government Department would probably very quickly expand into other -- at least open the gates to other involvement.

So I'm in the Business School in CALS. So we have 30 of us in the Dyson School that are in the same position. There are folks throughout the university. So if there were an option here, you're absolutely right, that this group could vote neither. I think that would be unfortunate. I don't think it would acknowledge the enormous work that has gone into this by the committee. They were laboring under -- in my estimation, laboring under these two constraints; and I think that Option 2, this motion, I think that it portends well for the future.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: In favor of the resolution, please raise your hands. Just Number 2.

All those in favor of Number 2?

DAVID LEE: Be it resolved the Faculty Senate supports the development of a cross-college school of public policy.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: All those opposed?

Anybody abstain?

So what were the numbers?

This is like Iowa, if you are wondering.

JILL SHORT: Pass is 46. Opposed is 6. And 10 abstain.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: To move very quickly here, the last resolution.

DAVID LEE: Resolution 3 --

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: Comment on that?

DAVID LEE: I'll just reread it. This is the flip side, remember. This is the flip side of Resolution 2, the so-called college option.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate does not support the re-envisioning of the college of Human Ecology as a college of public policy. In other words, a yes vote here does not support the recommendation of the committee.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: So all those in favor of this resolution?

All those opposed?

And all those abstained?

Do we have the numbers for that one?

JILL SHORT: 53 pass, 2 opposed, and 5 abstain.

DAVID LEE: Thank you.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: I thank you all for your patience. We are adjourned. And if you are wondering, we have some more rain, sleet, and snow between 9:00 p.m. tonight and 7:00 a.m. tomorrow. I am not going that far on the limb.