

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020

THE SPEAKER: The very first thing I need to remind you, if you are called on to speak or you want to speak, make sure that you say who you are, who you represent, that sort of thing, so we know. Senators have preference in today's meeting in terms of speaking. Of course, we do have perhaps some people that aren't senators here, so be aware of that.

I haven't been notified that "The Cornell Daily Sun" is here, but it's always possible -- oh, they are here, okay -- that "The Cornell Daily Sun" is here and perhaps other media, so be aware of that as well.

What we are hoping to do is have a discussion about the Coronavirus crises that we all are aware of. And the normal way that you do it, according to Robert's Rules of Order, is you have a motion on the floor. We've been reminded of this by different individuals over the previous meetings, but the idea was that it would be better just to have a discussion without a motion, just to start today's meeting. So we're going to suspend the rules that require a motion just at the beginning, and then we'll go back to our normal way of doing things.

Before we do that, though, I believe there is issue about today's agenda that someone wanted to bring up; is that true? Yes, Richard. Yeah, come on up.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thanks, Sam. So I think all but one of you, whose address I cannot for the life of me figure out, have received messages on the alternative agenda that I and five others have proposed for this meeting. So I don't think I need to make a long introduction to that alternative agenda. You should have copies of it. I left 100 or so copies on chairs. If you don't have a copy, look to your neighbor, because one of your neighbors is holding them, but you should have it. In the messages I sent out, I explained the rationale that we had, the reasons we had for the alternative agenda.

Unless there are any questions that you want to pose about it, I don't have more to say on the agenda itself.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you, Richard. I wanted to give you an opportunity to say something as well. Okay, go ahead.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yes, I formally move that we adopt the alternative agenda that you have before you. Thank you.

SPEAKER NELSON: Great. When there's a motion like this on the floor, the first thing we have to determine is whether or not there's quorum. Is Mark, the parliamentarian, here? I think he's checking the quorum right now, but we need mid-60s, 65 to have quorum. I don't know if we had it. Just a minute ago we had 40-some.

Okay, why don't we have Charlie respond. He's the one who came up with the original agenda that we were scheduled to use today.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's not quite right. The UFC determines the senate agendas. They are elected. A great deal of thought goes into the order and the time allocated. We're very flexible. Richard posed this thing at 11:30 this morning. If we received that back last week when we talked about these things, we would have been happy to make considerations.

We also order things in a certain way to respect faculty time. Sometimes a faculty member can't get here till 4:15. Sometimes we don't have quorum until 4:15. All these things go into figuring out how the agenda is structured, so I really oppose this resolution. It sets a bad precedent and it's not well-reasoned or vetted properly.

SPEAKER NELSON: We'll let Richard give the final say on this. We are seven short of quorum at this time.

RICHARD BENSEL: I was informed 3:30 Monday afternoon that the agenda that the UFC has proposed was final. There were three other tentative agendas offered over the last couple

weeks. I couldn't figure out which one was going to be the final one, to which the alternative agenda would be approved. Once I had, at 3:30 in the afternoon on Monday, the final agenda before me, I consulted with the cosponsors of the alternative agenda.

That is the reason, Charlie, that is the reason that you got it this morning. Wasn't our fault. The problem with this is the administration of the Faculty Senate in an orderly way, so that we can determine what the will of the faculty is.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, Mark, what's the final number?

Waiting. He's counting, hopefully.

Thank you all for coming to today's meeting. Once we decide which agenda to use, I'm sure it will be a rip-roaring time.

Yeah.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: For this meeting, up until the last minute, we had just time. We are very flexible about that. The agenda that was circulated on Saturday in my usual pre-meeting message, you had exactly the same agenda with different times, okay. And we are going to jettison probably stuff in the agenda today. Joanie?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I make a motion that rather than just sitting here and waiting, can we -- we are going to discuss the Coronavirus. Perhaps we could start doing that. And also, I know that there are individuals here who have come to the meeting because of the divestment issue, to speak about that or listen to that. If we could perhaps front-load those issues, it would be great.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'm in favor of that. We don't have quorum, so let's -- we just proceed, then.

SPEAKER NELSON: We are going to proceed on the original agenda that was put forth.

RICHARD BENSEL: One of the problems here in getting the will of the senate before this body --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Use the mic, please.

RICHARD BENSEL: We should use regular procedure. Now, I'm willing, under unanimous consent, to go to the Coronavirus discussion, because that is a consensus. It's on both agendas.

I do want to say one thing in response to Charlie. Sam told me at 3:30 on Monday that it was the final agenda. This Saturday business, who is to know that it was the final agenda? Look, this is a problem.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have to have a quorum to vote on this kind of agenda item or this kind of motion, and so anything else that we do is out of order.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, let's ask the parliamentarian, but he's not here. This is a -- go ahead, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's just vote. How many want to stick with the current agenda, so we can get going?

Opposed?

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, it's very clear that the majority of the people want to stay with the current agenda.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So just a couple of brief announcements. First of all, elections in April, and we have full slates for everything, except for my position, so I'm sure this particular -- well, nothing. Okay, thank you.

You know, over the last three or four years, we had various colleges come forward saying they want to be able to offer certain titles. There's a set procedure for doing that. Vet

wants to offer professor of the practice. What they do in that case is they go to the enabling legislation, follow the rules, send it to CAPPs. CAPPs approves it, it comes here. We have done that, it's been posted and we'll vote on that in April.

Free-form discussion here. The thing I am most interested in here is copying down concerns and questions that you feel are still outstanding. And then I will, in my best ability, relay them to the authorities or whatever in charge. I just want to call your attention to three websites. There's the main university website, there is one that hangs off of Center for Teaching Innovation dealing with online delivery of courses, and then off of our website, we have had this going for a week; if you want to post something, there's a venue for you to do that.

We'll pay a lot of attention to what's said here today. There will be a transcript, of course; but again, what I want are your concerns and questions that I can then assemble and try to get some answers for you.

One more thing. Last week, when I was gathering some data on this, a third of the faculty is over 60, and that's an important concern. Of course, international students, the students, huge issues, things we should pay attention to. This is another factor. Having said that, we aren't passing around the mic, for obvious reasons. There are mic stands. So this is free-form. Keep your comments down to two minutes, if possible. Let's go.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So one thing that may be buried on one of those websites somewhere, although I looked quite a bit and didn't see a ton about this, is from the perspective of faculty who have students coming to us, asking us very specific questions. I think that first of all, there are communications being sent to the students, is my impression, and we don't know what they know or what they are getting or what they are finding out. So that sort of lack of coordination is making it difficult for us to communicate with them in a way that's consistent with what they've already heard.

The second thing, and this is the biggest concern that I've heard the most from at least the students that I engage with, is for low-income students or students who lack material resources, really what is the plan. I think it may be there's a plan and that, again, it's buried somewhere in these websites, but it is my impression students aren't aware of the resources they have access to are.

And this includes both material resources, like I can't go home, I have no home to go to, I have no way of getting home; but also mental health resources. I've had students who say I get counseling here on campus. If I go home, I don't get that and then I'm not in a good place mental health-wise. And it also includes resources for their families. I have students who work on campus, and part of what they do with that money is they help their family. So there are all sorts of problems here.

And my sense thus far from my students is they have no idea where to go with those various problems, short of calling a hotline. And many of them don't feel like they've been getting the kind of help there or from the financial aid office that they need.

And the last thing is whatever the answer to that is for students, if there could be a way of getting that information to faculty, so that we know what to tell our students and we're not just sort of well, I don't know, ask somebody else who maybe won't help you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, I think in terms of communication, I think there should be a stress on putting these things online, and then you email students and CC faculty with very short emails just with the link. These very long postings and emails do not facilitate this. So I've heard a lot of cases where a dean sent something to faculty or to students, and the other group doesn't know anything, so that's an important point.

Another thing is that -- let's just call it rollout. I'm sure Ryan knows about the issues that you're talking about, and hopefully in due course they'll be addressed.

Let's try to get some order here. Yeah.

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Christine Leuenberger from the Department of Science and Technology Studies. I have talked to a number of seniors who are very upset and very angry, and I think we should take their concerns seriously. For them, of course, graduating is a big symbolically important ritual and it will impact their long-term loyalty to the institution, and we should really make it possible for them to graduate in a way that's meaningful for them. That's all I want to say.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, so two parts, which is the graduation requirements, getting to that point, and then the commencement exercise itself.

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Correct.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Bruce Lewenstein from Communication. Just a question that I've been hearing a bunch is for those students who are staying on campus, particularly research graduate students, have relatively small meetings, A exam, B exam meetings are small gatherings of people who are staying on campus, not participating in travel and so on. Are they going to be -- what's the recommendation for those?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The large group directive right now -- there's no restriction on any kind of class, but you're thinking that do we need a special announcement about A and B exams; that would be a valuable thing.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: A and B exams or other small committee meetings, just a general sense of what's the recommendation for small meetings. Are we all supposed to self-isolate after spring break or, if we are on campus, can we go ahead and keep doing the things we do on campus that are small group.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So those are probably the smallest kind of -- aside from one-on-one with a faculty member, A exams and B exams are small. So right now, everything is okay,

just use common sense; but down the road, we need explicit -- because these are pivotal episodes in a student's life.

TIM DEVOOGD: Tim DeVoogd, Psychology. What is the understanding right now about doing things in foreign countries that are not Italy and Iran and the places that are designated by CDC, in the summer and going forward? Is there any definition about when it is that we'll be able to start doing foreign programs with students?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I don't know the immediate answer, but right now, no international travel on Cornell's dime. That's a rule right now. So you're sort of saying do we need definitions, say CDC has some definition of your Level 3 country, Level 2 country, a criteria, which if satisfied, makes it okay. And you would like to have something like that as things unfold.

Chris?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi. Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering and, relevant for this discussion, also the faculty and residents, Mary Donlon Hall. Picking up on the previous comment, while I realize clear timelines are not going to be possible now, criteria associated with the unwinding of some of these restrictions would be very helpful for the university administration to make clear, under what circumstances to travel, travel restrictions, meeting restrictions, things like that get unwound.

Two other comments. One would be direct engagement with the fraternity and sorority systems regarding both their housing and their ongoing social activities. As of last night, there were large-scale parties evidently going on on North Campus, because I saw the same ritual of younger students being picked up by parades of cars to go to parties, so asking the Greek community to contribute by decreasing those events would make a lot of sense.

I have been asked by several colleagues in Engineering to bring up the issue of design projects for senior students. These design projects are difficult to complete remotely, are a significant and actually -- and their existence and completion is part of the accreditation process for engineering programs, so thinking about where do both master of engineering and seniors with design projects fit in to the understanding of is this a research activity, is this an educational activity, should these students be allowed on campus, should these students not be allowed on campus.

Finally, I've had some suggestions, what about students who choose not to travel for spring break. Could that be a way to remain on campus and remain active in things like research activities, senior design or other design projects, without this sort of requirement just to leave campus. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just to recap, we need to see directives to the Greek system about how they do their thing, so to speak. In terms of -- flexibility is the rule, not just for us, but for various authorities. So for example, I know New York State, the Education Department has relaxed certain rules. Their definitions of credit hour and what you need to -- my impression is there's a relaxation above and at the funding agencies for a lot of this stuff.

Locally, for example, I would sort of say how you use spring break as a faculty member in any way should be your call; but you, of course, have to respect the fact that some students can stay and some can't. We have to also say the 4:30 to 7:30, the free zone, you can use that in any way you want. You can use the weekends. It's just common sense. You consult all your students and pay attention to those who can't exploit your flexibility. Yeah.

THOMAS GOLDEN: Thomas Golden, ILR School, Yang Tan Institute. Two issues. One, I have had a few students that have come to me, students with disabilities, that have expressed and asked a lot of questions about the formatting that will be used for the virtual learning, and

concerns expressed that their initial request for accommodations through Student Disability Services did not include distance learning technologies and accommodations that they might need. And so we need to address the degree to which SDS has really looked at those issues to ensure that accommodations are provided.

Secondly, took a look at the feature in Canvas this morning, which is not accessible. Given that we have a history at Cornell of not being Section 508-compliant, I think it's probably important that the technologies that we're thinking about for virtual learning that we have a commitment to, we need to make to ensuring accessible uses for all populations of our students.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks. So I did get an email from Zebadiah, who runs the disability office, about these sorts of things. Before all this happened, there was all kinds of web accessibility issues. The key thing is that we have to make sure that kind of philosophy carries forward to these situations.

David.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. A student in one of my classes this morning said to me: I'm probably just going to stay.

He's from Long Island, by the way. Just thought you might want to know. And he lives off-campus. And I'm curious about how the university plans to quote, unquote enforce students not coming back. Do they become *personae non gratae*? There are students who told me that if it's a big hassle for you to go away and stay away, then you are allowed to petition. Like if you live halfway around the world or if you live in an abusive home, school is a refuge for you, you can petition. Do they leave North Campus open for ten people in each dorm? I'm not sure what they are going to do about that, and that's one question I had.

Second question came up just a minute ago. Evan suggested that I ask the following: Is the IT support for Zoom capable of handling the flood of activity that's going to arise when we all have our scheduled Zoom Q&A sessions? IT folks disagree on that. Some say no.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That came up early, the overload question, because the load on Zoom is going to go up by orders of magnitude. So that's a question -- I know it's being looked at and so on.

In terms of the go home, if a student has an apartment in Collegetown, you cannot say anything about going there, but your question is sort of like how are we going to use the dorms and how are we going to filter for when you can stay in the dorm past the break, so guidance on that. What are the criteria? What's the definition of hardship that gets you over the line and you can stay in the dorm?

SUMAN SETH: Suman Seth, STS. The question actually that came up the most when I was talking to students today about packing up their rooms had to do with storage. They're really worried about storage costs and exactly where they're going to put these things. So I promised that I would ask whether Cornell could help with storage costs and help with abilities to find places to put stuff. I think a lot of students imagine their parents picking them up and driving them home with a car-load of stuff. That's not happening anymore on the new timeline, and I think a lot of them are going to really struggle to be able to fund that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, there will be some instruction about how much you have to empty your room. I'm not sure what it is right now. I think it was Ithaca College said take all your critical stuff. So you want clarity on what exactly you have to remove from your dorm room and then where might it go.

SUMAN SETH: And how they might be able to afford storage. Most of my students are actually talking about paying for storage. They didn't tell me that there was some distinction

between how much they were packing up. They were told to pack up their rooms. They don't know when they're coming back, so there's -- it seems strange to me. I didn't think of it at all, but they were actually -- they are in the middle of packing, so they don't know what they're doing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: A Zoom question?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ken Birman. Some students have serious financial stress. They may not be able to afford other accommodations if they are asked to leave the Cornell dorms for which they paid for the whole semester. Are we turning people out on the street who would have no funds to live elsewhere?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I don't have the answer, but I'll see if I can get -- yeah, it was a version of that question earlier. We have to pay attention to that. I think there's no surprise, there's so many details here that have to be taken into account. Okay, next.

BETH MILLES: Beth Milles from PMA. I have three specific questions. The first one was touched on earlier. Some of our students don't want to go home because they're entering areas where there's a proliferation of illness already. How do they manage that? Are they being forced to go to an area in Westchester, where there already is more illness than there is here?

The second question is about time zones. I'm sure this has been addressed, and I'm sorry if it's already in what's been shared, but how do we manage Zoom classes in a time zone such as California, if we teach a morning class?

And the third one is this morning in class, a lot of students came in upset about something they called akin to riot behavior on North Campus. Not angry riot behavior, but the behavior of students who were coming to buy and spend all of their money that they had left on their food allotments and were going to stores. And there were long lines and they were taking everything out of stores.

And I didn't know what had been shared with leadership, and there was a lot of anxiety and upset in class this morning about it, so I just don't know how to address or answer that question. They don't know the answer to what to do about that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Those are all good points. I can just comment on the middle one, because I got a comment from a faculty member about if you teach, do you have to teach at your same time. And we need rules about that. We need rules about I have a prelim Tuesday after spring break, can I move it before the spring break. Please send me all kinds of queries like that, okay. Thanks.

Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, English. I learned today from a student who was part of a group discussion with Ryan Lombardi that students will not be reimbursed for their housing or any prorated basis. I wonder about that. So if faculty or staff get quarantined, we are on paid leave. So just thinking about the logistics of pay and -- is that fair? At least it's storage space, if they can't stay there.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. So the key thing in all this is there might be some reticence from an office in Day Hall to come out with a pronouncement. These things have to be consistent messages laid out. I'm sure that prorating your dorm fee and so on, I'm sure it is going to be part of the picture.

Anything else? Okay, so again, just to go back, you can send me questions personally or you can post them. I think it's very useful to put things up on the website, so others can look at them and pay attention to that website, because I will be putting stuff there myself. But again, there's a great effort now to have consistent messaging, like each dean is sending things to their students, and those messages are being cleared centrally to make sure it's consistent. Of

course, every college has a different scene, whatever. Any way that I can help, please contact me, because this is -- well, none of us have ever seen anything like this.

Finally, any other -- okay, so I'm going to run through like 50 slides, when things were nicer, I was hoping to talk about, but now we --

SPEAKER NELSON: I will take care of that very quickly.

RICHARD BENSEL: I want to speak to this.

SPEAKER NELSON: Come on up. Do it quickly, because --

RICHARD BENSEL: Because we should reset this, since we agreed to go on. Look, one of the problems that we have with the agenda, the regular agenda of the UFC is that it eliminated any discussion of the super-departments resolution. Between the last meeting and this meeting, the provost has unilaterally declared a policy without the advice or discussion of the Faculty Senate.

That was the primary point, motivating factor behind the alternative agenda. That should be clear, as we decide which agenda to follow. Thank you.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, thank you.

Okay, we have to decide which agenda we're going to use. We'll have a vote again. We have a motion -- Richard, do we have a motion? Same motion as --

RICHARD BENSEL: We didn't have a quorum.

SPEAKER NELSON: Now we have quorum. Now we have quorum. So all those in favor -
- how should we phrase the motion, Richard?

RICHARD BENSEL: The motion is to replace the agenda proposed by the UFC with the alternative agenda, which you have in front of you.

SPEAKER NELSON: All right, thank you. Okay, all those in favor of that motion, please raise your hand.

Yeah, replace the current agenda that was posted by the UFC with an alternative agenda that was distributed by Richard.

Yeah, so to be clear, we're voting should we replace it with Richard's suggestion. So all those in favor of replacing the motion that was posted with this alternative motion, please raise your hand.

All those opposed?

Does the motion pass or fail?

The other way around, yeah. So the motion fails. We'll continue with the agenda that we've been advanced. Good. Go ahead.

Okay, do we have a motion to discuss the fossil fuel divestment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So moved.

SPEAKER NELSON: Okay, and come on.

BOB HOWARTH: Thank you. I'm going to briefly run through the resolution presented to the senate back in December by Caroline Levine. We also formally presented it at the February meeting and we discussed it some there. So let me just remind you, we have several sponsors for the resolution.

The goal, which is laid out by the trustees, if they are to consider divestment, is that the same resolution come from each of the five assemblies, including the Faculty Senate, to them. The resolution which is before you has been passed unanimously by the Employee Assembly, the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly and the University Assembly, and will be voted upon by the Student Assembly tomorrow.

We have several whereases. Global warming and climate disruption have accelerated since this last came before the trustees. We believe that fossil fuel use is a real threat to our

society and that fossil fuel companies nonetheless continue to mine and drill for new resources, which the world simply cannot use if we are to address climate change.

Cornell is a world leader in sustainability. We should all be proud of that. We need to maintain our leadership by favoring divestment. And I'll point out that since I spoke to this last month, Brown has announced they are divesting, so we can't even any longer be the first of the Ivies, but we can at least do it in the same semester. The trustees have established ground rules for divestment. We believe that our resolution and the supporting document that the Campus Infrastructure Committee at the University Assembly put out, and it's been available since November, reaches those, including the fact that the fossil fuel industries have acted in a morally reprehensible manner by suppressing the truth about climate change and actively working to undermine progress on that.

The actual resolution is this, it's very simple, which is how we hope to get it to all the assemblies, including the senate: Be it resolved that Cornell divest from all investments in coal, oil and natural gas in an orderly manner and as rapidly as possible.

And I would like to invite -- we have three student leaders from the divestment movement. The start towards divestment at Cornell goes back decades now, but the students have been in a leadership role, and I would like to ask Katie Sims, Julian Kroll and Indigo Pavlov to come here to the podium and very briefly tell you the student perspective on this. Thank you.

KATIE SIMS: Hi. I'm Katie Sims, and I think Bob has already highlighted a lot of the important considerations here. There are a lot of different elements of it. So the one particular one I want to highlight today for you all is the connection to academic integrity.

The code of academic integrity means -- it outlines that we are responsible for having integrity in all of our dealings, and I think we've seen with increasing clarity in the past few years

since the last time divestment was considered, that fossil fuel companies have acted to present false information or partial information or to repress information that prevents the free exchange of knowledge and ideas. And I think that where there are a lot of different -- you can take a lot of different moral stances on a lot of different things. That is one of our clearest moral considerations at this university and a reason to consider it.

JULIAN KROLL: Hi. I'm Julian, from the Student Assembly. Thank you for having us. So when I brought this to students, a lot of the concerns that were directed to me were regarding whether or not this would have an actual impact on the fossil fuel industry, because there isn't much point in messing with our endowment if it's not actually going to have a tangible effect.

So I thought that was a pretty valid concern, and I looked into it. And until about 2019, there wasn't much data on the impact of divestment on fossil fuel shares, but I think a study was published last year which established with some confidence that divestment announcements and large-scale climate protests do decrease the shares of fossil fuel companies, which hopefully will incentivize fossil fuel companies to clean up their act.

The point is that what is at stake isn't necessarily the money that we have invested in the fossil fuel industry. It's the symbolic impact of divestment and the precedent in terms of market legitimacy, so thank you.

INDIGO PAVLOV: Hi. I'm Indigo Pavlov. I serve as the Vice President of External Affairs on the Student Assembly. So are you all familiar with the white gate in Collegetown? Yeah, oh, okay. It's like down on Eddy Street, okay. So the inscription on that gate reads: So enter that thou mayest become more learned, more thoughtful. So depart that daily thou mayest become more useful to thy country and to mankind.

And this quote, to me, represents the intersection of why divestment from fossil fuels meets all three of the board's criteria. As faculty, you have prepared cohorts of students to

enter what we call the real world and to make it a better place. At the same time, Cornell's investments are contributing to the demise of that world, destroying what we are supposed to be improving.

One of the factors that made me choose to attend Cornell two years ago was the university's commitment to environmentalism and our branding as the most sustainable Ivy League. Investing in fossil fuels is blatantly inconsistent with this principle and goes against such goals as reaching carbon neutrality by 2035. It also disempowers the climate science that Cornell is working to develop in units such as the Atkinson Center.

As soon as I got to Cornell, because of this, I sought election in the Student Assembly, running on a platform that included fossil fuel divestment, and now it seems fitting to watch this project come into fruition, along with the domino effect of peer institutions such as Brown and Georgetown that are committing to divestment at the same time. So I hope today you vote to send the resolution to the board of trustees, and I'd be happy to answer any questions about the student perspective of divestment. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

BOB HOWARTH: Are there any questions for the students or for me or for Caroline Levine, who is the lead author on the white paper, which if you have not read it, is a brilliant document. Questions, debate?

HAROLD HODES: Harold Hodes, Philosophy. I'd like to know whether Cornell has done anything to use its shareholder power in fossil fuel companies to encourage them to refocus their efforts in producing sustainable, environmentally good energy and moving away from fossil fuel energy. It was pointed out last time that it is possible for shareholders to exercise some influence on companies in which they hold shares, so I'm wondering whether Cornell has done a thing in that direction. Does anybody know about that?

BOB HOWARTH: Let me give a quick answer. We asked, after the last Faculty Senate meeting, and the university said they're not aware of actions that they've taken. The way the endowment is handled is that we set broad policies that then handed out to multiple contractors, if you will. It would be the responsibility of those people to act, if they wanted. The university has not directed them to do so.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And one more note on that point is the university has a voluntary disclosure about their sustainable investments in the American Association for Sustainability in Higher Education, and they have noted for the past several years that they do not engage in any sort of shareholder advocacy to promote sustainability.

JULIAN KROLL: I think a final note, most investments in the fossil fuel industry are facilitated by asset managers like Blackrock and Vanguard and State Street, and they have a track record of, I think, voting down 90% of sustainability-related motions at fossil fuel firms' share meetings, so I think we can trust that so long as we are making explicit movements to direct them to act sustainably, they will default to maintaining the status quo.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Apparently, between 1992 and 2019, every single shareholder resolution for the fossil fuel industry to investigate the relationship between fossil fuel use and climate change was rejected by the industry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Doesn't it seem a little hypocritical to be asking Cornell to divest in energy stocks, when we keep using it?

BOB HOWARTH: Cornell has made a commitment to be 100% carbon-free in our own energy use by 2035, and I believe we are on target to do that, so I don't think it's hypocritical in the least. This is consistent with our goals to both symbolize to the world, and ourselves become carbon-neutral.

JILL SHORT: Excuse me. I have a comment from Zoom. Buz Barsto would like to add a rebuttal to the point about the hypocrisy of fossil fuel usage, please.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Can you read his question or his rebuttal, or --

BOB HOWARTH: I thought I did a great job of --

JILL SHORT: Okay, so now we have Ken Birman: I have a question on this too. What I would ask is as we know, the world's demand for energy is currently much larger than the world's capacity to create power from solar and wind. In fact, the only real option available, other than fossil fuels, would be nuclear. Are the speakers advocating a massive shift to nuclear power? Wouldn't the issue of radioactive waste and the dangers of accidents be a concern?

Conversely, if they favor more use of solar and wind, shouldn't the resolution focus on incentives to do research on solar and wind? Are we doing all we can to make it feasible to shift the world away from fossil fuels?

BOB HOWARTH: I have my personal opinions on what an energy feature should look like, and it's also an area of research for me, and I'm a member of the New York State Climate Action Council that's charged by law with making this state fossil fuel-free; so I believe we can do it, but the resolution is silent on issues such as nuclear power. It's a very clear-cut resolution that we should divest from fossil fuels because of past actions of the fossil fuel industry and because of where we need to go in the climate. So I think the broader debate is not the right context.

SPEAKER NELSON: I think we're ready to vote. Do we have a motion to vote on the adoption of the fossil fuel resolution?

Okay, do we have a second?

Great. So I think we'll do the hands. That seems to be working. Mark, are you ready to count? You want to start with no?

We'll start with yes. All those in favor of the resolution, please raise your hand.

All those against the resolution, please raise your hand.

All those abstaining, please raise your hand.

Okay, the motion passes.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I just want to thank the three students and for all the students you represent for energizing this.

(APPLAUSE)

SPEAKER NELSON: Do we have a motion to discuss the withdrawal of the super-department resolution?

Okay, good.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So recall last meeting, we had the three resolutions. We got to two of them and, towards the end, the super-department resolution was tabled. Since then, of course, the provost made his announcement and before we got to meet again, so perhaps that is an issue. The UFC met last week, and it was our preference to pull the resolution.

And the reasoning is this: If one wants further senate action on this, it should come from the group most affected. Also, if one wanted a resolution to register dissatisfaction with the timing of the thing, that could be a separate resolution as well. So this doesn't preclude anything. It simply says we'd like to pull this resolution and clear the decks for anyone who wants to proceed. This requires a two-thirds vote. We should have discussion of this, yeah.

SPEAKER NELSON: If you would like to make a comment, yeah, come on up.

RICHARD BENSEL: I'd like to amend this motion to withdraw the resolution. And you have, on the back of the sheet I distributed, the amendment in the form of a substitute for this motion. In support of this amendment, it is clear that the provost -- let me read it.

The motion, after it's substituted, would read: Whereas, the provost has announced a plan to create super-departments in the social sciences before the Faculty Senate has discussed the issues raised in that plan. Whereas, the Faculty Senate, under university bylaws, must be consulted on major changes in educational policy before they are adopted. Resolved, the provost's actions violate university bylaws.

This is an unavoidable implication of the actions of the provost and the rights of this body. Must say, that has happened before. Probably before most of you senators were here, there was a corresponding action by the provost to create a college of business. And in that discussion and in those proceedings, the Faculty Senate would have had before it a resolution to censure the president of the university. I think that would have passed; but the president, in the interim days before the meeting, unfortunately passed away.

These things happen with some regularity. I think this is a mild statement of the faculty senate's rights in this case. That's the motion.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you. Any other comments on the motion or on the amendment?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I have a question. Should we vote on withdrawing? And if the will is don't withdraw, then we amend your thing to the -- okay, all right.

SPEAKER NELSON: All right, any other comments on this? It just doesn't look like there's any other comments, so we'll deal with the amendment first. He's offered an amendment, he stated it. That's what we are voting on, whether or not to support that amendment or not, okay?

Ready, Mark?

My understanding, Richard, is the amendment is what you read. We're voting on the amendment.

RICHARD BENSEL: To add it to the resolution or --

SPEAKER NELSON: Yeah. To amend the resolution. The word "amend" means to do that thing that Richard read.

RICHARD BENSEL: Parliamentary procedure can be really complicated.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Can't hear you.

RICHARD BENSEL: My point is not to make this complicated or that -- so that we don't uncover the will of the Faculty Senate. Technically, and then you could ask questions about it, technically, it is an amendment in the form of a substitute. It replaces the withdrawal with the language that you have before you on the sheet. When it does that, it also removes, if the amendment were adopted, it would then be a majority vote for adoption. It's the withdrawal that causes the two-thirds in parliamentary procedure.

So if the amendment I offered in the form of a substitute were adopted by a majority vote, then it would be before the Faculty Senate, that resolution would be before the Faculty Senate and would require only a majority vote because it would not be a withdrawal of the motion. Is that clear?

I'm sorry about this, but this is the only way we can get to the sense of the faculty is through the rules.

SPEAKER NELSON: I think we understand. Very well-put. So everybody knows what they are voting on. We are voting on the amendment. If you support Richard's amendment, raise your hand.

And if you vote no against the amendment, you don't like the amendment, you don't want to vote for it, raise your hand.

And if you want to abstain, please raise your hand.

It passes. The motion passes. Richard, do you want to say something?

RICHARD BENSEL: Just to be technical, all we have done is replaced that motion with my amendment. We haven't adopted my amendment yet. We can do it this way --

SPEAKER NELSON: So just to be technically correct, we are now going to vote on whether or not we should adopt Richard's amendment as a motion. All those in favor?

Okay, Mark.

All those against?

All those abstain?

Motion passes, okay.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Grade change.

SPEAKER NELSON: Do we have a motion to discuss?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a motion to amend it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's present it first, then you can amend it.

SPEAKER NELSON: Yeah, we'll present it, then you can say okay, here's how I want to amend it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: David Delchamps?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Once again, last spring, we learned that there were things going on that we didn't know about. These retro Ws were being applied to people's transcripts, Fs were being changed to Ws after Fs had been entered on the transcript, things like that. And obviously, we didn't know about it and, therefore, we didn't have oversight a fortiori. So we took up this matter over the ensuing nine months, and the first thing that happened was that -- I guess this is from the UFC? Oh, you just left the final thing, yeah, good.

So the UFC passed a resolution, or the senate passed a resolution from the UFC last May saying that we should at least hear about these things after they were done, but we didn't think that was enough, so we went to work with the associate deans -- I, along with several faculty

members, and the associate deans. I, representing the EPC and our interest, as best I could -- and we came up with something better, and that's what it is.

Essentially, there are some retro Ws that we're not entitled to know hardly anything about, and all we get in those cases is assurance from some authority figure in the college that protocols were followed, et cetera, et cetera. All the other ones, which apparently constitute the majority of these retro Ws, we have to give our approval before they are implemented on the transcript. And that's about as good as it's going to get for faculty oversight of these things.

So that's the resolution we introduced at the last meeting. And on a point of order, the voting was postponed till this meeting, and here it is.

Carol says there's another -- oh, yeah. This is the ones we are not entitled to know a lot about. This is the instructor approval must be obtained for the non-sensitive ones. So that's our resolution.

SPEAKER NELSON: Are there any comments or amendments?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you, yes. I'm Joanie Mackowski, in English. I would like to propose this following amendment: To allow the retroactive W of an F in cases that are not legally private, but that also clearly do not infringe on an instructor's rights and responsibilities. I'm concerned that these retroactive Ws, that they're not about cheating necessarily, and they're not about eroding the faculty's rights and authority. I actually believe that many, maybe even a majority, of these retroactive Ws may be to correct obvious oversight.

An example; imagine a freshman international student in A&S, whose first language is not English. A&S has a language requirement. The student enrolls in a language course to fulfill it. However, the student subsequently learns that the course is not necessary, due to the student's language placement test score. The student either forgets to drop the language

course or doesn't realize it's necessary to drop it, assuming that someone is going to drop them from it, and the student gets an F.

So this stuff happens a lot. And in a case like this, if the instructor that issued the F says no, the F must stay, this is an appropriate punishment for your absent-mindedness or whatever, that's not realistic. Nobody's going to say that, I hope.

And then also, by the time the committee or whatever is dealing with this issue -- it's not always easy to contact the instructor in A&S. By the time the academic records committee is meeting to consider this instance of a retroactive W, the instructor might be on leave. Yet, because of this F, the student is on academic probation now and this affects how the student approaches the upcoming semester.

So this resolution, while it is protecting our rights and responsibilities, it's also creating a rigmarole for the people trying to resolve an understandable situation.

Also, the registrar states that the quality point equivalent of an F is 0. So Fs are not really an evaluation of a student's work. They mark the lack of it, except in cases of academic integrity hearings, when an F is a punishment or a sanction. So I'd like to allow retroactive Ws of Fs in cases that are not legally private, but they're also clearly not infringing on instructors' rights and responsibilities.

So this is how I would amend it. Additionally, it's adding a paragraph above that one, yeah, above that paragraph. Additionally, when the grade to be replaced with a W or expunged altogether is both, one, an F and, two, not a sanction resulting from academic integrity proceedings, the college associate dean for academic affairs or equivalent position will inform the instructor of the impending transcript change before it is made, will explain to the instructor that university protocols, including appropriate consultation, were followed.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Okay, I would like to respond to that briefly, and others may wish to add. First of all, the academic integrity ones are covered under another umbrella, so that's nothing to worry about.

Second of all, it took a long time to come up with appropriate text, in consultation with colleges and associate deans, and this is about as tight as it's going to get. You may say what about those cases where the faculty member's on leave. These are boundary cases, these are tiny instances that rarely happen.

And if a faculty member did say no, that's conceivable, we envision the department chair of the faculty member getting involved, like the college authority says look, this person is standing in our way and this is obviously what we should do. So those, in my opinion, are not cases that warrant a major textual revision of this, based on my experience helping negotiate it. Now, that's just my response to it, and I'll leave it at that.

SPEAKER NELSON: Any other comments? Do you mind walking to the microphone?

DAVID ZAX: David Zax, Chemistry and Chemical Biology. My department is actually the one where this first arose a year ago, the discussion about what was going on. And it's been frustrating to listen to all of the discussion about the cases that we're not allowed to hear anything about because they're legal issues, they're medical issues; the cases of someone who didn't show up and nobody thought that it was important to actually ask the professor if no one showed up.

Almost all the cases we can identify are neither of those two. They're cases where somebody in one of the college offices really didn't want someone to get an F, even though that's what they earned, and some parent called up and was angry with the faculty member, and then went on to the associate deans.

Part of what I'm frustrated by is that we don't have very good information, and that this is the kind of policy which, when I read it, I say this is lovely as the reading goes, but I also am perfectly aware that there are all kinds of petitions which require faculty signatures, either as advisors or instructors, which routinely the college offices ignore when we don't put our signatures on them.

So one of our other classes, we have a faculty member who won't sign withdrawal petitions after the withdraw date. And one of the colleges routinely just goes ahead and does it anyway, and they say we just don't worry about the fact that he's not happy about this. So it makes me a little uncomfortable, because it gives a level of discretion to people who I don't always think of as working in good faith.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: We have no control over the process now. The practice occurs, it will continue to occur and, now, according to this, we do. You say that maybe this doesn't have teeth, that people will ignore it. Well, I think we have to start from a position where we trust that everyone involved in this noble enterprise has everyone's best interest at heart and we have to work together. And I think this is a positive kind of working together. Now, bad actors may exist in these college offices. I don't know what we're going to do to --

DAVID ZAX: Primarily, this was a statement against the proposed amendment. Beyond that, it was a request which says why has it taken a year and we still don't actually have any facts as to how often this happens, under what circumstances.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: We can ask for such facts, but this is about the future, not about the past. That's the way I look at it.

SPEAKER NELSON: First of all, we have to vote on the amendment, and then we'll see what happens.

Yeah, is there a motion in favor of the amendment? Yes? Second it? Okay.

All those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand.

All right, all those against.

All those abstain.

All right, so the motion fails. The amendment fails.

Oh, there's a second amendment. Let's hear the second amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER(Bryce Corrigan?): Okay, so we call the resolution of November 13, 2019, which mostly hasn't been discussed. Basically, we resolved that the university work with the Faculty Senate to incorporate changes that allowed faculty involvement in setting the grading policy and the retroactive grade change policy.

So my faculty's main concern is that if this resolution passes, because the involved faculty, who are informed of grade changes, are unlikely to report incidents to us, we won't actually know the continuing scope and scale of the problem.

So it speaks directly to what the gentleman in the back spoke about. And particularly, we know that there are really problematic cases. Roughly five cases per semester involve Title IX, University Council or Cornell Health. And in these cases, grades are changed without the consent of the instructor. Now, those instructors aren't going to come forward and talk to us, and so I would suggest that we actually need to gather this information. So my resolution, my proposed amendment to the resolution to clarify grade change protocols is to augment the "be it resolved" text, the outer text with the statement of the senate.

Additionally, in order to facilitate the essential role of the Faculty Senate in supervising policy related to grading, each academic unit shall report and the dean of faculty shall convey to the Faculty Senate annually the total counts retroactive grade changes originated by the Cornell Health, Title IX Office, the University Council, or through any other means, respectively, along

with the general explanation of the respective reasons for such change, whether by administrative mechanics or by faculty consent.

So basically, we want at least four numbers, but possibly more, if they want to give us other reasons. Along with those numbers, they are going to give us the reasons, the general reasons for each of the general category of change.

So the amended resolution allows us to learn at least the counts. It is possible for the units to provide us with more information, possible for the senate to ask for more information in the future. And finally, the real impetus here is that if we learn from further reporting that the number of administrative interventions increases beyond five, depending upon the reasons given, we may want to revisit this issue in the future. Thank you.

SPEAKER NELSON: Are there any comments on this proposed amendment?

MIKE WYSOCKI: Mike Wysocki, in Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. What do you mean by the reasons? Do you want an explicit reason why mental health came up with their decision as to the diagnosis or what you want from Title IX? Or is the number sufficient?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER(Bryce Corrigan?): So the number was important, but also if, for example, there was some -- so I have been informed that in some cases, the Colleges Committee disagrees with one of the offices. And the college might want to offer, for example, two different categories, one with oh, University Council said this, but we said the other thing, and this is what was done.

And so what -- if they want to offer that count, that's fine, as long as what we're being given is a count of at least three general categories of cases and any other cases that they want to report with just a general reason. So not every single specific case and its reasons because, of course, those things cannot be revealed, for privacy reasons.

MIKE WYSOCKI: So for privacy reasons, you can't give the reason.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER(Bryce Corrigan?): You cannot give a case-specific reason. You can give a general reason, like the Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX Office said that there was a conflict of interest and an instructor could not assign in a particular case.

I understand about five of these cases are involved per year, so these are serious cases we need oversight over, as a senate. And the first step in oversight is not just passing this general policy, but that conveys the sense of the senate and the resolution of the senate, but also to continue to gather data and know exactly how many of these different cases are happening.

MIKE WYSOCKI: So if there are 30 cases, and they say -- sexual, that's what you want, right? You want the reason being that there was sexual abuse or something, the six cases?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (Bryce Corrigan?): All that is required is that they would say the Title IX Office was involved.

SPEAKER NELSON: Excuse me. We have to move on. We just don't have time for a long, involved dialogue.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government. It needs a second, so I second. I want to point out that it's been ten months, at least nine months since we first adopted a resolution on this. We have had no one from the central administration come before this body to explain their policies on grade changes. We have had no declaration information.

One of the categories here that you should really be interested in is the University Council one. I mean, what is that? Why is the University Council involved in grade changes? And I want to underline what we said in the fall and last spring: Grading is a primary fundamental right and responsibility of the faculty. The fact that we cannot get any information on how and if, what ways that is being infringed, is a very bad thing.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you. Any other comments at this time? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER(Carol Grumbach?): -- (Off mic) Associate Vice Provost. I'm one of the people who was involved in the drafting of the resolution and on the academic policies working group that studied the underlying issues. I tried to do an exhaustive analysis, and I do have the statistics. There are just a handful of cases a year that involve one of these three offices.

I do not think it's appropriate to come before a public body and say that one of those five cases involves the Title IX office. Although it's unlikely, it is possible that people in the room or people reading the minutes can identify who the individual is.

Other cases involve administrative error typically, that it takes a long time to process the paperwork. The staff are overworked in the registrar's office, takes them too long to process the paperwork. A student is asked to be dropped, the professor has approved that the case is dropped, then the paperwork's not filed. And those cases will be fully transparent so that the faculty will be able to not only understand the basis for the request for the retroactive W, but to decide whether to grant the retroactive W.

So in a nutshell, what I'm trying to say is we really did try to circumscribe the number of cases where faculty do not retain their prerogative, are not involved in the decision-making. I plead with you please not to demand that it be publicly announced what those cases are about.

I'd also say it would be a little bit ironic if the cases that involve -- we had most of the cases are error due to overworked staff or what not, and there are about 40 of those a year, and we're talking about 120,000-plus grades a year. So the number of cases are so small. But anyway, we would just add to their workload by now telling them that you have to gather statistics and reasons on every single case. I did it myself, as I said, for one year to try to get a sense of it, and it took me hours and hours and hours. I don't feel that it's necessary, so that's it.

SPEAKER NELSON: Thank you. Do you have a response?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do thank you for speaking to this, but I have been told that it's only maybe -- that this time it maybe would only take five hours of work for the year's worth of data, and I think there's no reason for us to not know that a certain number of cases involved a particular office. I mean, we should be looking at ourselves and being honest about the situations that are arising and making sure that we address those, if the numbers of these cases increase.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, so I'm strongly against the amendment. Here's some reasons, in no particular order: First of all, shared governance takes work. We worked through the senate, through the EPC, and David worked with the players. The associate deans, they deal with the committees in each college that deal with academic actions. If you want to have enforcement, you have to have people feel they're part of the resolution. They are a part of this resolution.

I'm a data-driven guy. I love the idea that data will inform our decisions, but this is not going to help. What would those statistics tell you? I can't think of anything they would tell us.

Also, you say oh, just four numbers. Well, there are ten colleges. That means our office has to get 40 numbers, and do we want to spend our time on that? Does the senate want to spend time on this kind of data, when there are other things much more important that are undermining the integrity of the grading process? For example, academic integrity; for example, faculty bias. Do we want to spend time on this and let the -- it's important, but there are other things that are much more important.

Also, the mechanism in place here is a faculty member will see things. So if a faculty member sees an override that they are unhappy with, they know they can come to my office. That's the check on the system.

Now, I know in Chemistry, I'm sure Professor Zax has seen some bad stuff, but I don't share that cynicism. We have to, again, be positive about this and not create a problem where there is none. The numbers here are tiny, absolutely tiny, and there's never been a policy.

I keep hearing oh, let's get someone from Day Hall to say what the poll is, if there's some subbasement office there dreaming up this stuff. There was no policy. And now there is. It's our job to provide guidance to these offices, and now we have it. There was none before, and stuff happens. We heard about stuff, now we acted on it. So I'm not in favor of this amendment and hope that we pass the main one.

SPEAKER NELSON: You want to respond at all? No? We're running out of time, so I'd like to vote, if that's possible. We're going to vote on the amendment. We have a motion, we have a second. All in favor of this amendment, please raise your hand.

All those opposed?

All those that abstain?

The amendment fails. Now we have to vote on the main motion. Do we have a motion on the main one? Do we have a second? Okay, good.

All right, all those in favor of that motion, please raise your hand.

All those opposed, please raise your hand.

All those abstain, please raise your hand.

So the motion passes. Okay, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: This came up briefly at the last senate meeting. There was no discussion. It may be because people think it's a difficult thing and we need more time. So is there a motion to consider this? We have ten minutes to wrap this up, if we can.

SPEAKER NELSON: It's not very much time, but ideally, we can at least start it. So is there a motion to discuss the if teacher is family member resolution?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Second? Okay, here's the gist of it. First of all, this does happen, as I mentioned before. There are about 280 student undergraduates who have a parent who's either a faculty or a staff member, so it does come up every so often. The idea here is, of course, conflict of interest and that if stuff happens, some kind of recusal plan, perhaps thinking a little bit about 6.3. This would hang off of the conflict of interest policy. We'd have an explicit mention of this.

It would sort of go like this: So the only way that you can have a family member at the board is the course has to be required and it was impossible to find a substitute. And second, the student and the instructor just can't juggle their schedules so there's no collision.

If both of these conditions are satisfied, then there has to be a recusal plan. It's sort of easy, if it's a big course, to off-load things to, say, a TA; but in any case, that has to be written down and signed by the players and the chair.

So it's just a small, little thing. We had no data on how often there'd been abuses, but let's just get some clarity. It was proposed by a professor who had seen some things that looked a little fuzzy, so we thought why don't we do this, just to be absolutely clear. So do --

SPEAKER NELSON: Do we have a motion to vote on the if teacher is family member resolution? Do we have a second?

Yes, so we should have a discussion. Feel free to come up to the microphone, if you have a comment.

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: Can we go back to the resolution? Jonathan Russell-Anelli, SIPS, Soil and Crop Sciences. I think the number one point is somewhat problematic because "no substitute courses," that is not clear enough. I know it sounds like it is clear, but it is not because there's a lot of room, wiggle room for what a substitute course might, in fact, look like or be.

I teach science courses, and there's a lot of wiggle room we use for people that can't take my core courses, which are, in fact, required courses and there's no way we can schedule, so we'll make up room for it. Not that I have any kids here, but I do have a problem with that, "no substitute courses are available." What does that actually mean?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You just outlined a situation where, in your unit, this is a DUS decision. The student is required to take -- what department are you in?

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: I'm Crop Sciences.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: -- Crop Science 1, but the powers that be, the DUS says okay, you can do Crop Science 2. So you just outlined a case where you seem to have a necessary flexibility.

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: I'm not necessarily comfortable with that, though. We do it because it's okay, we're going to do it, but I say that very facetiously. But I'm not necessarily sure that's the way we should be addressing it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: But it's local authority. It's your call. So if you say there are no substitutes, okay, and there's no schedule juggling.

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: So it's my course and it's my daughter. Who makes the call?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's the DUS. It's a local decision.

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: I think there's a little wiggle room in there that I'm --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: How would you change the wording?

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: I don't know. I'm just observing a problem.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seems to assume the worst of professors. Suppose a student wants to take a course taught by a family member that is not required by the student's degree

program. The relevant student just is interested in the subject matter and wants to take the course.

Surely, there should be ways to allow for that. For example, grading for that particular student in that course could be taken away from the professor teaching the course and put in the hands of either a colleague or a teaching assistant. It just seems to be overly draconian.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So students can audit courses, if they are elective, for example. Also, look, 1% of 1% of 1% of the faculty are bad actors. We have to have like a research misconduct policy. You can't walk into that saying this assumes the faculty are all bad. So this hardly ever comes up. We're just saying let's be clear.

And think about the other students in the course. They're going to know there's some kind of relationship. Don't they deserve clarity on this? Don't they deserve to know that people are paying attention to it and there's a recusal plan?

JERY STEDINGER: Jerry Stedinger from Civil and Environmental Engineering. My son took my course.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There's your bad actors.

JERY STEDINGER: He heard about it a long time, it wasn't required by his program. He took it. The course is fortunately large enough that my TA just handled it, so I never saw things sort of at the end, that I didn't look. It wasn't my place to look.

So I sort of, like the gentleman ahead of me commented, let's not make a rule where we don't have to, but I love the last paragraph. There ought to be a written statement somewhere that recognized that we were doing it and here's how we addressed it. And if someone has a complaint, they should be able to find out what happened, but it shouldn't have to be required course in the program and all that other sort of stuff.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So you would prefer not to have the -- that any course.

JERY STEDINGER: I would just take the last paragraph, that if you have a family member in your course, you ought to recognize it and the department chairman have a statement that people can look at. Imagine it was a seminar with five people, and my son was in there and everybody knew it, we had a good time and discussed the topic. Is this a disaster? I mean, how often does this happen? Is he only going to manage to graduate because he got a C from me in the seminar course?

(LAUGHTER)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm back. I think maybe Point 3, I would support that. Just have something in there that says there needs to be blind grading or something like that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Do we have a --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would say Point 3 being we put in blind grading or --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Jerry's motion is to remove everything but the last sentence. Do we have a second?

How many people support that modification? How many don't? Pardon me?

SPEAKER NELSON: Here it is. It's 5:00 now. That's when we adjourn the meeting. This is going to have to carry over into a future meeting. Thank you very much.